
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 2016

by Nick Fagan BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y9507/Y/16/3158377

Greenfields, East Street, Hambledon, Hampshire PO7 4RX

- 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 Dr Marie-Louise Millard against the decision of the South Downs National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref SDNP/15/05787/LIS, dated 2 September 2015, was refused by notice dated 23 March 2016.
 - The works proposed are the replacement of the existing front entrance sliding sash window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and listed building consent is refused.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed replacement window would preserve this Grade II listed building and preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hambledon Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. Decision makers are required by statute in considering whether to grant listed building consent to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses¹.
4. The appeal property is a two-storey end of terrace house, one of three listed as a group in 1986. The listing description mentions sash windows in exposed frames, although the Council acknowledge that the window in question, immediately to the left of the front door, is not original. The sash windows are manifestly an important element of the terrace, which contribute to its significance as a listed building. It is also obvious by looking at the front elevation that the original opening was for a door, the brickwork below the existing window having been inserted more recently.
5. The existing window is slightly narrower than the windows on the western part of the front elevation but wider than the first floor window diagonally above it. It is three panes of glass wide and four high, which means that the panes are approximately square rather than having a vertical emphasis, as the other windows in the terrace generally do. The upper sash has horns which the older

¹ S16(2) Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

- windows in the terrace lack, and which are not an original feature. The Council accepts that it is beyond economic repair. As such there is no objection to its replacement in principle.
6. However, it is unclear exactly what type of window it would be replaced with. The drawings submitted with the application show single glazed windows of 4mm laminated glass with the same 3 x 4 glazing pattern as the existing window. In contrast, the appellant's statement of case says that the new window would be incorporate slim-line double glazing and be four panes wide rather than three. But I have no details of such a new window, including its glazing pattern, width and profile of its glazing bars, the colour and thickness of the spacers between the glazing panes or the overall thickness of the double glazing.
 7. The appellant has drawn my attention to Peartree Cottage and 3 and 4 East Street where slim-line double glazed windows have recently been installed. I agree with the Council that the circumstances of Peartree Cottage were different to the appeal property and so that comparison is invalid.
 8. I was able to see at close quarters the recently installed slim-line double glazed shallow bay window at Nos 3 and 4 (now one house), which occupies a similar prominent position on this principal thoroughfare of the village close to the appeal property. Its 22mm wide glazing bars with white spacers between the two panes of glass make it very difficult to actually detect that it is in fact double glazed unless one stands right next to it. As such this window successfully matches the others on the street and enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, as the Inspector in that decision stated it would.
 9. It is possible that a slim-line double glazed window with the same features would do the same at the appeal property, and also preserve or enhance the listed building. But since I do not have any details of the proposed window described in the appellant's appeal statement I cannot be sure that this would be the case.
 10. As such there is no certainty that the significance of the listed building would be preserved and the character of the Conservation Area preserved or enhanced. This would be contrary to national policy in Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. It would also be contrary to Policies HE5 and HE14 of the Winchester District Local Plan, the development plan, since such policies reflect national policy and are relevant material considerations in this case.
 11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should fail.

Nick Fagan

INSPECTOR