



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 10 April 2025

by **R Catchpole BSc (hons) PhD MCIEEM IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/Y/25/3359640

Townend Farm, Kilnwick, Driffield YO25 9JR

- 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 Mr C Rice against the decision of the East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application reference is 24/00916/PLB.
 - The works proposed are to “replace rotted windows”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the proposal relates to a listed building I have had special regard to section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act).
3. I have shortened the description of the proposed works for the sake of brevity and in the interests of clarity.
4. The Council adopted an emerging plan after the appeal was submitted¹. However, as there were no changes to the relevant policy, I am satisfied that the appellant's case is not prejudiced by this update.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve a Grade II listed building known as “Town End Farm and Outbuildings to Right and Left” (Ref: 1103448) (the LB), and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

6. The LB dates from the mid-18th century and is attributed to John Carr of York. The farmhouse comprises 2 storeys and is constructed from brown brick surmounted by a pantile roof. The architectural composition consists of 3 bays which are defined by giant, round-headed, arched recesses with a brick impost that rises through the full height of the house. Simple modillion brick eaves sit above the archways. The features are reflected in the flanking outbuildings. The Palladian proportions of this composition are particularly distinctive given the modest scale of this rural dwelling.

¹ East Riding Local Plan Update, 2025-2039, April 2025 (the LP)

The fenestration of the principal elevation of the farmhouse comprises contemporary, slimline double glazed sash windows in various configurations.

7. Given the above, I find that the special interest of the LB, insofar as it relates to this appeal, to be primarily associated with the striking architecture of its main elevations and the historic association with John Carr.
8. The proposal seeks to replace the existing windows on the main elevation of the farmhouse with double glazed, wooden sash windows. These would have the same pane configuration and I note from the drawings, as well as my own observations, that the integral glazing bars would be a similar width to the existing ones and that this would also be the case for the meeting rail. They would lack horns and consequently be of a more historically authentic design than the existing windows, which are horned. However, they would not be a like-for-like replacement because the width of the individual glazing units would be around 21 mm which would be considerably thicker than the existing units. This would lead to deeper, bulkier windows that would detract from the architectural composition of the main elevation.
9. The Council highlights the fact that standard double glazing is not recommended or supported on listed buildings due to the larger frames required to house the glazing. It notes that this considerably alters the dimension and character of the windows. Although the width of the glazing bars and meeting rail would be similar, the depth of the windows would inevitably increase and they would become a distractingly heavy feature. This would not only be in contrast to the existing windows but would be very far removed from the elegance and finesse of a typical Georgian window.
10. The appellant maintains that the replacement windows would help to reduce carbon emissions and that they are part of a wider energy saving initiative which would include the installation of an air or ground source heat pump. However, as the existing windows are already double glazed it is unclear how the new windows would materially alter the overall energy efficiency of the property. Moreover, whilst there was notable rot in some places, the windows are not beyond repair and would not fail if renovated appropriately.
11. The appellant has suggested that the proposal would not harm the listed building because it would not be more widely visible. This is because it is situated on a country road with no footway and because the ground floor is obscured by a high hedge at the front. However, listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest irrespective of whether or not public views of the building can be gained.
12. The appellant points out that standard double glazing was permitted at the Old Stables and the Coach House (now Flagstones) which formed part of the original farmstead. These properties are also part of the same listing. The Council notes that these permissions were granted in 2012 and 1995. This predates current policy and guidance which means that the circumstances were not the same in all respects. I also do not have the full facts before me and in any event, each case must be determined on its individual merits.
13. Given the above, I find that the proposal would harm the special interest of the LB through the introduction of more bulky, double glazed windows. Consequently, the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building.

14. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 213 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets and that any such harm should have a clear and convincing justification.
15. Given that the proposal would replace existing double-glazed windows, I find the harm to be less than substantial in this instance but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. Where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimal viable use.
16. The appellant is of the opinion that the proposal would be beneficial because it would improve energy efficiency. However, I do not find this to be the case and this public benefit can, at best, be considered neutral because double glazing is already present. As such, the proposal does not gain support from paragraph 167 of the Framework in terms of energy efficiency and low carbon heating.
17. I do not find that there are any public benefits sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified in this instance. I also note that the continued viable use of the appeal property as a residential dwelling is not dependent on the proposal as the building has an ongoing residential use that would not cease in its absence.
18. Given the above, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the Grade II listed building. This would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 210(a) of the Framework and conflict with policy ENV3 of the LP insofar as it applies. This seeks, among other things, to ensure that proposals conserve or enhance the significance of heritage assets.

Conclusion

19. Given the above and considering all other matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

R Catchpole

INSPECTOR