
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2016

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/Y/16/3154759

Yew Tree Cottage, Gangbridge Lane, St Mary Bourne, Hampshire SP11 6EP

- 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 and Mrs Farrell against the decision of Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01368/LBC, dated 19 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 June 2016.
 - The works proposed are the replacement of 13 single glazed Crittall windows with 13 double glazed Crittall windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for the replacement of 13 single glazed Crittall windows with 13 double glazed Crittall windows at Yew Tree Cottage, Gangbridge Lane, St Mary Bourne, Hampshire SP11 6EP in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 16/01368/LBC dated 19 April 2016 and the plans submitted with it subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
 - 2) No development shall commence until details/samples of the windows and the frames to be used in the works hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details/samples.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the architectural and historic significance of the listed building.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this detached, thatched house which is grade II listed. The listing description indicates that the oldest parts date from the 17th Century. However, the property has undergone a number of extensions which have added significantly to the original modest cottage.
4. The 13 windows which are the subject of this appeal are sited predominantly within the south-west elevation and 1 on the north-west elevation. None of these are contained within the original parts of the building but are within extensions dating from 1968, 1979 and 1983, according to information

submitted by the appellants and not contradicted by the Council. The appellants also point out that, within the various extensions there are 29 windows, 16 of which are Crittall double glazed (as proposed herein) and 13 are single glazed (the subject of the appeal).

5. The Council indicate that the 13 windows reflect the historic phases of changes made to the listed building and that their loss would represent the removal of historic fabric which is of interest. Although not stated in the reason for refusal, the Council's submitted documents offer some criticism of the appearance and form of the proposed double glazed windows due to the greater thickness of the frames and the appearance of 2 layers of glazing. However, in the same document they state that, if it were necessary to remove the existing windows then the proposed windows would represent an appropriate design "*being of a very similar design and made by the same manufacturer as the originals*".
6. It seems to me that the significance of this listed building derives predominantly from its age and historic building form, as well as its surviving thatched roof. The large accumulation of extended form is the subject of negative comments in documents produced by the Council and submitted by the appellants. Whilst I can understand that the evolution of a building can add to its significance it does not necessarily follow that all alterations and extensions do so. The 13 windows are all contained in relatively recent extensions and are not on parts of the building which face the oldest parts. The proposed replacements would be the same as the majority of the other windows on the various extensions. The existing single glazed windows may be reflective of the era in which they were installed but I do not see them as adding to the significance of the listed building. The Council states that the windows were recognised as contributing to the significance of the building; however, there is nothing submitted to support this statement. Furthermore, the fact that 16 other windows have been installed as double glazed as now proposed substantially weakens this point in my view.
7. I consider that the proposal would have a unifying effect on the extensions by the installation of matching windows. The greater thickness in the frames would only be marginal and the presence of 2 layers of glass is apparent elsewhere and in the majority of windows in the extensions. I find that the proposal would not result in the unacceptable loss of historic fabric and would not introduce elements which would negatively affect the significance of the listed building. Therefore, the proposal is not in conflict with Policy EM11 of the Local Plan 2011-2029 and it would preserve the architectural and historic interest of the listed building. For the same reasons, the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the St Mary Bourne and Stoke Conservation Area.

Conditions

8. It is necessary to ensure that the exact design of the windows is agreed by the Council and I shall include a condition which requires details and samples to be submitted and agreed; in this respect, the Council suggested a condition which specifies the manufacturer which I consider to be unduly specific and so I do not use their wording. I have made reference to the submitted plans in the wording of the consent and do not intend to specify the plans in a specific condition, as suggested by the Council.

Conclusions

9. The appeal is allowed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR