

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2023/0191
Valid 15/05/2023

58 CHURCH STREET
GLOSSOP

LISTED BUILDING CONSENT
FOR THE REMOVAL OF 2
OUTBUILDINGS

(LISTED BUILDING CONSENT -
ALTERATION)

MAIN ISSUES

- Impact on designated heritage asset

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

58 Church Street is an end terrace property of stone and slate located within the Old Glossop conservation area. The rear wall of the dwelling is rendered in white. The dwelling house has a small yard to the side of the property, with a parking area to the rear of the curtilage.

The dwelling of No. 58 Church Street is not a Listed Building, however the two outbuildings proposed to be removed are attached to a Grade II Listed Building (No. 56 Church Street).

PROPOSAL

Listed Building Consent is sought for the removal of 2 outbuildings.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Local Plan

SS1 Development Principles
DC1 Design Considerations
DC 2 The Historic Environment

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 16 – Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/2023/0205 – New gate and hardstanding. Awaiting determination.

HPK/2023/0206 – Listed building consent sought for new gate and hardstanding. Awaiting determination.

HPK/2023/0070 – Single storey rear extension and alterations to windows and doors. FULL-APP.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 29/06/2023
Neighbour consultation period ends: 29/06/2023
Press Advert: 08/06/2023

Public Comments

None received within consultation period.

Town / Parish Comments

None received within consultation period.

Conservation Officer

Objection.

The Heritage Statement is rather disjointed, and I am not confident the heritage assets concerned have been thoroughly assessed. At the introduction it is not clear whether the structures concerned have been determined to be connected to the listed building of 56 Church Street or not; *List UID: 1384223*. Though later, the plans of the existing show that they are.

The Historic England listing summary which does not form part of the assessment, denotes the pair of end cottages (now one dwelling) of number 56. The heritage asset is directly impacted by the neighbour of number 58, due to it forming part of the setting and its close proximity. The structures concerned are directly adjoined to the listed building and the natural shrinking of modern white render or plaster away from the elevations does not solely determine that they are not. The document goes on to discuss that the structures were not built at the same build date as the listed building, due to the materials not being 'meshed together' per say. I disagree, of course there may be a short span of years between, however the traditional stonework craft of simple vernacular structures did not at the time require comprehensive thought or design, and cannot be measured against modern expectations of stonework construction seen today. Many of these coal shack, privvy or shelter type structures were simple and functional. These are many factors of which I am not convinced the Heritage Statement has gone into enough detail realising, despite a method of exploration on page 3.

Further, Historic OS Maps dated 1880, that are also not consulted on the document, identify the two small structures of the same footprint, scale and location shown to those concerned in the application - directly connected to the listed building. It should be noted that curtilage is not based on the literal demarcations of modern boundaries on a modern map. In general the criteria is any pre-1948 structure that formed part of the land or building at the time of listing, and in matching material palette to the principle listed building. This affords curtilage items the same protections due to forming part of the make-up of a listed building and its setting. This material palette is shown in the photographs. In addition to this, the same map shows evidence of the neighbouring properties along Church Street to contain within their historic plots, other small and similarly located structures in relation to the principal buildings. As such it is clear to me this forms part of the traditional identity and evidence of development of the Conservation Area.

Setting is not discussed at any great length, consequently I am not convinced that a conclusion can be made that there will be low harm imposed on the listed building or the Conservation Area. I note the Conservation Area is not described or discussed at all, it is recognised by name only on page 4.

I am not confident there is any real assessment into for example the character of the vicinity, how the listed building forms part of the area, its setting, traditional forms, scales, materials, contributing factors, development, and streetscape among other things.

The schedule of works envisaged on page 16 discusses the removal of the features, and 'making good' of mortar directly at the listed building. I presume of course this heritage asset is owned privately by a neighbour and I am concerned that works of this nature and alteration would in fact directly concern them. These elements concern the physical fabric of the historic building.

To conclude; most pertinently I can't see a reason as to why these are wishing to be removed, nor any convincing justification for their removal. The application form notes briefly a separate application for a gate and hardstanding, of which the latter will pose further issues I will not discuss at this time. Consequently, and due to my assessment above I cannot confidently support this proposal where it is not clear or convincing that the public benefit outweighs the harm imposed on GII no.56.

Historic England:

No comments.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development:

The application is for works to a listed building. In principle repairs and renovations are welcome and, in some cases, do not require consent however this proposal involves removal of a feature attached to a listed building. The LPA has a duty under section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 have very special regard to maintaining or enhancing its special interest.

Impact on significant of designated heritage asset:

Paragraph 199 of the NPPF states that 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.

Paragraph 200 of the NPPF states that 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.

Paragraph 202 states that 'where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'

Policy EQ 7 states that the Council will conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. This will take into account the desirability of sustaining and enhancing their significance and will ensure that development proposals contribute positively to the character of the built and historic environment in accordance with sub area strategies S5, S6 and S7.

No. 58 Church Street is not a listed building itself, however the proposed works with the removal of the 2 outbuildings are attached to No. 56 Church Street which is a Grade II Listed Building.

The conservation officer has objected to the proposed development, their full comments are above in this report.

It is considered that insufficient information has been submitted and that the heritage statement provided with the application does not fully assess the impact on the heritage asset and has not provided enough detail with regard to the impact on the Conservation Area. Furthermore, no sufficient justification has been provided to explain the reasons for removal of the two outbuildings and it is not clear or convincing that the public benefit outweighs the harm imposed on Grade II Listed Building (No. 56).

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

It is considered that the proposed development by reason of its lack of information does not demonstrate the impact the proposed development may have on the designated heritage asset or the Conservation Area. Furthermore, it is not clear or convincing that the public benefit outweighs the harm imposed on Grade II Listed Building.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATION :
REFUSE**

Case Officer: Nicole Quinn

Recommendation Date: 05/07/2023

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council