

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2022/0400 Valid 12/10/2022	6 GROSVENOR MANSIONS BROAD WALK BUXTON	REPAIR AND RESTORATION OF ALL SASH WINDOWS (LISTED BUILDING CONSENT - ALTERATION)
---	---	--

MAIN ISSUES

- Impact on the significance of designated heritage asset

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The Grade II listed building is situated in Buxton Central Conservation Area at a prime, public facing location.

The listing description is as follows:

BUXTON

SK0573SE BROAD WALK 616-1/4/7 (East side) Grosvenor Mansions, Nos.1, 2 and 3

GV II

Row of 3 villas or boarding houses, now houses. Mid C19. Possibly by Sir Joseph Paxton for the Duke of Devonshire. Rock-faced millstone grit with ashlar dressings and Welsh slate roofs with stone stacks. EXTERIOR: 3 storeys plus attics and basement. Chamfered plinth, first-floor band, ground and first-floor sill bands and flush quoins. Symmetrical front, 9-window range. Central doorway with projecting pilaster porch with Ionic columns in antis and moulded cornice plus a glazed door with overlight, and above a plain sash. Flanked by pairs of 2-storey canted bay windows with plain sashes and hipped lead roofs. Flanked again by single doorways with pilaster surrounds and moulded cornices with glazed doors and overlights, and above single plain sashes. Flanked at either end by further single 2-storey canted windows. Above 9 segment headed plain sashes, and above again 9 gables each with a smaller segment headed plain sash. Basement openings to each bay window, and steps up to each doorway. Left and right returns 2 window with plain sashes. INTERIOR: not inspected. The Broad Walk comprises a series of Victorian villas and a walk overlooking the Pavilion Gardens originally laid out by Paxton c1850, though most of the surrounding houses were built by speculative developers. Some are reputed to be designed in detail by his former pupil Edward Milner from 1871, and built by Sanders & Woolcott of London for the 7th Duke. (The Buildings of England: Pevsner N: Derbyshire: Harmondsworth: 1953-1986: 117).

PROPOSAL

Listed Building consent is sought for the following works to the first floor existing windows indicated on dwg/01 on the building as follows :

- Repair and retain the original wooden sash frames.
- New draught proofing
- Windows reglazed with double glazing

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan 2016

S 1 Sustainable Development Principles
S 1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
EQ 6 Design and Place Making

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 16

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/2022/0399- Planning permission for repair and restoration of all sash windows-pending

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: expired
Neighbour consultation period ends: expired
Press Advert: expired

Public Comments

None received within consultation period.

Conservation Officer

Objects to the development as the proposal does not show a thoroughly considered intervention to properly consider and mitigate any harm. The scheme currently imposes harm on the Listed Building and core area of Buxton Central Conservation Area for the following reasons:

- Lack of content in the heritage and design and access statement fails to explore, realise and therefore understand the significance of Grade II listed Grosvenor Mansions
- No information submitted showing the current status of the glazing to explain reasons behind their wish to replace them.
- Replacing 18th century glass in their respective frames with double glazing is not possible. The wooden frames/units and their mechanisms and fitting would need to be replaced to take the heavier modern glazing this would be considered harmful and risk loss. The loss of the historic glazing is very much part of the tangible historic character of the listed building. The scheme does not explain how it will address this nor provide methodology. It doesn't explore any potential impact the scheme will have.
- Historic England provides guidance on improving thermal performance and it would be pertinent to have the existing units properly assessed to ascertain whether repair work can be undertaken to avoid harm.

DCC Highways

No comments to make.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application is for works to a listed building. In principle repairs and renovations are welcome and, in some cases, do not require consent. The LPA has a duty under section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 have very special regard to maintaining or enhancing its special interest.

Impact on significance of heritage asset

Policy EQ 7 states that the Council will conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. This will take into account the desirability of sustaining and enhancing their significance and will ensure that development proposals contribute positively to the character of the built and historic environment in accordance with sub area strategies S5, S6 and S7 by

- Preventing the loss of buildings and features which make a positive contribution to the character or heritage of an area through preservation or appropriate reuse and sensitive development, including enabling development, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss or other relevant provisions of the NPPF apply.

Paragraph 194 of the NPPF 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.

The application proposes to replace all glazing within the sash windows with heritage slim line double glazing, and the sash frames will all be removed, refurbished, draught proofed and replaced.

The heritage statement submitted with the application considers that the use of heritage double glazing with putty pointed will make no aesthetic difference to the appearance of the building and it is hard for the LPA Conservation Officer to argue that the removal of the Victorian glass will amount to a significant loss for the building as a whole. The alterations are proposed as the existing windows create draughts and these draughts indeed mere chill, become very evident as one approaches certain windows, and this clearly reduces the effect of heating and represents a dreadful waste of energy.

The Conservation Officers disagrees with the details within the heritage statement and considers that the development and craftsmanship of centuries old joinery, design style and glass blowing is an intrinsic part of architectural history. One that cannot be replicated accurately if lost. The mechanisms, materials and joinery of windows reflect the historic development of the window and its style, and size and quality of glass that is part and parcel of industrial and social movements of the time of build or construction. In addition, the issue relating to draught problems within the property often down to panes being askew in the main frame and not individual plates of glass. Therefore, draughts within the property do not justify the introduction of double glazing.

The Conservation Officer suggested that the applicant propose secondary glazing as this both adheres to Historic England guidance and meets modern living standards at no detriment to the historic building's character, setting nor physical fabric and is a reversible intervention. It was also requested that a refurbishment schedule be submitted. Subsequently the applicant submitted these details but did not amend the scheme to propose secondary glazing. The Conservation Officer considers that the internal condition of window sashes schedule appears to demonstrate fairly minor works. Unit no's 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9 and 12 from schedule indicate cord and mechanism issues making for ill-fitting pieces; (overpainting, cord issues-misalignment, gaps etc); if total replacement is required, they would require photographs to be submitted and this can be conditioned on any subsequent approval. Conditions relating to the paint colour and replacement fitting would also be attached.

The applicant considers secondary glazing impractical for some of the windows and considers secondary glazing to be unsightly.

For this reason, it is considered that the proposed development would see a complete overall of the wooden frames/units and their respective mechanism as well as result in the loss of the 18th century glazing within the existing frames. The proposed development is therefore considered to result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building.

Paragraph 199 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 (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.

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.

In view of the possibility of installing temporary, reversible secondary glazing, the improved thermal performance provided by the proposed scheme would not justify irrevocable harm to the heritage asset arising both from loss of the historic windows and the installation of inappropriate window replacements.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

For the reasons given I conclude that the proposed works would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building. The harm to the building would be less than substantial but would not be outweighed by the public benefits including improved thermal performance and the same effect could be achieved by less harmful means.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: That listed building consent be refused.

Case Officer: Rebecca Bowers

Recommendation Date: 14.08.2023

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council