
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2025

by **A James BSc (Hons) MA MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/Y/25/3371329

Pound Cottage, Spy Lane, Loxwood, West Sussex RH14 0SQ

- 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 Richard Keates against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application reference is 24/02841/LBC.
 - The works proposed are described as 'replacement of Qty 5 Crittal style windows.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the appeal relates 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).
3. The Council's Statement of Case confirms that following the Council's issue of their decision notice, the Chichester Local Plan 2021 - 2039 was adopted on 19 August 2025 (the Local Plan). The appellant has had the opportunity to comment on the Council's submission.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve a Grade II listed building, known as 'Pound Cottage' (Ref: 1222809) and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

5. Pound Cottage is a Grade II listed building, which is estimated to date back to at least the 17th century. It is timber framed with plaster and painted brick infilling. It is two storeys high with a half-hipped tiled roof. The windows are predominantly casement windows with diamond pattern leaded lights.
6. 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 at least the 17th century. The building's timber frame, the presence of traditional materials, its surviving historic fabric and its pleasing architectural design make important contributions in these regards.
7. The proposal seeks consent to replace 5 nos. windows, which are believed to date back to the 1920s. The appellant advises that the windows are hot rolled standard

metal windows, with standard hinges and ironmongery, which were mass produced from around the 1920s. I observed no marks or stamps on the windows during my site visit and it is not believed that they are original Crittall windows. However, the windows are Crittall in style and have been in place for some time and form part of the historic and architectural evolution of the building. While the leaded light windows are not specifically referenced in the list description, listings are primarily for identification purposes and do not provide an exhaustive or complete description of the special interest.

8. The appellant argues that consent has previously been granted¹ to replace other Crittall style windows on the building of the same vintage. The Council disputes this and believes that the previously replaced windows were later additions. Nonetheless, full details of the consented schemes are not before me and I therefore give them limited weight in my decision.
9. The appellant advises that the existing windows are in a poor condition; some casements no longer open; there is water ingress in certain conditions; and, some of the glazing panels are distorted. However, there is no condition survey before me. While one of the windows has buckled slightly, on the whole they appear to be in a reasonable condition and have been well maintained. The existing windows by reason of their traditional character, design, appearance and historic fabric make a positive contribution to the special interest of the listed building.
10. The proposal seeks to replicate the existing windows, providing new, single glazed, leaded light windows, which would match the other windows that have been recently installed on the building. To the untrained eye and from a distance, there may appear to be little difference between the historic and recently installed windows. However, I observed on my site visit that the lead in the recently installed windows is slightly thicker and has a more uniformed finish, when compared to the historic windows. The hinges also differ. The proposal would result in the loss of historic fabric (albeit from around the early-20th century), which forms part of the evolution of the building.
11. While views from the public realm would be limited, listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest irrespective of whether or not public views of the building can be gained.
12. 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 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.
13. 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.

¹ Application refs: 14/3767/LBC and 23/00529/LBC

14. 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. The appellant argues that the new windows would be more environmentally friendly, improve the thermal efficiency of the building and would reduce energy costs. The appellant considers that the cost and benefits of repairing and draught proofing the existing windows cannot be justified. However, there is no repair schedule or substantive evidence before me that similar benefits could not be obtained through repair works and/or draft proofing.
15. Any improvements to the building's thermal insulation and in respect to energy efficiency have not been quantified. Given that the proposal relates to a single property, any environmental benefits which would flow to the public at large are likely to be minimal. It is clear that the benefits which would accrue would primarily be of a private nature. There is no compelling evidence before me to suggest that the use of the building would cease in the absence of the proposed changes. As a result, I do not find them necessary to secure the viability and long-term conservation of the building.
16. 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.
17. 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 Policies P9 and P10 of the Local Plan. These policies among other things require that listed buildings are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Other Matters

18. I appreciate that no objection was raised from the Parish Council; however, this does not alter my finding set out above.
19. While there is some discussion in the evidence about the principle of installing double glazing on the building, such a proposal is not before me. I have considered the appeal scheme based on the plans that were considered by the Council.

Conclusion

20. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A James

INSPECTOR