

APP/19/0995 – Eastney Farmhouse, St Peters Road, Hayling Island

Proposal:

Listed Building application for demolition of existing porch and construction of replacement porch and fenestration to Eastney Farmhouse. Replacement fenestration to ancillary building 'The Pigsty'.

Background

Eastney Farmhouse is a Grade II listed building, first being listed in 1984. The oldest part of the house dates back to 1620. It comprises two storeys with a high ridge and clay tiles. It has dormer windows on both the front and rear elevations. The main property features a small front porch with a pitched roof. In the rear garden, is an ancillary building known as The Pigsty. Windows in the main property have been replaced over time and now some exist with double glazing.

Legislative and Policy Context

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires planning authorities, when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, to 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.

The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in February 2019 and sets down the policies that the Council must take into account when determining planning applications. The 'Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2', states at paragraph 4:

'The significance of a heritage asset is the sum of its archaeological, architectural, historic, and artistic interest' and provides at paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 that in order for the Local Planning Authority to make decisions in line with legal requirements, the objectives of the development plan; and, the policy requirements of the NPPF, great importance is placed on understanding the nature, extent and level of the significance of the heritage asset.

The revised NPPF (February 2019) sets out in Chapter 16, the core principles relating to development affecting Heritage Assets that local planning authorities should consider in making planning decisions in the following paragraphs:

'184. Heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.

189. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities

should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

190. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

191. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.

192. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Considering potential impacts

193. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

194. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional

Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy states that planning permission will be granted for development that:

Protects and where appropriate enhances the borough's statutory and non statutory heritage designations by appropriately managing development in or adjacent to conservation areas, listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments, historic parks and gardens, archaeological sites, buildings of local historic or architectural interest.

Policy CP16 (1a) of the Core Strategy states Planning permission will be granted for development that is designed to a high standard, which helps to create places where people want to live, work and relax. All development should demonstrate that its design:

Identifies and responds positively to existing features of natural, historic or local character within or close to the proposed development site.

Policy DM20 of the Allocations Plan states that development proposals must conserve and enhance the historic assets of Havant.

Assessment of proposal

In principle, the proposal to replace the porch, which is in poor condition and the windows on both the main house and the Pigsty, is supported. However, the style/design of windows being proposed is of concern.

With regards to replacement windows on heritage style and listed buildings, the Council has specific guidance in the form of 'Windows in Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Guidance Note'.

<https://www.easthants.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Windows%20in%20Listed%20Buildings%20and%20Conservation%20Areas%20April%202015.pdf>

Whilst the timber frames are supported, the style of double glazing and glazing bar details is not. The window detail plans show standard stock mouldings which are usually coupled with mass produced timber frame windows. These mouldings show little regards for the subtleties that give the original their unique character and architectural interest. Glazing bars are an important component of a window and its visual character, window designs in historic properties will be expected to utilise true glazing bars. The use of glazing bars sandwiched between layers of glass or stuck on the external faces lack credibility and are not suitable for listed buildings.

The window design referred to above is a result of the style of double glazing proposed. Due to the additional weight and thickness, a standard double-glazed unit is incapable of achieving an authentic glazing bar profile. It is reliant either on an oversized, visually inappropriate glazing bar or playing false bars externally to the glass.

In order to amend the design so that it can be supported by the Heritage team, I advise that the window units are altered to include slim line double glazing which can be used in conjunction with an authentic glazing bar profile capable of taking a crisp putty bead. I appreciate that this may result in a more costly project however, the Council have to heed to the Section 66 of the Planning Act and other relevant national and local planning policy.

Please note – this refers to the main listed building only. The proposed windows are considered to be acceptable. The replacement porch is supported.

Conclusion – Holding objection subject to the submission of amended plans showing slim line double glazing with revised glazing bar details.

Rachael McMurray

Senior Conservation Officer – HBC & EHDC

14/11/19