

Conservation Response.

Date: 27/10/2023.

File/Application ref: HPK/2023/0412.

Case Officer: Pet Twigg.

Proposal: 'Listed Building Consent for removal of 2nr outbuildings (resubmission of HPK/2023/0191)'.

Site Address: 58 Church Street, Glossop, Derbyshire, SK13 7RN.

Dear Pet,

The Heritage Statement notes that these small structures connected to, and within the setting of GII listed 56 Church Street, are historically associated and have an earlier origin in association with no.56. It also notes they are evidence of, and indicative of the dwelling's early use and development. This listed building is the immediate neighbour to no. 58 and concerns this proposal though the structures are not connected to no. 58. It should be noted that no. 58 is not a listed building.

The courtyards and relationships between these features in this vicinity contribute to the setting and character of the Conservation Area. The discussion goes on to note other buildings of this build date with similar external and simple ancillary structures within similar yards. Rudimentary vernacular dwellings often saw deliberately placed courtyards with these types of small structures. Subsequently, the level of survival is therefore deemed to be vulnerable and additionally, of historic significance.

The Heritage Statement is in agreement with my earlier assessment for previously refused applications (HPK/2023/0191, HPK/2023/205 HPK/2023/0206) and echoes that the structures are illustrative of historic functions for humble living, sharing group value and historic interest among the Conservation Area and other vernacular dwellings. However, I do not see that for example the renewing of some roof timbers at some prior time justifies their total eradication and disinterest. 'Outbuilding no.2' demonstrates scale and form that of a coal store including scale of door evident of use. This structure sees original and vernacular roofing material associated to the material palette of the listed building. Whilst 'Outbuilding 1' appears more interesting and has again scale of doors evidence of previous use including a smaller lower door which has qualities of being a primitive form of piggery or chicken enclosure.

For planning history associated to both addresses it appears these two coal and or animal sheds have been unaddressed for some time.

The proposal goes on to note removal of further historic fabric that of which includes but is not limited to surviving stone flags or flagstones. Their replacement is proposed to be 'Indian stone' which has no relation and no relevance to the palette of the Conservation Area nor that of the listed building. This feels to be a random unfaithful element and I am not sure why the original pieces are not to be reused.

~

To conclude:

I cannot provide full support.

The conclusion reached by the Heritage Statement is that minor harm will be imposed as a result of the scheme. I am in agreement and will state that in terms of heritage harm this would in fact equate to less than substantial with regard to NPPF paragraph 202 being relevant. I cannot identify public benefits or clear and convincing justification to outweigh this heritage harm identified.

I assess that the removal of these structures looks to sanitise and eradicate surviving features. Something of which will confuse remaining historic legibility, and I remain concerned that this will risk transforming the character of the dwellings into anonymous terraces. This does not faithfully reflect or enhance the evidential or aesthetic value of the listed building or Conservation Area.

The proposals would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building contrary to Section 16 (2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. It is also deemed the proposal will fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area contrary to Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Regards,

E Holland.
Principal Conservation Officer.