



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2025

by Simon Hand MA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/W2845/F/24/3348085

5 Tower Court, Overstone Park, NORTHAMPTON, NN6 0AS

- The appeal is made under section 39 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Dermot Thurley against a listed building enforcement notice issued by West Northamptonshire Council
 - The enforcement notice was issued on 13 June 2024
 - The contravention of listed building control alleged in the notice is: without listed building consent the installation of 6 first floor windows are contrary to Listed Building Consent Reference DA/2019/0716 (as shown on the attached photographs and additional details) in that; the casement and glazing bar details on the installed windows do not match the original window profiles and details. Wood beading has been used to fix the glass instead of putty. The windows have been supplied with a factory applied paint coat, rather than being finished with a traditional hand painted finish. Conventional plastic/plastic-coated handles and stays have been used.
 - The requirements of the notice are: (i) The installed casement windows on the first floor are to be replaced with new flush timber casements. All joinery shall be constructed in accordance with the design and dimensions as detailed on drawing no. DA/2019/0716 "Approved Windows" attached to this notice as PLAN 1; (ii) All casement frames should be of simple Ovolo mouldings and glazing bars should be added in accordance with the details as shown drawing ref. 'Window details' attached to this notice as PI-AN 2; (iii) All seals around the 12mm (4mm/4 mm/4 mm) double glazed units are to be finished with a heritage face putty (not a timber bead); (iv) Any and all timber elements to the windows are to be coloured white with a hand painted finish; (v) All window furniture is to comprise spoon end casement handles/fasteners and stays in antique brass. Design and dimensions are to match those shown on the photographs labelled 'Photograph 1', 'Photograph 2' and 'Photograph 3' attached to this notice
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is 6 months.
 - The appeal is made on the ground set out in section 39(1) (e) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended.
-

Decision

1. Listed building consent is granted for the retention of 6 first floor windows at 5 Tower Court, Overstone Park, Northampton, NN6 0AS subject to the following condition: Within 3 months of the date of this decision letter the handles and stays on the 6 windows hereby granted consent shall be replaced by wrought or cast iron versions, which will thereafter be retained.

The Appeal on Ground (e)

2. Tower Court is a Victorian stable block set around a courtyard. It has been divided up into 8 dwellings but has had a varied history. Originally it seems the upper floor, at least of the appeal property, was used as accommodation for stable hands. Afterwards the whole property was part of a large school and the upper

floor was an open dormitory for boarders. After that it was used as classrooms and finally converted into dwellings.

3. I accept that following this chequered history, very little remains of the historic character of the building internally and the main significance lies in its form and external appearance. Consent was granted for the replacement casement windows but it was for slimline double-glazing (some 4mm deep) whereas 16mm deep standard double glazed units have been used.
4. The Council accept that to the casual observer there is little difference between the new windows in No5 and the rest of the Court but argue that the use of traditional materials and construction methods are important to retain the architectural integrity of the façade. I am not sure I agree in this particular case, especially as the building has undergone a number of transformations and it is unclear (but seems unlikely to me) that the windows were original. It is also the case that double glazing, of any sort, is not traditional in any sense. If the Council were, quite reasonably, prepared to accept replacement double glazed windows than I think it is their appearance that matters most rather than the more esoteric issue of construction and hand painting.
5. Having seen the site, the row of upper floor windows across several properties at the front and back appears to be entirely consistent. The new windows do not look out of place and it would take very careful scrutiny to determine any differences. It follows from this that I think the Council's concern over the use of glazing bars rather than putty, lack of hand finished paint and ovolo moulding is misplaced. None of these details cause harm to the listed building.
6. There is a separate issue over the ironmongery used. I agree with the Council that the plastic coated handles and stays are unfortunate and an obvious modernisation. I also agree with the appellant that the proposed brass fittings are unsuitable. The appellant suggests a sensible compromise of cast or wrought iron which would have been more typical of the stable use and probably the old school as well. I shall therefore grant consent for the matters alleged subject to a condition that the internal handles and stays are replaced within 3 months.

Simon Hand

INSPECTOR