



Conservation Team Advice

Date: 2nd April 2025
Application Ref: HPK/2023/0118
Site Address: Land at Hole House Mill, Marple Road, Chisworth
Proposal: Redevelopment of site

Conservation Advice – Amendments

Assessment and Impact

These comments are based upon the following amended plans received:

- *Sketch Site Plan (dwg no. 1225-JDA-XX-XX-PP-A-0001) – received 28th February 2025*
- *Sketch Site Plan showing parking and interfaces (dwg no. 1225-JDA-XX-XX-PP-A-0004 Rev P01) – received 28th February 2025*
- *Proposed Section A-A (dwg no. 1225-JDA-XX-XX-PP-A-0005 Rev P01) – received 28th February 2025*
- *Proposed Elevations Northern Buildings (dwg no. 1225-JDA-XX-XX-PP-A-0002 Rev P01) – received 14th February 2025*
- *Proposed Elevations Southern Buildings (dwg no. 1225-JDA-XX-XX-PP-A-0003 Rev P01) – received 14th February 2025*

This is a rural industrial site, immediately adjacent the Conservation Area. The proposed redevelopment would involve the retention of the stone mill building to the northeast of the site and its conversion to 3 dwellings. The proposal would also involve demolition of the dilapidated ropewalk building and construction of approx. 30 new dwellings, shown in 3 separate blocks (annotated on Fig.1).

The latest proposed plans show Block B & C as long linear units. The proposed elevations indicate these would mimic an industrial scale and design, with Block B having a uniform appearance and continuous ridgeline. Block C would have a sawtooth roof design. Block D would be a smaller unit, but no elevations appear to have been provided for this.

As this is a rural industrial site, the existing buildings are reflective of both commercial design, in their uniform appearance and massing, as well as vernacular design in their palette of materials, height and scale. This, along with the retention of the mill pond and relatively verdant border to the south, has helped maintain a positive setting to the Holehouse Conservation Area.



Fig.1 – annotated proposed site plan

We welcome the retention and reuse of the existing stone mill building (Building A) as, subject to the proposed detailing, this would help maintain the rural industrial character of the adjacent Conservation Area and be an interesting focal point upon entrance to the site.

In principle, a scheme which is more reflective of the industrial character of the site would work much better than the previous design, which was much more suburban / urban townhouse in its design, scale and layout. However, from a conservation perspective, there are still some concerns with the intensive form of development with these latest revisions as the footprint of the new builds would be expansive; filling most of the site. This, coupled with the large areas of parking and hardstanding around the buildings, would diminish this *rural* industrial character.

In contrast to the scheme's intensive form of development, rural industrial sites typically include relatively modest scale buildings, often with a more spacious and fortuitous layout in comparison to their urban counterparts and, in some instances, still retain verdant character in or around the site. As set out in the appraisal (2010), these characteristics are quite common features in the Holehouse Conservation Area.

Whilst it is recognised that the existing ropewalk building has a large footprint and the functional need for an industrial building is often uniform in its appearance, it is considered that Block B would be significant in its scale, massing and bulk. Its continuous ridge line and mass would appear quite monotonous. It would be recommended that the bulk of this is somewhat broken up, either with a slight recess in the ridge line of the building and/or with a slight gap or



break in the building line of Block B. For example, a step down of the ridge of the part of the block nearest Building A could help minimise any dominating or overbearing impact the new build might have and would potentially allow better appreciation of Building A.

Block C is proposed to be a linear block to the south of the site. This would be 2-storeys with a sawtooth roof design. This roof design is not a distinctive feature in this locality (i.e. a rural context) and the proposed pitch of this roof would be quite steep and not reflective of the traditional asymmetrical and lower pitch often seen in historic factory buildings (see example in Fig.2). In this context, the proposed steep pitched roofs would create a repetitive gabled design which would likely create the impression of a taller building i.e. 3-storeys. This may result in a building which starkly contrasts and competes with the more vernacular and traditional buildings within the site and in the adjacent Conservation Area. The use of this gabled/sawtooth design across the whole of Block C would create quite a visually imposing design which may exacerbate the intensive form of development.



Fig.2 – example historic sawtooth roof design

A sectional drawing has been provided (dwg no. 1225-JDA-XX-XX-PP-A-0005 Rev P01) which indicates the ridge heights of Block B & C would be similar. However, the gradient of the site rises steeply towards Marple Road and it is not clear from the section how the proposed development (notably Blocks C & D) would relate to the scale and height of buildings within the Conservation Area, such as Chisworth House which is in close proximity to the development

site. It would be useful if a sectional drawing could be provided to better illustrate the impact on the context of the site, for example heights/scale of Block B, C & D in relation to Building A and also in relation to building(s) immediately adjacent to the site in the Conservation Area.

No details appear to have been provided for Block D, so it is difficult to provide comment on this. In general, it would be encouraged that the scale and design of this does not compete with Building A.

As an overall comment, there are no concerns from a conservation perspective with the principle of utilising a more contemporary fenestration on the new builds as there would likely be limited inter-visibility of their frontages with buildings in the Conservation Area. The main concerns relate to the scale, massing, form and palette of materials as these have greater potential to impact the setting and appreciation of the Conservation Area.

It is noted that the amended site plan indicates there would be some designated areas for parking, rather than all the parking spaces being provided immediately outside the blocks. From a design and conservation perspective, this may help alleviate the cluttered appearance of multiple cars to the fronts of buildings.

Overall, these latest revisions are a marked improvement on the previous iteration of the development. However, it would be recommended that further clarification is provided on the numbers of new dwellings (if it has not already been provided) as the current proposal would be a high intensity form of development which would starkly contrast with the more sporadic and looser grain of buildings in the adjacent Conservation Area. Notwithstanding this, it would be suggested that revisions are made to Block B to break up the massing and bulk of the building. It would also be suggested that revisions are made to the design of Block C as this roofline has the potential to be more visible from the Conservation Area, particularly in winter months with reduced vegetation. Further information is also required on the design of Block D and the sections of the site in relation to Building A and buildings in the Conservation Area, to help fully understand the heritage impact.

Legislation and Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024

In determining applications, local authorities should take account of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation, the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to

sustainable communities including their economic vitality, the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness (par.210).

Any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within the setting), should require clear and convincing justification (par.213).

Where a proposed development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use (par.215).

The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining applications and a balanced judgement will be required in regard to the scale of harm or loss of significance of the non-designated heritage asset (par.216).

Local Development Framework

Consideration should also be given to the following documents and local development framework policies:

- High Peak Local Plan (Adopted 2016) – EQ7 Built and Historic Environment
- Hole House Conservation Area Appraisal (2010)

Conclusions and Recommendations

In summary, the proposal would likely result in moderate scale of harm to the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area, due to the intensive form and unsympathetic design of the new build development. With reference to planning policies, this would be ‘less than substantial harm’ to the designated heritage asset (par.215 of NPPF and policy EQ7 of the local development framework). At this stage, there does not appear to be clear and convincing justification for the level of harm and there is a lack of detailed information to fully assess the impact on the setting and significance of the adjacent Conservation Area.

Whilst we welcome the reuse of the existing mill building from a conservation perspective, we cannot support the proposed design and intensity of the new build element within the immediate setting of the Conservation Area. As set out above, further information and amended designs would be suggested from a conservation perspective.

Conservation Officer: Megan Atkinson

