



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2024

by Ian Radcliffe BSc(Hons) MRTPI MCIEH DMS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T3725/Y/23/3330701

Arnolds Farm, 272 Cromwell Lane, Burton Green, Kenilworth, CV8 1PL

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs S Gummery against the decision of Warwick District Council.
 - The application Ref is W/22/1460/LB.
 - The works proposed is described as 'the replacement of 14no. casement windows throughout the property. Our client intends to replace the existing windows with new double-glazed heritage timber casement windows installing them into the existing brickwork apertures. All new windows will replicate the existing glazing bar configurations with emphasis on slim section sizes and glazing making sure to complement the property's and surrounding area's heritage. The proposed replacements will not alter the overall size of the windows or brickwork openings. (see proposed design specifications)'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the application the original specification for the thickness of the proposed double glazing was 18mm with applied astragal window bars. The appeal statement states that the specification changed before the determination of the application to 12mm thickness with structural window bars. However, the most recent of the joinery detail sheets submitted prior to the determination of the application specify 14mm thickness (4mm glazing:6mm spacer:4mm glazing) and it is on this basis that I have determined the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is whether the proposal would preserve the Grade II listed building, Arnold's Farmhouse, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Reasons

4. The National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') identifies at paragraph 195 that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource. Paragraph 205 of the Framework advises that when considering the impact of a proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, such as a listed building, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
5. In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works, the statutory requirement is that special regard is had to the desirability of

- preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
6. Arnold's Farmhouse (List Entry No:1253076) is a two storey, detached farmhouse with an attic set well back from the road behind a long, lawned garden. Constructed of red brick with a plain tiled, hipped roof in the late seventeenth to early eighteenth century its front and rear elevations have a pleasing symmetry with timber casement windows around a central front and rear door.
 7. A few metres away to the north east is a timber framed barn range from the same era which is also a Grade II listed building. The Burton Green Neighbourhood Plan confirms that the farmhouse is one of the few heritage assets in the settlement. The location of the farmhouse and nearby barn, set further back than far more recent residential development along Cromwell Road, emphasises that they are from an earlier period when Burton Green was far less developed and agriculture was far more important to its identity.
 8. On the basis of what I have read and seen, as far as is relevant to the proposed works, the special interest and significance of Arnold's Farmhouse is architectural and historic, and is mainly due to its polite, well-proportioned architectural style, its authenticity and its association with Burton Green's agrarian past. The layout, proportions and detailing of the casement windows contributes to that significance.
 9. The proposed works would replace all the windows to the house as well as their arched frames. The existing windows are casement windows that have not been repaired or repainted for a significant length of time. As a result, they are in poor condition. There is some evidence that repairs to the casements have been carried out in the past using a synthetic filler prior to repainting. The approach of the Council explained in its Historic Building Guidance¹ is to prefer the repair of windows over replacement unless the existing windows are actively harmful.
 10. The existing casement timber windows are not original. The view of the appellant is that the casements are only a few decades old and are set in older arched frames. On the basis of the machine routed casements and presence of non-float glass, I agree that the casements are most likely to be recent. Other than on the small lean to addition, the windows contain single glazed, six pane casement lights which are the type of window contemporary with the building. As a result, the existing windows, their proportions and detailing sit comfortably in this building.
 11. Turning to the arched frames in which the windows are held, as each frame has not been individually assessed in the submitted Design & Heritage Statement (D&HS) this document provides insufficient detail to determine the extent of historic fabric that would be lost as a result of the proposed works. Furthermore, reference to the casement lights as 'sashes' throughout the D&HS also undermines confidence in the contents of this document.
 12. In keeping with the existing windows, the replacement units would be wooden, six pane casement lights. In design they would also include thin structural glazing bars of similar dimensions to those found in the current windows. The

¹ Historic Building Guidance – Windows in Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas

existing windows though are single glazed and the replacements would be double glazed. As single glazed windows most often have a noticeably different reflective quality to double glazing, the appearance of the windows would likely be different to the existing windows and those historically seen in the house. In the double glazed units a spacing strip would also be sandwiched between the two panes of glass. In the absence of information that confirms the appearance of this spacing strip, it is not possible to further assess the visual effect of the proposed double glazing. At 14mm the overall thickness of the double glazing and spacing strip would be thinner than normal. However, this consideration does not overcome the concerns I have identified.

13. In terms of the general design of the windows, in the three light casement windows present on the front and rear elevations of the house, the historic windows are most likely to have had balanced openings, with a central fixed light and opening side lights. The proposed replacement windows would reverse this arrangement with only the central light opening. In the absence of clear evidence of the opening arrangements of the original windows, I find that the proposed arrangement would therefore further emphasise the awkwardness of the windows in relation to the heritage of the building.
14. Taking all these matters into account, I find that the proposed work, associated with insufficient detail to justify the adopted approach, means that I am not persuaded that the replacement windows and frames would sit comfortably within the building and preserve its significance. The fact that the difference in glazing would not be apparent in public views from the road does not negate the adverse effect that would be caused. This is because the acceptability of work to a listed building is not dependent upon its public visibility.

Less than substantial harm

15. The harm that would be caused to the significance of the listed building would be less than substantial. Paragraph 206 of the Framework requires clear and convincing justification for any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset. Paragraph 208 advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
16. In accordance with the statutory duty, I attach considerable importance and weight to the harm that would be caused by the proposed works to this listed building. By virtue of its construction, the heating costs of the house are twice that of an average house of the same size. As double glazing is more energy efficient than single glazing it reduces heating costs and carbon dioxide emissions. It also reduces the transmission of noise from outside. However, secondary glazing can be as equally efficient thermally and acoustically and is currently installed within the house.
17. In the absence of evidence that if the existing windows were in good repair the double glazing proposed would materially outperform the installed secondary glazing, the public benefits of improving the energy efficiency and noise insulation of the listed building, which forms part of the District's housing stock, and reducing carbon dioxide emissions have not been demonstrated. Moreover, no evidence has been submitted which demonstrates that if the proposed works did not go ahead the heating costs of the building would result in its use as a dwellinghouse no longer being viable.

18. Taking all these matters into account, my overall conclusion is that the public benefits of the proposal do not outweigh the considerable importance and weight that I attach to the harm I have found.
19. In light of my reasoning, I therefore find that the proposal would not preserve the Grade II listed building, Arnold's Farmhouse, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. This would be contrary to the requirements of sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Act. Conflict would also occur with policy HE1 of the Warwick District Local Plan and the provisions within the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment.

Other Matters

20. As I have noted earlier, a few metres away to the north east of Arnold's Farmhouse is a timber framed, Grade II listed barn range from the same era. Arnold's Farmhouse therefore lies within the setting of this designated heritage asset. Owing to its agricultural associations, age and form of construction the significance of the barn range is historical and architectural. However, as the proposed work to the farmhouse would only alter its windows it would not harm the setting of the listed barn range.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ian Radcliffe

Inspector