
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2025

by **Samuel Watson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/Y/24/3357530

Landry Cottage, Old Hill, Lewannick, Launceston, Cornwall PL15 7QD

- 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 Matt White against the decision of Cornwall Council.
 - The application Ref is PA24/06651.
 - The works proposed are to replace all windows and doors within the property for Residence Collection windows and doors with colours to match the existing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and listed building consent is refused to replace all windows and doors within the property for Residence Collection windows and doors with colours to match the existing.

Preliminary Matters

2. I wasn't able to get inside or to the rear of Landry Cottage during my site visit. However, I am content from the information before me that access inside the property would not have materially changed the decision I have made here.
3. As the appeal relates to a listed building consent, I have had special regard to section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).
4. Although the description of works above only covers the replacement of windows and doors, from the plans before me it appears that alterations inside the property are also proposed. During my site visit it appeared that the internal works may have already occurred. These internal works may require listed building consent but it would be unfair for me to consider these here as they are not before me, and were not dealt with by the appellant or Council.
5. I have changed the description of works above from that on the application form so that it more accurately describes the proposal without going into superfluous detail.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve a Grade II listed building known as "Doctors Surgery to West of Pen-inney" (Ref: 1277518), and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

7. The host building is a small cottage of a simple vernacular style. It is finished in roughcast white render with a slate roof. There are five windows on the front

elevation, three to the ground floor and two the upper floor. These are irregular in their positioning and size but are all casements set back from the external wall face, with the single glazing divided into six by fine glazing bars. The front door is low in height and sits fairly centrally within the front elevation. Its top half is divided into three panels while the lower is a simple vertical tongue and groove. Although simple in their appearance, the windows and door provide the greater part of the detailing on the otherwise plain frontage.

8. Landry Cottage sits against the carriageway of Old Hill which leads directly to the centre of Lewannick. In this position it is a prominent feature and it sits amongst other traditional buildings. I find the significance of this building to stem in part from its age and the way in which its historic use, appearance and form as a vernacular village cottage are still readily legible, as well as the extent to which historic materials are still present.
9. The appellant's submissions are not sufficiently detailed as to the level of damage to the windows and doors across the building. Although I understand a local joiner assessed the windows, I have not been provided with any details or report. While photos have been provided showing evidence of rot and broken glass, it is not clear which windows and doors these relate to. It is also not clear whether they are all in a similar state. Moreover, during my site visit I noted that the front windows and door had been repaired or, at least, repainted.
10. It is not possible, from the information before me, to ascertain the age of the existing windows and doors. While they are unlikely to be original, it is clear they are of some age and their loss would be detrimental to the historic fabric and interest of the host building.
11. A sectional drawing of a Residence Collection window has been provided. However, the drawing appears to be indicative rather than representing any of the host building's windows. The window frame, layout and opening do not reflect those of the existing windows and no glazing bars are shown, although they are proposed elsewhere. I note that it is intended that the uPVC windows would replicate the appearance of timber construction methods, this has also not been demonstrated. While it has been suggested that Residence Collection windows have been approved elsewhere on heritage assets, the details before me do not suggest they would be of a suitable design as to not unacceptably affect the listed building. No details of the replacement doors have been provided and so I can also not ascertain that these wouldn't harm the host building.
12. I note that there is an Article 4 that covers the appeal site that supports the use of modern materials. However, this support does not preclude me from finding otherwise, especially given that the appeal relates to a listed building. Moreover, while other buildings within the surrounding area may have uPVC windows, this does not justify their use on the appeal building.
13. Against this background, and given the scale of the development, I find that there would be a moderate degree of less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset. Although less than substantial, the Framework is clear that great weight should be given to any asset's conservation. Paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

14. It has been suggested that the proposed works would improve the thermal and acoustic efficiency of the windows and doors providing an airtight barrier against noise, pollution and heat loss. I am mindful of the close proximity of the building to the carriageway and that passing vehicles are likely to be detrimental to the living conditions of future occupiers. Moreover, although I have not been provided with the efficiency values of the current windows and doors, it is likely that the proposed modern materials and construction methods would provide an improvement against heat-loss.
15. As such, the proposal would result in an improvement to housing stock as well as a small and time-limited economic uplift during the construction works and a small reduction in carbon emissions. These would be public benefits but would only be modest given the scale of the proposal. Although the proposed windows may not require as much maintenance as the existing timber windows, this is not a public benefit. In light of the circumstances of this case, the public benefits do not outweigh the harm to the designated heritage asset as set out above.
16. Given the above, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the Grade II listed building and thus fails to satisfy the requirements of the Act, Framework and the development plan policies insofar as they are relevant.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Samuel Watson

INSPECTOR