
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2020

by H Butcher BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/Y/19/3236856

**Hardings Farm, Selsey Road, Donnington, Chichester, West Sussex
PO20 7PU**

- 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 J Sellers against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref D/19/00350/LBC, dated 31 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 April 2019.
 - The works proposed are to replace 8no. windows to the north, east + south elevations on a like for like basis.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed works on the special architectural and historic interest of Hardings Farm which is Grade II listed.

Reasons

3. Hardings Farm is a Grade II listed L-shaped house. The south wing dates from the 17th century, and the south elevation of the south wing is heavily punctuated by a number of ground and first floor windows of varying sizes. Part of the significance of Hardings Farm is derived from the historic windows in the south wing in terms of their materials and craftsmanship. Furthermore, their aesthetic quality, derived from their age, also contributes to their visual interest. Consequently they contribute to the significance and special interest of the property.
4. At the time of my site visit the first-floor windows in the south elevation of the south wing had been replaced as well as the window in the east elevation and two windows in the north elevation of the same. The plans before me broadly show the windows as installed but do not show the trickle vents I observed on site, nor the protruding casements. For the purposes of this appeal I will assess the windows as installed.
5. At ground floor, in the south elevation of the south wing, timber, side hung, single glazed, casement windows with timber glazing bars remain in-situ. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary I will assume these are similar to that which the new windows replaced.

6. The replacement windows loosely replicate the more historic windows found in the south wing, but there are key differences. Firstly, they are double glazed which gives depth to the casements and is also visible through the glass. As set out above they also include trickle vents which are visible from inside and out, and overall the window frame and glazing bars have sharper, squarer, engineered edges in contrast to the more historic windows which have thinner puttied glazing bars which gives them an entirely different appearance. Again, as previously noted, the plans also show flush casements but on site these sit proud. When looked at in detail, therefore, the proposed windows are not a 'like for like' match.
7. I therefore find that the loss of historic windows and their replacement as proposed would cause harm to the special architectural and historic interest of Harding's Farm. It follows that the proposed works would also conflict with Policy 47 of the Chichester Local Plan 2014-2029 which seeks to conserve the historic environment. The harm I have found would be 'less than substantial' for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) given the scale and impact of the proposed works. As per para 196 of the Framework this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
8. The appellant states that the previous windows were beyond repair but there is no evidence before me that this was the case. I accept that the new windows have improved the internal living environment for occupants and might be more thermally efficient. However, there are alternative thermal upgrading options such as those set out in the Historic England document: Traditional Windows, Their Care, Repair and Upgrading which reduces the weight I can attach to these benefits. Such benefits would not, therefore, outweigh the harm that I have identified, which must be given considerable importance and weight in the balancing exercise.
9. That the windows are not visible from public viewpoints or that there were no objections to the planning application or appeal does not alter my findings above. As set out in the Framework heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource which should be conserved so that they can be enjoyed by existing and future generations.
10. The appeal is dismissed.

Hayley Butcher

INSPECTOR