

Planning Statement

(Incorporating design and access and heritage statement requirements)

Application for replacement windows (Article 4 Direction)

14 Prestwich Park Road South, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 9PE

5th November 2022

Prepared by Jane Healey Brown BA (Hons) (Oxon) MA FRTPI

1. Summary of Proposed Development

This application is to replace the windows in the residential property at 14 Prestwich Park Road South, M25 9PE.

This document provides a planning statement incorporating the planning, heritage and design and access requirements.

The property is located in the St Mary's Conservation Area, which is subject to the Bury St Mary's Conservation Area (Prestwich) Article 4 Direction (2009). This Direction restricts development that would otherwise be permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). Consequently, express planning consent is required in the area for, amongst other things, the installation of windows. The property is included in the draft list of Non-Designated Heritage Assets. It is not a listed building. It was constructed around 1896.

The proposed replacement windows have been designed to be sensitive to the existing and original features. The style and proportions of the original windows would be retained throughout; details are provided below.

The windows are required to replace the energy inefficient and unsafe windows. The majority of existing windows are single glazed and the others are old double-glazed units with low thermal performance (small gaps between panes and no argon). The replacement windows will considerably increase thermal insulation and reduce the energy use in the property thereby reducing the carbon impact.

There are no toughened panes in the existing windows where current regulations require. The second-floor windows are unsafe due to rotting frames. The replacement windows would ensure building regulations for safety are met.

There are limited safe access routes in case of fire from the first and ground floor windows because these windows were bolted shut possibly decades ago and so are not usable in case of fire. The replacement windows are designed to ensure suitable fire access. The windows are being fitted by a CERTASS approved fitter ensuring that all Building Regulations and Fire Regulations are complied with

2. Description of Existing windows

The photographs below show the current front elevation (Figures 1a and 1b), side elevation (Figures 2a and 2b) and rear elevation (Figure 3).



Figure 1: Front elevation



Figure 1b: side of bay showing small side windows to first floor bay.



Figure 2a: side elevation



Figure 2b: side elevation from adjoining private property



Figure 3: Rear elevation

Figure 1a also shows the considerable set back (11 metres) of the property from the pavement.

All 12no. front windows (Figures 1a and 1b) are proposed to be replaced (excluding the windows surrounding the front door). The second-floor window has been previously replaced but is proposed for replacement through this application because it is dangerous due to the rotting frame and it not being fitted with required toughened glass. The ground floor bay windows (3no.) are required to be fitted with toughened glass and therefore do not meet current building regulations. There are 5 no. windows to the upper bay (see Figure 1b).

All 3 windows on the side elevation would be replaced. As shown from the photographs, only limited and oblique views are possible, even from the private vantage points where these photographs were taken. The second floor (top) window has been replaced previously but is dangerous due to the rotting frame and it not being fitted with toughened glass, as required by current building regulations.

All 7no. windows to the rear of the property would be replaced. This includes the more modern windows in the 1990s rear kitchen extension and the previously-replaced window above the kitchen extension. The basement French doors are not proposed for replacement.

The height of the second floor windows and the limited access down the side of the property means maintenance of these windows is difficult, resulting in the rotting of these frames.

3. Description of Proposed Development

The style and proportions of the original windows would be retained throughout.

All existing casement windows would be replaced with casement windows. All existing sash windows would be replaced with mock sash windows, including run-through sash horns. Run-through sash horns would be provided to replace all existing sash horns, i.e. bay, ground and first floor side windows and rear living room and rear first floor bedroom windows.

Horizontal bars would be in the existing locations, i.e. in the bay, side and rear windows would be across the middle and in the front bathroom, cloak room and loft windows would be one third from the top.

The existing window frames (sash and casement) are 70mm wide. The proposed replacement window frames would also be 70mm wide.

Given the window style and frame size would match each existing window, photographs have been provided below to show the dimensions and style of the proposed sash window and proposed casement window (figures 4 and 5). This is appropriate given it is replacing with equivalents, rather than providing drawings of 22 windows. Conditions of approval can therefore refer to this section of the Planning Statement.



