

COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee: East Area
Date: 10 June 2010

Ward: Huntington/New Earswick
Parish: New Earswick Parish Council

Reference: 10/00424/LBC
Application at: Hawthorn Terrace South, New Earswick, York, YO32 4BL
For: Installation of replacement white timber double glazed windows at 1-16 Hawthorn Terrace
By: Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust
Application Type: Listed Building Consent
Target Date: 19 May 2010
Recommendation: Refuse

1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 This is a listed building consent application for the installation of replacement white timber double glazed windows at numbers 1 to 16 (inclusive) Hawthorn Terrace, New Earswick.

1.2 The application relates to the following entries in the Statutory List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest;

- No.'s 1-4 (consecutive) Hawthorn Terrace, New Earswick. Terrace consisting of two pairs of cottages, built in 1907 to a design by Parker and Unwin for the Joseph Rowntree Village Trust. Grade II Listed Buildings.
- No.'s 5-8 (consecutive) Hawthorn Terrace, New Earswick. Terrace consisting of two pairs of cottages, built in 1907 and designed by Parker and Unwin for the Joseph Rowntree Village Trust. Grade II Listed Buildings.
- No.'s 9-12 (consecutive) Hawthorn Terrace, New Earswick. Terrace of four cottages, built circa 1907 and designed by Parker and Unwin for the Joseph Rowntree Village Trust. Grade II Listed Buildings.
- No.'s 13-16 (consecutive) Hawthorn Terrace, New Earswick. Terrace consisting of two pairs of cottages, built circa 1909-1914 and designed by Parker and Unwin for the Joseph Rowntree Village Trust. Grade II Listed Buildings.

1.3 The group of Grade II Listed Buildings is situated in New Earswick, established in 1901 as a garden village by Joseph Rowntree, the chocolate manufacturer. The master plan and building designs are those of Barry Parker and Raymond Unwin, pioneers of the Garden City movement.

1.4 In 1986, some 222 domestic dwelling houses in New Earswick were included in the Statutory List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest as Grade II

Listed Buildings. The majority of the listed dwelling houses are situated to the east of Haxby Road. In 1991, New Earswick was designated as a Conservation Area.

1.5 Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust seeks to improve the thermal performance of rented houses in New Earswick for their tenants. 127 of the Listed dwelling houses in the village have 230mm thick solid external brick walls rather than cavity walls. In order to improve the thermal performance of these properties it is proposed to install double glazed timber framed window replacements and dry lining to the inside face of external walls (the drylining proposal to which there are no objections have already been approved under delegated powers) . This initial application relates to 16 dwellings located on Hawthorn Terrace. A further application has also been submitted for similar works to properties at 1-20 Ivy Place (Planning Reference 10/00427/LBC), also to be considered on this agenda.

1.6 The existing windows incorporate slender frames with fine glazing bars that replicate the proportions of the glazing of the original windows (Refer Brochure: New Earswick, York, published by the Joseph Rowntree Village Trust in July 1913.)

1.7 The current design philosophy is to replace the arrangement of the sashes and method of opening to match the existing windows. The external reveal depth will remain the same as existing. The windows are to be timber constructed double glazed units.

1.8 The application is accompanied by a supporting statement incorporating a design and access statement and an assessment of the proposed window replacements with regard to national heritage planning policies including an additional statement considering the proposal against the new Planning Policy Statement 5 'Planning for the Historic Environment' which superseded Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 'Planning and the Historic Environment' in March of this year.

1.9 The application has been called into committee by Cllr Runciman 'due to the concerns of residents that their homes should reach a decent standard as soon as possible and that these applications are of significant importance for the future of sustainable measures in New Earswick.'

Planning History

1.10 Listed building consent was refused for the install of the same design of double glazed window in January 2010. That application included internal dry lining of the walls. The reasons for refusal related to the design of the particular window and the lack of information on other alternatives which could have been considered other than replacement windows. (The dry lining proposal was not controversial and has been re-submitted as separate applications).

