

Latoya Blake-Griffiths
The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Date: 15 May 2025

Our ref: 69396/01/MLW/33776657v1

Your ref: APP/X5210/W/25/3363058

To Whom It May Concern

APP/X5210/W/25/3363058 - Final Comments

I write on behalf of the appellant, Johanna Ehrnrooth, in response to the Local Planning Authority's (LPA) statement and third-party comments submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in relation to this appeal.

LPA Statement

Paragraph 5.15 of the Council's Statement states that the purpose of Condition 4 is to preserve "*the particular character and qualities (i.e. the positive contribution) made by this particular site*".

Paragraph 5.15 goes on to state "*it was considered necessary to restrict the materials of the window frames to timber in order to preserve the positive contribution which it makes to the character and appearance of the conservation area (which is chiefly by reason of its C19th appearance, that appearance being made up of its architectural design, form, scale, evidential value and materials).*"

In arriving at these conclusions, the Council continue to resolutely ignore the range of existing fenestration materials at the property, including top hung UvPC windows, presumably because they didn't conduct a site visit to ascertain the existing appearance of the property.

This presumption is given further weight by paragraph 5.16 of the LPA statements which fails to recognise that the 'existing windows' referred to on the proposed drawings are not constructed from timber.

Redington Frogna Neighbourhood Forum

As with the LPA's statement the objection submitted by the Redington Frogna Neighbourhood Forum takes no account of the property in its current form. Furthermore, the quotes utilised make no reference to the materials being proposed by the removal of Condition 4.

Summary

Neither statement acknowledges the significant improvements being made to this part of the host property through the proposed works, including the reinstatement of the garage door and removal of concrete lintels, instead fixating on the proposed high quality, durable materials in place of the existing mismatched fenestration.

For the reasons set out above and within our Statement of Case, Condition 4 is considered to fail two of the six tests, being both unnecessary and unreasonable, and thus this appeal should be allowed.

Yours faithfully



Anna Snow
Planning Director