

Conservation Response.

Date: 14/11/2023.

File/Application ref: SMD/2023/0492.

Case Officer: Reuben Berriman.

Proposal: 'Installation of 10.no solar PV panels to the east and west facing roof slopes.'

Site Address: 9 Chorley Street, Leek, Staffordshire, ST13 5EW.

Dear Reuben,

Objection. Recommended refusal.

Chorley Street terraces are within direct line of sight and therefore prominent intervisibility position of GII Wellington Mill to the immediate south; *List UID: 1268546*. The Mill sits centrally to Chorley Street in particular.

To the north of Chorley Street, Brunswick Mill circa 1900, though not listed, sits prominently almost as a bookend with Wellington Mill. Exhibiting similar architectural scales, though with a somewhat Second Empire design, the relationship of these former industrial buildings and respective workers housing within the vicinity, gives this surviving early portion of the town, historic interest.

The terraces are impressive uniform Victorian dwellings which appear on Historic OS Maps from circa late 1800s. They exhibit simple detailing and have direct historic association to Wellington Mill; build date 1853, as workers housing. Chorley Street terraces sit centrally and are solid in urban plan, mirroring that of earlier Wellington Street to the west, and short time later; Gladstone Street to the east.

The Heritage Statement is poor and does not satisfy NPPF paragraphs 194. Further, it does not explore Setting or heritage harm adequately in order to conclude there will be no impact.

The proposal envisages solar array to rear and front elevation. Some unsympathetic projects have taken place within this vicinity. However, I do not believe the further intensification of modern elements at street facing elevation is an enhancement to the character of the Conservation Area.

I encourage where possible solar arrays are limited to rear elevations on undesignated structures within Conservation Areas.

To conclude:

The proposals 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. I deem the project to cause less than substantial harm. It is not considered that there are public benefits to outweigh the heritage harm identified, as such I cannot support this scheme and recommend refusal.

This scheme contravenes the following Local Policy:
Policy EQ7.

This scheme conflicts with the following NPPF paragraphs:
194.

Regards,

E Holland.
Principal Conservation Officer.