2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Development Plan Allocation:

Conservation Area New Earswick CONF

City Boundary York City Boundary 0001

DC Area Teams East Area (2) 0005

2.2 Policies:

CYHE3

Conservation Areas

CYHE4

Listed Buildings

CYGP4A

Sustainability

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

INTERNAL

3.1 Conservation Officer - The Conservation Officer has commented extensively in relation to this development and these comments are incorporated into the report. Overall the Conservation Officer whilst not objecting to the principle of the development does have strong reservations about the details of the replacement windows and is objecting to the proposal.

EXTERNAL

3.2 New Earswick Parish Council - Support the application

3.3 Conservation Areas Advisory Panel - The Panel made the following comments as part of the discussions on the previously refused application:-

The applicant made a presentation to the Panel prior to the matter being discussed. The Panel's views on the proposals were mixed however on the close of discussion the majority vote was against the existing proposals. It was suggested that, in future, a management plan for the estate be prepared and this should also consider Article 4 Directions.

Considerations to take from the meeting include:-

- Using thin glazing (Histoglass or Slimlite)
- Removal of glazing bar
- Entirely different, more modern window

- Investigate different manufacturers

3.4 In addition to the Conservation Area Advisory Panel comments the chair of the panel has written a further letter expressing their concern about the details of the proposal. This letter can be summarised as follows:-

- The panel's concerns relate to the impact the windows will have on the listed buildings in the New Earswick Conservation Area. The panel's assessment of the significance of the buildings is based on the following:-

1. New Earswick is the earliest planned community to be built under the influence of the ideals of the Garden Cities Association, founded in 1899. Commencing 1901, the village pre-dates the better known Letchworth Garden City (begun 1903) and Hampstead Garden Suburb (begun 1907), and was regarded as a model for social reformers in England and abroad.

2. From the start, houses were experimental and designed to make the execution of daily chores easier and less onerous through improved domestic arrangements. They were to differ radically from the crowded and dark C19 terrace housing in which many of the eventual tenants were likely to be living.

3. Their small-scale modest appearance was a conscious harking-back to pre-industrial vernacular housing which is why they were described as 'cottages' in contemporary literature.

4. Both terraces which are the subject of these applications were constructed in the first phase of building before the 1914-18 War. The designs of both, developed during this period, were included as models in the government Manual for the 'state-aided housing schemes' of the 'Homes fit for Heroes' campaign initiated by the 1919 Housing Act.

- For the above reasons it is considered that the houses in the origins and development of early social housing is of the highest. The Panel are concerned that to replace the windows in the way proposed will have a detrimental effect on their character and appearance. The window design made with timber with an aluminium element and a 'stuck on' glazing bar of an unspecified material applied to the surface is considered to be contrary to advice within policy HE4 of the Local Plan and GP4a sustainability which says that development should be of a high quality design, with the aim of conserving and enhancing local character and distinctiveness. It is also felt that the altered dimensions of the windows would have a disruptive effect on the simple but carefully proportioned elevations of the houses and will have an adverse impact on the appearance of the listed buildings.

- The panel conclude that based on the advice of PPS5 Officers should work with the applicant to find a less harmful solution to their long - term need to find more energy-efficient replacement window design for the village.

3.5 The application was referred back to the Advisory panel who made the following additional comments:-

The panel reiterated their previous comments. Considerations to take from the meeting were as previously stated (see above)

PUBLICITY

3.6 The application has been advertised by means of a site notice dated 6th April 2010 and by newspaper advert dated the 7th April 2010. Neighbour notification letters have also been sent.

4.0 APPRAISAL

4.1 Key issue

- Consideration of the effect of the development on the Special Interest of the Listed buildings

4.2 Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that in determining whether to grant listed building consent for any works the Local 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.

4.3 Since the submission of this Listed Building Consent application, and indeed the consideration of the previously refused application for the same development, Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment,(PPS5) and the Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide have been published on 23 March 2010. PPS5 sets out the Government's national policies on planning for the conservation of the historic environment and supersedes previous advice set out within PPG15.

4.4 PPS5 states that the Government's objectives are to deliver sustainable development by ensuring that policies and decisions concerning the historic environment;

- recognise that heritage assets are a non-renewable resource
- take account of the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits of heritage conservation; and
- recognise that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term.

