

Conservation Team Advice

Date: 14/04/2026

Application Ref: HPK/2026/0034 (FULL) and HPK/2026/0035

Site Address: 6 Grosvenor Mansions Broad Walk, Buxton

Proposal: FULL - The proposal is to refurbish four sash windows, maintaining their appearance and rendering them fully operational and efficient. The intention is to repair, retain (if possible, or else replace entirely with like for like) and reglaze the original wooden sash frames

LBC - Listed Building Consent to refurbish four sash windows, maintaining their appearance and rendering them fully operational and efficient. The intention is to repair, retain (if possible, or else replace entirely with like for like) and reglaze the original wooden sash frames

Heritage assets affected:		
Designated Heritage Asset(s):	☒	Grade II Listed Numbers 1, 2, and 3 Grosvenor Mansions, Broad Walk Buxton Central Conservation Area Setting of: Grade II* Pavilion Gardens, Buxton
Non-Designated Heritage Assets(s) (NDHAs):	☐	

Conservation Advice

Summary of Significance

The application site consists of an apartment within the Grade II Grosvenor Mansions. Grosvenor Mansions is a row of 3 terrace villas now apartments. The building is of three storeys plus attics and basement, with a symmetrical of a 9- window range. It is possible the building was designed by Sir Joseph Paxton for the Duke of Devonshire.

Grosvenor Mansion is a prominent building along Broad Walk overlooking the Pavilion Gardens. The building contributes positively to the character and appearance of the conservation area and contributes to the distinctive character of the Broad Walk Street scene, which is lined with large villas.

Assessment and Impact

Consent is sought to refurbish and reglaze four sash windows. The applications also refer to the potential replacement of the four sash windows if repair is not possible.

A *Condition Survey of Windows* has been provided detailing the condition of the four windows proposed for intervention. These details confirm that a well-considered and sympathetic program of refurbishment and repair would benefit their condition and longevity. Therefore, the refurbishment of the frames is accepted in principle. However, the condition survey provided does not adequately detail the need or necessity to fully replace any of the four windows under considered. Furthermore, details of the proposed replacements have not been provided. Prior to consideration of any replacement windows full details to a scale no greater than 1:20 would be required illustrating the full sectional and elevation details. However, replacement of existing windows is a much greater intervention than sympathetic repair and refurbishment which poses a potential risk to the special architectural interest of the Listed Building. On this basis the reference to replacement should be removed from the application description as to not inadvertently provide consent for replacement with insufficient details.

Furthermore, a previous set of applications (HPK/2022/0399 and HPK/2022/0400) considered the reglazing of all the sash windows to the apartment. These applications were refused and subsequently dismissed at appeal. At this time the Planning Inspector stated:

20. The retention and repair of the existing timber frames and sashes, along with adding draft proofing would, subject to detail, have the potential to sustain the heritage interests of the listed building while enhancing the windows' thermal efficiency.

In view of these comments the loss and replacement of the existing frames would not be supported and consists of a larger intervention than favourable refurbishment. As such all reference to replacement should be removed from the applications.

The details provided in relation to the proposed refurbishment and reglazing have been considered in detail below.

The applications include document titled *Window Refurbishment Methodology*. This methodology briefly details the proposed removal of the existing sashes, cleaning of paint, fitting of new glazing and refitting. This methodology is brief and does not adequately detail the proposed method of repair and refitting. A more robust and detailed methodology would be required in regard to the level of repair taking place. Outstanding details include:

- Methods to be taken during transportation of window units to avoid damage during transport. Both following removals, and for refitting.
- Method of paint removal
- Method of timber repairs proposed. For example, timber splicing, resin etc
- Details for creation of rebate. For example, use of hand tools or mechanical
- New paint details, including colour and paint type.
- Details of draft proof bushes and method of fitting
- Details of new hardware (catches, lifts and rings)

In the absence of adequate details of the methodology proposed the applications lack clarity over the impact upon the Listed Building special architectural interest and appearance.