Figure 4: 70mm mock sash window frame from proposed manufacturer (note the proposed windows would not include the central vertical bar shown in this illustration)



Figure 5: replacement 70mm casement window frame

All windows frames would be made from white wood effect uPVC: the manufacturers colour sample is provided at Figure 6. Obscure glazing in bathroom and cloakroom panels would be retained in the same window panels. Vents would be provided in the frames in accordance with building regulation requirements.



Figure 6: white wood finish (MWDtrade frames)

No existing external features would be affected, including stone lintels and sills. Internally, the existing wooden architrave surrounds will remain.

Toughened glass would be installed in panes in locations required by current building regulations, addressing current safety problems.

The proposed development would improve fire safety at first and ground floor as most of these windows were bolted shut decades ago making them unusable, including for purposes of fire escape. The windows are being fitted by a CERTASS approved fitter ensuring that all Building Regulations and Fire Regulations are complied with.

4. Heritage Statement

The property was constructed around 1896. It is located in the St Mary's Conservation Area, which is subject to the Bury St Mary's Conservation Area (Prestwich) Article 4 Direction (2009). This Direction restricts development that would otherwise be permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). Consequently, express planning consent is required in the area for, amongst other things, the installation of windows.

The property is included in the draft list of Non-Designated Heritage Assets as part of the group of properties 14-42 Prestwich Park Road South. The draft list does not provide details of any features and has not been adopted, giving it very limited weight. The property is not a listed building.

The St Mary's Conservation Character Appraisal was published in 2008. A separate St Mary's Conservation Area Landscape Appraisal was published in 2009, but the property is not mentioned in the landscape appraisal.

The Conservation Character Appraisal provides a description of development in the area in the nineteenth century (4.1). Although the older properties on Prestwich Park (as it was then known) are mentioned, the row that includes the application property is not mentioned in this section.

Section 5.1 describes the Prestwich Park area as:

'diverse use and character...the overall impression is of an area set in a treed landscape where the landscaping is a dominant feature. Within this, building groups are fairly well hidden by mature street trees.'

Section 5.2 describes Prestwich Park Road South / St Ann's Road as follows:

'The style of individual buildings varies from the remnants of the Georgian tradition through Victorian and Edwardian styles to mid war dwellings. All these combine, together with a mature street and garden landscape, to produce an area of significant character. The quality of the area has been eroded by a mix of modern development during the last half of the 20th century, when original dwellings were removed to allow the denser development of plots. In the main, poor quality architecture came hand in hand with redevelopment. New development has also been built up to the edge of the older areas.'

The application property (number 14) is included as part of a group of properties in the section titled 'Other significant buildings that make a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area'.

'Numbers 14 to 42 (even) - Three storey Victorian semis with black and white timber jettied bays forming top floor on top of brick bay window projections. Tall windows with corbels to sills, long timber canopies to doorways, and overhanging dentilled eaves. Some have large out of character dormers. There is a mixture of window design and window material.' (P33)

The mixture of window designs and materials is of particular relevance to the current application.

There are no historic photographs in the Conservation Area Appraisal of number 14-42 Prestwich Park Road South. However, there is an available photograph of one of the houses (no. 36) around the time of construction (1896); this is provided at Figure 7 below. It is notable that the ground floor bay windows are casement windows rather than sash windows, whereas the first-floor windows are sash windows. It is believed the application property did originally have sash windows in the bay on

both the ground and first floors. This shows that there was not consistency in the windows even at the time of construction.



Figure 7: front elevation of no.36 soon after construction showing a mixture of window types, notably casement windows to the ground floor and sash windows to the first floor of the bay (photograph believed to be the turn of the 19th/20th century i.e. within 5 years of construction).

A survey of the current windows of numbers 14-42 Prestwich Park Road South (15 properties) confirms the considerable variation in style and materials of the windows:

- 12 properties have bay casement windows; 3 properties have bay sash/ sash-style windows
- 10 properties have uPVC window frames (bay windows, more properties have uPVC in other window frames); 5 properties have wooden window frames
- 14 properties have some or all replacement bay windows; only the application property has full original bay windows.

