



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2025

by Rachel Hall BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/Y/25/3369286

225 Wendover Road, Stoke Mandeville, Buckinghamshire HP21 9PB

- 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 Dr Mohammed Jahngir against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - North Area (Aylesbury).
 - The application reference is 24/02915/ALB.
 - The works proposed are replacement of casement windows (retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the proposal 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 (as amended) (the Act).
3. It is not a matter in dispute between the main parties that works to the windows have already taken place. As such, the appeal considers the effect of retention of those works.

Main Issue

4. The appeal property is the Grade II listed building known as “Tudor House” (Ref: 1392490) (the LB). In that context, the main issue is whether retention of the works preserves the LB, or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

5. The LB dates from 1915 and was designed by a local architect, Frederick Taylor, for his own occupation. It comprises an arts and crafts design with tiled hipped roofs and gabled main elevations. Its front elevation displays a jettied first floor with herringbone brick infill and a timber mullioned window. In addition, there is a tile-hung gable with windows below at both ground and first floor level. A timber casement, bay window with leaded lights and stained glass is also a prominent feature along with the timber front door, which contains a circular stained glass window. The rear elevation similarly contains a tile-hung gable end, above a full-height canted bay, with first and ground floor windows separated by hung tiles. The building is said to have been significantly extended in the 1950s with the style designed to match the original building. It is also said to have been further extended, less sympathetically, to facilitate its use as a clinic. It nonetheless

retains a range of historic features synonymous with the arts and crafts movement that contribute to its significance as a whole. The listing description, which was made in 2008, refers to the windows being mainly timber casements with leaded lights.

6. Therefore, insofar as it relates to this appeal, the significance of the LB is primarily derived from the characteristic craftsmanship of its arts and crafts architectural style. This includes the quality and detailing of its historic features encompassing stained glass and timber framed casement windows, with leaded lights.
7. The appeal scheme retains the timber window framing, including mullions, transoms and sills. However, where they are said to have been beyond repair, the timber casements have been replaced with painted aluminium, double glazed casements. These are described as conservation grade, heritage leaded lights and good quality window furniture and are intended to replicate the design, materials and craftsmanship of the historic windows. The original design of the leadwork is said to have been copied and in some instances the original pane pattern that had been altered is said to have been restored.
8. I have no reason to doubt that the casements that have been replaced were in a poor state of repair. However, no detailed condition survey is before me. Therefore, insufficient evidence has been provided that all of the windows that have been replaced could not instead have been repaired. Not all of the casements that have been replaced are said to have been historic, having been subject to previous alterations. Nonetheless, evidence indicates that some of the timber casements that have been replaced were historic. Their replacement with aluminium casements therefore amounts to a loss of historic fabric and the introduction of inappropriate materials that fail to reflect the craftsmanship of the arts and crafts movement, which is harmful to the special interest of the LB.
9. Where historic timber casements have been retained, including the stained glass bay and adjacent ground and first floor windows on the front elevation, I note that these are recessed from the timber mullion and transom. This results in a pleasing simplicity of design. I appreciate that the replacement windows are designed to replicate the appearance of the retained timber casements. The submitted typical new window elevation and sections details indicate that the replacement aluminium casements match the dimensions of the historic timber casements. However, the installed aluminium casements do not appear to adhere to those details. This is due to the aluminium opener sitting proud of the aluminium frame that is inserted into the timber surround. This gives a fussier appearance relative to the cleaner lines of the retained historic timber casements, which is visible externally and internally even when windows are closed.
10. Although the aluminium casements have a white finish intended to match that of the timber casements, the smooth finish and sharp edges to the aluminium frames is distinguishable from the softer, less uniform appearance of the timber casements. Moreover, contrary to the appellant's view, I consider the double glazed nature of the replacement windows is apparent even with the black painted inserts and the leaded panes described as conservation or heritage grade. Consequently, these are clearly distinguishable as modern replacements that detract from the historic character of the listed building.

11. Similar window replacement and repair may have been undertaken on other homes in the vicinity. However, the appeal scheme must be assessed with specific regard to its effect on the significance of this LB. Whilst iron framed casements may be used in arts and crafts buildings elsewhere, that does not justify the use of aluminium casements in a building where timber casements contribute to its historic significance.
12. Therefore, retention of the works fails to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the LB, contrary to the provisions of the Act. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (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 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets and that any such harm should have a clear and convincing justification.
13. Given the scope of the works and that some of the historic windows have been retained and repaired, I find the harm to be at the lower end of less than substantial in this instance, but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. Where a proposal leads to less than substantial harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimal viable use.
14. The appellant is of the opinion that the proposal is beneficial because it comprises repair of the LB helping to ensure its long term future. However, no substantive evidence indicates that the continued viable use of the appeal property as a residential dwelling is dependent on the replacement windows. In addition, the appellant submits that the works have in some cases restored the original pane pattern and window furniture. However, no detailed information is before me as to the extent to which the pane pattern and window furniture required restoration. Furthermore, I am not persuaded that the black handles on the aluminium casements are consistent with the historic design. No substantive evidence is before me in that respect.
15. It is also submitted that the replacement double glazed units reduce the building's carbon footprint. I give significant weight to the need to support energy efficiency and low carbon heating as required by paragraph 167 of the Framework. However, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal is the least harmful way to achieve better energy efficiency and improved amenity for its occupants. Although aluminium casements are said to be longer lasting, timber casements that are well maintained can also be long lasting.
16. Although paragraph 164 of the Framework requires significant weight to be given, irrespective of any energy efficiency improvement and the scale of any associated carbon reduction, it does not disapply those parts of the Framework set out above or the need to give any resulting heritage harm great weight in the public benefit balance.
17. Accordingly, I find that the public benefits are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that has been caused. Therefore I conclude that, on balance, the completed works have failed to preserve the special historic interest of the Grade II listed building. This fails to satisfy the requirements of the Act and the provisions within the

Framework. Insofar as relevant, it also conflicts with policy BE1 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (September 2021). Amongst other things this seek to ensure that alterations conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance and for less than substantial harm to be weighed against the public benefits.

Conclusion

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

Rachel Hall

INSPECTOR