

9th May 2022

HPBC DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

UPDATE SHEET

HPK/2021/0645 & HPK/2021/0646

At the time of preparing the Committee Report, there were a number of outstanding issues that Officers were working closely with the applicant's agent and Mel Morris (Heritage Consultant acting on behalf of HPBC) to address.

Further detailed comments forwarded to Officers from Mel Morris are available to view online, and are set out below for ease of reference:

Mel Morris 3rd May 2022

[1. Arcade Screen](#)

- Option 1 – Curtain Wall
- Option 2 – Frameless Glass Buttress
- Option 3 – Frameless Steel Support

I have received visualisations showing these three options. In each instance there is a frame with a bottom rail running along the line of the cornice of each column at the springing of the arch; I think this is acceptable, and in combination with glass louvres it works quite well as a hybrid. Option 1 shows metal louvres and in my view these are quite heavy, particularly when seen from outside the building (see Curtain Wall External View) and should be avoided. In each visualisation the doors are illustrated with a relatively chunky metal frame and a sub-frame. I have spoken to the architect and he is getting clarification over this detail. Clearly, if the doors do not need a sub-frame and can be frameless glass doors, this is the best of all possible worlds (see images below). Until that is clarified, we are not in a position to agree to the detail. Any glazed screen will also still need 'manifestations'. Therefore, we will still need a condition to control the detail of the glazed screen, with detailed drawings.

There are clear benefits to the frameless glazed system, as the views through the arcade are not obscured. The curtain wall system has a series of multiple slim piers which interrupt the views and in oblique views will also have a high impact. Both systems are of course much better than having a design located between the columns. The plan drawing needs to be amended but we are confident that this can be achieved. I have not seen an amended plan yet.

The best-case scenario is Option 2 – frameless glass buttress, because this removes all posts, which means that the columns can be seen from both sides, with uninterrupted oblique views through the arcade. The glass louvres in Option 2 also have a clearer division allowing more light between the arches.

In order of preference, therefore:

Option 2

Option 3

Option 1

I don't think we should be agreeing to Option 1, and you may like to consider whether you can also condition that the screen shall be a frameless glazed screen and then condition the drawings.

2. Lighting

I don't consider we can agree to the lighting drawings at this stage, and this will need a detailed condition. There are too many grey areas, without elevations, and insufficient justification.

Drawings :

- 6301-Ground Floor Lighting and Emergency Lighting
- 6302-Mezzanine Lighting and Emergency Lighting
- 6303-First Floor Lighting and Emergency Lighting
- 6304-Second Floor Lighting and Emergency Lighting

Drawings are annotated with the following legend:

A1 – pendant

B1 – wall uplighter

C1 – LED downlighter

D1 – globe pendant

F – black spot light

G1 – linear LED

H1 – circular LED

J1 – suspended LED

X1 – IP65 black wallwasher

K1 – suspended LED circular

K2 – suspended LED square

K3 – recessed LED

L1 – festoon light

Arcade Lighting

The soffits of the arcade have largely replacement beams and plastered soffits, a simple geometry. It is virtually impossible to interpret the lighting drawings from plans, as it doesn't show where they are being fixed in elevation. For example, one of the visualisations of the screen shows the uplighting (B1) fixed to the columns in the arcade. I would strongly object to the light fittings being placed on the columns. These are visually intrusive and harmful to the architectural character of the LB, surface mounted fixings drilled into the columns and wiring on top of the columns will be harmful and unsightly. Any uplighters need to be fitted to the top of the capital, sitting on the ledge of the cornice. The location cannot be ascertained from the drawing (6301) but it will be very harmful if copying the existing arrangement. The cornice is currently covered in anti-pigeon 'spikes' and the glue from the spikes has dribbled down the cornice. I assume that these can all be removed

(?). We will need a drawing showing B1 light fittings in elevation. It is not clear where the emergency fittings labelled E3 are relative to the columns (drawing 6301).

