



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2025

by A James BSc (Hons) MA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M3645/Y/25/3367188

Champions Place, Kent Hatch Road, Limsfield, Surrey RH8 0TA

- 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 Sparkes of R & G Sparkes Ltd. against the decision of Tandridge District Council.
 - The application reference is TA/2025/221.
 - The works proposed are remove the existing windows in part and replace with new glazing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the works relate to a listed building, I have had special regard to section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve a Grade II listed building, known as 'Champions Place, including attached terrace, terrace walling and steps' (Ref: 1096100) and any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

4. Champions Place is a large, detached former dwelling, which is currently in use as a private residential care home. It was built towards the end of the 19th century and was significantly enlarged in the early 20th century. It is two storeys high with attic and is built of sandstone, with a tiled roof. The building has an asymmetrical form and an irregular pattern of fenestration. The windows typically consist of single glazed, leaded lights, integrated within stone mullions. The building was designed by Mervyn Edmund Macartney, who was a founder member of The Art Workers' Guild.
5. Based on my site visit and the evidence before me, I find that the listed building's special interest insofar as is relevant to this appeal is derived from its historic and architectural interest as an illustration of domestic architecture from around the late 19th century/early 20th century. The building's surviving historic fabric, its pleasing architectural design, its association with a notable architect linked with the Arts and Craft movement and the presence of traditional materials and fenestration make important contributions in these regards.

6. The building features a variety of window sizes; however, the windows are typically single glazed, with leaded lights which are predominately set within metal frames or directly fitted to the stone mullions. Although the leaded light windows are not expressly mentioned in the list description, listings are primarily for identification purposes and do not provide an exhaustive or complete description of the special interest.
7. The appellant argues that the windows were installed during the early 20th century. Even if this was the case, the windows have been in place for some time and form part of the historic and architectural evolution of the building. While the appellant considers that the existing windows are of low asset value, I find that the historic windows by reason of their traditional character, design, appearance and historic fabric make a positive contribution to the special interest of the listed building.
8. The appeal scheme seeks to replace the existing windows with double glazed windows, which would have applied lead on both sides. The proposal seeks to reuse and refurbish the existing frames and historic ironmongery. Although slimline double glazing is proposed, it would have a chunkier profile and different reflective qualities when compared to single glazing. The provision of applied lead would also fail to be authentic. Overall, the proposed windows would be more modern in their appearance than the existing, historic windows and would erode the authenticity and integrity of the listed building. Furthermore, the proposal would result in the loss of historic fabric through the loss of the existing glass and lead, which makes a positive contribution to the special interest of the listed building.
9. On my site visit, I observed the presence of some modern windows on the building, which feature double glazing and applied lead or glazing bars. Nonetheless, traditional, single glazed, leaded lights are the predominant window type. Where double glazing and applied lead are present, it demonstrates the harm that can be caused due to its more modern appearance and different reflective qualities.
10. Both parties refer to Historic England's Guidance 'Adapting Historic Buildings for Energy and Carbon Efficiency' (2024). While paragraph 81 of the guidance states that the 'installation of slim-profile... double glazing within historic frames will generally be acceptable'. This paragraph continues to state that windows with leaded lights are an exception and such installations are unlikely to be acceptable.
11. The appellant advises that the existing windows are at the end of their life and are rusty, decaying and drafty. The appellant also states that some of the windows do not close properly due to their poor condition and that some of the lead comes have come loose from the metal work, have split and are not re-usable. However, there is no condition survey before me. While I observed some signs of rust and deterioration of the windows and some damage to the stone mullions, there is no compelling evidence before me that the existing windows are beyond repair.
12. The proposal seeks to remove the existing aluminium, secondary glazing, which is visible internally and externally. The secondary glazing was installed towards the end of the 20th century and is currently in a poor condition. While the removal of the secondary glazing would enable the windows, sills and jambs to be more fully appreciated, I do not find that its removal outweighs the harm that I have identified above.
13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal scheme fails to preserve the special interest of the listed building. Given the nature and extent of the works, I

find the harm to the significance of the listed building to be 'less than substantial' and at the mid-to-lower end of the scale. However, this should not be equated with a less than substantial planning objection and is of considerable importance and weight. 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 the asset's optimum viable use.

Other Matters

14. While the appellant has provided examples of other similar installations, full details of the circumstances of the other cases are not before me. I therefore give them limited weight in my decision.
15. The appellant argues that the secondary glazing provides a barrier limiting escape in the event of a fire and is likely to require removal in the future. However, there is no compelling evidence before me that this is likely to be a future requirement nor why an adequate means of escape could not be provided through a window if the secondary glazing is designed and maintained appropriately.
16. The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (the Equality Act) identifies that age and disability are relevant protected characteristics for the purposes of the Equality Act. The PSED sets out the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. I turn to this matter further below.

Public Benefits, Heritage Balance and PSED

17. Paragraph 212 of 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 advises that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets and that any such harm should have clear and convincing justification.
18. I acknowledge that double glazing would improve the thermal efficiency of the building and contribute to the government's goal of achieving net zero. The proposal also has the potential to improve ventilation and comfort levels for occupants of the care home, which include elderly and disabled individuals. The proposal also seeks to undertake repairs to the listed building (including to the stone mullions) and removal of the modern, secondary glazing. However, there is no compelling evidence before me that similar environmental and social benefits cannot be achieved with an alternative scheme, which does not result in the harm that I have identified, for example repairing the existing leaded lights and installing more discrete secondary glazing. Accordingly, I give the environmental and social benefits limited weight as a public benefit.
19. In this case, there is no substantive evidence before me that the proposal equates to the least harmful option for securing these public benefits. As a result, clear and convincing justification for the harm that would be caused to the significance of the designated heritage asset has not been demonstrated.
20. The proposal would result in investment into the property, which has a small economic benefit, which I give limited weight in my decision as a public benefit.

There is no compelling evidence before me to suggest that the use of the building would cease in the absence of the appeal scheme. Consequently, I do not find the appeal scheme necessary to secure the viability and long-term conservation of the building. There is also no substantive evidence that the appeal scheme is necessary in order to secure the optimum viable use of the asset.

21. Overall, I give the public benefits limited weight in my decision. Consequently, in attributing great weight to the harm that would be caused to the significance of the designated heritage asset, I find that there are insufficient public benefits arising from the proposal to outweigh this harm.
22. Given the above, I conclude that, on balance, the proposal fails to preserve the special interest of the listed building. Accordingly, it fails to satisfy the requirements of the Act and the historic environment policies of the Framework. The appeal scheme conflicts with Policy DP20 of the Tandridge Local Plan 2014 – 2029, adopted July 2014. This policy among other things seeks to protect, preserve and wherever possible enhance the historic interest, cultural value, architectural character and visual appearance of the District's heritage assets.
23. I have had due regard to the PSED, but the unacceptable effect of the proposal identified above, outweighs its benefits in terms of eliminating discrimination against persons with the protected characteristics of age and disability and advancing equality of opportunity for those persons and fostering good relations between them and others.

Conclusion

24. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, including the PSED, I conclude that it is proportionate and necessary to dismiss the appeal.

A James

INSPECTOR