
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 12 November 2025

by Jennifer Wallace BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 January 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/P1560/W/25/3369209

Mill House Station Road, Ardleigh, Essex CO7 7RS

- 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 Tim Rowe against the decision of Tendring District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00689/FULHH.
 - The development proposed is 1. Reglazing of 18 single glaze sash windows and 1 door with vacuum glazing 2. Installation of 13 solar panels to the rear extension roof 3. Replacement of wooden gate with automated wooden gate
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/P1560/Y/25/3369215

Mill House Station Road, Ardleigh, Essex CO7 7RS

- 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 Tim Rowe against the decision of Tendring District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00687/LBC.
 - The works proposed are 1. Reglazing of 18 single glaze sash windows and 1 door with vacuum glazing 2. Installation of 13 solar panels to the rear extension roof 3. Replacement of wooden gate with automated wooden gate.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A: The appeal is dismissed.
2. Appeal B: The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. These decisions address both planning and listed building consent appeals for the same site and the same scheme. To prevent duplication and for the avoidance of doubt, I have dealt with both appeals within a single decision letter.
4. These appeals relate to a listed building within a conservation area. I have had special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) which require me to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses; and to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.
5. I have removed extraneous words from the description of development and works.

Main Issue

6. The main issue for both appeals is the effect of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building Mill House and

whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ardleigh Conservation Area.

Reasons

Special Interest and Significance

7. Mill House¹ dates from the early/mid-19th century. From the evidence before me and my observations on site, its significance lies in its special architectural and historic interest as an example of a 19th century mill house built from gault brick with a slate roof, incorporating finely crafted and polite Georgian detailing. In addition, the building's significance is enhanced by its group value with the neighbouring Grade II listed building Phoenix Steam Mill and Engine House (Phoenix Mill) which dates from the mid-19th century.
8. Fenestration is a key feature of the polite detailing of the building. The windows' sliding sash style, glazing pattern with elegant glazing bars and traditional materials of painted timber and glass, contribute in a meaningful way to the building's heritage merit.
9. Mill House has been extended twice to the rear. These have the appearance of distinct phases clearly discernible from the main body of the property. One is a modest single storey projection constructed from brick with a slate roof and was granted planning permission in 2002. The other is one and a half stories in dark timber cladding and red pantiles and was granted planning permission in 2007. Due to their age and appearance, they make a neutral contribution to the special interest and significance of Mill House as it relates to this appeal.
10. The appeal site also lies within the Ardleigh Conservation Area (CA). Its character and appearance are mainly derived from its architectural and historic interest as a historic rural settlement with a small, but notable industrial component. A key feature of the CA as a whole is the retention of historic fabric and detailing to the buildings within it. Mill House makes a positive contribution to this as an example of residential development that went alongside industry and from its architectural qualities.

Appeal Proposal and Effects

Reglazing

11. It is proposed to reglaze 18 sash windows and a door at the property. The windows are comprised of small panes set within narrow glazing bars. It is proposed to reglaze these with ultra-slim vacuum glazing along with any associated making good of the existing window frames.
12. There is no substantive evidence before me as to whether the glass in the panes is original or has been replaced over time. From my observations at my site visit, it seems likely that the answer is a combination. However, in the absence of a robust assessment, I cannot be certain as to the extent of any loss of historic fabric.
13. The detailed scope of works indicates the manufacturer of the vacuum glazing. However, the information does not specify the depth of the glazing. Nor are there any detailed sections of the existing glazing bars to demonstrate that they would

¹ List Entry Number: 1112057 Date first listed: 30-Nov-1987

be capable of accommodating vacuum glazing without an adverse effect on their elegant detailing.