Will the existing massive uplighter fittings between the shops be removed? These are currently fixed to the square face of the piers. They are very unsightly, with prominent black wiring (see photo below from the architect).

I understand that within the arcade it is intended to drill and tap, glue or screw soffit panels to hide wiring. These are shown on drawing number 6302 as an inverted ceiling plan with regularly spaced rectangles or square panels. However, the drawings with the wiring diagram show wiring running below and above the panels and along and over the beams, so the amount of wiring visible is quite extensive and the soffit panels seem to be virtually redundant. Furthermore, the panels are symmetric, but the light fittings are regularly spaced but don't relate to the panels; so we have light fittings evenly spaced and then off-set and then missing the panels entirely and fixed to the beams. This needs some further explanation and exploration and I suggest that until a more rationale and reasoned design is clarified we will still need this and the soffit panels conditioned, for the Arcade at least.

Staircases – H1 Lighting -acceptable

Lighting to the Open Plan Offices of the Town Hall – not acceptable

Drawing 6303 seems to suggest that the soffit of the Town Hall office spaces in the main chambers will have a suspended ceiling with flat opal recessed LEDs. This would be totally unacceptable. The drawings need clarification.

The ceiling is a decorative plastered coved ceiling which is due to be restored. It will not be acceptable to install either recessed flush LED opal panels or a suspended ceiling. Alternatives must be considered, which rely on task lighting at desks and wall lighting, which is not shown.

We also need to know on a ceiling plan whether the locations of the Emergency lighting in the ceiling (E1), as proposed, will have an impact on the decorative ceilings. They may need to be relocated.

External Lighting –X1 black wallwashers. Not acceptable.

It is impossible to tell from the drawing where these are located. We need elevations. These are black and quite obtrusive fittings. Further thought should be given to the choice of colour for external lighting, as outside there is nothing else that is black in terms of joinery and finishes and I suggest this needs tailoring to the overall decorative scheme.

Lighting to the Market Hall

The proposed lighting to the Market Hall incorporates extensive track lighting fixed to a rigid framework which is in turn suspended. It is quite a visually heavy structure but something is needed for task lighting. I don't have any objections to the festoon lighting (L1) but it is extremely busy to have this in conjunction with four others forms of lighting in the same space (B1, D1, F2 and E3) and I'm not sure of the logic or justification. It seems to over-complicate the space and the festoon lighting would normally be suspended low, so I don't understand what function it is performing here.

It may simply detract from the architecture. The suspended LED pendants to the soffit of the mezzanine (J1) and the emergency lighting (E1) are fine.

3. Side (east) elevation screen.

Drawings nos:

- GTH-90-D-003 – Louvre Screen Details
- GTH-90-D-002 – Service Yard Gate Details
- CCL-1-21193-303 – External Screen & Door Details
- Service Yard 3D Visual

See also 7-8956-CCL-XX-00-DR-M-5701 – Ground Floor Ventilation Layout

The function of the screens is to literally hide the air handling equipment from view. The drawings do show a high impact from the high-level screen, which is on stilts. This is not desirable as it obscures the flank windows from view, but I accept that it is probably marginally preferable to have a screen rather than see the air-handling equipment. There are very few metal screens which will have less impact, although the colour could be reviewed so that it is less of a contrast. I suggest that the colour is conditioned, so that the screens are more subdued (e.g. sandstone / buff, greys, etc.). The low level screens have a low impact on significance, obscuring the public flank.

On balance, the screen and equipment together will have 'less-than-substantial' harm and has a low to moderate harmful impact because of its prominence in public views from the car park. This has to be considered against the public benefits of the scheme and the new retail and hot food use.

4. Market Hall - Mezzanine to Retail Units

Drawings nos:

- GTH-22-D-001 – Mezzanine Retail Unit Plans and Sections
- GTH-22-D-002 – Mezzanine Retail Units Details
- Fisher Frame Anchor DOP Certificate

The architect has provided the following justification:

Our justification for preferring the ridge and furrow design over the pentice design as follows.

