

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2024/0069
Valid 11/03/2024

LADYSHAWE HOUSE,
BRIDGE STREET, NEW
MILLS, DERBYSHIRE, SK22
4DN

LISTED BUILDING CONSENT
TO STRENGTHEN SIX
EXISTING TIMBER CEILING
BEAMS (LISTED BUILDING
CONSENT - ALTERATION)

MAIN ISSUES

- Impact upon Listed Building

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site relates to a detached building, in use as a dwelling, which is located within the built up area for New Mills as defined by the Local Plan Policies Map. The building is a Grade II Listed Building, known as Ladyshawe House. The official Listing identifies the building as:

Mid C18 house of 3 storeys in coursed stone with slate roof with stacks at gable ends. Rusticated quoins. Gable end to road has door and 2 windows under lintels with one window under lintel above. Main elevation to side has round-headed rusticated doorway with keystone and 2 windows of 3 mullion lights on ground floor. 2 windows of 3 and 1 of 2 mullion lights on 2 upper storeys. Only one window retains glazing bars.

The site is located within a predominantly residential area, although backs onto a Green Wedge known as Ladyshaw Bottom.

PROPOSAL

This application seeks Listed Building Consent for the strengthening of 6 timber ceiling beams. Those beams proposed for support are located within 5 separate rooms, three on the first floor and two at second floor.

The application has been supported by a Heritage Statement, a letter from a structural consultant, plans and photographs.

The proposal is to strengthen the timber beams with steel strengthening. The steel supports would be bolted to the timber beams.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan (Adopted 2016)

- S1 Sustainable Development Principles
- S1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

EQ6 Design and Place Making
EQ7 Built and Historic Environment

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

Various applications for Listed Building Consent.

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 18/04/24
Neighbour consultation period ends: 11/04/24
Press Advert: 11/04/24

Public Comments

None received

Town / Parish Comments

None received

Conservation Officer

Objection.

Whilst there is identified some *physical need* for the works, the plans lack legibility in order to ascertain the resolution.

The plans are hand drawn but do not provide annotations into what is proposed, and provides a series of short lines only. It also isn't very clear or made clear using detailed sections how this engineered solution will be affixed. Currently it appears that RSJ's will be attached to the sides of the joists and below the ceiling depicted by a large gap, but not seated within the walling? This will not provide improved support and instead create more weight at the joists. If seated within the walling this will require investigation and clearer drawings as it is an invasive method into the structural envelope. Other questions are, what length are they? Unfortunately it is not very clear, and the 1.1 section shows too many obscurities.

There is no timber report to identify what in terms of decay or past deterioration has occurred and its cause, in order to prevent a reoccurrence in the future. The letter simply notes a repair recommendation, not a structural report or survey. Sagging of the flooring and natural age related movement is expected in historic building stock, however some white marks are evident on some of the timbers suggesting trouble with moisture, which certainly will not be helping decay mechanisms. Another photograph labelled 'bathroom' depicts superficial signs of age. i.e in the top layers and not straight through. Further to this, photograph 3 appears to be a later machined timber and has a different finish. To what if any are the original beams?

I would like further details to ensure this project is undertaken sympathetically and has the long term health of the fabric in mind. I will await further information before providing final comment.

Historic England

Historic England provides advice when our engagement can add most value. In this case we are not offering advice. This should not be interpreted as comment on the merits of the application.

We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers. You may also find it helpful to refer to our published advice at <https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/find/>

It is not necessary to consult us on this application again, unless there are material changes to the proposals. However, if you would like advice from us, please contact us to explain your request.

DCC Conservation

Ladyshawe House (DDR6475) is a mid 18th century house and a Grade II listed building. There will be no below ground archaeological implications from the proposal and for my part I have no objection, you should however also consult your Buildings and Conservation officer.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Impact on Listed Building

S.16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires, when considering applications for Listed Building Consent, that special regard be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Local Plan Policy EQ7 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. Particular protection will be given to designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings, including listed buildings.

NPPF paragraph 205 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. Para 206 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.

The main consideration in this instance is whether the proposed works would cause harm to the significance of the heritage asset. The application has been supported by a Heritage Statement, letter from a structural consultant, along with plans which outline the proposed works.

The Heritage Statement states that the supporting timber beams are of variable quality, some showing signs of cracking, and bowing. As such floors above are sagging and springy. As such the owners are concerned about the safety implication and that urgent remedial work is necessary. This has been supplemented by a short letter from a structural consultant which recommends strengthening of the timber beams, with the plans showing steel supports bolted through the timber beams. The heritage statement indicates that these would go into the walls at either end. The structural letter suggests that the works are urgent and if not carried out then propping of the beams would be necessary. It also indicates that the beams are of insufficient depth to conceal structural strengthening.

There is no information within the application which confirms whether the timber beams are original. If original, then the beams would form elements of historic and architectural interest of the building and, therefore, its significance. Nonetheless, steel supports would contrast with the timber beam ceiling supports and would be a departure from the design approach. This would be to the detriment of the listed building.

Notwithstanding the above, it is acknowledged that some structural concerns exist and remedial work may be necessary – which would be in the interest of the longevity of the heritage asset. However, the Conservation Officer has reviewed the information and considers that there is insufficient detail within the application.

The application provides no detailed assessment of the beams, (through a timber report) to identify what the cause of the structural concerns are. The application simply jumps to a recommendation of steel support. Furthermore, there is no detailed assessment of other solutions although the heritage statement states that alternatives have been considered. Without such information, the LPA cannot be satisfied of the cause of the issues, whether they would reoccur, and whether the proposals are the only practical solution.

The submitted plans indicate that the steel supports would be bolted through the beams, although the section shows that there would be a gap retained between the beam and the ceiling. In addition, there is no detail provided within the application to demonstrate how the steel supports would be affixed to the walls. The heritage

statement suggests that the beams would go “into the walls at each end”. However, such an approach may affect original fabric of the Listed Building. Without details plans and an assessment of the walls, and details of their means of attachment, the LPA cannot be satisfied that the steel supports would not have further implications on the Listed Building.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposed works to the Listed Building are unacceptable and would cause harm to the significance of the heritage asset. The degree of harm would be less than substantial. Although such works may have knock on implications on the building whereby a greater degree of harm may arise.

The proposals would result in works which would support the structural integrity of the building which would be a public benefit of the scheme.

Nonetheless, for the reasons outlined above, there is insufficient clarity in the application, to confirm that the proposed works would be acceptable in the interest of the Listed Building. In light of these matters, the works would not deliver sufficient benefits to outweigh the harm identified.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

The application seeks consent for works to a Listed Building and it is considered that the works would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Grade II heritage asset. Insufficient public benefits would arise to outweigh this harm. As such, the application is recommended for refusal.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

Case Officer: Declan Cleary

Recommendation Date: 02/05/2024



On behalf of High Peak Borough Council