



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2022

by Cullum J A Parker BA(Hons) PgCert MA MRTPI MCMI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G2245/Y/21/3283242

11 Yew Tree Mews, Westerham, TN16 1BF

- 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 H Long against the decision of Sevenoaks District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01289/LBCALT, dated 23 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2021.
 - The works are described as '*2 No replacement windows to the front elevation at second floor level*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the works preserve the listed building or any features of special architectural or historic interest its possesses.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a listed Grade II building located within the Westerham Conservation Area, dating from the 18th Century, comprising a two-storey building with two square, flat roof dormers in the attic spaces and has classic styling. The ground floor is used for commercial premises with a 19th Century shop frontage. The upper floors are used for residential purposes with the listing description indicating that the dormers are '*small leaded dormers with C18 square paned leaded casements*'. It is from the architectural details such as these that the special interest of the listed building derives.
4. The appeal scheme seeks to formalise the position as replacement windows have already been installed¹. The Appellant asserts that the original windows were 'beyond the point of repair' and the new windows preserve what is significant about 11 Yew Tree Mews as a listed building.
5. However, the windows installed have significantly wider sections to the dormer faces (adjacent either side of the cheeks) with the overall grey coloured framing being significantly thicker and heavier in appearance. This is further exacerbated by the chunky frame in which the casements in both dormers are located; with a thick central grey coloured mullion at odds with the prevalent dormer window style in the area where windows in dormers are significantly

¹ See Appellant's *Grounds of Appeal Statement* Page1, Paragraph 1.1

less bulky in terms of their appearance and framing. I also saw during my site inspection that the double-glazed casement was especially bulky when opened.

6. Moreover, a mixture of white and grey lead style lines have been placed over the surfaces of the double glazed casements to emulate individual small panes of leaded glass as indicated within the list description. However, the effect visually is an odd addition to casement windows which is especially contrasting on the left-hand dormer when viewed from the A25 with the use of white colouring.
7. The cumulative effect of these features is that the windows appear as visually heavy and discordant features within the street scene and at odds with the typically much lighter framed windows used in dormers of this age and type. Accordingly, the proposal would have a negative effect on the listed building and would fail to preserve its special interest. Whilst this harm would be no greater than less than substantial, great weight should be given to a heritage asset's conservation.
8. Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) indicates that less than substantial harm to heritage assets should be weighed against the public benefits. In this case, I note that there may be some public benefits from the replacement of windows in poor condition. However, these do not outweigh the harm identified arising from the inappropriate windows sought in their failure to preserve the listed building, and similarly the character and appearance of the wider conservation area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy EN4 of the Sevenoaks Allocations and Development Management Plan insofar as relevant, and the policies of the Framework.
9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Parker

INSPECTOR