

Conservation Response.

Date: 01/11/2023.

File/Application ref: HPK/2023/0400.

Case Officer: Pet Twigg.

Proposal: 'Replace windows with sash UPVC to match existing'.

Site Address: Trinity Parsonage, Hardwick Square East, Buxton, Derbyshire, SK17 6PT.

Dear Pet,

Trinity Parsonage is a substantial traditional Buxton Villa, not listed, standing alone within its plot within Hardwick Conservation Area. It exhibits vernacular features such as prominent symmetrical fenestration over two storeys, highly decorative bargeboards and eaves, two tall chimney stacks, ornamental door surround with ironwork, carved stone gatepiers to boundary, two bays to ground floor and small yet deliberately landscaped frontage. It is an impressive well survived Villa, sitting quietly and in somewhat of a squat position along the street. The street does not see many of these types of dwellings in particular and sees a variation of three storey terrace, Ecclesiastical or smaller places of worship and some less uniform Villas to the north.

It is not made clear on the plans which or how many units are original, nor what assessment has been undertaken to determine irreversible loss is justified. It is discussed some but not all are deteriorated. From preliminary investigation it appears this property retains a full set of original to build date sash windows with horns.

I do not agree that plastic windows replicate traditional joinery 'perfectly'. They do not, and cannot replicate elements which include but are not limited to; the moulding, traditional craft, historic glass, mechanisms, pulleys, wheels, cords, frame sizes. It should be noted elements such as but are not limited to; flaking paint, the inability to open and dirt left by condensation residue is not a justification for total irreversible loss of historic fabric. This does not have conservation ethics in mind.

Thermal quality has been noted to be an issue, traditional timber windows are capable of repair and can where relevant be accompanied by draught strips and in some cases secondary glazing. The property is a traditionally built solid stone dwelling with no cavity walling in situ due to historic construction methods. The thermal bridging and capabilities of these age of structures cannot be measured against that of a new build house. I therefore encourage exploration of other ways to improve thermal quality, such as above; secondary glazing, draught strips, curtains, window shutters (where in some historic buildings they survive), draught excluders at doors, appropriate attic or loft insulation and where relevant; appropriate internal finishes such as wool or jute carpeting and not plastic laminate flooring. Cumulatively there are ways and means to tackle thermal comfort in traditional dwellings as I will note plastic units and their short lifespan will not solely resolve the complaint.

There is technical guidance from Historic England regarding traditional windows: '*Traditional Windows, their care, repair and upgrading 2017*'. My points above echoed on page 5. Mass manufactured window units cannot faithfully replicate traditional windows, and do change the

character and identity of a building. This does not have the character or setting of the Conservation Area in mind.

I will also query the removal of trees forming part of this application that is not noted in the proposal title. The proposal is for replacement windows, if there are other elements to this project I encourage they be accurately noted in the application title.

~

To conclude;

I cannot see there has been thorough assessment and therefore justification for this level of loss. As such I do not see that this has the special interest or historic value of the Conservation Area in mind. In terms of heritage harm I assess it to be less than substantial, as the proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area contrary to Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. With emphasis on preservation. It is not considered that there are public benefits associated to the scheme to outweigh this harm. As such I cannot support this scheme and recommend refusal.

Regards,

E Holland.
Principal Conservation Officer.