This confirms the findings of the 2008 Conservation Area Appraisal and continues the variation in style that has existed since the properties were originally constructed. It also demonstrates that almost all the windows are replacements to the original and the majority are not in the style or materials of the original. This suggests a variation in materials and styles are appropriate, but in line with policy (below) they should seek to be sensitive to the style of the original.

5. Relevant Planning History

There is no relevant planning history at the property. However, there is a relevant planning history at a neighbouring property.

A relevant recent case is from 20 Prestwich Park Road South: application 61683 (2017). This was a retrospective application for replacement windows in a property of matching style and period within

the conservation area and in the draft list of non-designated heritage assets (as part of a group including the current application property).

The application for the windows to the side and rear was approved, with the replacement windows to the front allowed on appeal (APP/T4210/D/17/3186980). The relevant extracts from the Inspector's Appeal decision are set out below :

'9. The appeal development comprises the installation of windows in the front, side and rear elevations of No 20. The windows have uPVC frames with a matte finish.

10. I saw that window frames vary in terms of materials and styles elsewhere within the row including the use of uPVC frames of a more standard finish in other properties, and I note the planning permissions drawn to my attention by the appellant in respect of Nos 28 and 32. Of these No 32 has windows installed with uPVC frames, and No 28 has uPVC-framed windows albeit with sash horn detailing. I note from the Officer Report that other windows present in the row may not benefit from planning consent, and that the Council is contemplating enforcement action. However, I have been supplied with no substantive evidence to suggest that these other windows are not lawful in planning terms. I saw that few, if any, original windows were in situ in the row, and I note that the windows installed at the appeal property have replaced a mixture of timber-framed casement windows and uPVC windows.

11. I am conscious that the frames of the installed windows are bulkier than sash or indeed other types of timber-framed windows, and the glazing has a flat profile. Nevertheless, due the varied window framing and glazing profiles along the street, including more visually prominent standard uPVC units, the installed windows do not read as incongruous elements in a generally more harmonious pattern. Moreover, the depth of their reveals and the matte finish of their frames reduces the visual prominence of the windows in the context the host front façade, allowing its proportions, and resultant balance with its attached neighbour to remain the dominant elements of its architectural character. I note references to Historic England guidance with regard to the thickness of double glazing units; however, as I have detected no harm in these regards, this advice does not weigh heavily against the appeal development in the overall planning balance.

12. Consequently, for these reasons, and mindful of the duty arising from section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I conclude that the windows have preserved the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and that they have not harmed the significance of their host listed building. As a result, the proposed development would not conflict with Policies EN1/2, EN2/1 and EN2/2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan (adopted August 1997); or the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as they seek, amongst other things, to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance; to preserve the character of conservation areas; and to ensure that proposals do not have unacceptable adverse effects on character and townscape....

Conclusion

15. The appeal development does not conflict with the development plan insofar as the above-referenced policies are concerned. Accordingly, for the reasons set out above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.'

Assessment

The appeal property is in the same row of properties referred to in paragraph 10 of the Inspector's Report. The current application proposes windows with a similar matt finish (wood effect) and depth

of reveals. This design would be appropriate, as the Inspector concluded it *'reduces the visual prominence of the windows in the context the host front façade, allowing its proportions, and resultant balance with its attached neighbour to remain the dominant elements of its architectural character.'* (paragraph 11).

The appeal property provided only casement windows and these did not replicate the style of the original sash windows. Nonetheless, the Inspector concluded *'due the varied window framing and glazing profiles along the street, including more visually prominent standard uPVC units, the installed windows do not read as incongruous elements in a generally more harmonious pattern.'* (paragraph 11). As already noted in Figure 1c, even at the time of construction it appears that the windows were not consistent in the row of properties.