4.5 Elements of the historic environment that are worthy of consideration in planning matters are called 'heritage assets', including buildings, parks and gardens, standing, buried and submerged remains, areas, sites and landscapes. Listed Buildings are considered to be 'designated assets'.

4.6 PPS 5 contains a number of policies to assist in the decision making process. Policy HE1: Heritage Assets and Climate Change says Local Planning Authorities should consider opportunities for the modification of heritage assets so as to reduce carbon emissions and secure sustainable development. However, where such proposals to mitigate climate change have a potentially negative effect on heritage assets local authorities should help the applicant to identify feasible solutions that

deliver similar climate change mitigation but with less or no harm to the significance of the heritage asset and its setting.

4.7 Policy HE7: Policy principles guiding the determination of applications for consent relating to all heritage assets states 'the key to sound decision-making is the identification and understanding of the differing, and perhaps conflicting, heritage impacts accruing from the proposals and how they are to be weighed against both each other and any other material planning considerations that would arise as a result of the development proceeding'.

4.8 Policy HE9: Additional Policy Principles Guiding the Consideration of Applications for Consent relating to Designated Heritage Assets. This policy considers that there should be a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets and that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. Where it is considered that a proposal has a harmful impact on the significance of a designated heritage asset, which is less than substantial harm, local planning authorities should weigh the public benefit of the proposal (for example, that it helps to secure the optimum viable use of the heritage asset in the interests of its long-term conservation) against the harm.

4.9 PPS5 Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide (The Guide) has been published to assist with the interpretation of PPS5 and requires at Paragraph 14 that the 'nature of the interest and the significance of the interest' is identified and defined. Significance, as defined in the PPS, encompasses all of the different interests that might be grounds for designating a heritage asset. Paragraph 17 states 'applications will have a greater likelihood of success and better decisions will be made when applicants and local planning authorities assess and understand the particular nature of the significance of an asset, the extent of the assets fabric to which the significance relates and the level of importance of that significance' paragraph 74 requires local planning authorities to use expert advice to inform their decision-making where the need to understand the particular significance of a heritage asset and any proposed impact demands it.

4.10 The Guide makes reference to the scale of heritage assets. Due to the large number of designated heritage assets or listed buildings situated within New Earswick village, this cluster should be considered as a 'large asset'. Paragraph 174 of the Guide states that, 'An inconsistency of approach to repair and restoration because of different ownership, or in methods and techniques may result in a loss of significance by obscuring the evidential value of the asset as a whole.'

4.11 The Guide, paragraph 185, states that, 'The insertion of new elements such as doors and windows is quite likely to adversely affect the building's significance. New elements may be more acceptable if account is taken of the character of the building'.

4.12 POLICY HE3 of the City of York Development Control Plan- Incorporating the Proposed 4th Set of Changes seeks to protect the character and appearance of Conservation Areas. Supporting text of the policy further states that the elevational

treatment of all sides of any development and roofscape are important, not simply the street frontage.

4.13 POLICY HE4 of the City of York Development Control Plan- Incorporating the Proposed 4th Set of Changes states that Listed Building consent will only be granted for internal or external alterations when there is no adverse effect on the character, appearance or setting of the listed building.

4.14 Policy GP4a of the City of York Development Control Plan- Incorporating the Proposed 4th Set of Changes '. 'Sustainability' of the City of York Council Development Control Local Plan (2005) states that proposals for all development should have regard to the principles of sustainable development and sets out those issues to consider as part of a sustainably designed development.

Consideration of the effect of the development on the Special Interest of the Listed Buildings:

4.15 This listed building application is for the insertion of replacement windows within 16 listed properties forming part of a total of 120 such properties within New Earswick. An application for the replacement of the windows was refused in January 2010. This application is a resubmission for exactly the same window design as previously considered.

4.16 The application, like the original submission, is supported by a specialist report by Roger Wools and Associates, Heritage Consultants, this report has also been updated by the submission of an additional statement to address new guidance in PPS5. The thrust of the report and additional statement can be understood by summarising the conclusion and recommendations of the submitted documentation which are:-

- The reasons for listing properties at New Earswick are noted in the many descriptions for individual blocks and these include the association with Joseph Rowntree and the influence he and the village had through the whole of the United Kingdom on the development of high standard public housing for the less wealthy members of society.

