

Teresa Turner

From: James Bate
Sent: 12 September 2019 08:38
To: Teresa Turner
Subject: 57 Church Lane

Teresa,

I have reviewed the comments made by the County Archaeologist who suggest that we consider whether or not to regard the property as a non-designated heritage asset (The NPPF makes clear that 'Heritage Assets' are either designated assets or assets identified by the LPA, as such it is for us to decide whether or not a structure or site is a non-designated asset or not).

I would be of the view that it should be considered in that way, however I would disagree with the suggestion that we have insufficient information to assess the impact upon the significance of the building. The building has already been significantly altered in several phases and has been vacant for some 20 years. We are already aware that the preferred approach of the owner and agent was to demolish the building and redevelop the site owing to flood risk and the difficulty in being able to obtain insurance for the property and the great difficulty in raising floor levels to mitigate flood risk owing to limited headroom within the building.

We have negotiated extensions which are disproportionate in terms of their height and might not be so readily accepted under alternate circumstances in order to ensure that the existing building can be retained at all, albeit mostly as ancillary accommodation. The retention of the building is itself somewhat of a compromise and given that without the works being proposed it is likely to sit unoccupied and abandoned as it has been for the past 20 years it is difficult to see how we are not in a position to assess the desirability of the proposal. Carrying out the research and justification work as advocated by the county archaeologist is almost certainly to result in a request that a condition of building recording be attached to any planning permission granted so that the current state and features of the building can be documented and recorded prior to works commencing.

Rather than put the applicant to abortive effort producing justification which is already well understood, only for a recording condition to be advocated I would suggest a condition requiring building recording be undertaken prior to commencement of works as follows:

No development shall commence until a record is made of the historic structure comprising 57 Church Lane, the record need not encompass the partly implemented extensions present on site which were granted planning permission in 1991. The record shall be produced by a suitably experienced person(s) or organisation details of whom have been notified to the local planning authority. The recording exercise shall be undertaken in accordance with a Level 2 building record as detailed in current best practise "Understanding Historic Buildings: A Guide to Good Recording Practice" (Historic England, May 2016). The recording report shall be submitted to the local planning authority for inclusion in the Historic Environment Record for Derbyshire prior to practical completion of the new extension hereby approved.

James Bate
Conservation Officer

T: 01283 595983

www.southderbyshire.gov.uk



Any advice is given at officer level only and does not prejudice any formal decision the Council makes in the future.