

APPLICATION FOR LISTED BUILDING CONSENT

OFFICER DELGATED REPORT

APPLICATION REFERENCE:	PL/2026/04340
APPLICATION TYPE:	Listed building consent (Alt/Ext)
SITE ADDRESS:	Applegarth, Chiseldon Road, Ogbourne St George, SN8 1SU
DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION:	Removal of the double-glazed dormer windows on the front of the house and reinstatement of the 4 No. salvaged windows; Retention of the double-glazed French doors on the front of the house; Retention of 3 No. double-glazed windows on the rear of the house.
RECOMMENDATION:	Approve with Conditions

SITE DESCRIPTION/CONTEXT

Applegarth is a grade II* listed building originally dating from the medieval period, with later additions ranging from the 17th, 18th, 19th and late 20th centuries. The oldest part of the building is built of banded flint and stone, and extended in Sarsen and chalkstone, and then again in brick. The historic building of 5 bays is under a continuous traditional combed wheat thatched roof. It has a right-angled garage wing, which had a second storey added in that later 20th century.

It is located within the Ogbourne St George Conservation Area.

The list description states, for means of identification purposes only, the following:

*Medieval, C17, C18 and early C19. Right 3 bays banded flint and stone, extended by 1 bay to left in C18, sarsen and chalkstone with brick dressings, and by a further 2 bays in early C19, all brickwork. Continuous thatched roof. The right 3-bay block has a central entrance, now a glazed garden door, and timber casement windows. Three flush half-dormers. The C18 bay has similar windows and gable brick stack with datestone reading ICC / I**. Left bays also have similar windows and half-glazed door to last bay and large gable stack. Outbuildings attached at right angles at end. Interior: Right 3 bays contain two short principal cruck trusses with chamfered arch braces to collars, the feet of the braces being continued by tenoned pieces down below the top of the walls. Saddle apex type C to east truss, scratch numbered I, and yoked apex clasping diagonal ridge piece to second truss, scratch marked II. Single cusped heavy windbraces to all 3 bays, and wall plate mortice on blades testify to original timber framed structure. Fire blackening to apex toward west end. C18 bay probably replaces original parlour end. This bay has, on ground floor, fine stone fireplace with moulded arch and jambs and wine-glass stops, reset here from cottage opposite the New Inn, High Street. On first floor of this bay, a duck's nest cast iron fireplace with date G III R. (Wilbr B.2343)*

PROPOSAL

Removal of the double-glazed dormer windows on the front of the house and reinstatement of the 4 No. salvaged windows; Retention of the double-glazed French doors on the front of the house; Retention of 3 No. double-glazed windows on the rear of the house.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Proposal / Summary
K/11524/L - Listed building consent Decision - Approve with Conditions Date: 11/3/1988 – ERECTION OF UTILITY ROOM AND VEGETABLE STORE, INSTALLATION OF FRENCH DOORS AND WINDOWS AND INTERNAL ALTERATIONS.
K/15104/L - Listed building consent Decision - Approve with Conditions Date: 19/1/1990 – PROPOSED REPLACEMENT PORCH
K/12136 - Full planning permission Decision - Approve with Conditions Date: 31/5/1988 – ERECTION OF TWO SINGLE STOREY EXTENSIONS TO REAR
K/40536/L - Listed building consent Decision - Approve with Conditions Date: 18/1/2001 – Insertion of two velux roof windows to rear roof slope
K/32201/L - Listed building consent Decision - Approve with Conditions Date: 15/12/1995 – The siting of solar panels on roof of northern extension.
PL/2026/00204 - Listed building consent (Alt/Ext) Decision - Withdrawn by Council Date: 20/3/2026 – Replace 4 front facing windows with identical windows
ENQ/2026/00216 - Pre-Application enquiry Decision - Pre-App Response Date: – Replacement of 4 Windows on the Front and 2 on the Back of the Main House (Retrospective)

RELEVANT LEGISLATION, POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

Legislation

From the point of view of the historic environment the main statutory tests are set out within the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Section 16 requires that **special regard** be given to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their settings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 also requires the Council to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of designated Conservation Areas.

