



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2022

by S Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 7th February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/Y/21/3274908

Blakelow Cottage, Butterton Moor Bank, Butterton ST13 7TD

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs and Mrs Andrew Johnson against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/SM/0220/0110, dated 31 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2021.
 - The works proposed are replacement windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for replacement windows at Blakelow Cottage, Butterton Moor Bank, Butterton ST13 7TD, in accordance with the terms of application Ref NP/SM/0220/0110, dated 31 January 2020 and the plans and documents submitted with it and subject to the following condition:
 1. The works hereby permitted shall be carried out within 3 years of the date of this decision.

Main Issue

2. As the proposal is in a conservation area and relates to a listed building I have had special regard to sections 16(2) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).
3. The main issue in this case is therefore whether the proposal would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building, Blakelow Cottage and, linked to that, whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Butterton Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. Datestones on the building indicate that Blakelow Cottage, which is a Grade II listed building, was built in two phases, 1777 and 1782 with a later addition at the rear dated 1817. Originally comprising a pair of cottages with a separate outbuilding, the two cottages were altered in around 1986¹ and linked to the outbuilding to form a single dwelling. A small addition was

¹ Application Ref: NP/SM/1285/98/LB

made to the rear at a later date. The building is two storeys high and is constructed in coursed rubble with ashlar quoins.

5. The special interest, or significance, of the building derives primarily from its age and evidential value of the social history of the area, as well as in its architectural detailing.
6. The building was listed in 1985 at which time it was unoccupied. The list description notes, amongst other things, that the fenestration is slightly irregular and that all windows are of 2 lights with central flat faced mullion, containing casements. Those casement windows were replaced some time ago with undivided double-glazed units set in a brown coloured timber frame. There is no dispute between the main parties that the windows are unsympathetic to the character of the listed building.
7. The proposal seeks to replace the existing windows with ultra-thin glazing units set in painted hardwood frames subdivided into 4 lights, with the exception of three windows which will be undivided. The opening windows would be flush casements, generally side hung.
8. The proposed windows frames would not entirely reflect the glazing pattern at the time of the listing, which from the limited evidence before me, appear to have included windows with a variety of glazing bar patterns, materials and thicknesses, potentially as a result of their individual replacement over the course of time. It seems to me that replacing that pattern, which was agreed as part of the earlier conversion scheme but never implemented, is not necessary for the preservation of the significance of the building.
9. Historic England² advises that 'Where historic windows or replacement windows of historic pattern survive without historic glass it may be possible to introduce slim-profile double glazing without harming the significance of the listed building. There are compatibility issues to consider as the introduction of double-glazing can require the renewal of the window frame to accommodate thicker glazing thereby harming significance'.
10. In this case the Authority has advised that there is no objection to the glazing bars, which would be 19mm wide, with ovolo mouldings and putty pointed. Nor is there any objection to hardwood window frames, the window furniture or the proposed paint colour. However, the windows would be double glazed, as opposed to the single glazing of the windows that existed at the time of the listing.
11. The Authority has not set out in detail why double-glazing would, in itself, be inappropriate in this instance although I acknowledge that double glazed units can affect light patterns in different ways and, under certain conditions, make them appear slightly different from historic windows. However, the historic windows, which may have been a feature of interest, have already been lost and there can be no doubt that the proposed windows would be far superior to those in place at present. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary it seems to me that any change in the light pattern as a result of the double-glazing would be limited. I therefore conclude that in this instance, the proposed windows

² 'Traditional Windows. Their care, Repair and Upgrading', Historic England revised 2017

in the form submitted would preserve the listed building and any features of architectural or historic interest it possesses.

12. The site lies within the Butterton Conservation Area which encompasses buildings set out along the historic street pattern of the village, and the fields beyond. Blakelow Cottage presently makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area because of its age and well-preserved appearance. The cottage is set well back from the road and is partly screened from public vantage points by mature vegetation. The windows are seen in fleeting views. Given that I have found that the proposed windows would preserve the listed building it follows that they would also preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.
13. On that basis I am satisfied that the proposal would accord with the requirements of Policies GSP3 and L3 of the Peak District National Park Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011 and Policies DMC3, DMC5, DMC7 & DMC8 of the Peak District National Park Development Management Policies 2019 which amongst other things seek to conserve and enhance or better reveal the significance of a historic asset, preserve or enhance a conservation area and ensure that development is appropriate in its context.
14. Furthermore, the proposal would accord with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, chapter 16, which, amongst other things, requires that great weight should be given to a heritage asset's conservation. Given that I have found that there would be no harm to the significance of the heritage assets in this case, I do not need to consider any public benefits of the proposal.

Conditions

15. The Authority has suggested two conditions in the event that the appeal is allowed. The standard time limit condition is necessary to provide certainty. However, a condition specifying the plans is unnecessary given that the consent is for the works and plans as approved, as set out in the formal decision above. Accordingly, such a condition would fail the test of necessity as set out in the Framework.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons set out above and taking into account all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the above condition.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR