

Hadlow (Hadlow)

Hadlow And East Peckham

a) 1 February 2022

b) 28 July 2022

a) TM/22/00101/FL

b) TM/22/00102/LB

- Proposal:**
- a) Retrospective application for the removal of 3 windows and replacement with 3 black aluminium double glazed windows
 - b) Listed Building Application: Retrospective application for the removal of 3 windows and replacement with 3 Black aluminium double glazed windows

Location: 1 Hadlow Castle High Street Hadlow Tonbridge Kent TN11 0EG

Go to: [Recommendation](#)

1. Description:

- 1.1 Retrospective planning permission and Listed Building consent are sought for the removal of three windows (one with an integral patio door) in the south elevation of 1 Hadlow Castle and their replacement with two new windows and a bi-folding door to the ground floor.
- 1.2 From studying photographic evidence of the building prior to the installation of the current openings, it can be ascertained that the ground and first floor windows that were replaced comprised white uPVC double glazed units with applied gothic detailing to the window frames, whilst the window on the second floor that was replaced comprised a white painted timber frame window with gothic detailing.
- 1.3 The windows and bi-folding door installed into the existing openings comprise black aluminium framed units with double glazing. The frames are of a simple form and appearance.

2. Reason for reporting to Committee:

- 2.1 At the request of Councillor Jill Anderson to enable the committee to consider the impact of the replacement windows upon the Grade II* Listed Building and the setting of nearby buildings and the castle/Tower.

3. The Site:

- 3.1 The site is located within the rural service centre of Hadlow and the Hadlow Conservation Area. It is to the south-east of the High Street and is accessed by an internal access road from the High Street. The site contains a Grade II* Listed building known as 'Hadlow Castle', which was listed on 19th February 1990. Within the setting of the site there is also the Grade I Listed 'Hadlow Tower', which was listed on 17th April 1951. Hadlow Castle is described on the Listed Building record as:

"Former stables, service building and walls around the stable courtyard north east of Hadlow Tower, the buildings converted to housing. Along with Hadlow Tower

these buildings are the remains of Hadlow Castle, a large Gothick house of late C18 origins, dismantled in 1951. Early/mid C19, one of the buildings dated 1856, with C20 alterations. Cement-rendered brick, matching Hadlow Tower, roof behind embattled parapets. Gothick.

Plan: Approximately rectangular courtyard with ranges of buildings on the north, west and east sides, walls on the south side adjoin Hadlow Tower (q.v.) which is sited in the south west corner of the courtyard. The house lay to the west of the courtyard and part of its west end wall, now freestanding, links Hadlow Tower to the west courtyard range. There is an archway into the courtyard through the north range and a second archway through the east range.

Exterior: The outer elevations of the buildings have been substantially altered in the course of conversion to houses, the elevations facing the courtyard are less altered but have a number of C20 windows and doors and almost certainly include re-used early C19 features. The courtyard elevation of the north range is asymmetrical and embattled with an approximately central archway below a gable decorated with fleurons. To the left of the archway an early C20 door with Gothick panelling and 2 traceried windows, C20 first floor windows. To the right the elevation is symmetrical. broken forward in the centre, with tall 2-light Gothick traceried windows to either side. The 2- centred east range archway has a stepped gable, carved spandrels and a date of 1856. The east range is also embattled with a 2-storey tower to the right of the archway with an embattled first floor oriel with a timber traceried window; tall 2-light Gothick traceried window to the left of the archway. The west range is picturesquely irregular and incorporates a 4-storey and 2-storey tower to left of centre. Asymmetrical 1:1:1:1:4 window front, the left hand window in a section of gabled wall that was part of the main house. This contains a large 3-light Gothick window with an ogee hoodmould, the window filled with stained glass. To its right an embattled block with a C20 flat-roofed porch. Adjoining this on the right a 4-storey tower with 4 Gothick windows with hoodmoulds, the ground floor window preserving early C19 tracery. A 2-storey tower to the right has a stepped gable and a 2 tier embattled projection on the front with 2-light C19 Gothick windows. A lower 4-bay block to the right is buttressed, with C19 Gothick windows and a C20 door. Early C19 walls to the east and south sides of the courtyard are included in the list.ing. The outer elevations of the ranges have suffered some severe alterations but preserve some C19 features including windows and buttresses and the west range, in particular, forms a good asymmetrical group at the base of Hadlow Tower.