- New Earswick as a cohesive architectural design has survived remarkably well and still displays those features that were influential in the national context. Fairly radical changes to aspect and layout of the properties have taken place in the last 100 years providing greater comfort and facilities for residents and in the spirit of Joseph Rowntree who wished his workers to have housing that was of a good standard and that was socially appropriate.

- PPG15 (paragraph 1.3) emphasises that it is the management of change that is the primary issue with historic assets.

- Paragraph 3.13 of PPG15 is quoted (see paragraph above)

- The 1960 English Joinery Manufacturers Association (EJMA) windows are in 2009 reaching the stage where replacement windows is required and with energy prices

rising rapidly, the poor thermal performance of the windows imposes a heavy cost upon tenants on low incomes. There is therefore an imperative for their replacement. The JRHT acknowledges the historic merit of the village and is seeking to reconcile these often conflicting objectives of preservation and improvement.

- The proposal put forward that is represented by a prototype timber window incorporating sealed double-glazed units. This has been discussed with the council for almost two years and significant alterations to the proposals have been made in response to the comments of the Conservation Officers. The proposed windows are considered to be an effective compromise.

- When tested against heritage policy as set out in paragraph 3.5 of PPG15 in relation to the defined special interest of a listed building, the proposal as revised in option B for the casement windows is acceptable in preserving the special interest i.e. not causing harm. Therefore listed building consent should be granted.

- The changes made to the small sealed units since May 2009 have satisfactorily addressed the cumulative effect of the reflective quality of the spacer beads of the units.

- The proposed treatments of both the larger casement window units and the multi-paned windows are acceptable.

- The dry-lining proposals are acceptable.

- section 3.10 of the report defines the 'special interest' of the buildings it is an important point with reference to PPG15 that the proposals enable the original use of the listed buildings as family dwellings to be preserved.

- The windows are considered to be acceptable for both the listed and unlisted dwellings of the village and as such would preserve the uniformity of appearance that is an important part of the visual appearance of the area.

- PPG15 requires that a first stage is to assess what makes up the 'special interest' of the listed building that gives rise to designation. It is considered that the report does this.

- The special interest of the buildings would be preserved i.e. not harmed

- It falls to the decision maker to weigh any loss of special interest that they might judge to occur against other wider planning policies including PPS22 on climate change.

4.17 The additional statement concludes:-

- Having viewed the application against the new PPS5 and accompanying practice guide Roger Woolls concludes that the special interest of the listed buildings would be preserved i.e. not harmed

- PPS5 states that it is the duty of the decision maker to weigh any potential loss of interest that it might judge to occur against other wider planning policies including PPS22 on climate change.

- There are no significant changes between PPG15 and PPS5 that would militate against the approval of the submitted development. The PPS does however incorporate recent Government policy on climate change and the need to address these issues. This is new in terms of heritage policy and a material consideration that adds support to the applications.

4.18 The Local Planning Authority is required by PPS5 Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide, Paragraph 14 and 17 to identify and define the 'nature of the interest and the significance of the interest'. With regard to the Listed Buildings at nos 1-20 Ivy Place, New Earswick, the general criteria for assessment of the current proposals (the definition of the nature of the interest and the significance of the interest) are considered to be as follows:-

i. The buildings and layout for New Earswick were designed by the architects, Barry Parker and Raymond Unwin, notable as pioneers of the Garden City movement, and of national significance. Parker and Unwin closely considered the harmonious relationship between adjacent buildings and between buildings and their settings within the village. The simplicity of the design of the village architecture followed Morris' ideals of truth of materials and honesty of construction. Unifying features in the design of the dwelling houses are the gables, hipped roofs and design of the fenestration, where windows are formed of multiples of a single standardised glass pane. Standardisation of design and materials formed a unifying element of the village architecture. The special architectural and historic interest of the Listed dwelling houses at New Earswick is defined by the design philosophy employed by Parker and Unwin in the layout, architectural design of buildings and spaces that exist at New Earswick.

