

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2023/0203
VALID 22/05/2023

69, MANOR PARK ROAD,
GLOSSOP, DERBYSHIRE,
SK13 7SH

NEW DRAUGHT LOBBY AND
GARDEN WALL TO FRONT
ELEVATION (FULL –
HOUSEHOLDER)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of Development
- Design Considerations (inc impact on heritage assets)
- Impact upon Residential Amenity
- Impact on Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site lies within settlement boundary for Glossop as defined by the Local Plan policies map. The site comprises a two storey, semi-detached dwelling which is located on the eastern side of Manor Park Road. To the front of the property is a small dwarf wall along its northern boundary. The eastern side of Manor Park Road is predominantly residential in character comprising two storey terraced and semi-detached properties. On the western side of Manor Park Road, opposite the application site is Manor Park, which is a protected major park in the Local Plan, and forms part of the Old Glossop Conservation Area. To the immediate north of the site is the Former Tabernacle Chapel, a Grade II Listed Building which has been converted to residential. To the north of that building is the Northern Glass Works with attached gates and railing, which is also a Grade II Listed Building.

PROPOSAL

This application proposes the construction of a single storey porch (lobby) to the front elevation and erection of a small stonework wall. The porch would be constructed from coursed stonework with a stone tiled, lean-to roof. The scheme proposes the removal of the existing wall along the northern boundary of the site.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan (Adopted 2016)

S1 Sustainable Development Principles
S1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
S2 Settlement Hierarchy
S5 Glossopdale Sub-area Strategy
EQ6 Design and Place Making
EQ7 Built and Historic Environment
EQ11 Flood Risk Management
CF6 Accessibility and Transport

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

High Peak Design Guide (2018)

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 12: Achieving Well-designed Places

Section 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

None

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 04/07/23

Neighbour consultation period ends: 24/08/23

Public Comments

4 letters of objection received, comments can be summarised as:

Loss of wall, wall forms part of Listed Building and matched by similar wall to north.

Part of aesthetic

Wall was conserved when building works took place

Will affect symmetrical balance of church

Will imbalance semi-detached

Works on pavement land

Effect on highway and pedestrian safety

Town / Parish Comments

None received

DCC Highways

No Highway Safety comments to make.

Conservation Officer (Final Comments)

Page 6 at figure 5 of the revised and resubmitted heritage statement, this shows an example of the type of structure proposed to be situated at the principal elevation of no.69, and within the immediate setting of the listed chapel. It highlights the fact this type of structure is very unsightly and strange against these traditional terraces, and is seen to contribute nothing to the traditional form of no.69 or its counterpart. The latter of which is simply and clearly a well survived pair of historic cottages. As mentioned initially in my comments dated 30/06/2023, the surviving terrace of no.69

is evidence of build date and provides character to the vicinity and setting of the chapel. The scheme remains unnatural and I do not believe it is an enhancement.

Figure 8 on page 9 goes on to highlight the historic interest and contribution to the setting of the chapel that no.69 and its counterpart provides, with its neat uniform and unassuming frontage. Consequently I disagree that the addition of a generic porch 'stuck' on the front will not be visually detracting.

To conclude;

By virtue of the scale and design I am not confident the scheme reflects the architectural character of the existing building and its neighbour. I believe the scheme contravenes the High Peak Design Guide notably point 5.9, as it does not harmonise with its context. Due to this conflict there is harm imposed on the GII heritage asset and I cannot support this application.

Conservation Officer (Initial Comments)

Objection. Recommended refusal. This application does not include a Heritage Statement and Impact Assessment for Old Glossop Conservation Area, nor the listed buildings within the immediate vicinity. The latter of which are as follows: - Former Tabernacle Chapel. GII. List UID: 1384279. - Northern Glassworks with attached gates and railings. GII. List UID: 1384281. The application also does not include a Design and Access statement. The plans appear to show an encroachment onto the public pavement. This dwelling is of a traditional architectural scale and within historic plot sizes, evidence of built date. It is unnatural to find what is essentially a generic porch at the front elevation of such a small terrace cottage, that already sees very little 'frontage' between the public realm and the front door. Consequently, the scheme looks to remove portions of the boundary treatment which are uniform with the remainder of this terrace row and are seen to contribute to the setting of the neighbouring listed building. Setting does not appear to have been taken into account. See drwg ref: 2319 13 Proposed wall elevs, this shows an attempt to recreate the existing wall. Taking into consideration the remainder of the terrace – the alteration of the boundary alone will fragment the historic uniformity that survives across this frontage, and I believe it will risk depreciating this humble row. Old Glossop Conservation Area designated heritage asset is directly opposite the site, due to this the surrounding vicinity forms part of the setting and context. As above this has not been taken into account. Manor Park road is marginally unassuming and where the vernacular survives, their historic qualities remain legible. The site is located opposite an open vicinity, due to the location of access to the park and bowling greens. As a result this poses a risk of causing visual obtrusion, as there is simply no way of making this structure inconspicuous. To conclude; due to insufficient information provided I cannot confidently provide full support, as there has been no acknowledgement of any of the heritage assets. Therefore I fail to see clear and convincing justification that any public benefit will outweigh the harm currently imposed.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The application proposes householder development to a property which is located in the settlement of Glossop, which lies within the Glossopdale Sub Area as defined by the Local Plan Policies Map. Policy S5 seeks to promote sustainable growth within Glossopdale through promoting and maintaining the identity of its settlements. Policy S1, which relates to delivering sustainable development, seeks to promote the effective use of land. The principle of householder development in this location is considered to be acceptable.