The ridge-and-furrow design is intended to imitate the form of the main market hall roofs, albeit on a perpendicular alignment. This also allow the units to be individually framed with their oblique frontages and provided a vaulted ceiling within the units to accommodate the high arched windows.

In terms of the physical impact – the form of the units allows for the lateral loads to be more easily accommodated without the need for heavy anchorage into the existing building as the units are essentially primarily self-supporting. Fixings into the existing building should only be required at the upright studs where they abut the existing walls and the ledgers to support joists to the small flat roof areas. The rafters and ridges would be supported off the new timber framing so there would be not need to mechanically fix these to the walls but just a soft joint to provide a fire tight seal. The method of mechanical fixing will be by way of Fischer (or similar) framing anchor which are secured

with wall plugs rather than chemical anchoring. The fixings have a hexagonal head. Therefore, if the units are to be dismantled in future, the anchors can be unscrewed and wall plugs removed.

The pentice roof design would require a continuous timber ledger to be installed to the full length of the market hall to provide a fixing point for roof ridges at the apex. This ledger would need to be fixed at 400-500mm centres along its length with a chemical anchor fixings to provide sufficient pull out strength to resist lateral load expected caused by the slope of the roof. Likewise, the flank walls of the units at the northern most end of the units 'dog-leg' to avoid the gable end windows which offers very little opportunity for us to anchor in and provide stability at this point. These too would need chemical anchors to provide additional restraint at these points. The chemical anchors are not easily removed without causing damage to the building fabric and therefore not fully reversible.

Another consideration we mentioned was the lighting proposed above the units. Drawings circulated yesterday show uplighters to illuminate the roof areas and these light fittings would be concealed with the ridge and furrow design. If using the pentice design, this limits the opportunity to provide uplighters without them being visible. This may also make them more difficult to access and maintain when compared to the ridge design.

Regarding the frontage of the units, we are in agreement that these should be fully glazed and this will be reflected in the revised issued of LBC drawings as per the visualisations that have been previously presented.

I consider that the reversible nature of the alterations is a fair consideration, because we don't know how successful this scheme is likely to be, or its life and we have to build some flexibility into the proposal (the buildings have been subjected to distinct changes in use and internal adaptation over a long period). Reversibility is not the only consideration. The visual impact of the ridge-and-furrow roofs is greater than a pentice, but given the mitigation proposed in the form of the type of fixings and the extended glazed areas, so that more of the original arches and walls will be visible from the main body of the market hall, I can accept that there is marginal difference between the two options, and therefore that the preferred ridge-and-furrow roof is acceptable. It is still of low harm which will have to be factored into the balance vs. public benefit. I have not seen a revised drawing.

5. Mezzanine Edge and Signage

I have received a visualisation, which I am hoping can be translated into a drawing. This shows the large edge of the mezzanine being broken up with a form of cornice. This is much better and reduces the impact of the large concrete / render slab. This will overcome my concerns over the high visual impact of the mezzanine floor edge.

Note:

Please be aware that there is considerable inconsistency in the drawings with various drawings submitted which don't show all of the revisions. The architect must provide a full updated set of drawings (with a drawing list) or we could end up approving out-of-date drawings. Hopefully, there is time between writing the committee report and conditions for these to be provided (?)

Public Comments

Further comments dated 4th May 2022 have been received from the Glossop & District Heritage Trust, which are available to view online and are repeated below for ease of reference:

This is a further comment from the Trust, addressing some issues from the Victorian Society objection dated 20/1/22; Marion Barter's comments dated 26/1/22 and 2/4/22; the applicants' **response** dated 21/3/22; and the report from Mel Morris Conservation dated 6/4/22.