ii. Parker and Unwin's standardised designs for terraces of cottages in New Earswick are of national significance as prototypes of municipal housing developed in Britain from the 1920's onwards as part of the 'Homes for Heroes' building campaign. As stated in the list descriptions for nos 1-20 Ivy Place, 'The particular significance of New Earswick lies in its contribution to the development of low cost housing in Britain. Experience gained and practices introduced here were incorporated extensively into the Tudor Walters Report of 1918 which was instrumental in the passing of the Addison Act of 1919. Plans from New Earswick influenced the Government Manual on low cost housing which followed the Act.' As stated in section i., it is Parker and Unwin's layout, design, and materials of the cottages at New Earswick that defines the special architectural and historic interest of the buildings.

iii. The dwelling houses at nos 1-20 Ivy Place are arranged as four terraces around a three sided quadrangle. The unity of the scale, design and materials of this group of dwelling houses is consistent within this part of New Earswick, to the east of Haxby Road. The Listed Buildings' share the particular architectural forms or details of other buildings nearby'. The standardised design of the dwelling houses including the gables, roofs and fenestration pattern arranged within a master plan designed by

Parker and Unwin, forms part of the special architectural and historic interest of this group of Listed Buildings and is recognised in the designation of New Earswick as a Conservation Area.

4.19 The Conservation Officer acknowledges that, in principle, the installation of double glazed timber framed windows to the listed dwelling houses is likely to improve the thermal performance of the buildings, enhance the living conditions of tenants and bring associated benefits to the local community. However, the Conservation Officer has considered the details of the window design and has concluded that the proposed design is likely to have a negative effect on the significance of the individual designated heritage assets and this 'large asset' (see paragraph 4.9 above) or group of Listed Buildings at New Earswick because the standardised design by chosen window manufacturer, Whitakers Windows, has severely restricted the design of the replacement windows due to standardised factory manufacturing processes. The Conservation Officer considers that the proposed designs for the replacement windows are likely to have a negative effect on the significance of the designated heritage assets or the special architectural interest of the Listed Buildings for the following reasons;

i) Thickness of the frame and the ratio of the glazing to the timber frame. In order to accommodate the thickness of the double glazed unit and the multi point locking system, the frames are broader than those for single glazing. This results in a clumsy appearance with proportionally thicker frames and less glazing present. Other more acceptable manufactured types of timber framed double glazed windows are available.

ii) Thickness of the double glazed unit and appearance of the spacer bar. The thickness of the double glazed unit is proposed at 28mm. Due to the thickness of the glazed unit it is possible to view the spacer bar and two panes of glass that form the unit, on closer inspection, from the exterior. The spacer bar appears visually intrusive within the context of the traditional design of the Listed dwelling house.

iii) Applied or 'stuck on' surface mounted glazing bars to external face of double glazed unit. It is proposed to replicate the existing multi pane windows by means of the introduction of an applied or 'stuck on' glazing bar, that does not present a convincing or authentic appearance as a true glazing bar when viewed, on closer inspection, from the exterior.

iv) Timber beads and aluminium beads at base of the double glazed unit. The beading replaces the putty line to the exterior of the windows. The profile and width of the beads contributes to the uncharacteristic heavy appearance of the window frames. The aluminium bead at the base of the double glazed unit is likely to have a different weathered appearance from the adjacent timber beads. There is a visible, horizontal gap between the base of the aluminium bead and the frame of the sash that detracts for the traditional appearance of the Listed dwelling house.

v) Visible horizontal gap beneath base of sash window and frame. In addition to the visible gap between the aluminium bead and the timber frame of the sash window, there is a visible gap between the base or bottom rail of the sash window

and the outer frame. This visible, horizontal gap is repeated at the base of each sash window and detracts from the traditional appearance of the Listed dwelling house.

vi) Use of friction hinges and modern ironmongery/handles. The casements with friction hinges have a different appearance to the existing casements with butt hinges. The friction hinges create a visual separation between the open sash and the frame. The modern handles have the appearance of those for modern UPVC replacement windows and fail to respect the traditional character of the existing window furniture.

