

Conservation Response.

Date: 20/04/2023.

File/Application ref: HPK/2023/0105 & HPK/2023/0107.

Case Officer: Declan Cleary.

Proposal: 'Refurbishment works including some opening up works, replacement staircase, changes to openings at the rear, rooflights and a rear glazed canopy' & 'Listed Building Consent for the refurbishment works including some opening up works, replacement staircase, changes to openings at the rear, rooflights and a rear glazed canopy'.

Address: Rivelin, Brookbottom, New Mills, Derbyshire, SK22 3AY.

Dear Declan,

Rivelin is not within New Mills Conservation Area. The Conservation Area for New Mills begins at the top of Spring Bank Road, covers the core of the town at Market Street to Union Road, down to Hurst Lea Road and a short way west to High Lea Park and Torrvalle Road. Rivelin is approx. 1.2 miles north west of the centre of New Mills. Brookbottom is not mentioned at part of the Conservation Area Appraisal.

Brookbottom is a hamlet, on the border of Derbyshire and Greater Manchester, with The Fox Inn and (primitive) Methodist Chapel built 1874. Sat nestled in the landscape, the hamlet sees mostly low lying milstone cottages and is regarded as a 'Peak Miniature'.

In close proximity to Rivelin are six other listed buildings not forming part of the Heritage Statement and assessment of significance:

- Tara Cottage. GII. List UID: 1241859.
- Borderstone. GII. List UID: 1334753.
- Cottage adjoining rear of Fox Inn. GII. List UID: 1088137.
- Fox Inn. GII. List UID: 1088136.
- Fox Cottage. GII. List UID: 1088138.
- Gilbury Gate Farmhouse. GII. List UID: 1088135.

Historic OS Maps dated 1800s show the footprint of Rivelin, and the hamlet itself has not changed significantly over time. It remains, much alike its counterparts in the hamlet, relatively untouched by inappropriate modern intervention. Thus making for a rare and significant well survived collection of historic buildings.

An original one storey low lying extension or outrigger to the rear of properties of this age were typically used for food stores, laundry, kitchen/parlour type areas or even piggeries before roofs added. If its historic use was a workers cottage, the functions of the inhabitants would be focused

around accommodating this. However, most obvious examples of Weavers Cottages are three storey with more regimented fenestration, for example, those in Holmfirth. Rivelin may indeed have been a rural Cottage, as it is too small to be a double pile plan with two full storeys (small building scales seen in low set windows page 8 of D&A).

The listing summary mentions bays which indicates it could have been an example of a cross passage plan or derivative of. Later development suggest it may have at first been 1.5 storey with cellar, with later alterations seen today, to two storey to accommodate more amenity. Most surviving cottages have rather more accommodation. Mill buildings, workers dwellings and those with more coherent or conscious design are often focused in the larger towns. However, the lay of the land here and pattern of the access track into the hamlet seen unchanged in Historic Maps suggest the buildings could also have been constructed as is in relation to the topography, with only respective internal configurations altered overtime.

The Heritage Statement goes on to surmise thoughts on the buildings alterations, but does not go into great detail about the historic fabric and historic significance or character. Further, it does not really seem to assess its place or relation to other dwellings in the hamlet, therefore acknowledging Historic England's Conservation Principles, (namely heritage values).

In order of the Design and Access statement my initial comments are as follows:

A) Headroom and scales in a building this age, are demonstrative of the built date and therefore part of the significance and character. Historic England guidance notes that historic properties are not generally required to be brought up to modern Building Regulations standards. Volume 1 on dwellings states *requirements for accessibility should be balanced against preserving historic buildings or environments*. To substantially comment on this I require more photographs. Is this stair outlined on the photo on page 10 of the D&A? On drwg ref: 1774.PL04 Existing sections no existing heights are annotated in this area. I am hesitant to begin to allow the elimination of traditional scales of a vernacular building in a hamlet, as their plethora of sizes and intricacies of the floorplans are part of their significance.

C)1 Kitchen middle wall. Would like more photos of this area to provide a more confident response. I note the plan drawings from 1977 are provided, though do we have the ground floor plan? An amount of alteration undertaken in the 70s is nominal in comparison to the buildings age, so I don't believe that the main significance of the property is solely in the front elevation. The organic progression of the building forms part of its heritage value and is not based on the age of certain physical internal features. Historic legibility remains, hence the ability to 'read' the fabric to understand its 'story'.

C)2 New window in place of existing rear doorway. I am not convinced the original windows of this property were sashes. Full sashes are more square and set quite symmetrically in elevations, box sashes require extra room in solid walls due to the mechanisms. The remainder of the existing here are 3 light casements, originally they may have been fixed lights with one central opener. The Fox Inn public house nearby, also three light casements. Remote small cottages or traditional rural dwellings typically are seen with casements, sashes normally denote slightly more wealth or higher historic status of a build. I feel the installation of one or two lone sashes will appear quite random and lack cohesion across the elevations.

D) Glazed rear 'covering' to the rear at the courtyard. A conservatory? Or a glazed metal framed canopy? This is quite an alien element on a rural stone dwelling. I don't believe this would be an enhancement. More clarity required, or example images in the interim.

Other points and or queries at this stage:

- Use of Kingspan is not supported.
- A window specification would be required for any new units. Including material, glazing type, fixtures and fittings. Company or manufacturers details also would also be useful. Again, in considering the amount of casements in the property, two random sashes would be out of character.
- Details of ensuite ventilation. If there is a shower in the master bedroom en suite see drwg ref: 1774.PL08 *Proposed first floor plan* this would need to be self-contained and not affixed with tiles to the stone walling. More details required for the bathroom. Use of gypsum/generic plasterboard is ill-advised.
- Details of conservation rooflight required. To confirm – its placement is to the rear and between roof pitches?
- Lime plaster specification required.
- Is the kitchen floor directly onto earth? Insulation details required and underfloor heating – need more clarity.
- Window removal for new opening into garden – this opening is far too large. In noting traditional scales on this building mentioned previously, this is abnormal and not seen as an enhancement. A reduction is advised. Details of door/window for this required.
- *'Fit hardwood floating floor'* at dining and living room, meaning a new suspended floor? This isn't mentioned in great detail in A) - H) of the D&A. What is existing flooring? D&A just says it was replaced with some cellar supports. What is the reason for its removal/replacement?
- I appreciate the retention of the interesting window and respective cill and shutters? against existing stair. GF see drwg ref: 1774.PL02 *Existing plans*.

To conclude; I am not confident the Heritage Statement thoroughly realises GII Rivelin. I welcome answers to my queries above.

Regards,

Miss E Holland.
Conservation Officer.