Glass screen in the Arcade

The Trust recognises the need to keep the pigeons out and to make the Arcade a smarter and more welcoming space than it is at present, although we are less convinced that it either would or should become an extension of the Market Hall seating/eating area. However, if practicable bearing in mind the need for very frequent cleaning, we would favour the positioning of the screen as a free-standing structure behind the columns, which would be less visually intrusive and damaging to historic fabric.

If this remains a contentious issue, and given that the screen will presumably not be installed until towards the end of the project, consideration should be given to removing it from these applications and making separate applications later. This is the feature of the scheme on which the general public is most likely to have a view, but it was not mentioned at all in the Council's press releases and so virtually none of them will be aware of it.

Lined-out render in Town Hall and Market Hall

We have to agree with the Victorian Society that "the description of existing interiors is cursory at best, with no focus on the aspects which will be directly affected by the proposed works." As none of us have seen the interior of the Town Hall for over 10 years, and the higher levels of the Market Hall interior are but a distant memory for the oldest of us, we have been heavily dependent on what little information has been supplied by the applicants, and were not aware, until the report from Mel Morris Conservation, that there are surviving areas in both buildings of what may be original decorative surface finishes. We strongly support the recommendation in that report that these should be restored rather than replaced with plaster.

It now appears that the applicants are relying on the Conservation Statement produced by Donald Insall Associates in 2003. This was, at the time, a very useful document and many of its conclusions are still valid, but it was intended only to give general guidance to the Council which was then just beginning to consider the future

of the buildings, and not to inform a specific scheme or planning applications stemming from it. It is also now 19 years old, and predates research done by members of the Trust which, though still incomplete, has thrown more light on the sequence of evolution of the buildings themselves and their interiors, which is more complex than was understood 19 years ago. In the process the Trust has accumulated a large archive including material from the Sheffield City Archives and over 80 images. Some of this information is available on the Trust website but we are not aware that it has been accessed in the course of this application.

Energy efficiency

The old Market Hall was notoriously cold, and in 1973 a false ceiling was inserted to remedy this, at the expense of losing all natural light. That ceiling has now been removed, and the intention is to use the space primarily as a “food hall”, which will require it to be heated to a level acceptable for seated customers. However, whatever assumptions were originally made about heating costs will now have to be at least doubled. Provision for heat retention, though, appears to be less than optimum; the opportunity has not been taken to add insulation to the roof, and the side doors have no inner vestibules to reduce draughts and heat loss. There seems, therefore, a high probability that before the project is finished, design changes will be needed to improve energy efficiency to make the running costs affordable.

Change of use

The applicants’ response appears to confirm that the intention is for there to be a change of use of the first floor of the Town Hall from Class F.1 (public hall/law court) to Class E (g) (1) (commercial offices). The Morris report also notes that “alternative options for these first floor spaces have not been assessed or included in the justification so in my view we cannot state that this particular element provides the optimum viable use.” Change of use should therefore be specifically applied for, with supporting evidence.

Interior fixtures

The applicants’ response says that “original murals, wall mounted plaques etc are all being removed and stored ahead of the main regeneration works and as such are not considered as part of the original application”. Whilst it is sound practice to remove, temporarily, any fixtures or fittings which are at risk during works, provided this can be done without harm to them or the underlying fabric, any, such as the roll of past Mayors, which were intended to be permanent and are of historic significance are part of the fabric of the building and included within the Listing, and therefore need to be accounted for in an application for Listed Building Consent. All such features should be itemised, with details of their condition and any repairs or

restoration required, and if necessary a condition made requiring them to be returned in due course to their former locations.

Officer Comment

Points of Clarification

The report refers to two application reference numbers. The first (HPK/2021/0645) relates to the application for full planning permission whilst the second reference (HPK/2021/0646) relates to the associated Listed Building Consent application.

The material planning issues associated with both applications are considered within the report.

Response to Mel Morris Updated Consultation Comments

A preferred option for the Arcade Screen has now been agreed with the applicant. However full details will need to be secured by way of condition.

