

c/o Blakett, Hart & Pratt, LLP  
Aire House  
Mandale Business Park  
Belmont  
Durham, DH1 1TH

15 June 2023

Dear Mr Richards,

**DM/23/01354/LB and DM/23/01353/FPA 24 Hallgarth Street, Durham DH1 3AT**

*Renovation of property to include replacement of conservatory with a single storey rear extension, re-roofing of single storey off-shoot and associated internal works.*

1. The Trust welcomes the omission in these new applications of the conversion to two apartments and the frontage rooflights. However, it is concerned that there is a lack of information and analysis of the rear extension and attic interior. It also considers that the combined impact of the inappropriate new rear extension on this listed building will cause negative impact on the listed building and terrace, Hallgarth Street, and Conservation Area.
2. Hallgarth Street is an historic thoroughfare and is important for the quality of its buildings and terraces, their consistent detailing, and individual buildings. The property is one of the buildings in a short Grade 2 listed terrace and appropriate detailing and materials are needed for any rear extension. The rear extension may be of earlier date than indicated and there is a failure to analyse the remaining structure adequately. Local comment on the previous proposal also referred to possible demolition and this, at the least, should be disproven by current dated photographs.

**Proposal and Impact**

3. There is uncertainty about the rear garden and boundaries treatment as they are not shown in the submission and appear to be in very poor condition; it is important to ensure that these are appropriately dealt with. Their removal is not backed by adequate evidence. The new rear extension proposal with its hybrid contemporary elements combined with a pitched roof section creates awkward juxtapositions both with each other and the listed building. It is not known whether the proposed materials will be sympathetic to the main building.
4. The treatment of the new staircase and internal conversion of the attic room is unconvincing in its relation to this low pitched roof and its original supporting structure. Original material will be lost. The proposed additional rear rooflight adds nothing to the building and is a minor negative impact.
5. The creation of living space will require mitigation. Soundproofing will be essential given the juxtaposition of the attic with its neighbours. Any provision for this will exacerbate the negative impact upon the roof space and supporting structure.

# THE CITY OF DURHAM TRUST

---

6. The submitted heritage analysis fails to identify how the extension relates to the building and terrace or analyse its impact. There is a need to analyse the pantile and stone roofed extension and storage area and their significance. The Ordnance Survey plan circa 1857-1865 shows rear extensions to the terrace. It is therefore possible that the existing pantile roofed extension was constructed either with the terrace in 1840 or relatively soon after. It may be the last remaining example of the original offshoots. The low pitch of the main roof is noted in the listing and as a consequence significance should also attach to its internal structure. Both these and the rear boundaries and steps should be checked for significance and relevance to the listed building and its setting. Any interior features of significance that are believed to be in the house need to be identified and conserved.

7. The Trust does not consider that the poor condition of the shed and extension is sufficient reason to demolish and erect an inappropriately designed replacement. The new conservatory is unconvincing in its scale and relationship to the original building and original extension. It also considers that the negative impact of the rear extension and attic conversion are not offset by any public benefits and are an inappropriate change to this listed building.

## **Policies**

8. The Trust considers that the proposals fail against the following planning policies:

### **County Durham Plan**

#### **Policy 29 Sustainable Design**

a. The proposals fail to contribute positively to an area's heritage significance and townscape.

#### **Policy 44 Historic Environment**

##### **Designated Assets**

The proposals do not demonstrate that this listed asset is to be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to .... less than substantial harm to its significance.

##### **Listed Buildings**

b. The proposals fail to show respect for the historic form, materials, detailing, and curtilage, which contribute to the significance of the building.

c. The proposals fail to demonstrate the retention of the character and special interest of the building when considering alternative use as apartments.

##### **Conservation Areas**

f. The proposals fail to demonstrate understanding of the significance, character, appearance and setting of the conservation area and how this has informed proposals to achieve high quality sustainable development, which is respectful of historic interest, local distinctiveness and the conservation or enhancement of heritage assets.

### **Durham City Neighbourhood Plan**

#### **Policy S1: Sustainable Development Requirements of all Development and Redevelopment Sites Including all New Building, Renovations and Extensions**

The proposal fails because it does not:

c) Harmonise with its context in terms of scale, and height.

# THE CITY OF DURHAM TRUST

---

d) Conserve the significance of the setting, character, local distinctiveness, and the contribution made to the sense of place by Our Neighbourhood's designated and non-designated heritage assets.

## **Policy H2: The Conservation Areas, Durham City Conservation Area**

The development proposals negatively affect the Durham City Conservation Area by not taking into account, and meeting, the following requirements,

- a) Sustaining and enhancing the historic and architectural qualities of buildings
- e) Avoiding harm to an element of an asset which makes a positive contribution to its individual significance and that of the surrounding area.
- i) Having appropriate scale, massing, and form.
- j) Having, detailing appropriate to the vernacular, context, and setting.
- k) Using high quality design sympathetic to the character and context of the local area and its significance and distinctiveness.

Based on these policy failures, the Trust objects to the proposals as currently submitted.

Yours sincerely

John Lowe,  
Chair, City of Durham Trust