

**Application Number:** 18/00503/FUL

**Proposal:** Removal and replacement of shop front

**Site:** 73 Market Street Stalybridge

**Applicant:** Mr D Quinn

**Recommendation:** Refuse

**Reason for report:** The discretion of the Head of Planning.

## **1. APPLICATION DESCRIPTION**

- 1.1 The application seeks permission for the replacement ground floor shop front at the premises.

## **2. SITE & SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 The premises to which the application relates form part of a traditional row of properties in commercial use within the heart of the town centre conservation area.
- 2.2 The premises are a 2 storey brick built building with the ground floor in retail use. The property is located within the town centre conservation area the surrounding uses are typical of the town centre location.

## **3. PLANNING HISTORY**

- 3.1 None relevant

## **4. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES**

- 4.1 Unallocated site within the town centre conservation area.

### **4.2 Part 1 Policies**

Policy 1.5: Following the Principles of Sustainable Development.

Policy 1.6: Securing Urban Regeneration.

Policy 1.7: Supporting the Role of Town Centres.

Policy 1.11: Conserving Built Heritage and Retaining Local Identity.

Policy 1.12: Ensuring an Accessible, Safe and Healthy Environment.

### **4.3 Part 2 Policies**

S1 Town Centre Improvements

S9 Detailed Design of Retail and Leisure Developments

C1 Townscape and Urban Form.

C2 Conservation Areas.

C4 Control of Development in or Adjoining Conservation Areas.

C11: Shop Fronts

## **5. OTHER POLICY**

### **5.1 National Planning Policy Framework (2018)**

Section 7. Ensuring the vitality of town centres

Section 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities

Section 12. Achieving well-designed places

Section 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

### **5.2 Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)**

This is intended to complement the NPPF and to provide a single resource for planning guidance, whilst rationalising and streamlining the material. Almost all previous planning Circulars and advice notes have been cancelled. Specific reference will be made to the PPG or other national advice in the Analysis section of the report, where appropriate.

## **6 PUBLICITY CARRIED OUT**

- 6.1 A site noticed was displayed on the 11 June 2018, published on the local newspaper on 14 June 2018 and neighbour notification letters were issued on the 2 July 2018 in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 and the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

## **7. RESPONSES FROM CONSULTEES**

- 7.1 None

## **8. SUMMARY OF THIRD PARTY RESPONSES RECEIVED**

- 8.1 In response to the application 1 letter has been received from the Stalybridge Town team making the following comments: We would like to suggest the shop front and any shutters is in-keeping and the shutters are discreet to Market Street, Black/Grey, perforated and powder coated. The Town Team would like to forward their approval for this application.

## **9. ANALYSIS**

- 9.1 In accordance with the revised NPPF and Tameside UDP policies 1.3, S1, S9, C1, C2, C4 and C11 the main issues raised by the application relate to the following:

Impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area;

- 9.2 This is considered in more detail below.

## **10. PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT**

- 10.1 In terms of its detailed design, there are no specific local policies which relate to the designs of shop fronts; however Section 12 of the revised NPPF makes clear the importance of good design in new development and Part 1 Policy 1.3 of the UDP states that "all developments must achieve high quality design which is sensitive to the character of the local area, particularly in the relationship between buildings, between buildings and adjoining spaces, and in associated landscaping".

## **11. IMPACT ON THE CHARACTER OF THE CONSERVATION AREA**

- 11.1 The issue to consider in determining the application is the appropriateness of the proposed shop front in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the building and the conservation area, as a heritage asset, in which it is set and whether any harm it would cause to the significance of that heritage asset is out-weighed by the public benefits of the proposal including securing its optimum viable use.
- 11.2 The existing façade of the building is primarily brick-work with a continuous stone stall riser and decorative stone pilasters and capitals on either side of the shop front and a recessed doorway. The frame, door, fan light (boarded up), fascia and sign are all constructed in timber and painted white. The doorway is recessed from the street. External railing are currently in place over the glazing and to enclose the recessed door way. The property matches the adjacent shop front (71 Market Street) and as a pair are an important historic feature in this part of the conservation area, and provide attractive original shop fronts.
- 11.3 The proposed shop front would remove the recessed door opening and bring it level with the property front. The existing sill-level, stone stall riser would be removed and replaced with black granite and the window frame replaced and constructed in powder coated aluminium and the fan light above the door filled in.
- 11.4 Shop fronts are a conspicuous part of the street scene and conservation area it is important that designs of new shopfronts respect the historic character of the area. New shop fronts should be compatible with the style, character and form of the building and the character of the street scene. Timber and stone are the traditional material in this area and its loss and use of none traditional materials (aluminium and granite) is not considered appropriate in this prominent location.
- 11.5 The application site currently has a traditional recessed doorway which matches the adjacent property. Recessed doorways are a traditional feature of the Stalybridge Conservation area and their retention adds value to the street scene. Whilst the antisocial behaviour associated with a recess doorway are understood, the impact of the loss of the traditional recessed doorway is unacceptable.
- 11.6 It has been suggested that the development has been designed to replicate the existing shop front at the adjacent property at 75 Market Street. It is clear that at some point in the history of no. 75 the original large glazed shop front has been bricked up and a smaller window inserted, divided into 16 with glazing bars. As a single property this provides the story of this unit though it is not a traditional design and to replicate it would add a prominent addition that is not in keeping with the character of the area. The use of glazing bars whilst found on certain individual properties is not characteristic of the wider conservation area and not a window style that is encouraged.
- 11.7 The benefits that would accrue from the proposal would be providing security by removal of the door recess and reducing future maintenance and any physical deterioration that would likely occur if not maintained. It is not however demonstrated that the proposal is necessary to secure the future of the building or that any alternatives have been considered for securing the recessed doorway or for the use of traditional materials.

## **12. CONCLUSION**

- 12.1 Whilst the harm the proposal would cause to the conservation area, as a heritage asset, as a whole might be considered less than significant there are no immediate and apparent benefits that would accrue. The proposal must then be considered contrary to Section 16 of the NPPF.

- 12.2 Resulting from the proposal, although causing less than significant harm to the wider conservation area, the introduction of an uncharacteristic feature is considered insensitive and detrimental to the character of the immediately-surrounding conservation area and so contrary to Section 12 of the NPPF and policies 1.3, 1.11, C2, C4 and C11 of the UDP.

**13. RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Although less than significant, the harm that would be caused to the conservation area, as a heritage asset, as a whole by the removal of the existing shop front and loss of heritage features such as the recessed doorway and introduction of a shop front uncharacteristic to the building is not outweighed by any demonstrable, immediate and apparent public benefits. The proposal is thus contrary to Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. As a result of the proposal, the removal of the historic features and the introduction of a shop front uncharacteristic to the building would be insensitive and detrimental to the character of the immediately-surrounding conservation area and so contrary to Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policies 1.3, 1.11, C2, C4 and C11 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan.