

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 July 2022

**by Benjamin Webb BA(Hons) MA MA MSc PGDip(UD) MRTPI IHBC**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 14 July 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F1610/Y/22/3293883**

**Antelope Corner, West End, Northleach, Gloucestershire GL54 3HG**

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
  - The appeal is made by Mr CDF Coghlan against the decision of Cotswold District Council.
  - The application Ref 21/03112/LBC, dated 5 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 November 2021.
  - The works proposed are described as to replace 3 wooden 2/F attic windows and one G/F bathroom window with UPVC double glazed units.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the scheme would preserve a Grade II listed building and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses, and whether the scheme would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Northleach Conservation Area (the Conservation Area).

### Reasons

3. The appeal relates to Antelope Corner which is a Grade II listed building. The listed building is located within the Conservation Area. Whilst the Act sets out both the desirability of preserving listed buildings, and of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas, paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) makes clear that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets.
4. Insofar as it is relevant to this appeal the special interest and significance of the listed building resides in its early-mid C19th date, its traditional details, construction in Cotswold stone, and its physical and visual relationship with The Antelope and The Annex. The latter are each themselves Grade II listed, and share a fine formal ashlar façade with Antelope Corner. The facade otherwise features timber single glazed sash windows, as does the rear elevation of Antelope Corner.
5. The 2 dormer windows to which the scheme partly relates, are both prominent and somewhat incongruous modern features of the front elevation. This is given their flat roofed form, and their modern joinery and format, including top opening lights. Their design as such relates poorly to the rest of the frontage.

6. The 2 other windows subject of the scheme are located within the side elevation. That at attic level is again clearly visible from within the street, and, based on the surrounding stonework, appears to feature a historic opening. The window within it is a multi-paned timber casement of traditional design. The window at ground floor level is not visible from within the public realm. The opening is obviously relatively recent, and in common with the dormers, the window within it utilises an incongruous modern format with top opening light.
7. The dormers and ground floor window therefore detract from the special interest and significance of the listed building. Whilst an opportunity thus exists for improvement, the proposed replacement windows would instead perpetuate the existing format, which would be made even more incongruous through its execution in plastic. Whether or not this was given an imitation woodgrain finish, the alien character of the material would be reasonably obvious viewed in context, even across a distance. So too would some other typically standard modern details, including the storm proof construction to be used for 3 of the windows, stick on bars, and double glazing. The harm thus caused to historic character of the building would be amplified in relation to the attic window, given that its existing traditional design would be substituted for one less sympathetic in almost every regard.
8. Modern engineered and factory finished timber windows sometimes also have a plastic-like appearance. Consequently, windows of this type may not be well suited for use in buildings of traditional character and construction. That being so, their characteristics do not form a basis to justify the use of plastic in this case.
9. The lifespan of timber windows is subject to a number of variables. These include the type and quality of timber used, the design employed, and maintenance. Whilst some inferior modern timber windows may decay quickly, there is no reason to believe that timber windows are generally incapable of a long lifespan. This is indeed illustrated by the survival of historic timber windows across the frontage. The biological properties of timber do not therefore provide a basis to consider that the use of plastic is necessary.
10. Reference is made to the installation of a fibreglass spire at a listed church in Lower Slaughter. No further details have however been supplied, and it is hard to see what direct relevance this has to the case in question. Though there may sometimes be good conservation-based reasons for the use of modern materials, none appear obviously applicable to the current case.
11. I acknowledge that the Council has raised no in principle objection to use of 'slim line' double glazing. However, this is within the context of a theoretical timber window design which is not before me, and no sections showing the glazing composition have otherwise been provided. As such, this does not alter my overall findings above.
12. I therefore find that the scheme would both fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building and fail to conserve its significance. In relation to the latter the harm caused would be less than substantial. Such harm attracts great weight.
13. As noted above, the listed building is located within the Conservation Area. Insofar as it is relevant to these appeals the special interest and significance of the Conservation Area lies in the layout of the historic settlement, and the

historic buildings and spaces it contains. Within this context there is a notably low frequency of plastic windows. In view of the age, character, prominence and relationship of the listed building to others it makes a positive contribution to the broader Conservation Area. Given the harm I have identified above, much of which would be capable of perception from public spaces, it follows that the scheme would also harm the positive contribution that the listed building makes to the Conservation Area as a whole. The scheme would thus also both fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and fail to conserve its significance. The harm caused by the latter would again be less than substantial. Such harm attracts considerable importance and weight.

14. Having found that the scheme would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of both the listed building and the Conservation Area, it is necessary to weigh this harm against the public benefits of the scheme in accordance with paragraph 202 of the Framework.
15. It is claimed that the scheme would deliver enhancement, and that the proposed windows would be longer lasting and easier to maintain. However, having already considered lifespan above, given that claimed ease of maintenance would be a private benefit, and given my overall finding of harm, these considerations attract no weight. Implementing the scheme would otherwise generate minor work/trade for businesses. However, the benefits of this to the broader economy would be negligible. That and the above being so, the public benefits of the scheme would not outweigh the harm that it would cause.
16. For the reasons outlined above I conclude that the scheme would fail to preserve the Grade II listed building and fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, contrary to the expectations of the Act and heritage policy set out within the Framework.

## **Conclusion**

17. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Benjamin Webb*

INSPECTOR