The applicant has attempted to seek approval for internal and external lighting details prior to determination in order to avoid appropriate conditions. However, based on this further response from the Council's Heritage Consultant, conditions will be required in order to secure an acceptable lighting scheme prior to installation.

Similarly, the applicant has been working to address outstanding issues with regards to screens on the side (eastern) elevation, the design of the ridge and furrow roof associated with the Mezzanine Floor, as well as the Mezzanine Edge and Signage. Whilst progress has been made, it remains the case that further detailed plans will be required in order to secure an appropriate solution.

The progress that has been made since the writing of the Committee Report confirms the view of Officers that the individual and cumulative 'less than substantial' harm as a result of individual aspects of development, are on balance outweighed by the significant socio-economic benefits associated with the scheme and the benefits associated with the long term viable use of the heritage asset.

Mel Morris has highlighted that there are current inconsistencies with regards to plans and documentation and has recommended that a full drawing schedule is submitted alongside a full set of up to date drawings to ensure that the latest agreed plans are approved and noted on the Decision Notice.

Condition 2 (Approved Plans) will ensure that a detailed list of plans is set out on the Decision Notice in line with the drawing schedule which is expected imminently alongside a full set of up-to-date plans.

Response to Glossop and District Heritage Trust

The merits of the glass screen are highlighted within the Committee Report. Notwithstanding this, conditions are recommended that will require further details to be submitted and approved prior to their installation. Similarly, Officers agree with Mel Morris's assessment that the proposed render is not acceptable in its current form, and thus conditions are recommended that seeks a more appropriate solution.

Whilst there would be Energy Efficiency, implications of removing the false ceiling, these would be outweighed by the benefits in heritage terms. Furthermore, refurbishment of the building to modern standards and Building Regulations will bring with it corresponding energy efficiency improvements.

Officers acknowledge that the comments relating to interior fixtures is a valid one, and as such a further condition is recommended that secures the method for recording and removing these prior to renovation works taking place.

For the avoidance of doubt the recommendation for both applications is for approval with the following conservation conditions being applied (in addition to standard conditions):

1. Prior to commencement of any works relating to the restoration of either Staircase in the Town Hall, full details for the restored staircase 1, including dimensions of tread ends, sections through tread ends, the source of stone, and dressed finished, details of proposed handrail and balustrade to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the details hereby approved.
2. Notwithstanding details submitted, the masonry walls to the twin staircases shall be finished in three coat render and shall be lined-out to imitate ashlar set-out with the same spacing and format as the original lined-out render.
3. Prior to commencement of any works relating to the restoration of either Staircase in the Town Hall, full details of the setting out and full details of the specification of the render and the painted finish which shall be informed by mortar, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the details hereby approved.
4. Prior to commencement of any works associated with glazed screening within the Town Hall Arcade, full details of the proposed frameless glazed screen within the arcade shall be provided at a scale of 1:20 and full size sections through the frames, showing the relationship with the columns of the arcade

and the method of fixing, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the details hereby approved.

5. Prior to commencement of any works associated with the screen wall and any demolition works, full details of the proposed screen wall and the roof structure and finished of the Male WC lobby and its intersection with the existing roof and walls at a scale of 1:20 shall be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the detailed hereby approved.
6. Prior to commencement of any works associated with the screen wall and any demolition works, internal elevations from the arcade and details of the masonry door surround, stone lintels, door architecture, and new doors to the Arcade Accessible WC and Arcade Male WC lobby at a scale of 1:20, with full size sections of joinery panelling and mouldings, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the details hereby approved.
7. Notwithstanding the details submitted with this application, all ceilings shall be lath-and-plaster, and all cornices shall be lime plaster run in-situ to the original mouldings, unless alternative details have been otherwise submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of any works to the ceiling of the Town Hall. In the event that alternative details are submitted and approved, the development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the details hereby approved.
8. Prior to commencement of any works to the ceilings of the Town Hall, drawings of all profiles to plaster cornices shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the details hereby approved.
9. Notwithstanding the details submitted with this application, prior to the commencement of any treatment to walls within the Town Hall, details of a more appropriate alternative treatment shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the details hereby approved.
10. Notwithstanding the details submitted with the application, and prior to any works to the floor area of the Market Hall, a redefined area and pattern of paving flags, commensurate with the number of original paving flags that are suitable for re-use following inspection, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the details hereby approved.

