
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2013

by Mrs A L Fairclough MA BSc(Hons) LLB(Hons) PGDipLP(Bar) IHBC MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 November 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/E/13/2196242

Hodder Bank, Hodder Court, Knowles Brow, Stonyhurst, Lancashire BB7 9PP

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Darren Turner against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 3/2012/0792, dated 3 September 2012, was refused by notice dated 12 October 2012.
 - The works proposed are "the replacement of a wood front door and two side panels with a UPVC front door and side panels. UPVC material to be an antique wood grain effect i.e. the same as the other windows and doors at the property".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for the replacement of a wood front door and two side panels with a UPVC front door and side panels. UPVC material to be an antique wood grain effect i.e. the same as the other windows and doors at the property at Hodder Bank, Hodder Court, Knowles Brow, Stonyhurst, Lancashire BB7 9PP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 3/2012/0792, dated 3 September 2012, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The works hereby authorised shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
 - 2) The works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans and photographs dated 3 September 2012.
 - 3) Notwithstanding condition 2 no works shall take place until details of the proposed door have been submitted to and approved writing by the local planning authority, which shall include full details of the colour and finish of the door, sections of the frame and details of the glazing and ironmongery. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Background and Main Issue

2. Hodder Bank is a relatively modern rear wing of a larger building which together with Hodder Court, the Old House, Hurst Bank and Hodder Place make up a grade II Listed Building known as Hodder Place in the Statutory List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest. The building was formerly a house, of late C18th origins with early and late C19th and early C20th extensions, and then it became the preparatory school for Stonyhurst

College. I understand that it became listed in 1983. The Council states that the building was listed around the time of its conversion to houses and flats. However, the appellants state that it was listed after the buildings conversion. I have no conclusive evidence when the building was converted. Nonetheless the building is listed building and I am required to assess the impact of the proposed works on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

3. The Council refers to the proposal having an impact on the character, significance and setting of the listed building. In this case the works comprise the replacement of an entrance door. Thus what is proposed here is an alteration to a listed building, not development in its setting. On this basis the main issue is the effect of the proposed replacement door on the special architectural and historic interest (significance) of the listed building.

Reasons

4. Hodder Bank, a 3-storey house, forms part of the listed building and is located at the rear. It was built around 1927. I understand from the submitted evidence that it was originally part of the infirmary attached to the preparatory school. It is of modern construction and appearance with a rendered finish. The late 20th century conversion was undertaken when the building was in a derelict state and the evidence submitted indicates that parts of the building were demolished to accommodate the new residential use.
5. The proposed works comprise the replacement of an existing modern timber door at the main entrance. This is a modern off-the-peg door. The proposed door would be similar to the existing door in terms of its proportions and finish in that it would have a wood grain effect and it would have a central doorway and a non opening side window on each side. The replacement door would be a simple modern design, which would be an improvement over the clumsy modern design of the existing timber door. However, the proposed door would be made in UPVC with a UPVC frame and side windows.
6. The 19 windows and 2 glazed doors on the front and side elevations of the appeal property are all finished in wood effect UPVC. Consent was granted for these in 2006¹. The proposed door would be in a similar colour and finish to these so would create homogeneity in the appeal property. In addition there is a great variety in the finish, material and design of the other windows within the apartments/other houses in the listed building. Many of these are also UPVC finished in wood effect or white.
7. Given the location in a modern extension at the back of the listed building when combined with the variety of window materials within the other modern rear extensions of the listed building and the fact there is a large projecting first floor balcony immediately above the entrance, which casts shadow over the entrance area, the type of material would not easily discernible from the public footpath nearby especially in the context of the simple fenestration in a similar finish and design.
8. Overall whilst UPVC material is not normally favoured in heritage assets, it would not harm the significance of this heritage asset in this location.

¹ Application Ref: 3/2006/0278

Conditions

9. In addition to the time limit condition, the Council has suggested a condition relating to the specification of the doorway in terms of materials and appearance. I consider that such a condition is reasonable and necessary to ensure that the character and significance of the listed building is safeguarded. However, in the interest of precision I will alter the wording to include details and colour of finish and sections of the frames so that the works will reflect the existing UPVC windows and doors at the appeal property.

Conclusion

10. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed works would not harm the character or significance of the heritage asset. For the reason given above and having regard to all matters raised the appeal is allowed.

Mrs A Fairclough

Inspector