The main issues in this instance are whether the design is appropriate, having regard to heritage assets, whether any amenity issues would arise, and whether there would be an impact upon highway safety.

Design Considerations

Policy S1 states that new development will be expected to make a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and where possible enhancing the environment which would be achieved by, inter alia, securing high quality and locally distinctive design. Policy EQ6 states that all development should be well designed and of a high quality and that this will be achieved by requiring development to be well designed to respect the character of the townscape, and requiring development to contribute positively to an area's character, identity and history in terms of scale, height, density, layout, appearance, materials and relationship with adjacent buildings.

Policy EQ 7 states that the council will conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance and that particular protection will be given to designate heritage assets and their setting.

The site lies immediately adjacent to the Former Tabernacle Church, a Grade II Listed Building (List Entry Name: Premises Occupied by Helme Footwear), and close to the Northern Glass Works, which is also a Grade II Listed Building. S.66(1) of The Town and Country Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the LBCA), requires that special regard be had to the desirability of preserving the building, its setting, and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. The application site lies opposite the Old Glossop Conservation Area which is a designated heritage asset, and S.72(1) of the LBCA, requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. The site lies within the setting of all of these heritage assets.

The significance of both the Former Tabernacle Church and the Northern Glass Works lies within their historic origins and/or architectural detailing.

The scheme involves the removal of an existing boundary wall. It is not entirely clear whether this forms part of the Former Tabernacle Church itself. Nonetheless, the wall is similar to a wall on the northern side of the front boundary of the LB. These walls help to frame the symmetry of the front elevation of the building and contribute positively to its setting. The proposed removal of the wall in itself would have a negative effect on the setting of the listed building.

The proposed porch would obscure views towards both Listed Buildings when approaching from the south. While when approaching from the north the porch would project closer to the public highway creating an incongruous form of development which would detract from visual relationship with the listed buildings. Furthermore, the porch would visually disrupt the visual balance between the property and listed building neighbour.

The eastern side of Manor Park Road is generally defined by terraced or semi-detached dwellings of traditional design. Dwellings generally are built at the back of the pavement or have very small front yards. The front of these properties have a general uniformity and consistency in design and form, and provide uniformed and visually strong built edge to Manor Park on the western side of Manor Park Road. This lies within the Old Glossop Conservation Area, and the application dwelling and the row of properties contribute positively to its setting. There is one exception to this, at No.73, where a single storey front projection disrupts this uniformity. It is not considered that this development sets a precedent to allow for further disruption.

The application proposals would break the general uniformity and character of the streetscene which in turn would have a negative effect on the character and appearance of the setting of the Conservation Area.

Finally, the application dwelling, and its semi-detached pairing are modest and unassuming in appearance and have a balanced rhythm in terms of position of openings and ratio between openings and stonework. This would be unduly disrupted by the proposed development which would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its semi-detached pairing.

It is considered that the proposed development would cause harm to the significance of the heritage assets. The level of harm is considered to be less than substantial. In such circumstances, paragraph 202 of the NPPF confirms that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this instance, any benefits of the proposals are generally private, and it is not considered that the proposed development delivers such public benefits to outweigh the harm caused to the setting of Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area.

Amenity

Policy EQ6 requires development achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and not cause unacceptable effects by reason of visual intrusion, overlooking, shadowing, overbearing effect, noise, light pollution or other adverse impacts on local character and amenity.

Given the scale and siting of the proposals it is not considered that the proposed development would result in any adverse amenity issues.

Highway Safety

Concern has been raised that the proposed works would be sited on the public highway and could result in an impact on highway/pedestrian safety. While there is currently little definition between the back of the footpath and the curtilage of the

dwelling, it is understood that the works would be provided on land not part of the public highway. Therefore, no highway safety issues are anticipated, and DCC Highways have raised no objection to the proposed development.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

It is considered that the proposals would fail to comply with the policies contained within the Development Plan and guidance within the NPPF, and as such it is recommended that the application be refused.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

Case Officer: Declan Cleary

Recommendation Date: 13/09/2023

X *B.S. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council