

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

APPLICANT: MR TREVOR RIDE

Update

1. This application was deferred at the January meeting to allow for further discussions between the Applicant and Officers regarding alternatives and replacement of the stone mullions.
2. The proposal to replace stone mullions has been omitted from the application. The applicant has sought advice from a specialist stonemason and intends to repair the existing mullions.
3. Officers have confirmed with the applicant that the proposed window arrangement (2 over 2 panes) is acceptable in principle and have sought clarification from the applicant on why secondary glazing would not be suitable. The applicant has also referred Officers to a planning appeal at Blakelow Cottage, Butterton where double glazed replacement windows were approved. These issues are dealt with further in the report below.
4. The applicant does not propose to amend the application for the windows.

Summary

5. The application site comprises a residential property located in the village of Taddington.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. The proposed development would result in harm to the significance of the listed building and to the character of the Conservation Area.
9. The application is therefore recommended for refusal as the proposed works would harm the character, appearance and significance of the Grade II listed property and its setting.

Site and Surroundings

10. 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.
11. Lilac Cottage sits within the Taddington Conservation Area.

Proposal

12. 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.
13. The replacement windows would all be on the principle elevation of the property.

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 public benefits of installing double glazing would be outweighed by this harm. Therefore, the application is contrary to policies L3 and DMC7 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Key Issues

14. The impact of the proposed works on the listed building and its setting.

Relevant Planning History

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

Consultations

17. 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.
18. Highway Authority – No objection.
19. District Council – No response at the time of writing.
20. PDNPA Conservation Officer – Object for the following reasons:
 21. 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.
 22. 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.
 23. 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 adopted Development Management Policies DMC5 and DMC7 as well as chapter 16 of the NPPF.
 24. In regard to the correspondence following the deferral of the application in January the following comments are provided by the Conservation Officer:

25. Fitting of secondary glazing should not impact on the cleaning and maintenance of the primary glazing and surrounds. There are a wide variety of secondary glazing systems, the major companies offer bespoke fitting, but they are usually openable and easily removable. This allows for regular cleaning and ventilation. There are a variety of ways of fixing the frames, but in even if they had to be screwed in place this would be less harmful than the current proposal. Generally, the secondary frames are fitted just behind the primary frames, leaving most of the windowsill free, but of course this depends on individual circumstance.
26. The build-up of mould on the window mullions is indicative of a problem with the building, and shouldn't be seen in a healthy building, with old gritstone or otherwise. If penetrating rain is the issue, hopefully the repairs to the mullions will solve this. Otherwise I'd recommend talking to a building surveyor or architect with expertise in traditional construction to diagnose the cause of the problem.

Representations

27. 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

28. Relevant Core Strategy policies: L3
29. Relevant Development Management policies: DMC7

National Planning Policy Framework

30. 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.
31. Paragraph 182 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.'
32. Paragraph 200 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.
33. Paragraph 205 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.

34. Paragraph 206 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.
35. Paragraph 207 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

36. Policy L3 states 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

37. Policy DMC7 relates to 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;

Assessment

Background

38. The list description for the listed property refers to the windows on the front elevation.
39. *“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.”*
40. 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.
41. A photograph dated 17th March 2003 shows the new windows fitted, with the exception of two windows at the ground floor of the front elevation.

42. Numerous enquiries have been received by the Authority (PE\2020\ENQ\39492; PE\2022\ENQ\45268; PE\2022\ENQ\46835) regarding the possibility of the installation of double glazing.
43. The Planning Officer opinion and that of the Conservation Officer 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.
44. 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

45. The proposed windows would be timber framed and double glazed, with 20mm thick glazed units to be used.
46. 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.
47. 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.
48. For these reasons the proposed works would result in harm to the significance of the listed building. The harm 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. There is a strong presumption against any harm to a listed building in policy unless it is outweighed by public benefits.
49. Justification for the proposals concerns the poor condition of the existing windows, as well as their poor energy performance, and the states that replacement will enhance, maintain and prolong the life of the listed building. The existing windows are unauthorised and therefore very little weight is given to these in the balance, though it is recognised that appropriate replacement windows do need to be secured for the building.
50. 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.*

51. Therefore, if the windows are beyond repair the Authority 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

52. 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.
53. 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.
54. However, this benefit must be weighed against the importance of the continued conservation of the heritage asset as required by legislation and the NPPF.
55. Firstly, in the context of historic buildings, it is not necessarily the case that double glazing is more sustainable than the alternatives available. 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.
56. 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).
57. Officers have discussed the possibility of secondary glazing with the applicant. The applicant has raised concerns about the impact of secondary glazing on cleaning and maintenance and that secondary glazing may require fixings to the mullions. Furthermore the applicant is concerned about water ingress and mould build up with the stonework being behind the secondary glazing.
58. The Conservation Officer has responded in detail to these concerns. Secondary glazing is easily demountable and therefore should not have any significant implications for cleaning or maintenance. Even if the glazing did need to be fixed to the mullions this would be less harmful than the proposed glazing. Finally a mould build up may indicate a wider issue with the building fabric which would need to be addressed in any event.
59. The NPPF and Historic England guidance requires proposals to avoid or minimise conflict between a heritage asset's conservation and the proposals for that asset. Officers remain of the view that there are alternatives that would achieve similar public benefits to the proposed works without the harm to the listed building.
60. 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.

61. Therefore there is no evidence to suggest that double glazing is the only means of securing energy efficiency gains. There is an alternative option which would achieve similar benefits without the harm identified. There is also no justification for the type of double glazing proposed or the proposed stick on glazing bars which would be inappropriate for the listed building.

Conclusion

62. 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.
63. The applicant has referred Officers to an appeal decision at Blakelow Cottage, Butterton. The appeal related to an application for listed building consent for replacement windows. In that case 'slime line' double glazing was permitted to replace unauthorised windows. There are some similarities between these cases as the Inspector allowed double glazing in a case where unauthorised windows had been installed.
64. However, the appeal proposal was for slim line double glazing with proper glazing bars which is not the case here. In any event each application must be considered on its own merits having regard to the particular significance of the listed building and its features. The appeal decision therefore while a material consideration does not outweigh the harm identified or otherwise justify the proposals in this case.
65. Therefore, having special regard to the architectural and historic interest of the building, it is recommended that Listed Building Consent be refused.

Human Rights

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

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

67. Nil

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