

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2023/0301 AND HPK/2023/0428 (LBC) Valid 02/10/2023	81 HANOVER COTTAGE SIMMONDLEY VILLAGE SIMMONDLEY GLOSSOP	REPLACEMENT WINDOWS AT THE REAR OF THE PROPERTY (FULL – HOUSEHOLDER AND LBC)
--	---	--

MAIN ISSUES

- Heritage – Listed Building

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The dwelling known as Hanover Cottage is a Grade II listed building located in Simmondley, Glossop.

Hanover Cottage is a 2 storey, terraced dwellinghouse of stone and slate. The dwelling features a number of timber windows. Existing windows consist of timber casement windows in an off-white finish.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission and Listed building consent is sought for the installation of replacement windows to the rear of the building. It is proposed to install windows of a like for like appearance. The proposed windows will be timber and double glazed.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan 2016

S 1 Sustainable Development Principles
S 1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
S 2 settlement Hierarchy
EQ 6 Design and Place Making
EQ 7 Built and Historic Environment
CF 6 Accessibility and Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 4
Section 12
Section 16

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/2011/0242 - Listed Building Consent For Alterations Including: Removal Of Studwork Wall To Kitchen, Removal Of Ceilings To First Floor Level And Replacement Ceiling At Higher Level, Replacement Windows And Removal Of Thack Stones To Roof APPROVED

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 17/11/2023
Neighbour consultation period ends: 26/10/2023
Press Advert: 09/11/2023

Public Comments

None received

Town / Parish Comments

N/A

Environmental Health

N/A

Derbyshire County Council Highways

N/A

HPBC Conservation Officer

Objection – insufficient and inaccurate information

Historic England

No comment

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

LP Policy S 2, which states that development should be directed towards sustainable locations, including Market Towns such as Glossop. The site is situated within this built-up area boundary. Therefore the principle of the development is acceptable subject to consideration of the following policy.

Design and heritage

NPPF 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. 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.

Section 16 Paragraph 199 of the NPPF states 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. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Section 12 Paragraph 130(c) of the NPPF states that development should be sympathetic to the character and history of the area, while not restricting change.

LP Policy EQ 6 states that all development should be well designed, of a high quality and respond to the areas character, history and scale.

LP Policy EQ 7 requires 'all works that impact on a heritage asset or its setting or sites with the potential to include assets, to be informed by a level of historical, architectural and archaeological evidence proportionate to their significance and sufficient to undertake the potential impact of a proposal.

The application site is a grade II listed building. While a heritage statement has been provided by the applicant, it has been found lacking by the HPBC Conservation Officer. In their comments the CO states the following:

'The Heritage Statement is poor and does not note this building is listed. It also does not thoroughly consider the character of the Conservation Area, nor does it undertake an impact assessment to consider any potential harm arising from the scheme and how this is mitigated. Additionally, there is no conclusion reached as to what harm will arise from the scheme. It is therefore seen that there is insufficient or inaccurate supporting information for this proposal.'

The CO also identifies a number of inaccuracies within the heritage statement. These include the proposed use of sandstone, where the dwelling is constructed of Millstone grit.

The applicant has further failed to provide a deterioration assessment of the existing windows, nor technical drawings of the windows proposed. A deterioration

assessment is required to determine the need for the replacement windows, and the level of harm which would be caused. While technical drawings could be required by condition, a deterioration assessment and revised heritage statement are vital in assessing the proposal and its impact upon the listed building and wider conservation area. The applicant has not responded to the request for such revisions.

Amenity

Section 12 Paragraph 130(f) of the NPPF states that development should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

LP Policy EQ 6 states that all development should achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and doesn't cause unacceptable effects by reason of vision intrusion, overlooking, shadowing, overbearing effect, noise, light pollution or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity.

The proposed windows will replace existing windows and will not introduce any new openings. As such there will be no amenity impacts.

Highway Safety

There are no highway safety impacts.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

In conclusion the application does not provide sufficient information to allow for a full and accurate assessment of the proposal and its impact upon the significance of the listed building. As such the application is recommended for refusal on the ground of insufficient information.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Refusal

Case Officer: Rachel Robinson

Recommendation Date: 23rd November 2023

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council