Comments for Planning Application 21/01068/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/01068/FUL
Address: Craigard Canongate Denholm Hawick Scottish Borders TD9 8NF
Proposal: Replacement windows
Case Officer: Brett Taylor

Customer Details

Name: Dr The Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland
Address: AHSS National Office, 15 Rutland Square, Edinburgh EH1 2BE

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of Public
Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application
Comment Reasons:
- Designated Conservation Area
- Poor design

Comment:The AHSS Forth & Borders Cases Panel has examined this application, and objects to the proposed tilt and turn windows.

The provided design statement is helpful, and we agree that the existing windows are not original to the property. They are, however, sash-style with projecting upper sashes in the traditional manner when not open, and being wooden, the visible portion of their frames is somewhat smaller than necessary for uPVC.

We also note the permission given for Rose Cottage. These photographs helpfully show why tilt-and-turn windows have no place in a conservation area, with their massive thick frames and lack of projecting upper sash. On a practical basis they also block far more light than, for example, the uPVC sashes next door at Gowanlea. Scottish Borders planning policy has changed since Rose Cottage was permitted, but it is worth noting that the previous windows were single-paned centre-pivot windows of non-traditional appearance and thus not comparable to the wooden sash style windows here.

For a conservation area with a mix of different windows such as this, the aim is always to maintain or enhance the present quality of the conservation area. These proposals represent neither of these, instead being an inferior material and a visually inferior design and opening method.

The design statement notes that the homeowners want to gain "a large improvement on heat retention and energy conservation to the house". On a factual basis, replacing serviceable double-glazed windows will not achieve this, due to the minimal surface area of the glazing compared to

other internal surface areas (floors, ceilings etc.), and even replacing failed single glazing never pays for itself within the twenty-year lifespan of uPVC windows. Every other sensible means of insulation should be explored first, and will prove more effective. We also find the desire to both reduce and increase air ingress from the windows contradictory.

We therefore object to this unnecessary degradation in quality of the conservation area.