



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 6 March 2026

by A James BSc (Hons) MA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 MARCH 2026

Appeal A: APP/Y3615/W/25/3375941

**Parker's Lodge, 2A Rectory Place, 89 Portsmouth Road, Guildford, Surrey
GU2 4DG**

- 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 Steve Goss against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application reference is 25/P/00340.
 - The development proposed is replacement of 8 metal windows.
-

Appeal B: APP/Y3615/Y/25/3375947

**Parker's Lodge, 2A Rectory Place, 89 Portsmouth Road, Guildford, Surrey
GU2 4DG**

- 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 Steve Goss against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application reference is 25/P/00341.
 - The works proposed are replacement of 8 metal windows.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appellant advises that there is a correction relating to the appeal address. I have therefore taken the address from the appellant's Statement of Case. I am satisfied that no third party has been prejudiced by this amendment.
4. As the appeal site lies within a conservation area and relates to a listed building, 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).
5. While the Council's reason for refusal focuses on harm to the listed building, it states that the proposal would fail to comply with Policy D20 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Development Management Policies, adopted March 2023 (the LPDMP). Policy D20 requires that proposals preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of a conservation Area (CA). The Planning Officer's report states that harm would arise to the character and appearance of the CA. The appellant has had the opportunity to comment on the Council's case. I have a statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Act to pay special attention to the

desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA when making my decision.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are whether the appeal scheme would preserve a Grade II listed building, known as '87 and 89, Portsmouth Road' (Ref: 1029248) and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses and the extent to which it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Millmead and Portsmouth Road CA.

Reasons

Listed building

7. '87 and 89, Portsmouth Road' is a Grade II listed building. It was originally a large pair of semi-detached houses, which was built towards the end of the 19th century and was designed by Norman Shaw. The appeal property forms part of an extension to the building, which was constructed in the 1920s and is now occupied as a separate dwelling. The terrace provides accommodation over three storeys. It is constructed of red/orange brick and has brown, fish scale tile hanging on the upper floors. It has a plain tiled roof. The building features traditional, leaded light windows, which are predominately single glazed. The appeal property has a modern rear extension, which features double glazing.
8. 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 19th and 20th century architecture. The building's architectural design, use of traditional materials and its leaded light windows make important contributions in these regards. While the appeal property was not designed by Norman Shaw and is a later addition to the building, its design, use of traditional materials and its historic, steel, casement windows complement the 19th century part of the building and contribute towards its special interest.
9. The proposal seeks to replace four upper floor windows on the front elevation and four windows on the rear elevation. The existing windows are ungalvanized, leaded, steel casement windows, which are believed to date back to the 1920s. I appreciate that the windows on the appeal property due to their proportions, arrangement and detailing are not an identical match to those on the part of the building designed by Norman Shaw. However, the historic windows on the appeal property, by reason of their design and use of traditional materials make a positive contribution to the building as a whole and contribute towards its special interest.
10. The windows that are proposed to be replaced are in need of repair. While the condition of each window varies, I observed among other things, evidence of corrosion, rust jacking, distortion of the casements (which causes some windows not to shut properly), flaking paint and condensation, which is causing damage to the surrounding frames and windowsills. The appellant advises that the windows are not fully weatherproof and that some window stays are not usable. Although the Council appears content with the principle of replacing the historic windows with single glazed windows, there is no substantive evidence before me that the historic windows are beyond repair. In fact, the appellant acknowledges that the windows could be repaired but considers that the windows would need to be

removed in order to undertake repair work, which would be a disruptive process. However, based on my site visit and the evidence before me, there is no compelling evidence that the condition of the windows is so poor that they would all need to be removed in order to be repaired.

11. The proposal seeks to provide galvanised, white powder coated steel windows, with welded brass ironmongery. The appellant argues that the proposed windows would match the existing windows on the dwelling. However, the proposed double glazed windows would have a chunkier profile when compared to the existing windows. Although the proposed lead comes would be soldered, they would be applied on either side of the outer pane and would fail to appear authentic. The provision of double glazing also has different reflective qualities than single glazing. I appreciate that secondary glazing can alter a window's reflective qualities; however, secondary glazing is typically set further back, which minimises its impact from public views. There is no compelling evidence before me why the condensation and mould issues could not be addressed through the repair of the existing windows and upgrading of any secondary glazing.
12. Given the above, I find that the proposed windows would be more modern in appearance than the existing windows and would erode the authenticity and integrity of the listed building. The proposal would also result in the loss of historic fabric (albeit from a later phase of the building), which would harm the special interest of the listed building.

