
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 2 November 2021

by Jonathan Hockley BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 November 2021

Appeal A: APP/G2815/W/21/3271671

Tensor House, Main Street, Tansor PE8 5HS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Rupert Cadbury against the decision of East Northants District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01715/FUL, dated 22 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as the repair of two ground floor windows and the replacement of five upper floor windows including the installation of slimline double glazed units.
-

Appeal B: APP/G2815/Y/21/3271668

Tensor House, Main Street, Tansor PE8 5HS

- 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 Rupert Cadbury against the decision of East Northants District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01716/LBC, dated 22 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 February 2021.
 - The works proposed are described as the repair of two ground floor windows and the replacement of five upper floor windows including the installation of slimline double glazed units.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is allowed and planning permission is granted for the repair of two ground floor windows and the replacement of five upper floor windows including the installation of slimline double glazed units at Tensor House, Main Street, Tansor PE8 5HS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01715/FUL, dated 22 December 2020, subject to the conditions set out at the end of my decision.
2. Appeal B is allowed and listed building consent is granted for the repair of two ground floor windows and the replacement of five upper floor windows including the installation of slimline double glazed units at Tensor House, Main Street, Tansor PE8 5HS in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/01716/LBC dated 22 December 2020 subject to the conditions set out at the end of my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in both appeals is whether the proposal would preserve the special architectural and historical interest of the Grade II listed Tansor House

Reasons

4. Tansor House is a Grade II listed property sited at the heart of Tansor, a small linear village located just to the east of the River Nene. The listing notes that the House probably dates from the 17th century, although a datestone on the eastern gable has the date 1721 on it. The building is constructed with squared coursed limestone with ashlar dressings and a Collyweston slate roof and has an L shaped plan. The façade of the two storey with attic building is located very close to the street, and has two noticeable and attractive 2 storey canted sash bay windows (2 x 2) set around a blocked central doorway and upper window. There are two hipped roof dormers set above which do not follow the placement and rhythm of the windows below. The listing notes that windows in the façade are unhorned sash windows with glazing bars. There is much detail on the façade, including a chamfered plinth, a raised band between the storeys, moulded cornice and ashlar gable parapet and kneelers. The wing to the right rear is also thought to date from the 17th century.
5. Policy 2 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 (July 2016) states that proposals should conserve and where possible enhance the heritage significance of a heritage asset commensurate to its significance and complement their historic surroundings through form, scale, design and materials. The Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires special interest to be given to the desirability of preserving a listed building and any features or architectural interest it possesses.
6. The special interest and significance of Tansor House derives primarily from the quality of its architecture in its historic core, the detailing on its façade and its prominent setting in the heart of the village.
7. The proposal seeks to replace the windows on the façade of the building; with two at ground floor level, three at first floor and the two dormer windows. These are considered separately below.

Windows 1 and 2 – Ground floor

8. These canted bay windows currently serve a dining room and lounge respectively. Evidence submitted by the appellant notes that the upper three sashes on window 1 are original, although only two panes contain historic glass. Window 2 has retained more historic glass and was in slightly better condition than window 1 on my site visit, although rot was clearly evident in both windows. Given the presence of historic fabric in both windows the appellant proposes to repair/overhaul the existing windows, substituting individual timber elements where required.
9. The Council have no objection to the repair/replacement of these windows and based on all that I have seen and read I agree with this view.

Windows 3, 4, and 5 – First floor, and Windows 6 and 7 - Attic

10. Windows 3 and 5 are the upper canted sash windows, with window 4 being a flat sash window located centrally. It is stated by the appellant that the

windows were replaced in the 1980s, with the name of the local firm who carried out the works noted, although the Council state that there is no evidence that that is the case. From my site visit it was clear that all windows were in a poor state of repair, with window 5 appearing particularly poor. Rot was very evident in all windows, with mismatched and missing timber elements and evidence of water ingress.

