

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2023/0205
Valid 23/05/2023

58 CHURCH STREET
GLOSSOP

NEW GATE AND
HARDSTANDING

(FULL - HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of Development
- Heritage Assessment
- Impact on Character and Appearance of the area
- Impact on Neighbouring Amenity
- Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

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

PROPOSAL

Planning consent is sought for a new gate and hardstanding.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan 2016

S 1 Sustainable Development Principles
S 1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
EQ 6 Design and Place Making
EQ 7 Built and Historic Environment
CF 6 Accessibility and Transport

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 4 - Decision-making
Section 12 - Archiving well-designed places
Section 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

HPK/2023/0206 – Listed building consent for a 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: 05/06/2023

Public Comments

None received within consultation period.

Town / Parish Comments

None received within consultation period

Derbyshire County Council Highways

No comments to make.

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.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development:

Local Plan Policy S 2 states that development should be directed towards sustainable locations, including Market Towns such as Glossop. The site is situated within this built-up area boundary. Therefore, the principle of the development is acceptable subject to consideration of policy.

Heritage:

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.

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 the proposed works and it is not clear or convincing that the public benefit outweighs the harm imposed on Grade II Listed Building (No. 56).

Impact on the Character and Appearance of the area:

Design Section 12 Paragraph 130(c) of the NPPF states that development should be sympathetic to the character and history of the area, while not restricting change.

Local Plan Policy EQ 6 states that all development should be well designed, of a high quality and respond to the areas character, history and scale.

The Adopted Residential (SPD) (2005) chapter 9 states that “extensions and alterations to existing houses can have a significant impact on the appearance of a house, neighbouring property and the street scene. It is important, on all types of houses, that domestic development is carefully designed.”

The proposed new gate and hardstanding are located to the rear of the dwelling and therefore will not impact the street scene.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed development will not have a detrimental impact in terms of design on the character and appearance of the conservation area or the street scene.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity:

Section 12 Paragraph 130(f) of the NPPF states that development should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Local Plan Policy EQ 6 states that all development should achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and doesn't cause unacceptable effects by reason of vision intrusion, overlooking, shadowing, overbearing effect, noise, light pollution or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity.

Due to the limited works proposed it is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the neighbouring amenity of any adjoining dwellings and is therefore considered acceptable.

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking:

Policy CF 6 states that the Council will seek to ensure that development can be safely accessed in a sustainable manner. Proposals should minimise the need to travel, particularly by unsustainable modes of transport and help deliver the priorities of the Derbyshire Local Transport Plan.

The proposed development will not affect existing access and will not introduce any new bedrooms to the property, therefore there are no concerns with regard to Highway Safety or Parking.

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