

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2023/0032 VALID 14/02/23	HARDCASTLE MEWS, TERRACE ROAD, CHAPEL- EN-LE-FRITH, DERBYSHIRE, SK23 0EX	NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS (FULL - MINOR)
---------------------------------	---	---

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of Development
- Design Considerations
- Impact upon Residential Amenity
- Impact on Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site relates to a two-storey row of properties which lies within the settlement boundary for Chapel-en-le-Frith as confirmed by the Local Plan policies map. The building relates to a traditional row of terraced cottages, some of which have been retained, while the remainder have been converted to flats and is known as Hardcastle Mews. The site lies within the Town Centre boundary for Chapel-en-le-Frith and also within the Chapel-en-le-Frith Conservation Area. There are a number of Listed Buildings in the wider area.

PROPOSAL

This application proposes the replacement of existing doors and windows. The existing openings are timber and includes a mix of casement and sash openings. It is proposed for the windows to be replaced with timber effect upvc alternatives and composite replacement doors.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan (Adopted 2016)

S1 Sustainable Development Principles
S1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
S6 Central Sub-area Strategy
EQ6 Design and Place Making
EQ7 Built and Historic Environment
CF1 Retail and Town Centres

Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan

H3 Design Criteria
TC5 High Quality Town Centre Design

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

Residential Design (2005)
High Peak Design Guide (2018)

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 12: Achieving Well-designed Places
Section 16: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

Various, most recently including:

HPK/2022/0187 - Re-roof the whole property by replacing the existing stone slates with natural blue/grey slates – Approved – 10/01/23

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 06/04/23
Neighbour consultation period ends: 25/04/23

Public Comments

None

Town / Parish Comments

None received

DCC Highways

There are no highway objections to the application.

Conservation Officer (Further Comments – 08/09/23)

The revised documents show a wide choice of options from the chosen window companies. Though it is quite difficult to ascertain the choice of windows as for some reason none of them will match? I don't understand this. This is a small traditional row of cottages with remaining legible character.

Accurate mechanism such as sliding sash with horns are encouraged. A 'flip' or 'tilt' mechanism is not a sliding sash window and is not advised. What fittings/fixtures?

Similarly, the door information is a sales brochure and doesn't identify which is chosen, the colour or the fittings. Only 'English Cottage and Cottage' appear to be the correct style. The rest are inappropriate and not traditional.

As per the window schedule:

Photo 2; 2B and 2C – why are these to be casements? The shape and style of the reveal is for a square sash. A casement in this type of reveal detailing is not traditional.

Smaller and more narrow reveals would take casement though traditionally would take a two pane sliding sash with no bars. Modern door pairing with single casement is later additions.

Photo 6 shows the principal elevation? I don't see retaining casements as an enhancement to the conservation area. This photo shows quite a depreciated aesthetic not in harmony with the character of the cottage. The vernacular style of windows are sashes, I don't understand why this isn't being reinstated. This would be an enhancement to the c area.

Consultation Officer (Initial Comments – 17/03/23)

Objection. Recommended refusal.

The Heritage Statement accompanying the proposal fails to at the minimum acknowledge the Conservation Area by name, or through investigation and description of the heritage asset to ascertain the scope of any potential impact as a result of the proposal. This therefore does not adhere to the NPPF paragraph 194.

The site is in a core area and in close proximity to a number of listed buildings. This also does not seem to be acknowledged at the minimum within the document and assessed.

I am unable to provide a thorough response and clarity on a proposal that is based on 'probably'.

Housing Standards Officer

Confirmed issuing of a Hazard Awareness Notice for property – partly with regard to condition of doors and windows.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application proposes alterations to a row of residential properties which are located within the settlement boundary for Chapel-en-le-Frith, and lies within the Central Sub Area as defined by the Local Plan Policies Map. Policy S6 seeks to promote the sustainable growth of the Central Area. The site lies within the town centre boundary for Chapel, however the proposals do not seek any change of use and as such there would be no requirement to assessment the proposals in terms of the effect on the vitality and viability of the centre.

The principle of development is acceptable, subject to satisfying other considerations relating to design matters, with particular regard to heritage assets, amenity and highway safety.

Design Considerations (including effect on Heritage Assets)

Policy S1 states that new development will be expected to make a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and where possible enhancing the environment which would be achieved by, inter alia, securing high quality and locally distinctive design. Policy EQ6 states that all development should be well designed and of a high quality and that this will be achieved by requiring development to be well designed to respect the character of the townscape, and requiring development to contribute positively to an areas character, identity and history in terms of scale, height, density, layout, appearance, materials and relationship with adjacent buildings.

CF1 supports proposals that seek to deliver qualitative environmental improvements and support the local distinctiveness of town centre environments through high quality design.

Further guidance is contained within the High Peak Residential Design Guide SPD (2005), and the Design Guide SPD (2018). The Design Guide SPD (2018) provides guidance on windows and doors in paragraphs 7.4 – 7.8. This highlights the importance of windows, and states that *“The traditional materials used in window construction are timber, cast metal or lead. In sustainability terms, timber is today by far the best material to use. Upvc by contrast, is often inappropriate as an alternative to more traditional materials – particularly in historically sensitive areas such as in conservation areas or on listed buildings. They often have very heavy sections and profiles and lack the detail and finesse of their timber equivalents”*, and that *“The design of replacement or new windows needs to relate to the age and style of the property in question as well as to the local context”*. Paragraph 7.24 goes on to state that in sensitive areas, *“upvc should not be used on environmental and aesthetic grounds whether in the form of windows, doors, barge boards or conservatories”*.

