

Appendix 2

Report of Handling

Report dated 19 February 2018 by the Council's Authorised Officer under the Scheme of Delegation

| | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------|------------------|
|  | <h2>Delegated Report</h2> | Reference No | CL/17/0445 |
| | | | |
| | | Date | 19 February 2018 |

Planning proposal: Alterations to shopfront including removal of existing timber shopfront and replacement of aluminium and timber clad frontage, tiled stallriser and replacement of fascia board.

Location: 94-96 High Street
Lanark
ML11 7ES

Application Type : Detailed Planning Application

Applicant : Thomas Auld & Sons Ltd

Location : 94-96 High Street
Lanark
ML11 7ES

Decision: Refuse detailed planning permission (based on the conditions overleaf)

Report by: Area Manager (Planning & Building Standards)

Policy ref:

South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan (adopted 2015)

Policy 4 - Development management and placemaking

Policy 15 - Natural and Historic Environment

Development management, placemaking and design supplementary guidance (2015)

DM1 – Design

Shopfront Design Guide.

Natural and historic environment supplementary guidance (2015)

NHE7 - Conservation Areas

Assessment

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|
| Impact on privacy? | No |
| Impact on sunlight/daylight? | No |
| Impact on amenity? | Yes |
| Traffic issues? | No |
| Adheres to development plan policy? | No |
| Adverse comments from consultees? | No |

Representations: None

1 Material Considerations

- 1.1 The application seeks shopfront alterations to an existing retail unit on Lanark High Street. The application site is located within Lanark's conservation area and town centre. As such it is important to consider the proposal's visual impact upon the surrounding area.
- 1.2 The shop front as existing is a timber frontage containing traditional features including a curved fan light and top of the shop windows, each with attractive decorative turned wood detailing. The stallriser has decorative timber panelling detailing and the existing timber door has a traditional kickboard detail. The proposed replacement frontage proposes an aluminium frontage with timber curved sections, timber clad mullions and transoms which separate the display window into four sections. A tiled stall riser is also proposed.
- 1.3 A request was sent on 6th October 2017 requiring details of whether it is feasible to retain the existing frontage and requesting amendments to the design within 21 days. No information was received and further requests for the information were then sent. Additional information was provided on the 4th December and amendments to the proposals were submitted. These amendments added a kickboard to the proposed door and timber inserts to the aluminium frame to create a curved fanlight and windows.
- 1.1 The relevant policies in this case are Policies 4, 15, DM1 and NHE7. Policy 4 - Development Management and Placemaking seeks to ensure proposals integrate well with the surrounding area. Policy DM1 Design provides more guidance on design and in this case directs the reader to the Shopfront Design Guide. Policy 15 seeks to protect and enhance the natural and historic environment and Policy NHE 7 provides specific advice on conservation areas.

2 Assessment and conclusion

- 2.1 The application entails the replacement of an existing timber frontage with an alluminium framed shopfront with timber details within an existing retail unit on Lanark's High Street and Conservation Area.
- 2.2 The main determining issues in assessing this application are whether the proposal complies with the development plan policies, in particular whether the loss of the existing frontage is acceptable and whether the proposed development can successfully integrate with its surroundings.
- 2.3 Policy DM1 directs the reader in this case to the Council's Shopfront Design Guide. This Guide notes within the General Design Principles for Listed Building and Conservation Areas that the removal of a traditional frontage and its replacement is only permitted where 2 criteria can be met, namely, where it is not feasible to adapt or retain the existing frontage and where the new shopfront will not detract from the building or surrounding area. It has to be considered whether the proposal meets these 2 criteria.

- 2.4 The submitted reasoning as to why it would not be feasible to retain the existing frontage was based on 4 points, as follows: timber doors shrink causing issues with pest ingress; maintenance issues with timber frontages; time and cost to repair timber frontages and large areas of glazing in the event of vandalism, and the fact that Aulds are rebranding to have a more modern look and the traditional frontage does not fit in with this image.
- 2.5 Each point presented by the applicant is considered in turn. Timber doors can shrink and contract with age and if the current door is shrinking a replacement door which is properly seasoned, weatherproofed and maintained could be considered which should stop any movement or a barrier on the bottom of the door could be used to prevent any pests entering the property. Nevertheless, this point only relates to the door and does not provide reasoning as to why the rest of the frontage cannot be retained. The applicant has noted that wood deteriorates quicker than aluminium and leads to the shop looking 'shabby'. However, with proper and regular maintenance timber shopfronts can remain looking good for a long period of time. In addition, there are attractive traditional features such as the turned wood and curved features on the fanlight and display window which cannot be emulated by aluminium; it is these features which are unique to this shopfront and features which should be protected. Thirdly, the applicant notes that timber frontages with decorative features and large areas of glazing are more costly and longer to repair in cases of vandalism. However, the incidence of vandalism in Lanark High Street is low and Aulds does not carry high value items which would attract burglary. Additionally, depending on the level of damage timber may not always take longer to repair as a local joiner could fix a timber frontage with timber they have available to them whereas a standardised aluminium frontage may require to be ordered up or go out of stock. It is not therefore considered appropriate to compromise on the character of a shopfront in this conservation area based on the justification of possible vandalism; a circumstance which may never happen. Finally, it is understood Aulds are operating a companywide re-brand; however in planning terms proposals are assessed on the basis of their location, in this case a historic conservation area, not a company's national branding or commercial competition. It is possible to achieve an attractive rebranding of a company whilst working within the constraints of each individual site. For example, the existing shopfront could be repainted to follow the re-branding. In view of the above, the applicant has not provided sufficient reasoning as to why it is not feasible to retain or adapt the existing shopfront. Thus, the proposal fails on the first criteria of the Shopfront Guide.
- 2.6 The second criterion is whether the proposed frontage would detract from the building or surrounding area. The Shopfront Design Guide requires: original features to be incorporated in the design; stall risers to use materials sympathetic to the shop front; windows and doors to be of appropriate proportions to the building and those adjoining the street; where timber framed shop fronts are still predominantly intact, timber should be used to reinstate the frontage. The applicant has now amended plans to include curved features on the fanlight and window; however the turned wood details are lost. The Shopfront Guide details that frontages should be finished in predominately one material, in this proposal the main frame and door is aluminium with timber curved features and timber clad mullions; it is considered the mix of

