

7. LISTED BUILDING CONSENT – 5 NO.S WINDOWS TO BE REPLACED, STONEMWORK AROUND WINDOWS TO BE REPLACED, ALL TO THE FRONT ELEVATION – LILAC COTTAGE, MAIN STREET, TADDINGTON (NP/DDD/0823/0935, RD)

APPLICANT: MR TREVOR RIDE

Summary

1. The application site comprises a residential property located in the village of Taddington.
2. Grant aid was given for replacement windows on this property, which were completed by 16/4/2004. The grant aided windows have been replaced with double glazed windows sometime since 2005 without the consent of the PDNPA.
3. Listed building consent is now sought for the replacement of five windows with new timber windows including double glazed units, all to the principle elevation of the property.
4. The proposed development would result in harm to the significance of the listed building and to the character of the Conservation Area.
5. The application is therefore recommended for refusal as the proposed works would harm the character, appearance and significance of the Grade II listed property, its setting, and the conservation area within which it sits, and is therefore not in accordance with the relevant adopted policies.

Site and Surroundings

6. Lilac Cottage is a Grade II listed property situated on the northern side of Main Road, just to the east of the Methodist Chapel. It is a late 18th century, two-storey farmhouse constructed of coursed rubble limestone with gristone dressings. Stone slate roof with stone gable end stacks.
7. Lilac Cottage sits within the Taddington Conservation Area.

Proposal

8. Listed Building Consent is sought to replace five windows on the front elevation of the property, including the stonework around windows. The proposal would replace the existing unauthorised windows with new timber, double glazed units.
9. The replacement windows would all be on the principle elevation of the property.
10. A number of the stone jambs also require replacement.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reason –

The proposed works would harm the significance of the Grade II listed property, its setting, and the conservation area within which it is located. The arising public benefits are heavily outweighed by this harm. Therefore, the proposal fails to conserve the architectural and historic interest of the building, to which the Authority is required to have special regard as set out in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Key Issues

11. The key issues are the desirability of preserving the designated heritage asset affected by the proposed works, its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Relevant Planning History

12. September 2002 – DDD0902472: Listed Building consent - Erection of conservatory and alterations to dwelling – Granted Conditionally
13. September 2002 – DDD0902474: Erection of conservatory – Granted Conditionally

Consultations

14. Parish Council – In support of the application, on the grounds that they are restorative works that will also improve the resilience and energy efficiency of the building.
15. Highway Authority – No objection.
16. District Council – No response at the time of writing.
17. PDNPA Conservation Officer – Object for the following reasons:
18. Proposed new windows: Our starting point for determining the impact of the proposed windows is what is already approved. In 2002 the Authority grant-aided the installation of 12 6-paned casement lights, 9 to the front and 3 to the rear kitchen window. These were single-glazed with traditional detailing, slender frames and 18mm glazing bars. It appears that at some point since then the single-glazed windows were replaced with double glazed casements without consent.
19. The Authority's position on windows, which is in-line with Historic England guidance, is that where appropriately detailed single-glazed windows exist (or should exist), these should be retained and repaired as they contribute to the architectural and historic interest of the listed building. From our planning files, it appears the applicant has been advised on several occasions over the years that, in this instance, double glazed windows would not be appropriate, as the added weight of double-glazing units necessitates much thicker glazing bars, which are visually harmful.
20. The proposed windows would have 'stick-on' or applied glazing bars, which are a poor substitute for traditionally constructed timber windows with true glazing bars, and would harm the significance of the building by reducing its aesthetic value. This is contrary to Peak Park development management policies DMC5 and DMC7 as well as chapter 16 of the NPPF.
21. Replacement stone mullions and jambs: It is proposed that some of the stonework to the windows is replaced, although it is not specified why, how and with what. In order to properly determine this aspect of the application we will need to know the condition of the stonework, what's wrong with it, why have less intrusive repairs been ruled out? If the stonework does need replacing we will also need to know what the proposed new stone is and ultimately see a sample of it, although that can be conditioned. If less intrusive repairs are required, subject to details, they may not require listed building consent. At present there is insufficient information to determine this aspect of the application, again contrary to the above policies.

Representations

22. One letter of representation has been received by the Authority in support of the application, on the grounds that it would return the property to its original design at the time of listing and simultaneously improve the property's energy rating.

