

From: [James Stannard](#)
To: [Planning Comments \(HPBC\)](#)
Subject: FW: HPK/2024/0102
Date: 13 May 2024 12:26:18
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

See Conservation Officer comments in connection with HPK/2024/0102

James Stannard Planning Officer
Development Services
High Peak Borough Council and Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
www.highpeak.gov.uk | Follow HPBC on [Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#)
www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk | Follow SMDC on [Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#)

Please note that my working days are Monday-Thursday

From: Emily Holland
Sent: Monday, May 13, 2024 12:18 PM
To: James Stannard **Subject:** HPK/2024/0102

Hi James,

Land rear of 44 to 46, Town Lane, Charlesworth, Derbyshire.

Objection. Recommended refusal.

This scheme is within the immediate setting and historic context of Grade II listed 46-48 Town Lane, C18 cottages. The collection of which on the corner are tall, quiet and relate well to the topography. The lay of the land in the vicinity is flanked and almost drawn by other similar vernacular cottages, creating a close-knit and picturesque feel to the lanes. The latter of which historic significance is drawn in terms of material palette, scale, humble form and elevations, and historic development. All cottages within the area of a similar scale and form, creating the well established and recognised character of a hamlet or village in the rolling countryside known to this county.

Chapel Brow is a primitive narrow lane, ascending sharply south. There is piecemeal and very little development en route toward the Grade II Listed Independent Chapel. Other dwellings that are seen are of a similar ilk, and are also modest in terms of scale and form harmonising with the established grain. The setting is humble and well survived, with valued representation of a gentle rural village scene where these heritage values remain evident: historic, social, aesthetic.

The break between the Listed building of no46-48 and the Listed Independent Chapel affords both respectively, a sense of place, and in terms of setting there is to a degree some overlap. Historic interest is created as a result of this, representing an isolated early community constrained by the natural environment. There is positive value in this. The latter of which is nucleated at the core and intersecting roads, with vast expanse of views further afield contributing to the experiential value of the area.

The scheme is for what feels like an 'installation', of an adventurous building with an outward appearance and character of an office block. Within the setting of GII 46-48, it

is 'shoe horned' into the hillside facing directly into the back of the Listed building. The scheme sees the inclusion of what the '*proposed front visuals*' demonstrate as massive entrance walling, almost that of which is found at a bunker or what feels to be a security entrance. Other inappropriate and or unattractive features seen to jar with the primitive vernacular are as follows:

- Extensive ground excavations and disturbance to attempt to bury the structure.
- Lengthy glazed barriers at the top, or grass level.
- Competing or contrasting material palette.
- Uncomfortable fenestration.
- Heavy and imposing form and scale.
- Biophilic or green walling. Rife with issues, the climate of the High Peak would not be kind to this element and is therefore seen as ill informed and not sustainable.
- Flat roofing.
- 'Turn table'. This is particularly unorthodox and daring for this village.

It appears that unfortunately, with the concept to conceal this large project as much as possible, it has in fact created the opposite. It is now seen to be more uncomfortable and obvious than perhaps initially intended. I do not agree that the project is sympathetic to the area, as it is seen to introduce dramatically alien features where there is no precedent nor opportunity to attempt to harmonise.

The summary of significance is ambiguous and only identifies some diminutive and weathered boundary walling as reason for the immediate vicinity's perhaps tired appearance. The latter of which is in fact part of the honest character of the area, part of its historic evidential and aesthetic values, and should rightfully not be pin pointed as negative. For example, the northern part of the High Peak and its villages are particularly weather beaten due to the openness, topography and rural locations. Subsequently, the building of something that is new in this manner, and novel, is in fact very contrived, forced and out of place, and is not seen as an enhancement to the area. It is not seen that the scheme notes or respects the intrinsic and simple qualities of the vicinity, and looks more to be a statement piece.

To conclude; The scheme does not successfully harmonise among the well established grain and character of the vicinity. It looks to be an incongruous and uncomfortable form by way of its design, scale, materials, form and outward appearance. There is harm imposed upon the Grade II listed building of 46-48, and in terms of a scale this is seen to be on the higher end of less than substantial. There is also harm imposed on the Charlesworth Conservation Area, as the project looks to substantially fragment the sense of place, its grain and therefore the ways in which the area is experienced. This harm in terms of scale would be on the medium end of less than substantial. The rural break and break between the development of the vicinity leading up to and upon the GII Independent Chapel would receive harm. This would be upon its setting and the way in which it is experienced, its isolated nature and extensive views would be at risk. This would receive less than substantial harm though is harm nonetheless.

The proposals would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building contrary to Section (16) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The proposals would also 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 regard to the NPPF 2023, the accumulation of harm would equate to the higher end of less than substantial. It is assessed that there are no public benefits to outweigh this harm.

The scheme is not seen to be faithful to the following Local Policy:

- EQ7. *In particular noting that development should demonstrate how the proposal has taken account of design, form, scale, mass, traditional materials and detailing.*
- EQ6. *In particular noting that development should respect the character, identity and context of townscapes and landscapes.*

I cannot provide full support and recommend refusal.

Thanks

In your communications with me please always quote the planning reference number if you have one.

Advanced notice of planned leave: 14/05/2024-22/05/2024.

Due to work levels at this current time there will be a delay in responding to your query, however, I shall endeavour to do so as soon as I am able.

Emily Holland. Principal Conservation Officer.
Development Services.

High Peak Borough Council / Staffordshire Moorlands District Council.

www.highpeak.gov.uk | Follow HPBC on [X \(Formerly Twitter\)](#) | [Facebook](#)

www.staffsmoorlands.gov.uk | Follow SMDC on [X \(Formerly Twitter\)](#) | [Facebook](#)



High Peak
Borough Council



STAFFORDSHIRE
moorlands
DISTRICT COUNCIL
ACHIEVING • EXCELLENCE

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.highpeak.gov.uk/YourData>

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.highpeak.gov.uk/YourData>

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.highpeak.gov.uk/YourData>