National Policy and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) August 2026 sets out government policy, including in respect of the historic environment.

Chapter 20 - *Conserving and enhancing the historic environment*, recognises heritage assets as an irreplaceable resource. Heritage assets should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, with harm avoided unless there is a clear and convincing justification. Decision-makers are required to apply a balanced approach, giving substantial weight to the conservation of heritage assets and weighing any harm to significance against the public benefits of the proposal.

Chapter 5 of the NPPF sets out policies for *Meeting the challenge of climate change* and gives substantial weight to the benefits of improving the energy efficiency of existing buildings and/or drawing energy from district heat networks, renewable and low carbon sources (including through

the installation of heat pumps and solar panels where these do not already benefit from permitted development rights).

National Planning Practice Guidance provides guidance on interpreting the NPPF.

Historic England's *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance* (2008) provides policy and guidance for the "sustainable management of the historic environment". Additional guidance on the application of policies set out in the NPPF is contained within their publications:

- Historic Environment *Good Practice Planning Advice Note 2 – Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment* (2015)
- Historic Environment *Good Practice Planning Advice Note 3 – The Setting of Heritage Assets 2nd edition* (2017)
- Historic England *Advice Note 2 – Making changes to Heritage Assets* (2025)
- Historic England *Advice Note 18 – Adapting Historic Buildings for Energy and Carbon Efficiency* (2026)
- *Traditional Windows: their care, repair and upgrading* (2017)

Historic England's publication '*Traditional Windows – Their Care, Repair and Upgrading* (2017)' encourages the retention of windows that contribute to the significance of listed buildings but sets also out their approach to the alteration/replacement of windows where this is acceptable in principle:

1. Where historic windows, whether original or later insertions, make a positive contribution to the significance of a listed building they should be retained and repaired where possible. If beyond repair they should be replaced with accurate copies.
2. Where historic windows have already been replaced with windows whose design follows historic patterns, these usually make a positive contribution to the significance of listed buildings. When they do, they should therefore be retained and repaired where possible. If beyond repair they should be replaced with accurate copies.
3. Where historic windows or replacement windows of historic pattern survive without historic glass it may be possible to introduce slim-profile double-glazing without harming the significance of the listed building. There are compatibility issues to consider as the introduction of double-glazing can require the renewal of the window frame to accommodate thicker glazing, thereby harming significance. These issues are covered in Section 4 of this guidance.
4. Where historic windows have been replaced with ones whose design does not follow historic patterns, these are unlikely to contribute to the significance of listed buildings. Replacing such windows with new windows of a sympathetic historic pattern, whether single-glazed or incorporating slim-profile double-glazing, may cause no additional harm. It also provides an opportunity to enhance the significance of the building, which is the desired outcome under national policy.
5. Where a new window or re-glazing is agreed, the reflective properties of secondary and double-glazing as compared to modern, polished single-glazing, do not usually harm the significance of the building. But when new multi-paned windows are proposed, the desirability of reproducing broken reflections by individually glazing each pane should be considered. Where the aesthetic value of the building is high, then the impact on the whole of the relevant elevation should be considered, including the desirability of accurately matching other windows.

Wiltshire Core Strategy:

Whilst not directly relevant to listed building consent applications, the below policies give an indication of the Council's approach to development affecting heritage assets:

- Core Policy 57 'Ensuring high-quality design and place shaping': A high standard of design is required in all new developments, including extensions, alterations, and changes of use of existing buildings. Development is expected to create a strong sense of place through drawing on the local context and being complementary to the locality.
- Core Policy 58 'Ensuring the conservation of the historic environment' requires that "designated heritage assets and their settings will be conserved, and where appropriate enhanced, in a manner appropriate to their significance."

ISSUES

- Impact upon the preservation of the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural and/or historic interest.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Historic England – support –

'The submitted proposals align with our pre-application advice and we do not wish to offer any further advice. Historic England supports the proposal to reinstate the removed timber casement windows at the front of the building in new frames and to retain the replacement double glazed French doors at the front of the house and windows at the back of the house. As per our previous advice, the replacement French doors and rear windows can be justified in heritage terms as the French doors by their nature contrast with the other windows and replaced a modern door of unknown date, while the rear windows are predominantly within later lean-to extensions. It is not necessary to consult us on this application again, unless there are material changes to the proposals. However, if you would like advice from us, please contact us to explain your request.'

