

Overview of consultation comments from Haslingden CA Consultation

Resident of Haslingden

Comments from	Comments
Resident	<p>This is obviously a well researched and thought out proposal, well done to all those involved. I hope it all goes ahead. The Archaeological / History aspects could be really exciting, not many people realise that Haslingden has medieval roots. There should be strenuous efforts not to 'scare off' the existing building owners / users and residents. I feel there will be need to 'encourage' rather than 'force' changes. Many more positives than negatives.</p>
Rosendale Civic Trust – Brian Michaels	<p>Went last Monday to Haslingden Library, from just after 6.00pm to closing, and at last met your Conservation Officer Sebastian Pickles. Also present were 2 from Buttress, and 2 interested public. Explained to Sebastian, that the Report had been scanned to c29MB and was not easy to use; and also how an even larger Design and Access Statement for Warrington's Market Area redevelopment, had required the Planning Consultant to post it to a large files site and send an access code to get 34.9MB of 126 pages of readable and Word findable text. Here's a page of the 47 from the scanned Report for Haslingden CA, which shows how its text is still poor to read at full screen width.</p> <p>Could you please see if it could be made available in a more usable pdf format, as are the majority of other documents produced by or for Rosendale Borough Council – such as Conservation Area Appraisals? Note, at least with some for Spinning Point, coloured text on coloured background, could at least be copied into Word and font size changed for readability. Notice lots of CA extensions, now proposed, from that in the Local Plan, one if to include Haslingden Baths. Couldn't see a photo in the Report in hope it might be close to an explanatory text to explain why it's positive, given that it's been RBC's long term policy to replace it as a Baths, on basis of this attached Minuted Report from 1992. To locate needed someone, when I used to swim there, to recall when Speakmans did their works, and then to look at Minutes at Rawtenstall Library. Was also shown underneath the pool decking, and took this photos of the pool sides. Speakmans did the galvanised steelwork to replace failing columns. And after call and email to Swim England, no confirmation that it's still a pool of interest – they were when it was to be a new pool as part of the Haslingden Sports "Hub". So is there a text to say why it's now in the CA boundary – for conversion to another use. And in passing when it was offered</p>

	<p>to other users, it's costs at c£140k.year were about double those of Whitworth Pool – the predecessor of Marl Pits' design and construction.</p> <p>Discussed proposed areas and extension set out in the Local Plan. Comments regarding concerns of the Public baths included in the areas, discussing the costs of works required.</p>
<p>Rossendale Civic Trust – Kathy Fishwick</p>	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>Having been involved in Conservation Area designation and appraisals over many years (not only in Rossendale) I would be appreciative if you could take on board the following comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The boundary includes different character areas, but these are not fully defined or justified in the document. They, and the buildings within them, are not given a historical context in the development of the town nor an interpretation of their contribution to it. 2. The significance of the church, its importance to the whole area, and the development and relationship of the roads and spaces around it, some having medieval origins, have not been given due consideration. 3. Some relevant buildings, such as Fountain House, whilst being mentioned (albeit in relationship to Marsden Square, of which it was not a part) are left outside the boundary. Others, which make a dignified contribution, e.g. the Former Liberal Club, although within the boundary, are not mentioned. (It is surprising that the origins of Deardengate House as a Bank, despite the fact that it stands on Bank Street, have not been spotted.) Also, Manchester Road Methodist Church is already Statutorily Listed Grade II, and although this is indicated elsewhere in the document, it is put forward as a candidate for inclusion in the Local List. <p>It is this sort of detail, much more of it, that needs careful revision before this document is adopted.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The criteria by which buildings, or frontages, with a 'negative' impact have been chosen is not defined. It seems that this is weighted heavily towards 20th century interventions, with 'reversal' or 'renovation' in mind. It would be appropriate to relax this criteria to acknowledge recent changes, and the fact that a Conservation Area is a living, vibrant place which should include examples of what seemed right at the time, even though not necessarily good, design from all periods. <p>The choice of these buildings and frontages needs detailed revision.</p> <p>Yet some genuine negative impacts have not been addressed, such as the introduction, of huge flue pipes from takeaways, especially behind Lower Deardengate, and the deeply disappointing frontage of former council houses at the focal point at the top of Higher Deardengate, surely one of the very worst examples of town planning. By leaving this section of the</p>

