



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 6 October 2025

by **A Parkin BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th October 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/Z0116/W/25/3368823

1-2 Home Farm Cottages, Shaplands, Stoke Bishop, Bristol BS9 1AY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Simon Hawkins and Mrs Hannah Roston-Hawkins against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01257/H.
 - The development proposed is Replacement of existing timber casements with new timber casements with *Fineo* glazing in existing frames. Replacement of rear dormer windows with new side hung windows to suit existing openings.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/Z0116/Y/25/3368539

1-2 Home Farm Cottages, Shaplands, Stoke Bishop, Bristol BS9 1AY

- 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 Simon Hawkins and Mrs Hannah Roston-Hawkins against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01098/LA.
 - The works proposed are Replacement of existing timber casements with new timber casements with *Fineo* glazing in existing frames. Replacement of rear dormer windows with new side hung windows to suit existing openings.
-

Decision

1. The appeals are dismissed insofar as they relate to the replacement windows on the north elevation at first floor level, and on the south elevation. The appeals are allowed insofar as they relate to the replacement kitchen windows W05, W06; and, to the replacement rear dormer windows W13, W14, W15, W16 and W17, at 1-2 Home Farm Cottages, Shaplands, Stoke Bishop, Bristol BS9 1AY, in accordance with the terms of the applications, Ref 24/01257/H and 24/01098/LA, and subject to the conditions contained at Annex 1.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal site forms part of a Grade II listed building¹ and is located in the vicinity of a number of other listed buildings within the Downs Conservation Area (DCA). Consequently, I have had regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).
3. As set out above there are two appeals on this site for the same proposal, Appeal A and Appeal B. I have considered each appeal on its individual merits and with

¹ 1 and 2 Home Farm Cottages (List Entry Number: 1202427)

regard to relevant legislation, policy and guidance. However, to limit duplication I have dealt with the two appeals together, except where otherwise indicated.

Main Issues

4. For Appeal A, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the significance of designated heritage assets.
5. For Appeal B, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the significance of the Grade II listed building 1 and 2 Home Farm Cottages.

Reasons

6. Originally constructed as two attached cottages in the mid-19th century, the appeal building was subsequently converted into a single dwelling, set within its own grounds and set back from Shaplands via a shared driveway. Constructed from a dark red ashlar stone with limestone details and with a dual pitched tiled roof, the building has an asymmetrical front elevation, with a projecting gable to the north and two dormer windows with small balconies to the south.
7. Whilst there is a single storey kitchen extension on the northern elevation, and a single storey extension on the western (rear) elevation, the original form of the building can still be appreciated. There are many interesting architectural details, including the two historical entrance doorways, one of which has a substantial porch, and a considerable amount of the original fenestration remains.
8. Insofar as it concerns these appeals, the significance of the listed building stems from its historical function and from the traditional materials and architectural features that remain.
9. The DCA covers a wide and diverse area centred upon the Downs, an area of largely open grassland positioned to the east of the Avon gorge and above much of the city of Bristol. It was established for the people of the city to enjoy for recreation during Victorian times, and continues to fulfil this purpose today. Various tree-lined roads cross the Downs, and the DCA also includes adjacent areas which are predominantly residential.
10. The significance of the DCA, insofar as it relates to these appeals, stems from its historical development and the contribution the historic buildings and spaces make to its character and appearance.
11. To the rear of the building are five pairs of double-glazed, timber-framed 'dormer' windows², which span the eaves, and of each pair one window is an opening casement. The single storey kitchen extension also contains two sets of three double glazed timber casement windows³ of a similar design to the 'dormer' windows.
12. These non-original windows would be replaced with new windows within the existing openings. The design of the replacement windows would be similar to the existing, albeit set within a smaller and somewhat simpler frame. The windows would comprise a vacuum sealed double glazing system under the proprietary name *Fineo*, which is said to be similar in thickness to single glazing, but with much greater thermal and acoustic properties.