Historic England provide their own pre-application advice service, however due to the unauthorised nature of the works discussed at pre-application stage, and the grade II* listing of the building, the situation was discussed with HE and informal pre-application comments were received via email on 24/04/2026, which stated the following:

We understand that the first floor casement windows, which were later replacements but historic, have been replaced with double glazing with stick on glazing bars. The historic casements have been retained but not the frames. The ground floor French doors at the front were also replaced with double glazed doors. The rest of the front elevation casement windows are single glazed.

Some of the windows at the rear of the building (mostly in later extensions) have also been replaced with double glazing.

We agree that the replacement windows at the back of the house are likely to be acceptable given these are predominantly within later lean-to extensions.

The replacement windows at the front, however, contrast with the detailing of the remaining single-glazed casements and incorporate an inappropriate timber sill detail.

We agree that the best route would be to reuse the timber casements in new frames. We recommend single glazing given the narrow profile of the glazing bars and that the other

windows are single glazed. Secondary glazing could potentially be installed to improve thermal efficiency.

Given that the replacement French doors by their nature contrast with the other windows and we do not know the age of the replaced doors we would consider it acceptable to retain these subject to securing LBC.

REPRESENTATIONS

In accordance with the requirements of Section 5(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990 (as amended) the application for listed building consent was publicised by way of:

- A site notice displayed near the site;
- An advertisement placed in the local press.

These methods were used to inform interested parties and to allow a statutory consultation period of **21 days** for representations to be submitted.

Below is a summary of the representations received during the consultation period. In accordance with the provisions of the *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990*, only matters relevant to the consideration of the building's special architectural or historic interest have been taken into account in the assessment of this Listed Building Consent application.

- None received.

ASSESSMENT

In accordance with Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, special regard has been given to the significance of the listed building, including its architectural and historic interest, and the desirability of preserving both the building and its setting. Relevant policies within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), particularly Section 20: *Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment*, have also been taken into account. These policies require that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset must be clearly justified and weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

In order to be acceptable, the application needs to be assessed against the following criteria:

Information considered/submitted

Policy HE5 of the NPPF requires applicants to assess the significance of any heritage assets affected by a proposal, including the contribution made by their setting, and to identify the likely effects of the development on that significance. Sufficient information should be provided to enable a clear understanding of the significance of the heritage asset and its setting, and the impact of the proposal upon it.

Decision-makers must be satisfied that assessments accurately reflect the effects on heritage assets caused by development proposals. In this case, the application has been accompanied by the following:

- Heritage statement

The submitted statement is a thorough document that covers the background of the works and proposals to rectify the situation. This is an extremely detailed statement that fully addresses the

requirements of the NPPF assessing the impact of the proposals on the significance of the designated heritage asset, focusing on the elements subject to the application.

The following heritage recommendations are therefore made on the basis of the local planning authority's own assessment of the significance of the heritage asset and the impact of the proposals.

Assessment of significance:

According to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), significance is defined as:

“The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting.”

Historic England further categorises significance into four key values:

- *Evidential* – the potential of the asset to yield evidence about past human activity.
- *Historic* – the ways in which the asset illustrates aspects of history.
- *Aesthetic* – the sensory and design qualities of the asset.
- *Communal* – the meanings and associations attached to the asset by people.

In this case the significance of the building lies largely with its vernacular architecture, character and traditional construction methods and materials, including timber framing surviving from the medieval period.

Impact of proposals on the significance and setting of the building/structure:

Understanding the impact of proposed works on a listed building requires a careful and proportionate assessment of how those changes affect the asset’s heritage significance and its setting. This includes both the physical alterations to the building itself and any changes to its spatial or visual relationship with surrounding structures or spaces.

The significance of a heritage asset is not static; it is shaped by its architectural, historic, and communal values, and by how these are experienced in context. Therefore, any intervention must be considered in light of the asset’s identified significance, with attention given to both potential harm and benefits. Benefits may include repairs that support the long-term conservation of the building, improved energy performance, or enhanced public access and understanding.

