
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 June 2019

by Patrick Whelan BA(Hons) Dip Arch MA MSc ARB RIBA RTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/Y/18/3205392

Dormer Cottage, Sandy Lane, Crawley Down RH10 4HS

- 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 Mrs U Carter against the decision of Mid Sussex District Council.
 - The application Ref DM/17/4480, dated 30 October 2017, was refused by notice dated 5 March 2018.
 - The works are the retention of secondary glazing units.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and listed building consent is granted for secondary glazing units at Dormer Cottage, Sandy Lane, Crawley Down RH10 4HS, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref DM/17/4480, dated 30 October 2017, and the plans submitted with it.

Preliminary Matters

2. The works were complete before I visited site. As they relate to a listed building, I have had special regard to section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed works preserve the Grade II listed building, Dormer Cottage (listed as East Cottage, Sandy Lane) and any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

4. Like the adjoining cottage under this listing, and its counterpart further along the Lane, Leighwood, this early C19 cottage exudes charm in the scale and arrangement of its architecture, and in its distinctive detailing. Alongside the engaged dormers, the steep gabled roofs with scalloped barge boards, and the decorated string courses and lintels, the cottage has delicate metal windows including some coloured Y-tracery and two geometric traced lights in pointed-arch openings. The windows are an intrinsic part of its historic and architectural significance.
 5. The secondary windows are the horizontal sliding sash type, installed with meeting rails aligning behind the primary mullions. In the front elevation, they are not, for the most part and except in close views, visible through the primary windows. What presence they do have is ordered in arrangement, and sensitive in section size, with the same colour as the primary windows. Given
-

the small size of the panes of the primary windows, reflections from the secondary glass is unlikely to disturb the elevation.

6. The sliding sashes appear to have been fitted all-round with some kind of timber sub-frame. While this has reduced the risk of any historic fabric being removed or damaged during fitting or removal, it has made the sliding sashes, particularly at cills, more prominent than might otherwise have been the case. Despite this, the secondary sashes are not so prominent as to disrupt the conspicuous lines, or detail of the slender profiles of the glazing bars of the primary windows or their delicate tracery. Indeed, in the two, pointed-arch openings in the front elevation, they stop behind the transoms at their springing lines.
7. The first floor windows at the front of the house, and most of those at the back are plain Crittall type. As with all the windows, these secondary sashes are visible from the outside to some degree. However, when viewed against the less delicate sections of the Crittalls, the secondary sashes are almost indistinguishable in views from the outside.
8. The primary windows in the side elevation appear to have thicker frames than those in the front. Here the secondary stiles and rails are barely distinguishable from the internal window reveals, and hardly visible in any view. The jambs of the only picturesque window in the back elevation are stout enough to hide the secondary stiles, as do their broad mullions. The bottom rails of the secondary glazing have more prominence, but against the cill and bottom rails of this primary window they do not disrupt sight lines or confuse the eye.
9. The secondary windows are noticeable from within the house but given their design, which shadows the framing of the primary windows, and their small section size, no more so than curtains or nets or other fittings. As secondary windows, and as an alternative to window replacement, a degree of visibility internally is not unreasonable, nor in this case, insensitive. I appreciate that their lines are smooth and machined, and they appear to be made of metal coated in plastic. However, this distinguishes them from the primary windows while their section size, regularity and finish are sensitive to them.
10. I appreciate that some elements of the secondary windows in some openings have a presence in views of the house. However, it is such a limited one that, in its context, the architectural significance of the windows would not be undermined. I therefore conclude that the works preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building, thus satisfying the requirements of the Act, paragraph 192 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and development plan policies insofar as relevant.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Patrick Whelan

INSPECTOR