

APPEAL CASE – FLAT 7, ROYAL APARTMENTS, HAYLING ISLAND, PO11 0AD

This Appeal seeks to overturn Havant Borough Council's, (HBC), refusal of Listed Building Consent, (LBC), to replace 6 No. Sash Windows in Flat 7 on the North side of the Royal, with new hardwood sash windows, including slimline double glazing, (DG). HBC says the proposal would be harmful to the architectural and historical significance of the building, resulting in less than substantial harm, at the low end of the scale, for which there are no public benefits arising. The following points rebut HBC's arguments:

1. Existing windows, now in poor condition, were probably installed during conversion to flats in the 1990's. No evidence of their history is available and they have no special historical significance.
2. Three precedents exist, (APP/11/01755, APP/16/01299 and APP/20/00783), where HBC gave LBC for installation of new windows including DG on the north, south and west sides of the Royal. The new windows on the south side of Flat 7, (APP/20/00783), blend perfectly with others in the building, are externally indistinguishable from the originals, have narrow glazing bars of the same width and preserve all architectural features and therefore the character of the Royal. Replacement windows proposed would be of the same design and would be installed by a company experienced in conservation. The character of the building and architectural features would be retained.
3. The views of the wider community were sought by Public Notice. No objections were raised. All owners at the Royal and the Management Company, support the proposal. Rather than being harmful, the proposal would be beneficial to the building, the public and the environment as the heritage asset would be sustained and enhanced.
4. The distinctive face of the Royal is on the south side. The north side setting is much less significant and is blighted by the adjacent Royal Shades, also listed, which has been derelict for many years. HBC has failed to remedy this situation. The north side is also cooler where good thermal efficiency is most important.
5. HBC follows advice from Historic England advocating repair rather than replacement. Most suggested measures to improve thermal efficiency - secondary glazing, blinds, curtains etc. are already in place and have proved ineffective and unsatisfactory. Opening and cleaning the sash windows is difficult. Ventilation is a problem and the windows are unsanitary with flies stuck in inaccessible places. While some windows might be repairable, the logistics and costs of repair are considerable. Making such an investment to achieve an unsatisfactory and inefficient result is not a realistic option. The only way to achieve a satisfactory, uniform, long term, cost-effective solution providing better thermal efficiency and fully functional windows while retaining the building's character and architecture, is replacement with DG.
6. HBC acknowledges the growing need for energy efficiency which will only increase. What is not appreciated is that a rigid, entrenched, over-zealous attitude to conservation will lead to an impasse where continued deterioration rather than conservation ensues. This harms the building, the public and the environment. The Royal Shades is an example.
7. The Inspector is invited to uphold the Appeal and grant LBC for the proposal which fully responds to the true spirit of conservation. HBC says Planning Permission is also required, duplicating what the LBC process covered, including the impact on the whole building. This will waste time and resources in HBC and cause additional expense and inconvenience. If the Appeal is upheld, confirmation is also requested that Planning Permission is not required for work to proceed.