materials would not achieve a coherent and unified frontage. In addition, the High Street still comprises predominately timber shop frontages; as such any replacement shopfront should be timber. If timber was used the decorative turned wood features could be incorporated in a new design. The proposed tiled stallriser is not an acceptable replacement for the existing timber stallriser and other stallrisers within the street use mainly timber or rendered stone. In addition, the consistent approach in the High Street is a set back entrance door with a single display window; many of the shops on the High Street have a similar sized display windows. The proposal seeks to divide this display window which would result in an anomaly within the streetscape. Therefore the proposal, through the loss of traditional and original features of the existing shopfront together with the use of inappropriate materials for the stallriser and frontage, would detract from the surrounding area and fails on the second criteria within the Shopfront Guide.

- 2.7 The proposal fails to comply with the Shopfront Guide and therefore does not comply with Policy DM1.
- 2.8 Policy 15 seeks to protect and enhance the natural and historic environment and Policy NHE 7 provides specific advice on conservation areas, namely that proposals should preserve and enhance its character. As detailed in the assessment above the proposal would result in the loss of attractive turned wood detailing and timber panelled stallriser, without proper justification, to replace with inappropriate materials. Consequently, the proposal fails to preserve the existing attractive features in the conservation area and proposes to replace with features and materials which do not enhance the area. Therefore, the proposal does not preserve and enhance and is deemed to have an adverse impact on the conservation area; the proposal therefore fails to meet Policy NHE7. Consequently, the development has an adverse impact upon a Category 3, local, designation and does not comply with Policy 15.
- 2.9 Policy 4 - Development Management and Placemaking seeks to ensure proposals integrate well with the surrounding area and, specifically, that there is no significant adverse impact upon the built heritage. It has been established above that there is a significant adverse impact on the conservation area which is considered built heritage. Therefore, the proposal fails to meet Policy 4.
- 2.10 In view of the above, the application site contains an attractive timber shopfront which contributes towards the appearance and character of Lanark's High Street and conservation area. There has been insufficient reasoning provided as to why it is not feasible to retain or adapt the existing frontage and the proposed frontage uses inappropriate materials resulting in the original and attractive features which make the shop frontage special being lost. It is therefore recommended that planning permission is refused.

3 Reason for decision

- 3.1 The proposal fails to comply with Policy 4, 15, DM1 and NHE7 in that: there is insufficient reasoning as to why existing frontage cannot be retained and the proposal would have an adverse impact upon the conservation area and built heritage.

Delegating Officer: Lynda Dickson

Date: 18/12/17

Previous references

- ◆ None

List of background papers

- ▶ Application Form
- ▶ Application Plans
- ▶ South Lanarkshire Local Development Plan (adopted 2015)
- ▶ Development management, placemaking and design supplementary guidance (2015)
- ▶ Natural and historic environment supplementary guidance (2015)
- ▶ Shopfront Design Guide
- ▶ Neighbour notification letter dated 06.10.2017
- ▶ Lanark Gazette advert dated 18.10.2017
- ▶ Site Notice dated 18.10.2017

Contact for further information

If you would like to inspect the background papers or want further information, please contact:-

Fiona Bailie

(Tel : 01698 455271)

E-mail: fiona.bailie@southlanarkshire.gov.uk

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

- 1 The proposed shopfront would be contrary to Policy DM1 of the Development Management, Placemaking and Design Supplementary Guidance in that it fails to comply with the Shopfront Guidance as sufficient and valid reasoning has not been provided as to why it is not feasible to retain or adapt the existing shopfront.

- 3 The proposal is contrary to Policy NHE7 of the Natural and Historic Environment Supplementary Guidance in that it would lead to the loss of attractive decorative features on an existing shopfront, failing to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area.

- 4 The proposed shopfront would be contrary to Policy 15 of the South Lanarkshire Local Plan as it would have an adverse impact on the conservation area.

- 5 The proposed shopfront would be contrary to Policy 4 of the South Lanarkshire Local Plan as it would have an adverse impact on the built heritage.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 This decision relates to drawing numbers: 2576-LP, 2576-D.001, 2576-D.002 Rev B