The current application is more in the style of the original windows than those allowed in the above appeal decision. Unlike the appeal property, the current proposals provide for sash-style windows, where the originals were sash and run-through sash horns. Neither were provided in the appeal property. Therefore, if the Inspector in the case of the above appeal concluded *'that the windows have preserved the character and appearance of the Conservation Area'* (paragraph 12), then it must be the case the current application which is more sensitive to the original windows will also 'preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area' and therefore be in accordance with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

6. Planning Policy Assessment

The relevant development plan is the adopted Bury UDP (1997), noting this is 25years old. The emerging Bury local plan is at an early stage. The Places for Everyone joint Development Plan Document (DPD) is subject to ongoing Examination and is therefore a material consideration. The Bury Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations and Extensions (2020) is also a material consideration.

From the review of these documents the key planning matters are heritage and sustainable development.

Heritage

The property is located in the St Mary's conservation area. An application is required for the replacement windows due to the corresponding Article 6 Direction. The property is included in the Bury Council list of draft non-designated heritage assets, but as a draft list and non-designated, this has very limited weight.

This application is therefore subject to the following:

UDP Policy EN2/1 – Character of Conservation Areas

UDP Policy EN2/2 - Conservation Area Control

UDP Policy EN1/2 - Townscape and Built Design

Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions

Policy EN2/1 Character of Conservation Areas states: *'the Council will be especially concerned with encouraging, and where appropriate, implementing measures to: retain, replace and restore features of historical and architectural interest...'*

Policy EN2/2 Conservation Area Control states: *‘Development within a Conservation Area will only be acceptable if it preserves or enhances the special character or appearance of the area. In considering proposals for development in Conservation Areas, regard will be had to the following criteria:*

- *the nature of the development in terms of its bulk, height, materials, colour, design and detailing;*
- *the relationship between the proposed development and the architectural and visual qualities of the surrounding area...’*

Policy EN1/2 Townscape and Built Design states: *‘The Council will give favourable consideration to proposals which do not have an unacceptable adverse effect on the particular character and townscape of the Borough’s towns, villages and other settlements. Factors to be considered when assessing proposals will include:*

- *the external appearance and design of the proposal in relation to its height, scale, density and layout;*
- *the relationship of the proposal to the surrounding area;*
- *the choice and use of materials...’*

Policy H2/3 Extensions and Alterations states: *‘Applications for house extensions and alterations will be considered with regard to the following factors:*

- *the size, shape, design and external appearance of the proposal;*
- *the character of the property in question and the surrounding area;*
- *the amenity of adjacent properties;*
- *visibility for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers of motor vehicles.’*

Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties (2020) is a material consideration. Paragraph 10.3 states:

‘The key aim within Conservation Areas is to ensure that local character is strengthened, not diminished, by change. If your house is in a Conservation Area (or alterations will affect a Listed Building’s setting) your application should be accompanied by a ‘Design and Access Statement’. Within the statement, special regard should be given to matters such as scale, massing, detailed design and quality of materials and how the proposal preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.’

Assessment

As set out in the description of the proposed development, the design of the windows is a sympathetic style with features to match the existing. The alignment of the horizontal bars is to match existing, run-through sash horns would be provided where existing and the matt wood effect uPVC is sensitive to the original. These are more strongly aligned to the original features than those allowed on appeal at 20 Prestwich Park Road South, as set out in the Inspector’s Report discussed above. The proposed development would ‘preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area’.

The application property forms a draft Non-Designated Asset as part of a group of properties that includes the appeal property. It is understood that this is a draft local designation and therefore has very limited weight. Furthermore, the Inspector considered the group value of these properties in

making their assessment and concluded the windows do *'not read as incongruous elements in a generally more harmonious pattern.'* (paragraph 11). As already evidenced in Figure 1c, there was not a consistent style of window at the time of construction, even in the bay windows.

The application therefore is in accordance with UDP Policies EN1/2, EN2/1, EN2/2 H2/3 (1997) and SPD6 (2020).

Sustainable Design

Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties (2020) is a material consideration. In the section on Sustainable Design, Paragraph 3.8 states:

'It is important that all alterations to existing properties recognise the need for sustainability and, in particular, the need for all of us to reduce of consumption of carbon.'