14. I have been directed to Historic England Advice Note 18 (HEAN 18)² which does advise that the installation of vacuum double glazing within historic frames will generally be acceptable. However, this also contains the caveat that such works are likely to be unacceptable where windows retain historic glass of interest and where the frames/glazing bars cannot support such glazing. I am also mindful that HEAN 18 is clear that there must be an understanding of the significance of a historic building and that harm should be minimised and avoided. In the absence of the information I have identified above, I cannot be certain of the extent of historic fabric that would be lost as a result of the proposal. Nor can I be certain that the proposal could be carried out within the existing frames and glazing bars. That such glazing has been used in other properties would also not address this uncertainty.
15. It is suggested that this is a matter which could be addressed by condition for the submission of more detailed drawings. However, given the uncertainty I have identified above, the positive contribution that fenestration makes to both the listed building and CA along with the great weight to be given to their conservation, the use of a condition would be unlikely to meet the tests set out in paragraph 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. Conditions must be reasonable and so should not prevent the permission or consent from being implemented. I cannot be certain that would be the case here.
16. I recognise that there would be benefits from improved energy efficiency to the building. However, I also give great weight to the conservation of this designated heritage asset. I conclude that it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposal would preserve the Grade II listed building Mill House, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
17. I therefore cannot be certain that the proposal would meet the statutory presumption set out in section 16(2) of the Act. Nor can I be sure that it would not harm the significance of the listed building and so comply with the provisions within the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment. Nor can I draw conclusions against the relevant policies of the development plan.

Solar Panels

18. To the rear of the site lies an open space with an equipped children's play area and sports pitches. This appears to be associated with the village hall and appeared readily accessible to the public at the time of my site visit. While not the principal elevation of the property, the rear is nonetheless readily visible in views from a public space and so makes a contribution to how Mill House is appreciated.
19. The installation of solar panels would introduce a new and unremittingly modern element into the roofscape of Mill House. This would be particularly prominent where it would contrast with the red pantiles. However, this is a clearly modern extension, set away from the rear elevation of the historic core of Mill House and its elegant detailing. Consequently, the installation of solar panels would not affect the intrinsic special interest of the listed building or the ability to appreciate it.

² Historic England 2024 Adapting Historic Buildings for Energy and Carbon Efficiency: Historic England Advice Note 18 (HEAN 18)

Gate

20. It is proposed to install a new automatic gate. This would replace an existing, non-historic gate with one of a very similar appearance but with the addition of an automatic opening mechanism. The Council has not raised any concerns with this aspect of the application. I have no reason to find otherwise and in relation to this element of the proposal, the special interest of the building would therefore be preserved.

Conservation Area

21. The potential for there to be harm to the fine detailing of the glazing bars would also have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the CA as a whole as the retention of historic detailing makes a strong positive contribution to its character and appearance. The installation of the solar panels, while adding a modern element, would preserve the character and appearance of the CA, particularly given the industrial history of Mill House and Phoenix Mill. The replacement gate would have a neutral effect and would therefore preserve the character or appearance of the CA as a whole.

Other Matters

22. Phoenix Mill is constructed of white brick and dates from the mid-19th century. Its significance as it relates to this appeal is primarily derived from its architectural and historic interest as one of the earliest purpose built steam mills in Essex, and its group value with Mill House due to their historic connection.
23. The appeal site also lies within the wider setting of the Grade II listed building New Hall³. It is a large house set in substantial grounds. It also dates from the early/mid 19th century and is constructed from gault brick. Its significance as it relates to this appeal is primarily derived from its architectural and historic interest as development made possible by the wealth generated by local industry. It also stems in part from its verdant grounds and nearby historic built backdrop.
24. Given the form and extent of the proposed scheme, the setting of both Phoenix Mill and New Hall would be preserved and their significance not harmed.

Conclusions

25. I find that the proposed solar panels and gate would preserve the special interest and not harm the significance of Mill House; and preserve the character and appearance and not harm the significance of the CA. A lack of harm in these respects is a neutral consideration which weighs neither for nor against the appeals.
26. However, there is insufficient evidence before me to allow me to conclude that the proposed reglazing would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building Mill House and not harm its significance. Nor can I be certain of the effect of the proposal on the character or appearance of the CA. Consequently, I cannot reasonably determine whether the proposal would meet the requirements of Section 16(2), 66(1) or 72(1) of the Act and thus comply with the provisions within the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment. Nor can I draw conclusions against the relevant policies of

³ List Entry Number: 1112056 Date first listed: 30 November 1987

the Beyond North Essex Authorities' Shared Strategic Section 1 Plan (January 2021) and Tendring District Local Plan 2013-2033 and Beyond Section 2 (January 2022).

27. For the above reasons, I conclude that both Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

Jennifer Wallace

INSPECTOR