



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2022

by Mr JP Sargent BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N1920/Y/21/3273684

Glebe House, Church Lane, Aldenham WD25 8BE

- 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 Ms Yulia Romanenkova against the decision of Hertsmere Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/0151/LBC, dated 22 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 March 2021.
 - The works proposed are small pane window glass replacement from single glazed units to double glazed units in a c20 bay window insertion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and listed building consent is granted for small pane window glass replacement from single glazed units to double glazed units in a c20 bay window insertion at Glebe House, Church Lane, Aldenham WD25 8BE in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/0151/LBC dated 22 January 2021 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
 - 2) Unless otherwise amended under Condition 3 below, the works shall be in accordance with the *Historic Building Impact Assessment* dated January 2021.
 - 3) Prior to the commencement of the works, the details of the double-glazed units (including their width, glazing finish and internal beading) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, and the works shall then be undertaken in accordance with those approved details only.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is whether the works would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of this Grade II listed building and whether they would cause any harm to its significance as a designated heritage asset.

Reasons

3. Glebe House (called Glebe Place on the listing details) dates from the early 18th Century and was formerly a vicarage. It has a graceful and attractive frontage that is seen over an extensive garden area. Much detailing and many features are apparent on this elevation that reflect its period of construction and demonstrate its origins as a house of some status. In particular, most of the windows, with their vertical emphasis, their large panes and their relatively slender window bars, are of a style that is typical of housing built around this

time. These elements therefore add to its special architectural and historic interest, while its significance lies in its architecture and its aesthetic value, as well as its historic associations with the village's vicar.

4. However, on the ground floor to the right of the original front door are 2 windows that are of a markedly different style and form to the others on the elevation. These are bays with a notable horizontal arrangement that is emphasised by the relatively long tiled roof under which they sit. The bays themselves comprise numerous smaller panes in a thick-framed window structure, and this contrasts markedly with the light, open appearance of the other windows on the frontage. They therefore have a certain discordancy when compared to the rest of the elevation, unbalancing it to some degree. Despite this, they demonstrate the building's evolution over time and add to an understanding of its past, as I was told they date from the turn of last century when the house was extended.
5. Based on the appeal submissions, this proposal relates just to the smaller of these 2 bays (and not both). It is also to replace only the glass (and not any part of the frame), and I have nothing before me to show this would not be a practicable undertaking. As has been made clear above, its form and framing mean the character of this window (along with the one adjacent) is very different to that of the others on the elevation, and it does not reflect the original and dominant architectural style of the building. Moreover, I have no reason to consider the glass, of itself, adds to the historic significance of the dwelling while the bay's extensive timber framework means that any internal beading within each double-glazed unit would not be readily apparent. In order to safeguard the historic context of the locality, the precise nature and form of the double-glazed units could be agreed. This would need to be by a pre-commencement condition though, as it would affect the implementation of these works from the outset.
6. Given how different it is to most of the other windows and the controls that could be imposed, being the only double-glazed unit on the elevation would not make it appear any more discordant and so the works would not harm this designated heritage asset. Whilst little evidence was offered to show the existing frame or glass were in poor condition, as I find no harm would be caused that is not a basis to resist the scheme.
7. Accordingly, I conclude the works would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of this Grade II listed building, and would not harm its significance as a designated heritage asset. As such, and insofar as these policies are material to this appeal, the works would not conflict with Policy CS14 in the *Hertsmere Local Plan Development Plan Document Core Strategy* (2013), or Policies SADM29 and SADM30 in the *Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan* (2016), which together seek high quality design that safeguards heritage assets. They would also not conflict with guidance in the *National Planning Policy Framework*.

Conclusion

8. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed

JP Sargent

INSPECTOR