
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2016

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/Y/16/3156569

Highfield Lodge, Church Lane, Hook, Hampshire RG27 0LG

- 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 Ian Bowman against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00757/LBC, dated 2 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2016.
 - The works proposed are the replacement of existing wooden single glazed sash windows and a single glazed standard window all from the 1980s with matching wooden double glazed units.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this single storey lodge building which is said to date from the mid-19th Century. It is of an attractive design and is grade II listed and sits within the Heckfield Conservation Area. The property has been extended and this proposal relates to the historic core of the building.
4. I noted at my site visit that of the 8 sash windows, 6 have a more detailed design wherein the glazing bars are profiled and relatively slim and delicate. The remaining 2 sash windows have glazing bars which lack this detailing, are plain and appear heavier. The casement window is different again. Although it appears that there is agreement that these are not the original windows, there is dispute between the appellant and the Council relating to the design of the sash windows and how they may relate to the design of the original ones. There is no documentary evidence submitted with the appeal to substantiate either side of the argument. However, in my judgement the 6 sashes referred to above appear to have appropriate detailing and proportions which complement the age and style of the building. The other 3 less so.
5. The appeal is not accompanied by any detailed drawings or other graphical information regarding the proposed replacements. The appellant refers to his intentions and to a willingness to agree details with the Council, but there is a notable absence of any firm evidence by which to judge the appearance of the

proposal. Taking account of the fact that double glazed units often include wider glazing bars and other visible details which betray their function and modernity I am concerned that there is no evidence by which to make an informed comparison. Without such material I cannot come to the conclusion that the proposal would preserve the special interest of the listed building and I have a more general fear that there is a strong likelihood that it would not do so.

6. In relation to the presence of double glazing, I agree with the Council that this aspect of the proposal would compound the likely harm to the listed building. The highly uniform, flat appearance and the double surface would be at odds with the single glazed windows which are in character with the listed building and in its most historic part.
7. I have taken account of the appellant's comments relating to thermal efficiency; although this has not been quantified by the appellant, I consider that any benefit in this respect would be far outweighed by the harm to the listed building. My attention was also drawn to some elements said to be UPVC on the existing frames of some sashes. In my view these are very minor details compared to the windows as a whole and would not justify the proposal.

Conclusions

8. Overall, I consider that the presence of double glazing within the historic part of this listed building would be an unacceptable replacement for the single glazed window units. In addition, whilst I have doubts that double glazed units could be appropriately designed for this building, there is no detail for me to be able to be sure that what is intended would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the building.
9. I judge that the harm arising from the proposal would amount to 'less than substantial harm' as set out in paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Having taken account of all other matters, including the age of the existing windows and the prospect of greater thermal efficiency, I find that there are no public benefits which are sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified. The proposal is contrary to saved Policy 17 of the Hart District Council Local Plan and, as a consequence of the above, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR