

Conservation Response.

Date: 17/02/2023.

File/Application ref: HPK/2022/0377 & HPK/2022/0376.

Case Officer: Rachael Simpkin.

Proposal: 'Listed building consent for 20 apartments two extensions to the rear elevation' & 'Full planning permission for 20 apartments and two extensions to the rear elevation'.

Address: Grove Hotel, Grove Parade, Terrace Road, Buxton, Derbyshire, SK17 6AJ.

Dear Rachael,

Objection.

Unfortunately it seems the scheme is not thoroughly realised despite discussion, and has a multitude of issues preventing full support from Conservation.

Currently, the most crucial is the lack of attention paid to the canopy at the front of the listed building. A very prominent element included in the listing description and of course attached physically to the main frontage. This decorative feature is very significant, forming part of the relationship across the historic frontages on the intersecting roads of Terrace Road. It is also in line of sight of The Crescent, and visually associated with a 'picture-postcard' introduction into the heart of the town. It pairs respectively with what is left of the historic canopy at the Buxton Baths and what is now the Cavendish shopping arcade. This feature no longer forms part of the HAZ (Heritage Action Zone) scheme and it is imperative it is included in any projects at The Grove Hotel.

There is little clarity on what interventions will occur on the physical fabric of the former Hotel as part of the conversion, as on site it was seen inside that a considerable amount of change has occurred over time. This includes the loss of some portions of historic lath and plaster walling, structural effects to flooring having a knock-on effect onto some period staircases and loss of rubble walling at the principle elevation around window reveals with unsympathetic use of cement.

Further, I am concerned the interventions focused at the rear elevation look to eliminate what remains as a well-read progression of historic alteration. Currently, the rear though of course being service areas and their respective features, looks quite humble and the simple linearity contributes to its subservience as it still forms part of the overall building. Initially, there was a modicum of concern regarding the extension, though now, with the scale and use of some features; it does look to become quite visually jarring. The inclusion of a large block above the ground floor bay, (former reception space) makes for a bizarre top heavy elevation. The direction of the existing pitch roofs here mostly face east, and can be well read as secondary against the historic footprint of the core of the building. I am concerned the proposed rear looks to compete and risk merging the two, loosing this legibility.

I reiterate that I have no issue in principle with the reuse of a listed building, though currently I cannot give full support as multiple items need rectifying.

Regards,

Miss E Holland.
Conservation Officer.