

Online Comment

Application H14-0578-18
Location Land adjacent: 33 Knight Street Pinchbeck Spalding PE11 3RA
Proposal Demolition of garage block and erection of two-storey dwelling

Name Ian Marshman, Historic Environment Officer
Address Lincolnshire County Council Places Team Lancaster House 36 Orchard Street LN1 1XX

Date Submitted 22-06-18
For/Against Comments

This office has a number of concerns around the proposed development and its impact on the Pinchbeck Conservation Area in which it is located.

The proposal to demolish the entire wall between 27-33 Knight Street in order to create replacement car parking for the garages that are to be demolished is unacceptable in the conservation area. It would create a void in what has until recently been a continuous boundary treatment gently curving along frontages to Knight Street from the historic garden wall of the Grade II Listed Graft House, unifying properties of varying ages into a cohesive street scene. The loss of front gardens to be replaced by parked cars would also be a detriment to the character of this part of the conservation area. It is evident that several neighbouring properties have lately removed their garden walls to provide easier parking, but I can find no evidence that permission was granted for this, and SHDC has previously rejected similar proposals at 28 Knight Street on these grounds, which has been upheld by a planning inspector on appeal.

The proposed new house has taken some inspiration from the character of historic 1930s properties nearby, but does so in such a way as replicate many of the insensitive late 20th century alterations often made to interwar houses which detract from their contribution to the conservation area, and for which planning consent would usually not be granted. This includes using modern materials of poor quality such as reconstituted slate, green plastic fascias and soffits and white plastic windows in a later, 1970s replacement style.

The Design & Access Statement makes no mention of the proposed development's impacts on heritage assets of archaeological interest, although it does note that the site's "village centre position will mean that it is likely to have seen previous development of some type." This is indeed quite likely as the site is situated on what was historically higher ground and could thus have been subject to Roman activity (as identified elsewhere in the village), as well as within the settled area of medieval Pinchbeck. Further along Knight Street at No. 43 archaeological intervention has also revealed brick cellars, wells and pits dating attesting activity here from the 1600s onwards.

Should the local planning authority be minded to grant consent, it is therefore recommended that the developer should be required to commission an Archaeological Scheme of Works (on the lines of 4.8.1 in the Lincolnshire Archaeological Handbook). This should be secured by South Holland District Council's standard conditions AR01, 02 and 03.

"They [the local planning authority] should... require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part), in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publically accessible", National Planning Policy Framework Section 12, para 141.

Initially I envisage that this would involve monitoring of all groundwork's, with the ability to stop and fully record archaeological features.