Main Policies

23. Relevant Core Strategy policies: L3
24. Relevant Development Management policies: DMC5, DMC7 & DMC8

National Planning Policy Framework

25. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012 and replaced a significant proportion of central government planning policy with immediate effect. It was last revised and re-published in July 2021. The Government's intention is that the document should be considered as a material consideration and carry particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date.
26. In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and the Development Management Policies document 2019. Policies in the Development Plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. It is considered that in this case there is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and more recent Government guidance in the NPPF.
27. Paragraph 176 of the NPPF states that 'great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.'
28. Paragraph 194 states that 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. It notes that 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. It advises that as a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary.
29. Paragraph 199 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.
30. Paragraph 200 states 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.
31. Paragraph 202 states that 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.

Peak District National Park Core Strategy

32. L3 - *Cultural Heritage assets and archaeological, architectural, artistic or historical significance*. Explains that development must conserve and where appropriately enhance or reveal the significance of historic assets and their setting. Other than in exceptional circumstances, development will not be permitted where it is likely to cause harm to the significance of any cultural heritage asset or its setting.

Development Management Policies

33. DMC5 - *Assessing the impact of development on designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting*. The policy provides detailed advice relating to proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, requiring new development to demonstrate how valued features will be conserved, as well as detailing the types and levels of information required to support such proposals.
34. DMC7 – *Listed Buildings*. The policy provides detailed advice relating to proposals affected listed buildings and states that;
- a. Planning applications for development affecting a Listed Building and/or its setting should be determined in accordance with policy DMC5 and clearly demonstrate:
 - (i) how their significance will be preserved;
 - (ii) why the proposed development and related works are desirable or necessary.
 - b. Development will not be permitted if applicants fail to provide adequate or accurate detailed information to show the effect on the significance and architectural and historic interest of the Listed Building and its setting and any curtilage listed features.
 - c. Development will not be permitted if it would:
 - (i) adversely affect the character, scale, proportion, design, detailing of, or materials used in the Listed Building; or
 - (ii) result in the loss of or irreversible change to original features or other features of importance or interest.
 - d. In particular, development will not be permitted if it would directly, indirectly or cumulatively lead to:
 - (v) Repairs or alterations involving materials, techniques and detailing inappropriate to a Listed Building;
- d. DMC8 – *Conservation Areas*. The policy outlines how developments in a conservation area that affect its setting or important views into, out of, across or through the area, should assess and clearly demonstrate how the character or appearance and significance of the Conservation area will be preserved or enhanced.

Assessment

Background

30. The list description for the listed property refers to the windows on the front elevation.
31. *“C20 part glazed door. Flanked on each side by a 2-light square section flush mullion window. Central single light window to first floor with flush stone surround flanked on each side by a 2-light square section flush mullion window.”*
32. A Historic Building Grant was given in 2002 for installation of 12 6-paned casement lights; 9 to the front and 3 to the rear kitchen window. These were single-glazed,

with traditional detailing: flush-fitting not storm-proof frames; slender frames and 18mm glazing bars; and with traditional profiled inner moulding detail to the glazing bars and frames. Listed building consent for these works was required but never applied for, albeit the works clearly progressed with the support the Authority's conservation officers as a grant-aided works that enhanced the listed building.

33. A photograph in the PDNPA archives dated to the 17th March 2003 shows the new windows fitted, with the exception of two windows at the ground floor of the front elevation.
34. Numerous enquiries have been received by the PDNPA (PE\2020\ENQ\39492; PE\2022\ENQ\45268; PE\2022\ENQ\46835) regarding the possibility of the installation of double glazing.
35. Our view and the view of the Conservation Officer on the matter has consistently been that double-glazed windows would not be acceptable in this property, and furthermore that we would not want to see windows which the Authority has previously grant-aided being removed or altered.
36. However, it is apparent that the grant-aided windows have been replaced with double-glazed units at some point within the last 20 years, with windows of modern detailing and wider frame sizes. These windows do not benefit from listed building consent and are unauthorised.