Starred for contribution to the setting of an outstanding Grade I building.”

4. Planning History (relevant):

TM/54/10077/OLD Grant with Conditions 6 August 1954

Conversion of existing outbuilding into Dwelling Unit.

5. Consultees:

a) TM/22/00101/FL: Retrospective application for the removal of 3 windows and replacement with 3 black aluminium double glazed windows

5.1 PC: Strongly object. Works undertaken to Grade II* Listed Building are illegal and should have been subject to enforcement action. Object to design, colour and material used, which are inappropriate for such a property/not in-keeping with the building or the neighbours

5.2 Historic England: HSE provides advice when engagement can add most value. In this case, do not offer advice and this should not be interpreted as comments on the merits of the application. Recommend that views of specialist conservation and archaeological advisers are sought.

5.3 Private Reps: 2 + site notice & press notice 0X/2R/0S: Objections summarised as follows:

- The works have already been undertaken.
- The works have damaged the fabric and visual setting of the Listed Building.
- The windows that have been fitted are out of character with the Gothic Revival architecture, surrounding properties and the castle/tower.
- Works have been carried out with the benefit of Listed Building Consent which is an offence – should be the subject of enforcement, not planning permission.
- The ground and first floor window openings are not original (formed in the 1950s), however the second-floor opening is part of the original house, with 1 Hadlow Castle being a small retained part of the original house.
- In 2013 the fenestration echoed the design of windows in the original house – suggest frames may have been reutilised in the property from the original Hadlow Castle.
- Black windows in adjacent square tower likely put in during 1970s – two windows contain stained glass from the demolished house, apart from these and the windows on Hadlow Tower, all-other windows around the courtyard are painted white.

b) TM/22/00102/LB: Listed Building Application: Retrospective application for the removal of 3 windows and replacement with 3 Black aluminium double glazed windows

5.4 PC: No objection.

5.5 Historic England: Do not wish to offer any comments – suggest views of specialist Conservation Advisor are sought.

5.6 Private Reps: 2 + site notice & press notice 0X/2R/0S: Objections summarised as follows:

- The works have already been undertaken/damaged fabric and setting of the Listed Building.
- Windows installed are out of character with the Gothic design of the castle and surrounding properties and their history – they do not include gothic detailing.
- If Listed Building Consent is granted, then the purpose of listing will become irrelevant/pointless – this will be contrary to its listed status.

5.7 Conservation Officer:

- From reviewing a range of sources of information the window composition of the windows that have been replaced comprised of double glazed UPVC windows with 'gothic' arches applied externally as fake detailing to the ground and first floors and a timber window to the second floor.
- We also need to consider the age of the openings. The openings themselves are very different to the character of the rest of the building complex and the list description acknowledges that the residential conversion had substantially altered the outer elevations. The elevation we are dealing with is an outer elevation. The only relevant comment in the list description regarding the outer elevation is:

“a. The outer elevations of the ranges have suffered some severe alterations but preserve some C19 features including windows and buttresses and the west range, in particular, forms a good asymmetrical group at the base of Hadlow Tower.”

We can draw a couple of things from this statement. It is believed that the large window openings at ground and first floor in this application are one of the 'severe' alterations that are a result of the conversion to residential. Historic application reference 54/10077/OLD does confirm that the ground and first floor window openings were widened/created during the conversion, the second floor window opening remained unaltered. The statement also makes it clear that this block has a strong group value connection in its relationship to the tower. The traditional material for windows in the tower is stone surrounds with dark metal casements.