² W13, W14, W15, W16, W17

³ W05 and W06

13. These existing windows do not make an important contribution to the significance of the listed building, and the proposed replacements would have a similar effect. The design and materials would be acceptable and would preserve the character and appearance of the listed building and to a much lesser extent the DCA.
14. Three casement sash windows are positioned on the southern elevation of the building, two at ground floor level and one at first floor level⁴. The appellant does not consider the two ground floor windows to be original. However, even if the ground floor windows are not original, their design is consistent with original windows on the building.
15. On the northern elevation, above the kitchen extension at first floor level, is a pair of timber casement sash windows⁵. The appellant accepts that the first floor windows on the north and south elevations are original.
16. These windows are each set within timber frames and with limestone surrounds, including lintels, sills and for the northern elevation pair, a mullion, which would be retained. These windows show some signs of warping, and I note that L-shaped brackets that sought to address this have been installed in the past. However, this has been a piecemeal approach and has not fully addressed the warping of the windows, and some gaps between the window and the frame are visible.
17. The appellant also considers some of the windows to be rotten in parts, and for W18 there was some clear evidence of this, particularly at the lower rail. The proposal is to replace these windows with timber casement sash windows of a design to match the existing, but including the same *Fineo* vacuum double glazing as is proposed for the rear dormer and kitchen windows.
18. The removal of these windows, some of which are certainly original, would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of 1 and 2 Home Farm Cottages, towards the lower end of the scale. The building makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the DCA, and so this harm also detracts from the significance of the conservation area to a much lesser extent.
19. Any harm to a designated heritage asset attracts considerable weight⁶. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification⁷.
20. The appellant has provided what is said to be guidance from Historic England on *Modifying historic windows as part of retrofitting energy saving measures - July 2024*. This *guidance* states that historic windows, whether original, or later replacements that follow the historic design of the original, should be retained and repaired where possible.
21. From the evidence, including the window survey, the letter from a replacement window fitting company 'retained to provide new windows', and from my observations on site, it is not clear why retention and repair of the existing windows is not possible.

⁴ W08, W09 (ground floor) and W18 (first floor)

⁵ W12

⁶ Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework December 2024 (the Framework)

⁷ Paragraph 213 of the Framework

22. Where less than substantial harm is proposed to a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal⁸. There would be some social and economic benefits associated with undertaking the proposed works, but the limited scale and duration of such works means they carry very limited weight.
23. The proposed replacement windows would improve the thermal performance of the building and I afford this significant weight. However, this is primarily a private benefit, and in any event, it has not been shown what the current and proposed thermal performance is or would be, or that the existing arrangements cause difficulties in terms of the current habitation of the building. Even if it were so demonstrated, it has not been shown that the proposed approach would be the least harmful means of addressing it.
24. For these reasons, the proposed replacement rear dormer windows and the proposed replacement windows on the kitchen extension would preserve the significance of the listed building and the DCA. I am also satisfied that they are physically and functionally separable from the other proposals. They would, therefore and insofar as relevant, accord with policies BCS21 (quality urban design) and BCS22 (conservation and the historic environment) of the Bristol Core Strategy 2011 (BCS) and policies DM26 (local character and distinctiveness), DM30 (alterations to existing buildings) and DM31 (heritage assets) of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan 2014 (SADMPLP) and with the Framework.
25. However, the proposed replacement windows on the south elevation of the building and at first floor level on the north elevation of the building would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building and the DCA. This harm would not be outweighed by public benefits. These replacement windows would, therefore and insofar as relevant, conflict with policies BCS21 and BCS22 of the BCS) and policies DM26, DM30 and DM31 of the SADMPLP, and with the Framework.

Conditions and Conclusion

26. For the development approved under Appeal A and the works approved under Appeal B, in addition to the standard commencement conditions, conditions specifying the approved drawings would be necessary for reasons of certainty.
27. For the reasons given above I conclude that Appeal A and Appeal B are allowed in part and dismissed in part.

Andrew Parkin

INSPECTOR

⁸ Paragraph 215 of the Framework

Annex 1

Appeal A - Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: 001rev1; 120rev2; 151rev1; and 153rev1.

Appeal B - Conditions

- 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than three years from the date of this consent.
- 2) The works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: 001rev1; 120rev2; 151rev1; and 153rev1.