

Conservation Response.

Date: 29/06/2023.

File/Application ref: HPK/2023/0191.

Case Officer: Nicole Quinn.

Proposal: 'Listed building consent for the removal of two outbuildings'.

Address: 58 Church Street, Glossop, Derbyshire, SK13 7RN.

Dear Nicole,

Objection.

The Heritage Statement is rather disjointed, and I am not confident the heritage assets concerned have been thoroughly assessed. At the introduction it is not clear whether the structures concerned have been determined to be connected to the listed building of 56 Church Street or not; *List UID: 1384223*. Though later, the plans of the existing show that they are.

The Historic England listing summary which does not form part of the assessment, denotes the pair of end cottages (now one dwelling) of number 56. The heritage asset is directly impacted by the neighbour of number 58, due to it forming part of the setting and its close proximity. The structures concerned are directly adjoined to the listed building and the natural shrinking of modern white render or plaster away from the elevations does not solely determine that they are not. The document goes on to discuss that the structures were not built at the same build date as the listed building, due to the materials not being 'meshed together' per say. I disagree, of course there may be a short span of years between, however the traditional stonework craft of simple vernacular structures did not at the time require comprehensive thought or design, and cannot be measured against modern expectations of stonework construction seen today. Many of these coal shack, privvy or shelter type structures were simple and functional. These are many factors of which I am not convinced the Heritage Statement has gone into enough detail realising, despite a method of exploration on page 3.

Further, Historic OS Maps dated 1880, that are also not consulted on the document, identify the two small structures of the same footprint, scale and location shown to those concerned in the application - directly connected to the listed building. It should be noted that curtilage is not based on the literal demarcations of modern boundaries on a modern map. In general the criteria is any pre-1948 structure that formed part of the land or building at the time of listing, and in matching material palette to the principle listed building. This affords curtilage items the same protections due to forming part of the make-up of a listed building and its setting. This material palette is shown in the photographs. In addition to this, the same map shows evidence of the neighbouring properties along Church Street to contain within their historic plots, other small and similarly located structures in relation to the principal buildings. As such it is clear to me this forms part of the traditional identity and evidence of development of the Conservation Area.

Setting is not discussed at any great length, consequently I am not convinced that a conclusion can be made that there will be low harm imposed on the listed building or the Conservation Area. I note the Conservation Area is not described or discussed at all, it is recognised by name only on page 4. I

am not confident there is any real assessment into for example the character of the vicinity, how the listed building forms part of the area, its setting, traditional forms, scales, materials, contributing factors, development, and streetscape among other things.

The schedule of works envisaged on page 16 discusses the removal of the features, and 'making good' of mortar directly at the listed building. I presume of course this heritage asset is owned privately by a neighbour and I am concerned that works of this nature and alteration would in fact directly concern them. These elements concern the physical fabric of the historic building.

To conclude; most pertinently I can't see a reason as to why these are wishing to be removed, nor any convincing justification for their removal. The application form notes briefly a separate application for a gate and hardstanding, of which the latter will pose further issues I will not discuss at this time. Consequently, and due to my assessment above I cannot confidently support this proposal where it is not clear or convincing that the public benefit outweighs the harm imposed on GII no.56.

Regards,

Miss E Holland.
Conservation Officer.