



High Peak Borough Council
working for our community



STAFFORDSHIRE
moorlands
DISTRICT COUNCIL
ACHIEVING • EXCELLENCE

Conservation Response.

Date: 19/10/2023.

File/Application ref: HPK/2022/0333.

Case Officer: James Stannard.

Proposal: 'Construction of 1no. dwellinghouse and detached greenhouse and related ground works. Retention of temporary site caravan relating to application and during construction of dwellinghouse'.

Site Address: Corbar Hill House, Corbar Road, Buxton, Derbyshire, SK17 6RU.

Dear James,

Objection. Recommended refusal.

The Heritage Statement is poor and contains an inaccurate assessment of the site concerned. It does not assess or acknowledge Setting, nor does it contain a thorough assessment of the level of harm imposed on this vicinity and any justification. Additionally, it does not note that Corbar House is within the northern portion of Buxton: The Park Conservation Area, designated heritage asset. Further, I do not see a Listed Building Consent application accompanying this Full Planning Permission, and due to the immediate proximity and siting I would expect to see one. Clarity required.

Firstly, I do not agree that the site, 'being a large banked plot had nothing more than vegetation' to note. Corbar House, *List UID: 1259375*, similarly not assessed in any real detail, Grade II listed building, is the only Listed Building along Corbar Road, and within this vicinity. It is therefore seen as vulnerable to change.

Historic OS Maps dated 1882 show Corbar House, ponds to the frontage (still extant), large landscaped grounds (frontage still extant), Coach House (still extant) and a small ancillary garden building (now lost). Properties of this size, build date and extensive architectural design are by their nature set among grounds and landscaping. This contributes to their Setting and forms part of an asset's experiential value. The curtilage of a Listed Building is not marked by modern lines on a modern map and must not be confused with red boundary demarcations. Subsequently, I cannot see how the land here and therefore Setting can be physically dissected, and have modern connotations imposed upon them.

The scheme presents itself as an extremely adventurous project, and something that attempts to become a regurgitation of a Frank Lloyd Wright piece. Using features that include but are not limited to; extensive glazing, cantilevered flooring and balcony, and burying the rear of the structure into the topography. These features are not seen to successfully alleviate the harm imposed on the asset, and the harm imposed on the Conservation Area. I do not see how it is a respectful or sensitive development within what is the curtilage, and immediate vicinity of a Listed Building and its survived Coach House. It appears to be forced in, and quite uncomfortable in its siting.

It appears that no landscaping scheme accompanies this proposal, however as seen on site extensive works have already commenced. This is seen but not limited to large roads or tracks

hugging the west elevation of Corbar House and Coach House, extensive boundary treatment alteration and the installation of networks and infrastructure.

~

To conclude:

I cannot provide full support. It is assessed the proposal would have an adversely negative impact to the heritage assets identified and fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building. This is in conflict with Section 16 (2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. It is also deemed 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.

With regards to the NPPF (2021) the harm would be less than substantial however this is deemed to be on the higher tier of this scale with paragraph 202 being relevant. It is not considered the public benefits will outweigh the heritage harm identified. Similarly, I do not believe that paragraph 194 has been satisfied.

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

High Peak Design Guide. New Development Designing in Context.

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”*.

Regards,

E Holland.
Principal Conservation Officer.