The application seeks to replace the existing single glazing within the four windows with a thin double-glazing unit. The photographs and information provided by the applicant indicated that four panes of glass proposed for replacement are historic. The two upper-panes in both the kitchen (window D) and bedroom (Window C) windows. A photograph demonstrates a crack in one of the historic panes of window C. As such there is agreement that this pane may require a sympathetic replacement. However, the remaining 3 panes of historic glass (two in window D and one in window C) remain in a good condition with no visible breakages. As such this glass should be retained as historic fabric.

In relation to applications HPK/2022/0399 and HPK/2022/0400 the Planning Inspector stated:

21. However, the installation of double-glazed units within the existing sashes would involve the irreversible loss of historic glass. Whilst I note the appellant's assertion that historic glass is present in only 5 windows, it would nevertheless weaken the building's heritage value in this respect. Moreover, the very flat and highly reflective nature of the double-glazed units would not replicate the slenderness and fragility of a single-pane unit. Thus, this would alter the building's character and reduce its historical merit.

22. The proposal's details lack precision and sufficient content, making a meaningful assessment of the proposal impossible. The application states that the unit 'may be slimline 11 or 12mm double glazing' for some windows with 14mm units in others, with no detail provided of the 11 or 12mm units or of any glazing bars. Whilst a basic section detail is provided of the 14mm unit, it is very clear from this that to accommodate the double-glazed unit, the profile of the

decorative moulding on the existing sashes would change. There is also no evidence as to whether the existing timber frames could support the double glazed units' weight. This raises concerns regarding the practical feasibility of the sashes to accommodate this change. From the limited information provided, overall, the proposal would alter the authenticity and integrity of the listed building and in doing so erode its heritage interests.

Although the type of double glazing proposed has been revised, the applicant has not sufficiently addressed the Inspectors previous concerns. The installation of double glazing to only four windows will alter the external appearance, and reflection of light on these four windows through virtue of them being double glazed units. This will impact upon the external appearance of the Listed Building, creating inconsistency across the building. Furthermore, the proposed reglazing will irreversibly alter the existing frames, with no information having been provided to demonstrate that the existing frames would be able to support the increased weight of the double-glazed units. As such the replacement of the existing glazing with double-glazing is considered to be harmful to the special architectural interest of the Listed Building. Furthermore, the impact upon the external appearance of the building would be harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Assessment of potential benefits

The application relates to the refurbishment of four existing sash windows. The refurbishment of these units would be considered a heritage benefit, provided that an appropriate methodology is provided and followed. As outlined above the present application lacks the sufficient details required assess the appropriateness of the methodology proposed. Therefore, this cannot be considered as a heritage benefit without sufficient supporting details.

Furthermore, the re-glazing of the four units is considered harmful to both the Listed Building and Conservation Area. The application relates to a private dwelling. As such any benefits from double glazing would be a private benefit and cannot be considered as a public benefit as per para 020 of the NPPG.

Legislation and Policy

Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 66(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that with respect to any buildings or land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of that area.

National Planning Policy Framework

In determining applications, local authorities should take account of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation, the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality, the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness (par.210).

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. (para 215)

Local Development Framework

Consideration should also be given to the following documents and local development framework policies:

- High Peak Local Plan (Adopted 2016) – EQ7 Built and Historic Environment
- Buxton area character appraisal (adopted April 2007)

Conclusions and Recommendations

The applications propose to refurbish and reglaze four of the existing windows to the Grade II Grosvenor Mansions. As outline in detail above, the proposed scheme presents several heritage concerns, in summary these are:

- Inappropriate reference to replacement throughout the application without supporting information
- Lack of sufficient details regarding the method of refurbishment
- The harmful impact of the proposed double-glazing
 - Loss of historic fabric
 - Impact on the special architectural interest of the Listed Building
 - Impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area
- Lack of public benefits

The above concerns amount to a moderate level of harm to both the Listed Building and

Conservation Area. In terms of planning policy this is considered to be less than substantial harm (NPPF para 215). As the application site is a private dwelling no public benefits are considered to derive from the proposed scheme in order to balance this harm. On this basis it is recommended that the application be refused in order to preserve the special interest of the Listed Building, and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Conservation Officer: Rachel Robinson
High Peak Borough Council