This is of particular relevance given the UDP was adopted in 1997 and therefore predates the requirements to move towards net zero carbon.

Delivery of more energy efficient homes is a key strand of the Greater Manchester Strategy, supporting the GMCA commitment to achieve net zero in Greater Manchester by 2038. This commitment is also included in the submitted Places for Everyone DPD, which is subject to examination and is therefore a material consideration.

Places for Everyone Policy JP-S2 Carbon and Energy states:

'The aim of delivering a carbon neutral Greater Manchester no later than 2038, with a dramatic reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, will be supported through a range of measures including: 1. Promoting the retrofitting of existing buildings with measures to improve energy efficiency and generate renewable and low carbon energy, heating and cooling...'

Places for Everyone Policy JP-S 1: Sustainable Development states:

To help tackle climate change, development should aim to maximise its economic, social and environmental benefits simultaneously, minimise its adverse impacts, utilise sustainable construction techniques and actively seek opportunities to secure net gains across each of the different objectives.

Supporting paragraph 5.8 states:

'The vast majority of the existing homes in Greater Manchester will still be in existence in 2050. Existing domestic buildings contribute 33% of Greater Manchester's carbon dioxide emissions whilst existing non-domestic buildings contribute 35%.(19) Retrofitting the existing building stock therefore presents a significant opportunity to help meet the 2038 carbon neutrality target. This can also contribute to the reduction of fuel poverty when targeted appropriately.'

Assessment

Replacing the single glazed and old-style double-glazed windows with wooden frames, many of which are rotten, with double glazed uPVC windows provides the best option for A-rated windows for energy efficiency. This would reduce energy use and carbon emissions from the property. This accords with Bury SPD6 and emerging Policies JP-S1 and P-S2 in Places for Everyone DPD.

7. Conclusion

The application is a sensitive design and thereby accords with the development plan, of particular relevance being the heritage policies in the UDP Policies EN1/2, EN2/1 and EN2/2 (1997). It is also consistent with SPD6.

The Conservation Area Character Appraisal and recent survey demonstrates that the other properties that form the group value with the application property have a considerable variation in the style and materials of their windows. Indeed, there is evidence of a variation of styles when the properties were originally constructed. The proposed application is more sensitive to the original style and materials than the majority of the windows in this group of properties.

The allowed appeal APP/T4210/D/17/3186980 at the neighbouring property 20 Prestwich Park Road South is of relevance, particularly as it is in the same group of properties as forms the draft Non-Designated Heritage Asset. The current application proposes similar materials but is more in the style of the original windows, replicating the sash windows and providing run-through sash horns, than the allowed appeal. In the appeal case the Inspector concluded *'that the windows have preserved the character and appearance of the Conservation Area'* (paragraph 12) and therefore do not conflict with the UDP policies and accord with NPPF and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. On this basis the appeal was allowed. This reinforces the case that the current application is in accordance with the development plan and relevant material considerations.

The proposed development provides a more sustainable development than the existing building and therefore would reduce energy use and carbon emission. It therefore accords with the emerging Place for Everyone DPD Policies JP-S1 and JP-S2 and Bury SPD 6. These are material considerations.

In conclusion, the proposed development accords with the local plan. The Inspector's report for allowed development at the neighbouring property further demonstrates that the more sensitive design proposed in the current application would 'preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area', related to this group of properties. The current application also benefits from the emerging Places for Everyone DPD and Bury SPD6 which postdate the appeal. The proposed development would accord with these policies in delivering carbon reductions. This furthers the planning balance in support of the application.

It is therefore respectfully requested that this planning application is approved.

The case officer is most welcome to visit the property and can be accompanied by the owner / applicant who is a chartered town planner.

Jane Healey Brown

BA (Hons) (Oxon) MA (Town and Regional Planning) FRTPI

Director of Planning, Arup

Visiting Professor of Geography and Planning, University of Liverpool

GMCA Planning and Housing Commissioner