4.20 Both the Conservation Officer and the applicant's specialist Heritage Consultant, in general, define the nature of the interest and the significance of the interest of the buildings in more or less the same way. The main areas at issue are the emphasis placed on the part that the windows play in adding to the special interest of the buildings, whether the particular details of the proposed window are acceptable and whether there are such community benefits that are of overriding importance.

4.21 Policy HE9 of PPS5 says that where it is considered that a proposal has a harmful impact on the significance of a designated heritage asset, which is less than substantial harm, local planning authorities should weigh the public benefit of the proposal against the harm. The Applicant's Specialist concludes that the differences in the windows when compared with the existing will be negligible when viewed from the public realm and will be small but acceptable when viewed at close quarters. More weight is however attached to the community benefits that would accrue to residents from installing double glazed windows in terms of reduced heating bills. Other documentation submitted by the Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust to support the proposal indicates that the type of window required by the Conservation Officer would cost an additional £5,600 per dwelling unit (and possibly some impact on the type of guarantees provided for the windows).

4.22 The Conservation Officer does not object to the principle of double glazing, however, having had an opportunity to view the new windows already installed on the unlisted properties in Poplar Grove, still holds that the windows, for the reasons explained above, would be harmful to the special interest of the buildings. Furthermore, as an alternative to the current proposals for window replacements, secondary glazing and draught strips could be installed to the existing windows to improve their thermal performance. The Conservation Officer has concluded therefore that the proposed window designs will have a negative effect on the significance of the designated heritage assets or special architectural interest of the Listed Buildings that outweighs the public benefit of the improved thermal performance of the double glazed windows. Thermal performance of the Listed dwelling houses could be improved through the installation of secondary glazing and draught proofing measures that will not have a negative effect or harm the significance of the designated heritage assets and would ensure their optimum viable use.

4.23 There has to be significant sympathy for the tenants and the financial benefits to them of insulating the properties. There is also understanding that the Trust has limited budgets and the potential additional costs of an alternative new window,

where there are so many properties that need to be refurbished, could be prohibitive. In terms of the tenants dry lining of the properties has already been approved under delegated powers and the Conservation Officer has indicated that whilst the detail of the particular window is likely to be harmful, the principle of the use of double glazed unit is acceptable. Officers conclude, therefore, that it is possible to meet the needs of the tenants and reduce their financial burden for heating costs. In terms of the Trusts additional financial burden in choosing another window type which would address (or partially address) the concerns of the Conservation Officer, the submitted details refer to an additional £5,600 per unit. However this is not supported by quotes from alternative window companies/ joinery firms or any other corroborative evidence and therefore it is difficult to attach significant weight to this argument. Furthermore there is little consideration of whether secondary glazing and draught strips could achieve a similar level of thermal performance, although Joseph Rowntrees state that it is an option not favoured by tenants, or that a more holistic approach that includes a range of measures to improve thermal performance has been considered. Such an approach could include a range of measures, such as the insulation of cold bridging locations including roofs/soffits to bay windows, the fitting of draught seals to openings and installation of loft insulation.

4.24 There remains a disagreement between the applicant's specialist and the Council's Conservation Officer regarding the acceptability of the window detail and in coming to a view in relation to the relevant merits of the arguments put forward, officers are mindful of advice within PPS5 which states at Paragraph 76 'The key to sound decision-making is the identification and understanding of the differing, and perhaps conflicting, heritage impacts accruing from the proposals and how they are to be weighed against both each other and any other material planning considerations that would arise as a result of the development proceeding.' The Conservation Officer, whilst accepting the principle of double glazing, has clearly set out the elements of the window detail that need to be improved for the detailed design to be acceptable and officers consider that the applicant has not clearly indicated, with supporting evidence, why these areas of concerns can not be addressed. For this reason, officers support the Conservation Officers view that the windows as submitted are unacceptable; the detailed design of the current proposals will have a negative effect on the significance of the designated heritage assets or the special architectural and historic interest of this group of Listed Buildings and should be resisted.