- No evidence has been provided to support the applicants claim that the existing windows were UPVC or to justify the metal frames.

- The existing windows cannot be considered to be of any particular historic value being modern, double glazed and very poorly detailed with the attached gothic tracery. In the case of the one timber window the only redeeming feature would be the use of traditional timber, which would be a reasonable argument for any replacement to also be in the same traditional timber. The window formats, including the timber window are harmful to the significance of the Listed Building, and in particular the UPVC material would be considered harmful.
- The proposal to change the material must be judged in terms of the level of harm caused to significance by the change. Given that the windows in their original form did not contribute positively and were considered to be harmful then the replacements cannot be required to be better, although naturally a better solution should be encouraged and actively sought and would be a part of the negotiations in any application. Those negotiations might well have resulted in the use of timber, but also could have resulted in the use of metal but of a more intricate slender design reflecting the adjacent tower. We might also have pushed for the introduction of stone mullions and attempted a more pastiche based improvement.
- There is no opportunity to negotiate as the windows have been installed so it only remains to judge if these metal windows are more harmful than the modern windows they replaced and if so, is this sufficient grounds for a refusal.
- A planning decision was overturned at appeal because the modern double glazed replacement timber windows were considered no more harmful than the non historic single glazed modern timber windows that they replaced. Therefore, given the appeal case we need to be absolutely clear that the replacement metal windows would be considered more harmful than the mix of UPVC and timber.
- It has been determined that the existing windows, both timber and UPVC, are detrimental to the character of the Listed Building, the UPVC being more so. It is suggested that the level of harm caused by the replacement metal windows is unlikely to be greater given that the original windows were poorly/clumsily designed and two are in a clearly inappropriate material (UPVC).
- It could be reasonably argued that the replacements are simply designed with an eye to being a contemporary proposal in modern scale openings (ground and first floor) in a material that reflects that of the tower with which it has a close relationship as stated in the list description. If we were to try to insist that the timber window at second floor be replaced with a timber replacement we have a number of difficulties. What format should be reproduced, the existing, which has been determined as harmful, or the new format but in timber. The second option would seem the more appropriate but would then lead to two separate materials being used which itself could be considered to be an

awkward or inappropriate architectural response. The use of the same material throughout would give consistency and look better than the use of two materials. Therefore, the choice is require use of timber to match throughout all three windows, accept a mix of materials or accept the consistency of the use of metal. Again, we have to look at the harm caused by the existing windows and the harm caused by the new windows. It is considered that an argument could not be sustained for replacing the UPVC with timber on the basis of the second floor window being timber and therefore suggest that the use of two materials, one traditional and two modern, would be more harmful than the consistency provided by a single modern material. This is especially true given that the ground and first floor window openings are modern and therefore a modern design response throughout the façade would be appropriate.

- On the basis of the above, while it might be desirable to seek a refusal based upon the materials and design used, or to seek a more appropriate solution, the submitted application would have to be considered as being no more harmful than the existing situation. Therefore, from a heritage perspective no objection is raised.

6. Determining Issues:

Principle of Development:

- 6.1 Policy CP12 advises that development will be permitted within the rural service centres, including Hadlow. The application includes replacement windows and a bi-folding door within existing openings to serve an existing residential property. The principle of development is therefore considered acceptable, complying with policy CP12.

Listed Buildings:

- 6.2 The property is Grade II* Listed and the site is within the setting of the Grade I Listed Hadlow Tower; therefore consideration needs to be made of sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The Act requires that in considering whether to grant planning permission for a development which affects a Listed Building or its setting or in considering whether to grant Listed Building consent for any works, the local planning authority should 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.
- 6.3 Chapter 16 of the NPPF is relevant to development which affects the historic environment. Paragraph 194 starts by explaining the following in relation to proposals affecting heritage assets:

“In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to

the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation."

6.4 Paragraph 195 then explains that:

"Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal."

