

Applicant: Hartwood Estates Ltd

Description: Replacement signage including new fascia sign, external menu boards and the fixing of timber boarding with railings onto shop front (Listed Building Consent)

Site Address: 5 Peel Square, Barnsley, S70 2QT

Site Location & Description

The application relates to a 3 storey, stone fronted, mid-terrace building located on the Northern side of Peel Square. The building is used as a Turkish/English restaurant and is Grade II listed. It also sits immediately adjacent to the Grade II listed 1-3 Peel Square which accommodates a Greggs and Currency Exchange and 1a Peel Square which accommodates Yorkshire Bank and a phone Shop. There is a further Grade II listed building opposite (boots) and to the rear on Market Hill (Wetherspoons).

The site sits within Barnsley Town Centre within the Westgate/Churchfields area. The building is also located in the Regent Street/ Church Street/ Market Hill Conservation Area

The works relating to this application have already taken place as shown on the images below.



Previous Signage



New signage

History

The site is the subject of an Enforcement letter in relation to the affixation of signage to the building (dated 21st May 2021). The letter states the following actions should be taken:

- Removal of all associated items affixed to the building
- Fixing all damage made when affixing the items so it matches the existing appearance
- Submission of an application for Listed Building Consent

Previous applications.

2008/1804 – Approved– Display of new signage

2008/1807 – Approved– Display of externally illuminated signage

B/04/0059/BA/AD – Approved – Display of advertisement on a Public House

B/04/0138/BA/LB – Approved with conditions – Display of illuminated signs to public house

B/91/0540/BA/LB – Approved – Display of illuminated signs, lamps and logo

Proposed Development

The works were carried out in November 2020, as such, the applicant seeks permission to retain the following;

- Replacement front sign;
- Replacement external menu boards (x3); and
- External wooden planks along the ground floor (x4).

The main issue to be considered in the determination of this Listed Building Consent application is:
-

- Whether or not the proposed alterations would harm the special architectural or historic interest or impact on the setting of the listed Building

Policy Context

The application property is Grade II listed, located in the Regent Street/ Church Street/ Market Hill Conservation Area and sits within the Westgate/Churchfields area of Barnsley Town Centre. As such, the following policies apply;

:

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

In terms of the impact on the special character and appearance of the listed building, Section 16 (2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, states:

In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority or the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses

Policy

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 195: Identify and assess heritage significance including the setting and the effect of a proposal

NPPF para 199: Great weight given to an asset's conservation, irrespective of the degree of harm

NPPF para 200: Any harm to or loss of significance will require clear and convincing justification

Barnsley Local Plan Policy HE1: The Historic Environment: Positively encourage developments that help in the management, conservation and understanding of the historic environment

Barnsley Local Plan Policy HE3: Developments affecting Historic Buildings: Proposals involving historic buildings should conserve and where appropriate enhance, respect historic precedents, and capitalise on opportunities to reveal significance

Consultations

Conservation Officer – Objects and recommends refusal

Ward Councillors – No comments

Representations

None

Assessment

This application is for retrospective consent for signage changes, fascia alterations, railings, and wood cladding to the listed building at 5 Peel Square currently known as The Lemon Tree. The application came about following a complaint received and Enforcement involvement. This highlighted the fact no Advert Consent or Listed Building Consent application had been made for approval of the changes.

The building is listed at grade II under NHLE reference 1191881 as the former White Hart public house. The submission includes a heritage statement and an impact assessment which sets out significance of the building and the impact the changes have made on this.

The building has clear aesthetic, historic and communal heritage values which underpin the significance and contribute to the special interest. In terms of the Statement of Impact towards the end of the Heritage Statement the Conservation Officer states it underplays the impact on the listed building. Consequently, the Conservation Officer concludes the harm both in terms of the fabric interventions to implement the changes and the overall final aesthetic is similarly underplayed. The submission also includes a Planning Statement that deals with the relevant planning policies, the planning balance and reflects on the contents of the HIA and concludes that the development is justified and acceptable:

8.1 the proposed development is acceptable, in that it will offer very significant public benefits while being of appropriate scale and massing to its location, and will not negatively impact upon the site, its setting, or the surrounding area.

8.2 The proposed works will result in minimal loss of historic fabric and a neutral change to the character and appearance of the listed building, when considered in relation to baseline conditions. The significance of the building including its character, appearance, architectural interest and historic interest would be preserved. The character, appearance and heritage values of the conservation area would also not be affected by these proposals.

8.3 The character and appearance of the building, compared to a baseline that includes previous signage and menu boards, would be little changed.

8.4 The scale of the proposals and proposed materials are in keeping with the historic and current use of the building and do not detract from the building's architectural detailing; they allow the detailing around the main door to be better revealed. In some cases, the scale of the signage is slightly smaller compared to what previously existed.

8.5 The minimal harm to the fabric of the listed building is significantly outweighed by public benefits, including economic activity, vibrancy of the town centre and nighttime economy.

The Conservation Officer strongly disagrees with several of the above points and has offered the following in relation (in no particular order):

The public benefit – the public benefit is not enhanced by the changes that have taken place. The use was existing, and this has not changed. It might be assumed by the applicant that the signage enhances the visibility of the food offer and makes the establishment more attractive to customers. However, speculative enhancement of economic activity due to the works is not a (very *significant* as suggested) public benefit. Neither is it an appropriate justification that comes at the expense of the erosion of the historic significance of the listed building which on balance and in the widest sense is a public disbenefit.

Fabric loss and intervention – The applicant suggests the works will involve minimal fabric loss. However, there is an historic and ongoing problem with signage and general shop front / retail paraphernalia in context with historic buildings. The use of fixings for signage directly into stone or decorative ashlar introduces irreversible harm to the fabric. This harm is compounded and becomes cumulative over the years where building frontages become peppered by old fixing points following changes to tenants or owners and building uses. Best practice involves the use of signage designed to be mounted into the joints of the stone / masonry which is repairable and

totally reversible. As the works have already taken place, the opportunity to advise on this matter is now unavailable.

Changes against baseline – there are changes against the baseline. The signage is different, it is larger and truncates architectural elements. Protective spiked fleur de lis railings have been installed across two thirds of the frontage. Moreover, the horizontal timber cladding is an incongruous device in this context and is fundamentally at odds with the rusticated stonework and the quality of the architectural composition.

Architectural / aesthetic value / general scale, design and suitability and preservation of significance – As noted above, the Conservation Officer does not agree the works are neutral against the baseline and states there is harm to the aesthetic value and therefore the significance. The fascia sign that spans the width of the unit is substantially taller the previous item. Consequently, this truncates and partially hides the stylised keystones at the head of each window. The newly installed canopy further hides these features and it is questioned how this is mounted and to what exactly. It is argued that as the sign above the archway has been removed this better reveals the archway dressing behind. However, the reality is that the archway is only partially revealed to the height of the new fascia which truncates other features. At lower level, rough cut horizontal planks of timber have been affixed into the rusticated ashlar blocks. These are an inappropriate material in this context and as a device they spoil the effect of the rusticated ground floor plinth and the cill detailing below the windows. The timber planks are also mounted directly to the stone blocks which is harmful to the fabric. The refreshed menus appear like the previous menus in scale but if existing fixings have not been used then new drillings into the ashlar are harmful to the fabric.

Overall, this is an unfortunate situation which risks becoming a negative precedent. The works also represent a degree of cumulative harm which is compounded by the fact the works were implemented without consent. The Council tried to enter positive talks with the applicant and their agent regarding potential compromises, amendments and ways forward, however, no agreement could be reached, and it was requested the application be determined as it stands.

Recommendation

Refuse