4.25 In terms of sustainability; since the previous refusal for the installation of the replacement windows, new guidance in PPS 5 places greater emphasis on climate change and the need for climate change to be considered within the decisions relating to the historic environment. This is consistent with advice within PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development'. The applicant makes reference in his submission to PPS22 'Renewable Energy'. PPS22 discusses how to deal with applications submitted for renewable energy proposals but is relevant to this proposal in its opening paragraphs when it says that Government's aim to cut carbon emissions will be aided by improvements to energy efficiency. The Local Plan policies, in particular GP4a, states that proposals for all development should respond to the principles of sustainable development. However Policy GP4a also states that development should be of a high quality design with the aim of conserving and enhancing the local character and distinctiveness of the city. Whilst accepting that

there is greater emphasis on the issues of climate change objectives within PPS5, officers are satisfied, based on the advice from the Conservation Officer, that it would be possible to achieve an appropriate design of double glazed window for the dwellings and therefore that it is possible with a differently designed window to achieve a better solution both in terms of the visual quality of the buildings and the area, and the sustainable objectives of both Central Government advice and Local Plan policy.

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 PPS5 states that the Government's objectives are to deliver sustainable development by ensuring that policies and decisions concerning the historic environment:

- recognise that heritage assets are a non-renewable resource
- take account of the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits of heritage conservation; and
- recognise that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term.

5.2 The Conservation Officer acknowledges that, in principle, the installation of double glazed timber framed windows to the listed dwelling houses is likely to improve the thermal performance of the buildings, enhance the living conditions of tenants and bring associated benefits to the local community. However, the detailed design of the proposed timber framed double glazed windows is likely to have a negative impact on the special architectural interest of the Listed Buildings at nos 1-16 Hawthorn Terrace and their setting within the village. Furthermore there is no consideration of whether secondary glazing and draught strips could achieve a similar level of thermal performance or that a more holistic approach that includes a range of measures to improve thermal performance have been considered.

5.3 In terms of the Trusts' additional financial burden in choosing another window type which would address (or come towards addressing) the concerns of the Conservation Officer; the submitted details refer to an additional £5,600 per unit. However, this is not supported by quotes from alternative window companies/ joinery firms or any other corroborative evidence and therefore it is difficult to attach significant weight to this argument.

5.4 Whilst accepting that there is greater emphasis on the issues of climate change objectives within PPS5, officers are satisfied, based on the Conservation Officers advice, that it would be possible to achieve an appropriate double glazed window for the dwellings and therefore that it is possible with a differently designed window to both achieve a better solution in terms of the visual quality of the buildings and area and the sustainable objectives of both Central Government advice and Local Plan policy.

COMMITTEE TO VISIT

6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

1 It is considered that the proposed installation of a standardised design of window has severely restricted the design of the replacement windows due to standardised factory manufacturing processes. It is considered that the proposed replacement windows would be harmful to the special interest of the listed buildings and their setting due to their detailed design and appearance, in particular:

- (i) the thickness of frame and ratio of the glazing to the timber frame;
- (ii) the thickness of the double glazed unit and appearance of the spacer bar;
- (iii) the applied or 'stuck on' surface mounted glazing bars;
- (iv) the timber beads and aluminium beads at the base of the double glazed unit;
- (v) the visible horizontal gap beneath the base of sash window and frame and
- (vi) the use of friction hinges and modern ironmongery/handles.

The design and appearance of the windows are considered to be contrary to Central Government advice in Policies HE1 and HE9 of Planning Policy Statement 5 'Planning for the Historic Environment', advice within the Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide March 2010 and Policy HE3, Policy HE4 and GP4a of the City of York Draft Local Plan Incorporating the Fourth Set of Changes (Approved April 2005)

2 It is considered that the application is not supported by sufficient evidence to demonstrate that a more holistic, less harmful approach that includes a range of measures, including secondary glazing and draught strips, could not be installed to the existing windows in order to improve their thermal performance. This is considered to be contrary to Central Government advice contained within Planning Policy Statement 5 ' Planning for the Historic Environment' and The Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide March 2010

Contact details:

Author: Diane Cragg Development Control Officer (Mon/Tues)
Tel No: 01904 551657