6.5 Paragraph 197 of the NPPF advises:

"In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and*
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness."*

6.6 Paragraph 199 states:

"When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance."

6.7 Paragraph 200 then goes onto explain that:

"Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;*

b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.”*

6.8 Paragraph 202 advises:

“Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.”

6.9 The applicant has explained that replacement windows were required due to leaking around the seals, resulting in leakage to internal fabric and a breach of the air gap between the glass panels causing misting and condensation in-between the panes of glass. The applicant has also explained that the openings are not original – being formed around 1954, with the windows having been replaced previously. The applicant justifies the use of black frames by explaining how they replicate the look of the Hadlow Tower, which also contains windows replaced during the recent conversion. They have not however justified the use of metal frames for the replacement windows and door.

6.10 From evidence available to the Council, it can be ascertained that the windows that were replaced comprised double glazed white UPVC windows with ‘gothic’ arches applied externally as fake detailing to the ground and first floors and a timber window to the second floor, also finished in white with gothic arches. The windows that were recently replaced were not the same units installed when the property was converted as planning application TM/54/10077/OLD showed that timber units were installed into each opening. This is confirmed within photographic evidence held on the Listed Building record for Hadlow Tower, which shows that the timber units comprised of simple white painted timber frames to all three floors, with no gothic detailing. As such, the windows that were removed were not original nor historically important.

6.11 In relation to the openings themselves, they are very different to the character of the rest of the building complex and the list description acknowledges that the residential conversion substantially altered the outer elevations. The elevation we are dealing with is an outer elevation. The only relevant comment in the list description regarding the outer elevation is:

“a. The outer elevations of the ranges have suffered some severe alterations but preserve some C19 features including windows and buttresses and the west range, in particular, forms a good asymmetrical group at the base of Hadlow Tower.”

6.12 We can draw a couple of things from this statement:

- It is believed that the large window openings at ground and first floor in this application are one of the 'severe' alterations that are a result of the conversion to residential. Historic application reference TM/54/10077/OLD confirms that the ground and first floor window openings were created during the conversion, with the second floor opening remaining unaltered.
- This block has a strong group value connection in its relationship to the tower - of relevance to this application is how the traditional material for windows in the tower is stone surrounds with dark metal casements.

6.13 The windows that were replaced cannot be considered to be of any particular historic or architectural value. This is because they were modern, double glazed and very poorly detailed with the attached gothic tracery. In relation to the one timber window the only redeeming feature would be the use of traditional timber, which would be a reasonable argument for any replacement to also be in the same traditional timber. The fenestration detailing on the south elevation before the windows were replaced was also inconsistent in its use of materials as a result of the use of both timber and UPVC units on one elevation. The finishing of such windows in white timber and not in black metal was inconsistent with the Grade I Listed Hadlow Tower (which the application property on this elevation has a close relationship with), which includes metal framed windows in black. These two elements therefore resulted in visual disharmony on this elevation. It is therefore considered that the window formats of the windows that were replaced, including the timber window, were not historically important and were harmful to the significance of the Grade II* Listed Building, and in particular the UPVC material was considered especially harmful. The removal of these units is therefore considered to be acceptable.

6.14 A planning decision was overturned at appeal because the modern double glazed replacement timber windows were considered no more harmful than the non-historic single glazed modern timber windows that they replaced. Therefore, given the appeal case we need to be absolutely clear that the replacement metal windows and door would be considered more harmful than the mix of UPVC and timber.

6.15 It has been determined that the windows that have been replaced were timber and UPVC and were detrimental to the character of the Listed Building, the UPVC being more so. It is considered that the level of harm caused by the replacement aluminium windows and door is not any greater given that the original windows were poorly and clumsily designed, two were in a clearly inappropriate material by way of UPVC and they were not in-keeping with the setting of the Grade I Listed Hadlow Tower which the application property has a close relationship with. It also has to be noted that there are a wide variety of fenestration finishes within Hadlow Castle, including single glazed plain timber windows, single glazed timber windows with gothic frames, single glazed plain metal frames and double-glazed UPVC windows. Therefore, there is no single window design to be adhered to.