11. Windows 6 and 7 are casement windows located in the attic of the property. Both windows are in a very poor state of repair and appear to require replacement urgently. The appellant provides the names of two local builders/joiners who replaced the windows in the 1980s and 1990s.
12. It was clear upon inspection that all windows were reasonably modern – with a date of around the 1980s seemingly likely. The window frames and the glass within them were not historic. I agree that all such windows require replacing and that given their condition repair is unlikely to be an option. The appellant proposes to replace such windows with slimline double glazing.
13. My attention is drawn to the Historic England document, 'Traditional Windows'¹. This publication notes that the loss of traditional windows from our older buildings poses one of the major threats to our heritage and that they are particularly vulnerable elements of a building as they are relatively easily replaced or altered.
14. Section 6.1 of this document states, in point 2 (page 62): "Where historic windows have already been replaced with windows whose design follows historic patterns, these usually make a positive contribution to the significance of listed buildings. When they do, they should therefore be retained and repaired where possible. If beyond repair they should be replaced with accurate copies."
15. It is clear that the design of the replacement windows followed historic patterns and that they make a small positive contribution to the significance of the building. It was also clear from my site visit that the quality of the wood in the windows is beyond repair, and therefore the guidance states that they should be replaced with accurate copies.
16. However, point 3 goes on to state: "Where historic windows or replacement windows of historic pattern survive without historic glass it may be possible to introduce slim-profile double-glazing without harming the significance of the listed building. There are compatibility issues to consider as the introduction of double-glazing can require the renewal of the window frame to accommodate thicker glazing, thereby harming significance."
17. In this case replacement windows of historic pattern without historic glass survive, and therefore slim profile double glazing may be possible but that compatibility issues are required to be considered.
18. The slimline double glazing proposed is of 12mm profile. Outer glass is proposed to be crown/cylinder style glass. The Council raise concerns that the increase in the size of glazing could increase the thickness of the timber members and this would be out of keeping with the original design of the windows and the existing ground floor units, noting that this can be particularly apparent in multi-paned windows. However, the appellant confirms that the

¹ 'Traditional Windows. Their Care, Repair and Upgrading', Historic England, Revised February 2017.

existing and proposed glazing bar thickness is and would be 18mm. Plans and sections confirm this and plans show that the design of glazing bars would match the existing Queen Anne profiles with weight pocket dimensions to match the existing windows with traditional lead weights. Given the evidence provided in my view it appears that compatibility issues can be resolved in this case and that the proposed replacement windows would not harm the significance of the listed building.

19. When weighing together all such issues, together with noting that it is only the upper floor windows which are to be replaced, I am of the view that in this instance the proposal would preserve the special architectural and historical interest of the Grade II listed Tansor House. Given the age of the current windows and the proposed design of the replacements the proposal would comply with the Historic England guidance, policy 2 of the Core Strategy, and with the National Planning Policy Framework which states that heritage assets such as listed buildings are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Conditions and Conclusion – Appeals A and B

20. I have imposed standard conditions relating to compliance with plans and time for implementation on both decisions, in the interests of certainty. I have amended some of the plan details from the Council's suggestions to make them accurate.
21. To summarise I consider that the proposals would preserve the special architectural and historical interest of the Grade II listed building. Therefore, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeals should be allowed.

Jon Hockley

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF TWO CONDITIONS FOR APPEAL A

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Heritage Impact Assessment – 14.12.20; Location Plan; 110 - Plans and Elevations; 1220 – Existing window photographs and stone sill detail; 1221 – Sash window details; 1222 Dormer Casement window details.

SCHEDULE OF TWO CONDITIONS FOR APPEAL B

- 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
- 2) The works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Heritage Impact Assessment – 14.12.20; Location Plan; 110 - Plans and Elevations; 1220 – Existing window photographs and stone sill detail; 1221 – Sash window details; 1222 Dormer Casement window details.