	<p>old market place out of the boundary, it both diminishes the former importance and interpretation of the square, as well as the chances of turning round a serious mistake.</p> <p>5. Whilst including 19th century terraced housing to show the growth away from a town centre is an acknowledged recent trend in designating Conservation Areas, surely the inclusion of so much of the street pattern between Bury and Manchester Roads is a step too far. A smaller selection of these might be a better option. It is noted that the Council chose not to include the streets around Waterside Mill in Bacup which were proposed as included in the appraisal of 2011.</p> <p>6. Returning to where these comments started, and in line with several references above, it would seem logical to include the area to the east of Church Street within the boundary. Church Street itself is an element in the organic growth of the town. Here is the site of the old town and bears evidence of its transition to present day: Fountain House shows the quality of a town house of its period, and the small adjoining Fountain Mill bears witness to the introduction of mechanised industry. Incorporated into the modern housing complex, which stands witness to the old Haslingden Council's 20th century ambitions, are reminders of the past; the drinking fountain from Hargreaves Street and the date stones of the old chapel, but above all the memorial to Michael Davitt, arguably one of Haslingden's most celebrated inhabitants.</p> <p>All in all, the rich history and evolution of Haslingden has been subsumed in this document: bringing out more of its background before concentrating on detail would be far more beneficial to understanding that detail, and dealing with it accordingly.</p> <p>The lack of consultation with local historians and local history groups is much regretted.</p>
<p>Resident</p>	<p>Move southern boundary to coincide with St Peter's Avenue, thus including buildings such as St Peter's vicarage (formerly Rye Hill), which is a candidate for inclusion on a local list; the slightly unusual stone houses on Colldale Terrace, etc.</p> <p>The general idea of a conservation area is a good one and there are some good ideas (such as using vacant first and second floor space. It could be used to provide relatively low cost living space for first-time buyers, single people etc. instead of building on the Green Belt). Some of the ideas are less useful. For example, it seems to be implied that uncovering more areas of setts would be one scheme. In what way would this benefit the town? As a general point, the report is very sloppy. Whoever wrote it ought to be ashamed of it. RBC would be justified in asking for at least some of the fee they paid Buttress to be refunded. For example, at 6.3.8 Manchester Road Methodist Church appears as one of Haslingden's Listed Buildings, but the description under the photograph relates to</p>

	<p>St. James's church and then at 10.3.7, the church appears as one of the town's unlisted buildings. The fitting of more blue plaques in the town is a good idea, but those that are already in situ need to be redone first. Some are in the wrong place or have inaccurate information or are badly worded. The use to which buildings are put needs to be addressed. There is no point restoring shop fronts, removing satellite dishes etc. if you still have the proliferation of takeaways along Manchester Road and Blackburn Road.</p>
Resident	<p>I refer to the report on the Proposed Haslingden Conservation Area by Buttress Architects.</p> <p>A list of Unlisted Buildings 10.3.7 is headed by Haslingden Public Baths to be considered for local or statutory listing. I would caution against considering this particular building without consulting the condition report which was prepared by the Public Buildings section of the Architects Department prior to the decision to close the Baths because they were considered to be uneconomical to repair.</p> <p>From my memory there was a very serious deterioration of the reinforced concrete pool tank and the roof trusses were subject to corrosion and potentially dangerous.</p> <p>Since I retired as Architect to the Council in 2003 I have read with concern about attempts to re-open the Pool with a limited budget reported in the Free Press.</p>