

From: Michael Miller
Sent: 14 July 2014 14:43
To: DC Consultation
Subject: FW: Comments on Lowstead
Attachments: Lowstead windows.pdf

From: Sarah Dyer
Sent: 14 July 2014 14:40
To: Michael Miller
Subject: FW: Comments on Lowstead

Michael

Please see my comments on Lowstead. I have fundamental concerns with the proposal and would prefer not to make a site visit until these concerns are addressed as it is not in accordance with policy in its current form.

Please contact me if you have any queries,

Kind regards

Sarah

Sarah Dyer, Conservation Officer

Tel: [REDACTED]

IMPORTANT NOTICE - Disclaimer - Officers are expressly required not to make defamatory statements and not to infringe or authorize any infringement of copyright or any other legal right by email communications. Any such communication is contrary to ICT policies and outside the scope of the employment of the individual concerned. Northumberland National Park Authority will not accept any liability in respect of such communication, and the employee responsible will be personally liable for any damages or other liability arising.

Michael Miller, Planning Officer

Tel: 01434 611552 (x278)

IMPORTANT NOTICE - Disclaimer - Officers are expressly required not to make defamatory statements and not to infringe or authorize any infringement of copyright or any other legal right by email communications. Any such communication is contrary to ICT policies and outside the scope of the employment of the individual concerned. Northumberland National Park Authority will not accept any liability in respect of such communication, and the employee responsible will be personally liable for any damages or other liability arising.

12NP0058LBC - Listed Building Consent in respect of replacement of existing windows and doors to south facing elevation at Low Stead, Wark, Bellingham

To: Michael Miller, Planning Officer, Northumberland National Park

Comments

The submitted proposal is to replace 11 No. existing double glazed sash look a like lift and tile windows, 2 No. 8 paned doors and 2 No 5 paned half glazed doors on the south facing elevation of Low Stead Farm house.

Low Stead is a Grade II farmhouse and is listed for its special architectural and historic interest. The existing windows appear to be later additions as the list description refers to the windows having diamond-paned iron casements. These are no long in situ and have been replaced by double glazed units at some point since the building was listed in 1985.

I would be grateful if you could search the NNPA records to establish whether the replacement double glazed windows were every granted Listed Building Consent.

I have not yet visited the site as I know the building and I have a number of fundamental concerns about the submitted proposal that I would like to see addressed before I make a visit to the property. No pre-application enquiry was made for this proposal so no previous advice has been given.

Policy Context

The NPPF directs LPA's the issues which are considered material to a listed building application in the section 12. It states that LPA's should take account of the desirability of **sustaining and enhancing** the significance of the heritage asset and the desirability of new development making a **positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness**. It also states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a heritage asset great weight should be given to the assets conservation and that **any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification**.

Discussion

Windows have a very significant part to play in the importance of a historic building and are often vulnerable to being replaced either because the original window is in need of repair to to achieve improved thermal performance. In Northumberland where traditional farm house windows have a small aperture but are generally traditional sash and case timber windows. The loss of the diamond paned metal windows is particularly extremely regrettable as these may have been very early windows which would have made a major contribution to the significance of the building.

Generally double glazed units in Listed Buildings are not acceptable. This is for two reasons, firstly because of the loss of historic fabric (which does not apply in this case as the original windows have already been lost) and secondly because it is not possible to achieve the correct slimness of the glazing bars. Applied or false glazing bars are historically incorrect and aesthetically unconvincing. Recent research by English Heritage has shown that repair and draught proofing is a simple and thermally effective way of reducing heat loss and I have attached a link to a recent article on this issue for information.

<http://www.buildingconservation.com/articles/secondary-glazing/secondary-glazing.htm>

However, as the original or early windows have gone and the current windows which are only 25 or so years old have failed I will consider the merits of the submitted proposal against the background of planning policy, research and advice as set out above.

I am not aware that the existing windows have Listed Building Consent. In any event, in the current policy climate they are entirely inappropriate due to being double glazed and look-a-likes instead of accurate box sash and case. However, as the applicant is considering replacing them this is welcomed in principle, but in my view this is an opportunity to get the detail of the window correct in the interests of sustaining and enhancing the significance of the building. The current submitted application does not do this for a number of reasons:

1. spiral balance is not acceptable. A proper weight balanced sash and case window is historically accurate and appropriate and should form part of the application;
2. as the original fabric is lost, double glazing **may** be acceptable however this should be achieved using individual units **incorporating** (i.e. not applied) a glazing bar. The glazing bar should also have a proper and historically accurate profile which is not shown on the submitted drawings. Ovolo type profile may be appropriate in this instance;
3. the top left hand window is shown as being top opening. This is not acceptable and the building regulations are able to apply some flexibility when it comes to Listed Buildings so please take further advice on this;
4. The central two window should also include vertical glazing bars unless there is full and proper justification for not doing so;
5. Justification for the use of redwood timber and its long term performance.

The application should be accompanied by a joinery schedule showing each individual window existing and proposed. Each window should also be given its own unique reference number so that it is easy to identify and cross refer to when considering the application.

I am aware that the Ancient Monuments Society has also requested a condition survey for all existing windows.

Conclusion

I am not in a position to support this application for the reasons set out above. As submitted as it is contrary to policy and would have an adverse impact on the character and significance of the Listed Building. I suggest that the applicant withdraws this application and considers the advice given above and re-submits a proposal that is more appropriate and that is in accordance with planning policy.

I trust the above is helpful. Please contact me if you have any queries.

Sarah Dyer IHBC MRTPI
Historic Buildings Advisor
Northumberland National Park