

Conservation Response.

Date: 18/10/2023.

File/Application ref: HPK/2023/0343.

Case Officer: Pet Twigg.

Proposal: 'Demolition of existing bungalow and proposed two storey detached house and outbuilding'.

Site Address: 40 Glossop Road, Charlesworth, Derbyshire, SK13 5EZ.

Dear Pet,

Objection. Recommended refusal.

The vernacular is discussed in marginally broad terms, including but not limited to the Dark Peak two storey traditional workers dwellings, and three storey Weavers Cottages where the latter have survived. Some 18th C Ecclesiastical buildings and rural farm buildings are generally larger but do maintain and demonstrate humble architectural scales evidence of build date. This affords rows of buildings and the street scene to remain close-knit and nestled into the topography. Consequently, the historic legibility of the area remains.

The proposal appears to be quite a massive structure situated in an open portion and prominent gateway entrance into the Charlesworth Conservation Area. To the immediate north of the site is an open piece of land containing what appears to be a public footpath or track, thus affording long range views and intervisibility across this area. An original vernacular building to the immediate south, no.36 Glossop Road whilst not a heritage asset within its own right, appears to be dwarfed by the scheme. Continuing south into the core of the village are well survived two storey workers dwellings and terraces. Further, it is seen that properties opposite the proposal site will be very much overlooked and imposed upon. Despite the latter being 1970's ribbon development, they are infact outside of the Conservation Area boundary and remain visually subservient in this vicinity.

The scheme looks to create an oversized regurgitation of the vernacular. This is assessed from the large heavy-set protruding porch, two intimidating pitched gable front quarters and proliferation of skylights. In viewing the traditional domestic architecture of the Conservation Area, these new features are not prominent on the modest workers cottages and the inclusion of them at this site risks undue visual conflict. Further, the size of the overall footprint and disproportionate ratios between the extension and principal building affords the two structures, though differing in height, to unsuccessfully compete. I do not agree that the rear structure can be called an outrigger as typically these are boot-room type structures associated to terraces or back-to-backs. In looking at plan see *dwg ref: A3/PM3D 1045*, the footprint and span of the ground floor appears to be quite excessive and does not faithfully note the vernacular within the Conservation Area. As such I disagree that the proposal is respectful of neither setting or character.

There is no landscaping scheme forming part of the proposal. The existing remains subservient and notes further drystone walling to the open grassland adjacent.

I do not support the inclusion of solar arrays at street facing elevations and require this to be limited to rear elevations.

To conclude:

I cannot provide full support. It is assessed the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area contrary to Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

By virtue of the scale, proportions and form of the proposal I do not see that the scheme falls in line with the following Local Policy:

Policy EQ6: notably *“requiring that development contributes positively to an areas character, history and identity in terms of scale, height, density, layout, appearance, materials, and the relationship to adjacent buildings and landscape features”*. And *“requiring that a development achieves a satisfactory relationship to adjacent development and does not cause...(cont).....adverse impacts on local character and amenity”*.

Policy EQ7: notably *“requiring proposed developments that affect a heritage asset and or its setting including alterations and extensions to existing buildings to demonstrate how the proposal has taken account of design, form, scale, mass, use of traditional materials and detailing(cont).....to ensure that the design is sympathetic and minimises harm to the asset”*.

High Peak Design Guide. New Development Designing in Context.

Regards,

Miss E Holland.
Principal Conservation Officer.