11. Notwithstanding the details submitted with the application, and prior to any works to the Masonry Walls of the Market Hall, full specification details of a more appropriate alternative three-coat render, which shall be lined-out to imitate ashlar, and set-out with the same spacing and format as the original lined-out render, together with the final paint or surface finish, informed by mortar analysis, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the details hereby approved.
12. Prior to the commencement of any works to the Mezzanine Floor in the Market Hall, full details of the decorative tongue and grooved panelling shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the details hereby approved.
13. Prior to the installation of the balustrade associated with the Mezzanine Floor, detailed drawings at a scale of 1:20 with full size sections shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the details hereby approved.
14. Notwithstanding the details submitted with the application, and prior to commencement of any works to the fenestration of the Market Hall, full details of alternative replacement windows to the Market Hall which shall include materials, the section of glazing bars, the section through the masonry showing the relationship of the windows to the inner and outer walls and stone cills, and colour scheme, informed by architectural paint analysis, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the details hereby approved.
15. Prior to the commencement of any works to any external steps or access ramp, full details of stone steps and paving flags to the entrance shall be provided, which shall include dimensions in section at a scale of 1:10, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.
16. Notwithstanding the submitted drawings accompanying the planning application, the proposed steps shall be solid blocks of gritstone, finished rubbed with a pencil-round or bullnose leading edge. For the avoidance of doubt, the proposed steps shall not be finished in paving flags.

17. Prior to commencement of any works to any external steps or access ramp, full details of railings and method of fixing shall be provided showing the dimensions of bars and profiles at full size, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the details hereby approved.
18. Prior to any cleaning works to any part of the Market Hall and Town Hall buildings, trial panels (300mm x 300mm) shall be undertaken to determine the most appropriate method of cleaning masonry in a variety of circumstances and shall be photographed before, during and after cleaning. A subsequent method statement and specification, which includes an identification the appropriate dwell times, flow times, neutralising and rinsing method, as a result of the trials, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the details hereby approved.
19. Prior to the installation of any internal or external lighting, full revised details of all external and internal lighting shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the details hereby approved.
20. Notwithstanding details submitted with this application, and prior to commencement of any painting to any part of the Market Hall or Town Hall buildings, full details of all paint finishes, and colour scheme to the historic joinery, metalwork, walls and ceilings, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the details hereby approved.
21. Notwithstanding the details submitted with this application, and prior to the installation of any free-standing screens to the east of the Market Hall building, full alternative details for the free-standing screens, to include dimensions, materials and finishes shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the details hereby approved.
22. Prior to the removal of any interior fixtures or fittings, a method statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.

HPK/2021/0677 – Victoria Hall, Talbot Street

No updates

HPK/2021/0663 – Glossop Fire Station Redevelopment

No Updates

HPK/2022/0028 – Glossop Fire Station – Temporary Change of Use

No Updates

HPK/2021/0127 & HPK/2021/0128 – Pavilion Gardens, Buxton

Points of Clarification

The report refers to two application reference numbers. The first (HPK/2022/0127) relates to the application for full planning permission whilst the second reference (HPK/2022/0128) relates to the associated Listed Building Consent application.

The Design and Conservation section of the report fails to reference Section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which states that with respect to any buildings or land in a Conservation Area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of that area.

For the avoidance of doubt, the recommendation for approval relates to both Full Planning and Listed Building Consent applications.

HPK/2022/0080 – 127 Bings Road, Whaley Bridge

No updates

HPK/2021/0680 – 35 The Front, Waterswallows, Buxton

No updates