- 6.16 It is considered that the replacement double glazed aluminium windows and door are simply designed, representing a contemporary proposal in modern scale openings (ground and first floor), finished in a material that reflects the windows within Hadlow Tower with which the application property has a close relationship with (as stated in the list description). The windows and door by way of their simple design are also similar to other plain timber and metal/UPVC framed windows in other elevations of Hadlow Castle. The painting of windows/doors are permitted development; as such their colour cannot be resisted. However the finishing in black is considered to be a clear reflection of the adjacent Hadlow Tower, which the south elevation of 1 Hadlow Castle is most commonly seen in the setting of.
- 6.17 If the Council was to insist that the timber window at second floor be replaced with a timber replacement, we would face a series of questions. What format should be reproduced, the pre-existing, which has been determined as harmful, or the new format but in timber. The second option would seem the more appropriate but would then lead to two separate materials being used on the south elevation which could be considered an awkward or inappropriate architectural response as the use of the same material throughout would give consistency and look better than the use of two materials. Therefore, the choice is to require the use of timber to match throughout all three openings, accept a mix of materials within the different openings or accept the consistency of the use of metal for all openings. Consideration again needs to be made to the level of harm caused by the windows that have been replaced and the harm caused by the new windows. It is considered that an argument could not be sustained for replacing the UPVC with timber on the basis of the second-floor window being timber, whilst the use of two materials, one timber and two metal would be more harmful than the consistency provided by the single material by way of the aluminium units as installed. This is especially true given that the ground and first floor window openings are modern and therefore a modern design response throughout the façade would be appropriate.
- 6.18 In summary, the three aluminium units as installed, comprising of two windows and a bi-folding ground floor door, are no more harmful than the windows they replaced by way of the two UPVC units and one timber unit. The development has therefore not resulted in less than substantial harm, retains the significance of the Grade II* Listed Building and has preserved the Grade II* Listed Building, the setting of the Grade I Listed Hadlow Tower and features of special architectural and historic interest which it possesses.
- 6.19 Overall, as a result of the above considerations, the development has not caused an unacceptable level of harm to the historical fabric, appearance and significance of the Grade II* Listed building and the setting of the Grade I Listed Hadlow Tower. The development is therefore acceptable in relation to Chapter 16 of the NPPF 2021 and Sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

Design, Materials and Character of the Area:

6.20 Policy P4/12 of the TMBLP 1998 states:

“Extensions to residential properties will not be permitted if they would result in an adverse impact on:

(1) the character of the building or the street scene in terms of form, scale, design, materials and existing trees;...

Permission will only be granted for proposals which meet the design criteria contained in Policy Annex PA4/12...”

6.21 Policy CP24 of the TMBCS sets out a number of key objectives in terms of design. It requires that:

“All development must be well designed and of a high quality in terms of detailing and use of appropriate materials, and must through its scale, density, layout, siting, character and appearance be designed to respect the site and its surroundings.”

“Development which by virtue of its design would be detrimental to the built environment, amenity or functioning and character of a settlement or the countryside will not be permitted.”

6.22 Policy SQ1 of the MDE DPD states:

“All new development should protect, conserve and, where possible, enhance:

(a) the character and local distinctiveness of the area including its historical and architectural interest and the prevailing level of tranquillity;

(b) the distinctive setting of, and relationship between, the pattern of settlement, roads and the landscape, urban form and important views; and

(c) the biodiversity value of the area, including patterns of vegetation, property boundaries and water bodies.”

6.23 Paragraph 130 of the NPPF details that:

“Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;

b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;

c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);

d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;...”

