

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2023/0206
Valid 23/05/2023

58 CHURCH STREET
GLOSSOP

LISTED BUILDING CONSENT
FOR A NEW GATE AND
HARDSTANDING

(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 it is proposed to install a new gate post and fence which will be attached to a listed building and the installation of hard surfacing, which appears to be attached to the Grade II listed Building.

The Grade II listed build is number 56 (and no. 54) to the west. The listing states:

Marked on OS map as Nos 54 and 56. Two cottages and workshop, now house. Mid C18, with early C19 additions and C20 alterations. Coursed millstone grit with tooled dressings and stone slate roof with 4 stone stacks and single brick stack. PLAN: 2 single fronted cottages, single depth. L-plan house of single room depth, incorporating later wing to rear. EXTERIOR: 2 storeys. Street front has irregular 2 window facade with quoins to right. Off-centre former doorway with flush ashlar surround now contains C20 glazing bar casement and tiny fixed window above, with to left 3-light glazing bar sliding sash and to right similar smaller 3-light window in flush ashlar surround, beyond single doorway in similar surround with C20 door. Above two 3-light glazing bar sliding sashes that to right smaller in flush ashlar surround. Left return, to Thorpe Street has single 3-light glazing bar casement to each floor and setback to left lean-to catslide extension has single C20 bow window and quoins to left. Right return has single 2-light garret window with flush mullions with 8-pane casements and former roof line visible below. Rear facade has variety of window openings including 2-light flush mullion window at first-floor level. Former C19 workshop wing to rear has two 9-pane glazing bar casements to first floor and C20 garage door to rear gable. INTERIOR: not inspected.

PROPOSAL

Listed Building Consent is sought for a new gate and hardstanding.

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/2023/0191 – Listed building consent sought for the removal of 2 outbuildings.
Refused.

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 Statements concerning the schemes, again, lack the level of detail expected. My comments echo that of an earlier response for the third application at

this address. It appears as though none of the supporting information has now gone into any detail regarding setting and an assessment of this, and what methods have been explored to mitigate harm on setting as a result of the projects. In regard to these cases, I am not sure how it can be concluded no harm will arise on the setting of the neighbouring listed building, when it has not been discussed at any level. Similarly in regard to archaeology and historic features, I am not sure how this can be concluded to have no adverse effect when it has not been discussed.

The projects in this case show an upheaval of earthworks and replacement of which with further hardstanding in immediate proximity to GII no. 56. The works appear to be at the extent of the east elevation of GII no.56. The existing plans show a concrete pad is currently in situ, with other patches of concrete at the most northerly point of the area. Works of this nature are particularly invasive, and the supporting information goes into no detail regarding method and intended approach to convincingly explain how the earthworks will have no impact on archaeology or historic features. There also does not seem to be any detailed drawings in section demonstrating to what proximity the new hardscaping will be to the listed building, whether it will be attached or at what ground level in relation to the property's footings or plinth where relevant. This is a significant element to be considered in respect of the integrity of the listed building's fabric. There also does not seem to be any consideration for water run-off, pooling or any drainage details despite the fact the envisaged works propose to add what is extensive hardscaping immediately adjoining historic stonework. This of course also concerns the integrity of the masonry of no.58.

Further information seen to be lacking is the proposed stone type for the hardstanding or discussion of intended material palette, working precedents or how the material palette has been informed.

The method of attaching a gate to the listed building shows a particularly invasive approach with incompatible materials such as resin and steel bolts. This is not supported, and unfortunately an alternative approach has not been explored. I again, echo earlier comments regarding the owners of the listed building; works directly concerning this heritage asset's fabric does concern them.

To conclude; the proposals fail to show a comprehensive scheme enabling me to provide full support at this time. I cannot determine there will be any public benefit to outweigh the harm imposed on no.56, and as such I recommend refusal.

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 concrete and its replacement with stone flags and the installation

of a 1.8m high vertical panel timber fence. 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 194 of the NPPF states that 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.

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 directly affect 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. In particular the conservation officer comments that the proposals involve the upheaval

of earthworks and replacement with hardstanding in immediate proximity to GII no. 56. The works appear to be at the extent of the east elevation of GII no.56. The existing plans show a concrete pad is currently in situ, with other patches of concrete at the most northerly point of the area. Works of this nature are particularly invasive, and the supporting information goes into no detail regarding method and intended approach to convincingly explain how the earthworks will have no impact on archaeology or historic features. There also does not seem to be any detailed drawings in section demonstrating to what proximity the new hardscaping will be to the listed building, whether it will be attached or at what ground level in relation to the property's footings or plinth where relevant. Moreover, no information has been provided on the type of materials to be used.

The conservation officer also considers that the method of attaching a gate to the listed building shows a particularly invasive approach with incompatible materials such as resin and steel bolts. As such it is considered that insufficient information has been provided, and in any event the works would have less than substantial harm to the heritage asset.

Insufficient justification has been provided to explain the reasons for the proposed works and it is not clear that the public benefit would outweigh 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. 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: 14/07/2023

X 

Signed by: Jane Colley Signature

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council