This assessment is grounded in the statutory duty under Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which requires special regard to be given to the desirability of preserving the building and its features of special interest. It is also informed by national policy, particularly policies HE4-9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and relevant local heritage policies and guidance.

The application has been submitted as the result of advice given via the Council’s pre-application advice route, in relation to a number of windows that had been replaced without the benefit of listed building consent. The situation is as follows:

- Front elevation – replacement of four windows and one pair of French doors
- Rear elevation – replacement of three windows.

The following advice was given in April 2026:

The enquiry seeks advice on the replacement of 4 windows and a pair of French Doors within the front elevation, along with 3 replacement windows on the rear elevation. The works have already been completed, without the benefit of listed building consent.

A site visit and meeting with the applicant took place on 18th February 2026.

As the building is grade II*, Historic England have been involved in some discussions about the situation, as although they do offer their own pre-application advice service, as the new windows are technically unauthorised replacements, they have provided some informal comments to aid the advice going forward.

Essentially the windows, prior to replacement, were as follows:

- Front elevation: 2 windows are historic and 2 windows appear to date from the mid-20th century. They were multi-paned flush timber casements, with true glazing bars with single glazing, and no cill detail. The French doors were also multi-paned single glazed timber doors.
- Rear elevation: 2 windows that form a corner to a modern rear extension (possibly dating from c.1988), and a window to a more historic, possibly 19th century, lean-to – these are understood to have replaced c.1970s 'storm-proof' type windows.

The current situation is as follows:

- Front elevation – 4 x flush timber casement windows, with double glazing, 'applied' glazing bars and addition of cill detail. French doors also now double glazed.
- Rear elevation – 3 x flush timber casement windows, with double glazing, 'applied' glazing bars.

Comments on the new windows are as follows:

The windows have not been replaced in line with Historic England's current guidance or conservation best practice i.e. that repair should be the first consideration, and in instances where repair is not an option, the windows should be copies of existing windows. This is particularly the case when the existing windows positively contribute to the significance of the designated heritage asset i.e. original or historic and/or are considered to be key features of the listed building.

In this instance, the front elevation is of high significance, and although two of the windows were 20th century in date, they were of an appropriate style and detail to have a relatively neutral impact on the vernacular character of this façade. The other two historic windows provided a more positive contribution by the very nature of their age and relation to the evolution of the building as it has been extended over the centuries. The later additions on the rear elevation are less significant to the building's overall special interest and although still form part of the building, have less of a visual impact on the building's aesthetic qualities, and replaced windows of inferior detailing.

It is fortunate that the actual casements have been retained, and these were available for inspection. It would appear that these were not beyond repair, and it is therefore assumed that it was the timber frames that were in poor condition and required replacing, rather than the casement lights themselves.

The new windows, with their double glazing, 'applied' glazing bars and additional cill detail are not considered to be appropriate replacements for the front elevation and have introduced features that did not exist (and do not exist on the older windows on the oldest part of the building). As a result, they are considered to have a harmful impact on the building's significance or features of interest.

The result of informal discussions with Historic England have produced the following comments:

We understand that the first floor casement windows, which were later replacements but historic, have been replaced with double glazing with stick on glazing bars. The historic casements have been retained but not the frames. The ground floor French doors at the front were also replaced with double glazed doors. The rest of the front elevation casement windows are single glazed.

Some of the windows at the rear of the building (mostly in later extensions) have also been replaced with double glazing.

We agree that the replacement windows at the back of the house are likely to be acceptable given these are predominantly within later lean-to extensions.

The replacement windows at the front, however, contrast with the detailing of the remaining single-glazed casements and incorporate an inappropriate timber sill detail.

We agree that the best route would be to reuse the timber casements in new frames. We recommend single glazing given the narrow profile of the glazing bars and that the other windows are single glazed. Secondary glazing could potentially be installed to improve thermal efficiency.

Given that the replacement French doors by their nature contrast with the other windows and we do not know the age of the replaced doors we would consider it acceptable to retain these subject to securing LBC.