6.24 The replacement windows are simply designed, comprising black aluminium framed units with double glazing, representing a contemporary proposal in modern scale openings (ground and first floor), finished in a material that reflects the windows within Hadlow Tower with which the application property has a close relationship. The windows and door by way of their simple design are also similar to other plain timber and metal/UPVC framed windows in other elevations of Hadlow Castle. Their finishing in black is considered to be a clear reflection of the adjacent Hadlow Tower. Additionally, the assessment above has determined that the windows and door are acceptable in relation to their impact upon the Listed Building and the setting of the nearby Grade I Listed Hadlow Tower. As such, it is considered that the replacement windows and door are acceptable in relation to design, materials and impact upon the character of the area.

6.25 Overall, the form, appearance and materials are considered acceptable and the two new windows and a bi-folding door respect the appearance of the host dwelling and character of the area, complying with Saved Policy P4/12 of the TMBLP, Policy CP24 of the TMBCS, Policy SQ1 of the MDE DPD and paragraph 130 of the NPPF.

Conservation Area:

6.26 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

6.27 Chapter 16 of the NPPF sets out that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Clear justification is required for any harm or loss of the significance of a designated heritage asset.

6.28 The replacement windows are simply designed, comprising black aluminium framed units with double glazing, representing a contemporary proposal in modern scale openings (ground and first floor), finished in a material that reflects the windows within Hadlow Tower with which the application property has a close relationship. The windows and door by way of their simple design are also similar to other plain timber and metal/UPVC framed windows in other elevations of

Hadlow Castle. Their finishing in black is considered to be a clear reflection of the adjacent Hadlow Tower. Additionally, the assessment above has determined the windows and door are acceptable in relation to their impact upon the Listed Building and the setting of the nearby Grade I Listed Hadlow Tower. As such, it is considered that the development has not had an unacceptable impact upon the Hadlow Conservation Area.

6.29 Overall, the appearance of the windows and door are considered acceptable and would not fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Hadlow Conservation Area, complying with Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and chapter 16 of the NPPF.

Residential Amenity:

6.30 Saved Policy P4/12 of the TMBLP 1998 states that extensions to residential properties will not be permitted if they would result in an adverse impact on residential amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of light and privacy, and overlooking of garden areas.

6.31 Additionally, paragraph 130 (f) of the NPPF advises that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

6.32 Due to the positioning of the openings in relation to the neighbouring dwellings and how the windows and bi-folding door were replacements for existing openings, there will be no additional overlooking than the existing situation and therefore there has been no adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties.

6.33 Overall, due to the design and prevailing site conditions, the windows and door have not unacceptably harmed neighbouring amenities. The development therefore complies with Saved Policy P4/12 of the TMBLP and paragraph 130 (f) of the NPPF.

Concluding Remarks:

6.34 The removal of three windows in the south elevation of 1 Hadlow Castle and their replacement with two new windows and a bi-folding door to the ground floor are considered to be of an acceptable design, in keeping with the surrounding area. No harmful impacts have arisen to the Grade II* Listed Building, the setting of the nearby Grade I Listed Hadlow Tower, the Hadlow Conservation Area or neighbouring amenity, as a result of the development. Accordingly, the planning application and listed building consent application are recommended for approval.

7. Recommendation:

7.1 a) TM/22/00101/FL: Retrospective application for the removal of 3 windows and replacement with 3 black aluminium double glazed windows

7.2 **Grant Planning Permission** in accordance with the following submitted details:

Location Plan received 22.07.2022, Notice received 22.07.2022, Photograph of south west elevation received 22.07.2022, Certificate B received 28.07.2022, Design and Access Statement received 28.07.2022, Photograph of installed windows received 18.01.2022, Specifications of windows received 22.07.2022

7.3 **b) TM/22/00102/LB: Listed Building Application: Retrospective application for the removal of 3 windows and replacement with 3 Black aluminium double glazed windows**

7.4 **Grant Listed Building Consent** in accordance with the following submitted details:

Location Plan received 22.07.2022, Specifications of windows received 22.07.2022, Photograph of installed windows received 18.01.2022, Design and Access Statement received 01.02.2022, Photograph of south west elevation received 01.02.2022

Contact: Andrew Longman