Impacts of the works on the significance of the listed building

37. The proposed windows would be timber framed and double glazed, with 20mm thick glazed units to be used.
38. The use of double glazed units would fundamentally alter the appearance of the windows when compared to historic single-glazed windows. They would possess different reflective qualities, and have spacers evident within the frames. This, and the greater weight of double glazed units, also gives rise to a different, wider, profile of frame. As a result they would not conserve the historic character or appearance of the windows, which form an important part of its architectural significance. As such, they would harm the significance of the listed building in a similar manner to the current unauthorised windows.
39. Further, it is proposed for the windows to have applied glazing bars – i.e. faux bars that are adhered to the outer faces of the glass. These do not accurately represent traditional joinery and would be historically incorrect. They would also fail to produce the multi-faceted reflectivity of individual panes of glass, appearing too uniform and flat. Additionally, with applied glazing bars there is a risk of the adhesive failing. The proposed use of applied glazing bars would therefore undermine the authenticity and integrity of the listed building.
40. With reference to Paragraphs 201 and 202 of the NPPF in finding harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the magnitude of that harm should be assessed. Given the extent and nature of the proposed works, it is considered that the harm in this instance would be 'less than substantial'. However, this should not be equated with a less than substantial planning objection and is of considerable importance and weight. Under such circumstances, Paragraph 202 advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing the asset's optimum viable use.
41. Justification for the proposals concerns the poor condition of the existing windows, as well as their poor energy performance, and states that replacement will enhance, maintain and prolong the life of the listed building. Given that the current windows

are unauthorised, their appearance is given very little weight in the balance; although it is recognised that appropriate replacement windows do need to be secured for the buildings sake.

42. In the case of listed buildings, the authority's position on windows is in alignment with that of Historic England, the government's advisor on the historic environment, who state that: *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.*
43. Therefore, if the windows are beyond repair we would expect any new windows to be a like for like replacement. In this case that would be in line with the grant-aided windows installed c.2003 which should be 6-paned single-glazed casements, flush-fitting with mitred joints, with narrow glazing bars (18mm) and slender frames, and with a traditional inner moulded profile to the glazing bars and frames. The glass should be secured with a glazing compound (putty), not beads. The new windows need to be in timber, but a more durable hardwood than was used historically would be acceptable.

Public Benefit

44. The installation of double glazing will improve the energy efficiency of the property. Whilst reduced costs of heating the property are a private benefit for the occupier, the improved energy efficiency leading to reduced loss of energy from the dwelling is a public benefit.
45. It is noted policy CC1 relating to climate change mitigation and adaptation recognises the benefits of improved energy efficiency. This public benefit is acknowledged and given weight in the planning balance.
46. However, this benefit must be weighed against the importance of the continued conservation of the heritage asset as required by both national legislation and the NPPF.
47. Firstly, in the context of historic buildings, it is not necessarily the case that double glazing is more sustainable than the alternatives. It is of note that double glazing units have a limited lifespan, typically lasting 10-30 years, after which the units need replacing with new glass – which is itself a high energy/high carbon material. Further, options of secondary glazing and other traditional methods of insulation (such as heavy curtains, shutters, blinds etc) can improve the environmental credentials of listed buildings with less or no impact on their significance.
48. This is material; it reduces any benefit arising from the introduction of double glazing when compared to other measures that could be introduced (rather than as a simplistic comparison between single and double glazing).
49. The NPPF and Historic England guidance also requires proposals to avoid or minimise conflict between a heritage asset's conservation and the proposals for that asset. Given that there are alternatives that would be achievable and less harmful, the proposals cannot be said to avoid or minimise harm to the listed building.
50. Further, and without dismissing the cumulative benefits that can arise from small domestic energy efficiency improvements, the benefits to climate change mitigation achieved through the insulation gains here would be modest, given the size and function of the building.

51. These are found to be heavily outweighed by the harm that would arise to the significance of the listed building and, consequently, the conservation area – matters to which the Authority is required to have special regard by primary legislation as well as by national and local planning policy.

Conclusion

52. The proposed works would harm the character, appearance and significance of the Grade II listed property, its setting, and the conservation area within which it is located. The public benefits arising from the proposals are heavily outweighed by that harm.
53. Therefore, having special regard to the architectural and historic interest of the building, it is recommended that Listed Building Consent be refused.

Human Rights

54. Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

55. Nil

Report Author: Rachael Doyle – Assistant Planner (South Area).