Taking into consideration the informal comments from HE above, the retention of the front elevation windows is unlikely to receive officer support. Therefore, to address the situation an application for listed building consent should be submitted covering the following:

- reinstatement of the surviving casement lights in new frames in the front elevation,
- retain the French doors in the front elevation,
- retain windows within the rear elevation.

Notwithstanding the advice given above, a full supporting statement, including an impact assessment of the works and potential effects on the significance of the designated heritage asset will be required to justify the proposals. It is suggested that consideration is also given to propose a realistic timeframe for the works, as it is likely a decision notice will include a condition requiring the works to be completed within a set timeframe.

The application has been made to reinstate the four pairs of casement lights on the front elevation (with new timber frames), retain the French doors on the front elevation, and retain the three replacement windows on the rear elevation (later additions to the building). The casement lights

from the four front elevation windows have, fortunately, been retained – two pairs of these date from the 19th century and two pairs from the early 20th century, so are earlier than first believed when the site was visited in February 2026.

The reinstatement of the four windows to the front elevation will reinstate the elevation as per the situation and appearance before the unauthorised works were undertaken. Although the frames will be new, these will be constructed to match those removed during the works. This will preserve the significance of the front elevation, which is a key feature that contributes to the building's overall significance. The retained replacement French doors, already being a modern (and authorised) intervention into the front elevation will retain the status quo. The windows being retained to the rear of the building are on later additions, which are not key to the building's overall significance, and their retention will not cause or introduce harm to this significance.

The application is therefore in line with the requirements stipulated by the Council at pre-application stage, and supported by Historic England to regularise the situation in order to replace the inappropriately detailed windows on the front elevation to preserve significance.

No joinery details have been provided to confirm the renewal of the timber casement frames, so these should be requested via condition, along with a timeframe in which to comply (due to this being an application to address unauthorised works).

Impact on Ecology

While Sections 16 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 do not explicitly reference protected species, Local Planning Authorities have a statutory duty to consider potential impacts on protected species when determining applications. This responsibility arises from broader environmental legislation and national planning policy, and must be taken into account where relevant.

		Y / N / NA
(a)	Does the site or proposed development possess/impact on any of the features where protected species are likely to be present (assessed against Natural England's standing advice) and where species are likely to be found?	N/A
(b)	If yes, has a protected species survey been submitted?	
(c)	If yes, does the survey show a detailed consideration of ecological impacts, wildlife mitigation and the creation, restoration and enhancement of wildlife corridors to preserve and enhance biodiversity in accordance with the standing advice?	

Comments (if any):

N/A

CONCLUSION

The NPPF confirms that when considering the potential impact of a development proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). It makes clear

that any harm to a designated heritage asset will be a matter of considerable importance and weight which requires clear and convincing justification.

The reinstatement of the four windows to the front elevation will reinstate the elevation as per the situation and appearance before the unauthorised works were undertaken. Although the frames will be new, these will be constructed to match those removed during the works. This will preserve the significance of the front elevation, which is a key feature that contributes to the building's overall significance. The retained replacement French doors, already being a modern (and authorised) intervention into the front elevation will retain the status quo. The windows being retained to the rear of the building are on later additions, which are not key to the building's overall significance, and their retention will not cause or introduce harm to this significance.

The requirements of current conservation legislation, policy or guidance are considered to be met and the application is recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Listed Building Consent be GRANTED, subject to the following conditions:

- Plans ref.
- Prior to the reinstatement of the four casement windows, no works shall be undertaken until joinery details (at scale 1:10 and to include section details) confirming the framing and lights of the four casement lights to be reinstated on the front elevation, have been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority within 3 months of the date of this decision notice. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. REASON: To preserve the special interest of the listed building by reinstating window joinery to match the window frames removed.
- The works to install the four casement windows being reinstated, with new framing, on the front elevation shall be completed within 6 months of the date of approval of the joinery details in Condition 2. REASON: To ensure the removed window joinery is reinstated within a reasonable time frame, to preserve the special interest of the listed building, its fabric and features of interest.
- Painted finish
- It should be noted that failure to comply with the conditions set out above may result in enforcement action being taken.
- Informative – any future replacement of the French doors may require traditional detailing i.e. a 'true' glazing bar to be reinstated.