



High Peak Borough Council

working for our community

Application number

HPK/2024/0299

And

HPK/2024/0302

Site location

GROVE HOTEL , GROVE PARADE , Terrace Road , Buxton

Proposal

Application for Removal or Variation of Condition 6 in relation to application

HPK/2022/0376

And

Application for Removal or Variation of a Condition 06 in relation to application

HPK/2022/0377

Conservation Advice – Amendments

Date: 24/07/2025

Heritage Asset:

1 2 & 3 Grove Hotel & Parade – Grade II listed

Buxton Central Conservation Area

Assessment and Impact

These comments are based upon the following amended plans received:

- P858 beam flitching and encasement detail with MF Ceiling
- new ceiling method statement
- P854A works to existing ceilings - ground floor
- P855A works to existing ceilings - 1st floor
- P856A works to existing ceilings - 2nd floor
- P857A works to existing ceilings - 3rd floor

Revised information was previously requested to seek clarity regarding the extent of the ceilings works proposed. Plans P854A; P855A; P856A; and P857A provide clarity regarding the existing and proposed ceiling materials. These plans confirm that the majority of ceiling are existing, or will be reinstated with lath and plaster sympathetic to the listed building. The extent of plasterboard ceilings has also been confirmed, with no further works plans to remove or alter these areas. Any loss of historic lath and plaster results in a degree of harm to the special interest of the listed building, and would not usually be accepted. However, as a vast proportion of lath and plaster has been removed without the proper consent, the proposed reinstatement of traditional lath and plaster mitigates some of the harm caused by its previous removal.

Plan P858 provides a detailed section of how the ceiling beams will be enclosed to create a 60 minute fire resistance. This has been supported by the addition of a method statement. However, the method statement submitted is brief and provides minimal details

regarding the proposed extent of works and construction. The method statement should include full 'step by step' details of the proposed ceiling scheme. For instance, the method statement omits reference to making good the existing ceiling through re-installing lath and plaster, therefore contradicting plans P854A; P855A; P856A; and P857A. Plan P858 makes reference to installing metal flitch plates to existing beams where necessary, this is similarly omitted from the method statement. The method statement also fails to make reference to the final appearance of the ceilings and its function of creating a 60 minute fire resistance.

Furthermore, the proposed ceiling works are likely to create the internal effect of a 'white sterile environment' following the boxing in of existing beams. The covering of characteristic features will be harmful to the overall character of the listed building. This could be somewhat mitigated by the installation of cornicing throughout the scheme. The Gazetteer submitted as part of the original 2022 application provides examples of cornicing being present in the existing ceiling designs (see pages 2 and 4 of gazetteer for reference). These could be replicated in the new ceiling scheme to reinstate some of the lost character, offering a small degree of mitigation. These details should be included within the proposed method statement, indicated on floorplan and in sectional details.

It should be acknowledged that the recommended cornicing will not overcome the harm in its entirety, only mitigate some of the harm caused. The boxing in of the ceilings will continue to result in harm to the special interest of the listed building. This harm must be justified accordingly. The requirement to comply with fire regulations and securing optimum viable use of the building may balance against the harm caused by boxing in the ceilings and provide the required justification. Harm can only be successfully justified once all reasonable steps to mitigate said harm have been proposed. As such the applicant is recommended to provide some justification for this harm within the recommended revisions.

Legislation and Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (2024)

Any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within the setting), should require clear and convincing justification (par.213).

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. (para 215)

Local Development Framework

Consideration should also be given to the following documents and local development framework policies:

High Peak Local Plan (Adopted 2016) – EQ7 Built and Historic Environment

Conclusions and Recommendations

In summary, the proposal lacks clarity, resulting in an inconsistent submission. The Grove is a grade II listed building and as such must be treated with care and consideration. The lack of clarity and detail within the current submission fails to provide reassurance that the

proposed scheme will not harm the listed building. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, the proposal would likely result in a moderate scale harm to the listed building. Without a comprehensive and coherent submission it cannot be confidently determined otherwise. With reference to planning policies, this would be 'less than substantial harm' to the designated heritage asset (par.215 of NPPF and policy EQ7 of the local development framework). Furthermore, the proposal alludes to the loss of character within the building as ceiling beams and other details will be enclosed. The scheme fails to provide any mitigation and adequately justify this loss of character.

While we welcome bringing the listed building back into use from a conservation perspective, we cannot support an unclear and lacking submission. As set out above, further information and amendments are suggested from a conservation perspective to ensure that the proposal has been properly thought-out and justified.

Conservation Officer: Rachel Robinson
High Peak Borough Council