



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2025

by **O S Woodward MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/Y/24/3354850

Hideaway Cottage, Ivinghoe Aston, Leighton Buzzard, Bedfordshire, LU7 9DF

- 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 Gareth Ainsworth against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - North Area (Aylesbury).
 - The application Ref is 24/01366/ALB.
 - The works are replacement of 14 timber casement windows with new timber casement windows with 20mm double glazing and low profile astragal bars.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The works have already been undertaken. I have based my decision on a combination of the submitted drawings, supporting documentation and what I observed on site including the previous windows which are stored in an outbuilding. I have amended the description of development to reflect that the works have already occurred and for general clarity.
3. Because the appeal relates to works to a listed building including a refusal to grant listed building consent, I have had special regard to Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether or not the works preserve the Grade II listed building, 'Hi Da Way'¹ or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Reasons

Significance

5. The building is a 17th-Century cottage. Various alterations have been undertaken, most notably a rear extension which itself replaces a previous rear extension, and a front porch. However, the extensions are clearly more modern additions and the historic core of the cottage retains legibility as a 17th-Century building with intrinsic architectural and historic significance.
6. The previous windows to the historic core of the building were likely from the 1980s. They are not, therefore, original and nor are they particularly historic.

¹ List entry number 1319238

However, they are timber framed, single glazed, the glazing bars are integral to the panes and the surrounding frames are relatively thin. This is with the exception of one window, which has relatively thick frames and a trickle vent. Despite the one aberration and that none of the windows are historic, the majority of the pre-existing windows are of appropriate material, style and design for the historic core of the building and positively contributed to the significance of the building.

7. There are also French doors on the historic core of the building which are relatively modern and double glazed. However, they were installed further to a listed building consent granted in 2008² and I consider them to be neutral contributors to the significance of the building.
8. The windows to the rear extension are timber framed, 24mm double glazed units with applied glazing bars and trickle vents. Similar windows are to be found to the front porch. They are not historically appropriate in design. However, they are located on modern extensions to the building. They are therefore neutral contributors to the significance of the building.
9. I acknowledge that the list description, in terms of items of detail, only specifically references the internal beams as significant. However, the list description is primarily for identification purposes and the lack of direct reference to the windows or other features does not mean that they do not contribute to the significance of the building.

Assessment

10. The new windows that have been installed are timber framed. However, they are 20mm double glazed, have applied glazing bars with internal aluminium spacers, and prominent trickle vents. This is an inappropriate style of window which changes the basic style of the previous single glazed windows, alters proportions leading to a bulky appearance contrary to the slender, delicate fenestration that would more accurately reflect the age of the historic core of the building. Consequently, the windows are a modern solution which do not integrate well with this historic core. As such, they detract from the significance of the building.
11. They are similar, although not identical, to the windows on the rear extension and front porch. Those windows are timber framed, double glazed with trickle vents, but are deeper with 24mm glazing. However, the rear extension and front porch are modern additions. The evidence before me is also that those works replaced a previous front porch with an inappropriately large window and an unsympathetic rear extension with a flat roof. Those windows must therefore be viewed in that context and do not provide a precedent for windows to the historic core of the building. With regard to the French doors, these replaced previous aluminium framed sliding doors, and are also not, therefore, precedent for works elsewhere to the historic core.
12. A schedule has been provided of the condition of the pre-existing windows. My assessment of this schedule is that three of the windows had suffered from extensive damage to their frames³, three also had damage to window panes⁴, four had relatively moderate levels of damage⁵, and seven had relatively limited

² Ref 08/0247/ALB

³ Refs 1.2, 2.2, 3.1

⁴ Refs 3.1, 5.2, 5.3

⁵ Refs 1.1, 4.1, 5.2, 5.3

damage⁶. It is likely that the three windows with extensive damage would need to be replaced. However, it is possible that the four with moderate levels of damage could be repaired. The seven with limited damage are likely to be repairable rather than requiring replacement.

13. I have considered whether or not it would be acceptable to allow for the retention of those windows that have replaced the three pre-existing windows with extensive damage. However, not only is this harmful in itself, it would also result in a patchwork appearance to the building. A more co-ordinated approach is required to ensure a consistency of style that would positively contribute to the architectural and historic significance of the building.
14. The building is set back from the highway and is not readily visible at close quarters. However, it is still visible to an extent. In any event, the harm I have identified is to the intrinsic architectural and historic significance of the building, and does not therefore rely on public visibility.

Overall

15. Given the above, I conclude that the works fail to preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the Grade II listed building, thus failing to satisfy the requirements of the Act, and Section 16 of the Framework and development plan policies insofar as relevant. I assess the level of harm to be less than substantial.

Planning Balance

16. In accordance with Paragraph 212 of the Framework, I place great weight on the conservation of designated heritage assets. Although less than substantial, I place considerable importance and weight on the harm that I have identified to the significance of the listed building. As set out at Paragraph 215 of the Framework, where there is less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
17. The appellant has stated that the building suffers from internal water damage, particularly following rain and storms. This is causing damage to other parts of the building and its historic fabric. However, it has not been substantiated that this damage could not be prevented by a mixture of repair and refurbishment works, at least to those windows that are not extensively damaged. The appellant has stated that it is not affordable to install ultra-thin double glazed units. However, the financial implications of this are not fully detailed. There is no significant evidence before me that continued habitation of the property could not be achieved in a more historically appropriate manner, whilst remaining affordable.
18. Therefore, the harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset that I have identified clearly outweighs the limited public benefits.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons above, the appeal is dismissed.

O S Woodward
INSPECTOR

⁶ Refs 1.3, 2.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 5.1, 5.4