Conservation area

13. The appeal property lies within the Millmead and Portsmouth Road Conservation Area (CA). The significance of the CA insofar as is relevant to these appeals is derived from the high quality of architecture within it of differing styles and periods, which includes a variety of uses including civic and residential. The CA also includes a group of buildings, which were designed by the esteemed architect Norman Shaw and feature historic leaded light windows. The appeal property by reason of its architectural design, use of traditional materials and presence of historic, steel windows makes a positive contribution to the significance of the CA.
14. The listed building by reason of its size, design and siting is highly prominent from the public realm. While the appeal property is set back from the highway and partially screened from the public realm by the front boundary treatment and planting, views of the building are available from the vehicular access and over the boundary treatment. Views of the rear of the building are also available from a nearby road. The proposed windows by reason of their chunkier frames, use of double glazing and applied lead comes would fail to replicate the quality of the historic windows and would therefore fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA.

Public benefits and heritage balance

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal scheme fails to preserve the special interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of the CA. Given the nature and extent of the works, I find the harm to the significance of the listed building and the CA 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.

16. 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 improve the thermal comfort and energy efficiency of the building and would be 100% more energy efficient when compared to secondary glazing. Accordingly, the proposal would help to contribute towards the government's aim of achieving net zero, reduce the deterioration of the historic fabric and reduce energy bills. The proposal would also help to protect the building against excessive condensation and would have health benefits in terms of removing mould.
17. 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.
18. I appreciate that the Framework and development plan support energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings and that the Framework requires significant weight is given to such proposals. However, this does not disapply other parts of the Framework, including paragraphs 202, 212 and 213. These paragraphs state that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. Paragraph 212 of the Framework states 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.
19. In this case, there is no compelling evidence before me that the proposal is the least harmful option for securing these public benefits. Consequently, clear and convincing justification for the harm that would be caused to the significance of the designated heritage assets has not been demonstrated. There is also no substantive 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 the proposal necessary to secure the viability and long-term conservation of the building. Nonetheless, even if I were to afford significant weight to the public benefits of the appeal scheme, the public benefits would not outweigh the great weight, which is required to be given to the conservation of heritage assets.
20. Given the above, I conclude that, on balance, the proposal fails to preserve the special interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of the CA. Accordingly, it fails to satisfy the requirements of the Act and the historic environment policies of the Framework. The proposal would also conflict with Policies D1 and D3 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015 – 2034, adopted April 2019 and Policies D18, D19 and D20 of the LPDMP. These policies among other things require that proposals conserve, enhance and where appropriate better reveal the significance of a listed building and preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of the CA. These policies also seek to retain architectural details and features, such as windows that make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

21. While a private representation has been received that supports the proposal on the grounds of energy efficiency, climate change and its visual impact, I do not find that this alters my findings set out above.
22. The appellant has drawn my attention to a nearby house that was designed by Norman Shaw that has had replacement windows (Hitherbury House). Full details of the circumstances of the other scheme are not before me. However, I am advised that Hitherbury House is not a listed building. It therefore does not have the same level of statutory protection or special interest as the appeal property and is therefore not comparable.
23. The appellant has also drawn my attention to Historic England's guidance entitled 'Adapting Historic Buildings for Energy and Carbon Efficiency'. This guidance indicates in some situations that slim line double glazing can be acceptable in existing frames. The guidance provides an example of a Grade I listed building where slim profile double glazing was deemed to be acceptable. Full details of this scheme are not before me. Nevertheless, the appeal scheme does not seek to provide slim line double glazing and is therefore not comparable to the example provided in Historic England's guidance. The appellant also argues that consent was granted for double glazed replacement windows (in consultation with Historic England) at a Grade II* listed building¹. However, full details of the circumstances and the design of the other windows are not before me. Given the above, I give the other schemes limited weight in my decision.
24. The appellant has provided details of an informal survey that they carried out in respect to single and double glazed windows. While I am advised that the participants were conservation specialists, details of the survey participants and their qualifications are not before me. Furthermore, the size and quality of the photographs makes it difficult to make an informed decision. Consequently, I give the survey limited weight in my decision.

Conclusion

25. **Appeal A:** The appeal scheme conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations, including the Framework, that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, Appeal A is dismissed.
26. **Appeal B:** For the reasons given above, Appeal B is dismissed.

A James

INSPECTOR

¹ The White House, Grayswood (WA/2019/0665)