TO: CONSERVATION MANAGER

FROM: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT



## **APPLICATION DETAILS**

**APPLICATION NO:** 

S120836/L

**DESCRIPTION:** 

Removal of Chimney stack and second floor unsupported

chimney breast.

SITE:

6-7 Broad Street, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR4 9AE

**H26** 

**APPLICATION TYPE:** 

**Listed Building Consent** 

PARISH:

Hereford

**GRID REF:** 

OS 350923, 239961

**CASE OFFICER:** 

Mrs Angela Tyler

I have received the above application on which I would be grateful for your advice. The application form and plans for the above development can be viewed on the Internet within 5-7 working days using the following link: http://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/searchplanningapplications

I would be grateful for your advice in respect of the following specific matters: -

| Χ | Listed Building            | Landscape interest    |
|---|----------------------------|-----------------------|
|   | Design comments            | TPO/Trees             |
| Х | Setting of Listed Building | Ancient Woodland      |
| X | Conservation Area          | Historic Park/Garden  |
|   | Archaeology                | Biodiversity Interest |
|   | Scheduled Ancient Monument | Designated Habitat    |
|   | Setting of Scheduled A M   | Amended Plans         |
| X | AAI                        | Additional Info       |

Please can you respond by 20/04/2012 to planning\_enquiries@herefordshire.gov.uk

## Comments

It is not uncommon for chimney stacks to have been truncated at ground level in commercial buildings in order to free up floor space and thought was rarely given to how they were supported. In the case of 6-7 Broad St the chimney breasts have been removed at both ground and first floor levels, leaving only a vestigial stack at second floor and above. Martyn Peters' e-mail explains that the structural support for this is uncertain but is liable to be inadequate if, as seems likely, it is dependent on the timber second floor structure, which was not designed for the purpose. The options for either reinstating the chimney breasts at ground and first floor levels or reinforcing the second floor are highly disruptive both in terms of access and disturbance to the fabric of the building, and I concur with Martyn Peters' view that on balance, removing the potential threat is the most logical solution and that the loss of significance is acceptable.

## Recommendation

No objection.

Signed: C A Partrick, Senior Building Conservation Officer

Date: 4/4/12