



High Peak Borough Council
working for our community



STAFFORDSHIRE
moorlands
DISTRICT COUNCIL
ACHIEVING • EXCELLENCE

Conservation Response.

Date: 30/10/2023.
File/Application ref: HPK/2023/0413.
Case Officer: Rachel Robinson.
Proposal: 'Proposed balcony and alterations to window'.
Site Address: 45 Church Street, Hayfield, Derbyshire, SK22 2JE.

Dear Rachel,

Objection.

This property is not listed and is situated within Hayfield Conservation Area. The rear of these cottages are all highly exposed to the open cricket ground in the centre of this vicinity. All rear elevations to the cottages can be viewed directly from GII listed Royal Hotel.

Some rear elevations at these cottages see a small balcony fit for, for example; individual table and two chairs. This can be accommodated where it would best suit the vernacular dwellings. The form and scale of the existing in the vicinity are seen to be subservient. With the existing at no. 45 successfully nestled into the rear elevation due to its diminutive size. However, the proposal sees the inclusion of a substantial platform extending out largely beyond what could be considered a balcony.

I am not confident the proposed will harmonise with the traditional cottage, as seen in section this substantial platform looks to compete with the scale of the dwelling. With regard to the immediate neighbouring dwellings, the scheme looks to impose directly upon both sides giving rise to visual conflict when viewed from the wider open vicinity noted above.

The Heritage Statement is poor and does not discuss Hayfield Conservation Area at all. There has been no assessment to justify or conclude no harm will be imposed. There are multiple intervisibility points across this portion of the Conservation Area that I assess to receive visual impact as a result of this proposal.

~

To conclude:

I cannot provide full support. I do not believe paragraphs 194 of the NPPF are satisfied. The proposal looks to impose visual conflict within the vicinity by virtue of its scale, design and siting. In terms of harm on heritage this would equate to less than substantial harm. In failing 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, it is not considered that there are public benefits associated with this proposal that outweigh the heritage harm identified.

Regards,

E Holland.
Principal Conservation Officer.