



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2025

by **R J Redford MTCP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/Y/24/3355362

The Cottage, Saul Lodge, Arlingham Road, Saul, Gloucestershire GL2 7JE

- 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 Michael Purvis against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref is S.24/0661/LBC.
 - The works proposed are the replacement of eleven casement windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Special regard must be taken to section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) as the proposal relates to a listed building.
3. To identify specific windows within the proposed scheme I have referred to them by the numbers on drawings DR-5-100 Revision P01, and DR-5-101 Revision P01.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve a Grade II listed building known as “Saul Lodge and Saul Lodge West” (Ref: 1340337) (the LB), and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

5. The appeal building forms part of the LB. It constitutes the part 3 and part 2 storey range to the rear of the main body of the LB and is more functional in its form and design. This is because it was originally an outbuilding that was later connected to the main body of the LB, before ultimately the LB was subdivided into separate dwellings. The LB as a whole is a good example of a large, late 19th Century / early 20th Century villa. It was built for the chief engineer of the Gloucester and Sharpness Canal Company. It is therefore prominent in its location along the canal, with the side elevation (which includes the main elevation of the appeal building) visible from the towpath.
6. Therefore, the significance of the LB is related to its design, age, and locational context. As part of the LB, the appeal site’s significance is its subordinate relationship to the main body of the building and its original functionality as part of a large residential property.

7. The proposal would seek to replace 11 windows with double glazed wooden casements. The appeal building has a mix of casement windows. Of those to be replaced the majority are timber framed, with windows 1, 6 and 11 having metal frames.
8. The Council have referenced the timber sash windows within the main body LB. However, these are not the only types of windows. Within the elevation facing the canal and elsewhere there are a high number of metal windows with uniform ironmongery. These windows appear to be largely located around the portion of the LB that would have been affected when the appeal building was linked to the main body of the LB. Windows 6 and 11 appear very similar to these, and although I was unable to view them internally seem to have the same ironmongery. Accordingly, these 2 windows clearly show the linking of the main body and appeal building, thus the evolution and extension of the LB even though they now form separate dwellings. They, therefore, form part of the historic significance of that building and without anything before me to show they are of a condition beyond repair, their loss would be detrimental to the LB.
9. In terms of window 1, again there is nothing before me to show its condition is beyond repair and as it appears contemporaneous, though of a more simplified style to the other metal windows (including a round feature window on the first floor which is not being replaced), it would be necessary to explore if it would constitute historic fabric relevant to the significance of the LB. As this has not been done, it cannot be concluded its loss would not be harmful.
10. Turning to the 8 timber framed windows, the main parties agree they are in a deteriorated condition and the Council has identified their simple casement form to be a traditional style for properties of this order within the locality. Through observations on site, I am satisfied these windows are modern interventions albeit from some time ago, and not original to the building. Therefore, with nothing before me to conclude otherwise, the replacement of these 8 windows would not harm the significance of the LB.
11. Nevertheless, what these windows are replaced with is important. Neither party has been able to provide information relating to the original form of windows within the appeal building, therefore retaining the simple casement form would be a reasonable response. The proposed windows would do this, and the outer frames and central mullions would be suitably proportionate in terms of dimensions to not be detrimental to their overall appearance. Equally the reflective quality of slim double glazing would not be so dissimilar to the plain manufactured glass within the current wooden framed windows.
12. However, the proposed use of stick-on glazing bars is not an ideal design solution as often these can look pastiche and dis-ingenuine when visually related to windows with through glazing bars within the same elevation. As would be the case in the canal facing elevation of the LB. As the information submitted concerning the glazing bars is very limited and there are no profiles or sectional drawings as to how they would be installed. Therefore, due to the irreplaceable nature of heritage assets, it is reasonable to take a precautionary approach on this issue. As such it cannot be concluded that the proposed glazing bar solution would not have a harmful effect on the significance of the LB.

13. It is noted that the appellant considers other forms of glazing bars to be more harmful in terms of the overall window form due to manufacturing requirements. However, there is no evidence to support this.
14. Accordingly, the proposal would constitute less than substantial harm to the LB, a heritage asset. Where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm Paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimal viable use.
15. No specific public benefits have been identified beyond the need to replace windows in degraded condition and that double glazing would increase the efficiency credentials of the appeal building. It is agreed that ensuring the appeal building is properly maintained as part of a heritage asset, would be beneficial. However, this does not negate the need for any replacements to be appropriately designed. Nor does it take into account other methods of improving the efficiency of windows, especially in relation to those with metal frames.
16. Therefore, the public benefits do not sufficiently outweigh the harm identified in this instance. Further to this the continued viable use of the appeal property as a residential dwelling is not dependent on this proposal.
17. The proposal would therefore fail to preserve the special historic interest of the LB and not comply with the Act, the Framework, or Policy ES10 of the Stroud District Local Plan which seeks to preserve, protect and enhance the district's historic environment.

Other Matters

18. That the window supplier has had similar styled windows approved in other listed buildings is noted. However, without details of those windows their significance to the listed building and what they replaced, the similarity to this scheme cannot be assessed. By their unique nature what may be acceptable in one heritage asset may not be in another.
19. That the appellant asserts the Council did not undertake a site visit is noted. This however does not alter the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion

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

RJ Redford

INSPECTOR