

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2023/0414
Valid 25/09/2023

BRENTWOOD
SILVERLANDS
BUXTON

REPLACEMENT DOORS AND
WINDOWS

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Heritage (conservation area)
- Design

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The dwelling known as 'Brentwood' is an end terrace property on the corner of Silverlands and Hardwick Square East. The dwellinghouse is of stone and slate construction with timber sash windows. Brentwood is located within the Buxton Hadwick conservation area, with Article 4 in place.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for replacement windows and doors. The replacements will be double glazed upvc of a similar appearance to the existing windows and doors.

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 Decision-making
Section 12 Achieving well-designed and beautiful places
Section 16 conserving and enhancing the historic environment

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/0002/2070 Proposed Extension To Form Conservatory And Play Area. APPROVED

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 07/12/2023

Neighbour consultation period ends: 17/10/2023

Press Advert: 26/10/2023

Public Comments

Support (1)

Objection (1)

- loss of historic glass, which is part of the character of the building
- replacement windows will not last as long as the existing have.
- secondary glazing suggested

Neither (0)

Town / Parish Comments

n/a

Environmental Health

n/a

Derbyshire County Council Highways

n/a

HPBC Conservation officer

Objection – insufficient information

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

LP Policy S 2, which states that development should be directed towards sustainable locations, including Market Towns such as Buxton. 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

Section 12 Paragraph 135(c) of the NPPF states that development should be sympathetic to the character and history of the area, while not restricting change.

Paragraph 200 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.

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 states that the council will conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. LP Policy EQ 7 also 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 plans provided are vague, lacking clarity of which windows and doors will be replaced, this is considered insufficient to allow proper assessment. The HPBC Conservation officer has further objected to the lack of information in the provided heritage statement which fails to properly assess the character of the conservation area and the windows being replaced. This therefore fails the requirement of NPPF para 200. Furthermore no sections have been provided to demonstrate where in the existing openings the proposed replacement windows will sit. No information is provided regarding the mounding types, horns, sash mechanism, beading or colour.

Therefore it is considered that there is a lack of information on which the properly and fully assess the application as required.

Amenity

Section 12 Paragraph 135(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.

From the plans provided it does not appear that the size or position of any openings will be changed. Therefore there is no amenity impact.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

In conclusion, it is considered that there is a lack of information provided with the application to accurately assess and approve the proposal. As the applicant has failed to provide the information required the application is recommended for refusal.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Refusal

Case Officer: Rachel Robinson

Recommendation Date: 27th December 2023

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council