The NPPF also seeks to deliver high quality design in development and, at paragraph 134, states that development which is not well designed should be refused.

Policy EQ 7 states that the council will conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

The application site lies within Chapel-en-le-Frith Conservation Area which is a designated heritage asset. The Chapel-en-le-Frith Conservation Area Appraisal (CCAA) identifies the characteristics of the Conservation Area. It is considered that the significance of the Conservation Area lies within its historic origins and development, along with the architectural quality of the buildings it possesses.

The application site lies within the old town of Chapel, the CCAA identifies that the key streets within the old town are Church Brow and Terrace Road, once forming one of the primary routes through the town. The character, history and origins of the old town are illustrated by the area's setted streets and stone terraced cottages. The application site contributes towards this element of significance. Further, the CCAA identifies that there are important key and glimpsed views in the context of the site.

With regard to windows the CCAA has highlighted the loss of traditional detailing which is *“particularly acute among the residential properties...sliding sash windows would have prevailed. Their glazing bar sub-division would have differed from as many as eight lights over eight to one over one to reflect the building's period. Very few surviving examples of these joinery details exist, having been replaced by modern stained or UPVC “look alikes”. It is these original details that greatly contribute to the character of an area and their retention must be encouraged. More recently the Council has been able to grant aid the reinstatement of traditional joinery details through the management of area partnership grant schemes. These schemes funded jointly by the County, Borough and English Heritage have been successful in restoring historic details to a number of traditional buildings within the conservation area”*.

The application site occupies an important position in the old town of Chapel within traditional cobbled streets to the front and side. The building has been altered over time with some of the traditional detailing being lost. This includes the loss of some of the traditional window designs on its prominent front elevation with a mix of sash and casement windows. Existing windows are, however, fabricated in timber.

It is proposed to replace all windows and doors to the property. These would be replaced by timber effect upvc openings. The existing casement window at first floor level in No.1 would be replaced by a sliding sash window to match the other openings at this end of the terrace.

Following initial concerns raised by the Conservation Officer, further information was submitted to support the proposed alterations. This included an updated heritage statement and manufacturers brochures of potential suppliers.

This additional information has been reviewed and the Conservation Officer has maintained concerns with regard to the alterations proposed. It is not clear what approach is to be adopted for the windows in the rear elevation (noted 2B and 2C on Photo 2). These would have traditionally been sliding sash windows and a casement window would not be appropriate. Furthermore, the replacement of the existing casement windows in the front elevation cannot be seen as an enhancement to that elevation. The submitted brochures contain a number of designs for each window type, and it is not entirely clear what is proposed for each opening.

The advice contained within the adopted High Peak Design Guide, discourages the installation of upvc openings. While the CCAA highlights the concern with regard to historic loss of traditional openings, window detailing is an element of significance. Given the potential for chunkier framework compared to the traditional more slim-lined timber approach, there is insufficient information provided within the application, with specific detailed information for each window, to be comfortable that the proposed replacement windows and doors, using the materials proposed, would be of an acceptable design and fabrication to preserve and enhance the Conservation Officer. It is not considered that reserving the detail to condition would be appropriate as there may be an in principle objection to the overarching approach for this building.

There are a number of listed buildings near to the application site, however there is limited intervisibility between the sites. It is not considered that the proposals would have any negative effect on the setting of listed buildings.

The proposals would therefore fail to preserve and enhance the character or appearance of the Chapel-en-le-Frith Conservation Area. The proposals would be contrary to S1, EQ6, EQ7, and CF1 of the Local Plan, guidance contained within the Design Guide (2018), and advice contained within the Framework.

The degree of harm to the significance of the heritage would be less than substantial and, in accordance with paragraph 202 of the Framework, should be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme.

It is understood that the existing openings are substandard and require upgrading to improve the energy efficiency of the properties. It has also been flagged that the Housing Standards Officer has raised specific concern regarding the windows and doors within the building and served a notice on the owner. The development would deliver environmental, economic and social benefits which would amount to public benefits of the proposals. However, it is not considered that this outweighs the great weight required to be attached to heritage assets conservation, given that the same benefits could be achieved with a more appropriate choice of window casement. .

Amenity

Policy EQ6 requires development achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and not cause unacceptable effects by reason of visual intrusion, overlooking, shadowing, overbearing effect, noise, light pollution or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity.

The proposed alterations would not affect the existing relationship with surrounding residential properties and as such, would not give rise to any adverse amenity issues.

Highway Safety

The proposed alterations would not result in an uplift of bedrooms within the property, or a loss of parking to the side. No highway safety issues would arise, as confirmed by DCC Highways.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

It is considered that the proposals would comply with the policies contained within the Development Plan and guidance within the NPPF, and as such it is recommended that the application be refused.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: REFUSED

Case Officer: Declan Cleary

Recommendation Date: 19/09/2023

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council