
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2019

by S J Papworth DipArch(Glos) RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/Y/19/3227675

29 Church Street, Steyning, BN44 3YB

- 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 Miss Liz Carboni against the decision of Horsham District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/18/2181, dated 29 October 2018, was refused by the Council by notice dated 21 December 2018.
 - The works proposed are replacement of windows in rear addition with Residence 7 Heritage frames and glazing.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Reasons

2. The building is listed Grade II and the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the works on the historic and architectural significance of the building. Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any special architectural or historic features it possesses. These duties are reflected in Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework on cultural and heritage assets and although section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 on the primacy of the Development Plan does not apply to listed building consent applications and appeals, this policy is a material consideration. Paragraph 193 of the 2019 National Planning Policy Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
3. The 6 windows that are proposed to be replaced are within a later rear addition to the historic building, 2 within a flat-roofed linking part and the remaining 4 within a longer and wider hipped-roofed addition further from the main house. Whilst the flat-roofed part has limited if any significance, it has the benefit of being low and unassuming, and the hipped-roofed part is well detailed, with bonnet tiles over flint-faced walls with brick quoins and reveals. The windows to these later parts are metal framed within timber sub-frames and as such are slim in section and are not confused with the truly historic parts of the house.
4. It is acknowledged from inspection that the present windows are at or reaching the end of their economic life, and they would have a poor thermal performance with extensive cold-bridging through the metal frames, together with likely draughts, even where still capable of being opened. The Council

accept the principle of their replacement but object to the nature of what is proposed.

5. The reference in the Reason for Refusal to them being '*in the context of the historically significant rear elevation of the cottage*' is not a misunderstanding of the significance of the addition, as the truly historic rear elevation is close-by, and the lack of a public view of this area is not decisive in the listed building consent regime as such buildings, along with their setting, are to be preserved for their intrinsic architectural or historic significance. The rear elevation displays a high level of significance.
6. A sample of the proposed window was available for inspection and it displays the flush fitting of casements that were seen on the front of the main house, but the frame size appears out of proportion for some of the masonry opening sizes and would impart an over-emphasis of solid to glazing. The use of glazing bars would follow that already in place, except for the larger kitchen window where an alternative appears to have been offered with no intermediate bars. The sample showed the use of individual glass panels but with a significant void in the double glazing where the spacer was prominent.
7. The Council were critical of the hinge method, although the sample had a no-gap hinge rather than the modern folding hinge that allows cleaning from the inside of casements, and the use of a top hung casement in the larger kitchen window would avoid the present clash with the gutter.
8. However, the replacement of the slimline metal windows with the thicker PVCu product with a wood grain, would appear over-assertive and out of proportion with the later addition and as such would cause harm to the setting and appreciation of the main listed building. The attempt to mimic the style of historic windows would not be accomplished successfully due to the change in profile, the style of glazing, the uncharacteristic visible graining and use of material, and would risk confusing the role of the later addition with that of the main listed house. The proposal would therefore cause harm to the historic and architectural significance of the listed building and its setting.
9. The level of harm would be 'less than substantial', a differentiation required between paragraphs 195 and 196 of the Framework. In this case the latter applies and this states that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.
10. There does not appear to be any risk of the building in this location falling out of its beneficial use as a dwelling and whilst there would be public benefits in the improved thermal performance, this must be balanced against the need to preserve truly historic structures, as well as the likelihood that a less assertive, thinner frame profile could be found.
11. The conclusion is that the harm is not outweighed by the public benefits and that the proposal is contrary to national and local policy as well as statute, that seek the preservation of heritage assets. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

S J Papworth

INSPECTOR