

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

HPK/2023/0105 &
HPK/2023/0107
(LBC)
Valid 17/03/2023

RIVELIN, BROOKBOTTOM,
NEW MILLS, DERBYSHIRE,
SK22 3AY

REFURBISHMENT WORKS
INCLUDING SOME OPENING
UP WORKS, REPLACEMENT
STAIRCASE, CHANGES TO
OPENINGS AT THE REAR,
ROOFLIGHTS AND A REAR
GLAZED CANOPY (FULL –
HOUSEHOLDER & LISTED
BUILDING CONSENT)

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of Development
- Design Considerations (Impact on heritage assets)
- Impact upon Residential Amenity
- Highway Safety

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site relates to a two storey dwelling which is located within the hamlet of Brook Bottom, which lies within the open countryside and Green Belt as defined by the Local Plan policies map. The building is a Grade II Listed Building, known as Rivelin. The Historic England list entry describes the property as:

House. Late C18. Coursed rubble front, random rubble rear with slate and graduated stone slate roofs and brick stack. 3 bays part single-depth part double with 2 storeys (plus basement) and a recessed bay to the right (now a garage). 2 3-light and one 2-light window on ground floor with door in bay 2. 2 3-light windows on first floor. All windows have flat-faced mullions and surrounds. Gable stacks. 3-light window to left gable and 2 2-light to rear. The rear range is roofed separately

The site lies within the Brookbottom Conservation Area.

A first floor extension was added to the rear projection in the 1970's.

PROPOSAL

These applications propose a number of works to the dwelling, much of the works are internal and, as such, only require Listed Building consent. In terms of external alterations the applications propose:

the construction of a rear glazed canopy;
the replacement of a first floor side window within the side (east elevation);
replacement of a door with horizontal sash window in rear elevation;

construction of new ground floor opening to rear elevation;
new patio doors in side (west) elevation;
replacement of first floor window in side (west) elevation;
new roof lights in rear facing roof slopes;
two extraction points in roof slope of rear elevation;

Internally, various alterations proposed, including:

Replacement of staircase;
Removal of woodchip wallpaper and ceilings;
Removal of carpets and replacement with hardwood floating floor;
Opening up of blocked fireplace;
Removal of plaster and replacement with wood fibre breathable insulation with lime plaster finish in a number of rooms;
Adjustment of stair steepness to bedroom 4;
Partial lowering of floor level to bedroom 4;
Works to ceiling and floor in bedroom 2
Reconfiguration of en-suite;
Reconfiguration of some doors;
Installation of new stair to w/c

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

High Peak Local Plan (Adopted 2016)

S1 Sustainable Development Principles
S1a Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
S6 Central Sub-area Strategy
EQ2 Landscape Character
EQ3 Rural Development
EQ4 Green Belt Development
EQ6 Design and Place Making
EQ7 Built and Historic Environment

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents

Residential Design (2005)
High Peak Design Guide (2018)

National Planning Policy Framework

Section 12: Achieving Well-designed Places
Section 13: Protecting Green Belt land
Section 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

None

CONSULTATIONS

Publicity

Site Notice expiry date: 25/04/23

Neighbour consultation period ends: 26/07/23

Public Comments

None received

Town / Parish Comments

No objection

DCC Highways

It is considered that the application will have no detrimental highway impact and on that basis there are no highway objections to the application.

Conservation Officer (Initial Comments)

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 as 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.

Conservation Officer (Further comments following applicants response to above)

With regard to my initial response dated 20/04/2023 and confirming receipt of agents response dated 04/07/2023 I will provide updated comments as follows. (In order of the document 1774.Db.02. Response to Conservation Comments).

Page 1-2. Discussion regarding stairway alteration. I am satisfied this is a neutral intervention and therefore;

- A condition is to be introduced to require detailed technical drawings demonstrating the method of construction of height alteration from 1555mm to 1760mm. As

although the physical material stair may be deemed to have little historic interest, the ceiling and walls will demonstrate historic fabric. Details of which to be identified and provided where relevant forming part of this condition.

In addition to this;

- A condition is to be introduced to require demonstration of the construction detail of the new stair as noted on Page 2. This should include materials, style, orientation/configuration, sizes, construction method, colour/s and finish.

Page 3-5. Kitchen wall.

- A condition to be introduced to require demonstration of ceiling finish/repair post wall removal. This should include identification of existing fabric once revealed, proposed materials and finishes.

Page 6. Window to rear/existing doorway. And having regard to drwg ref: 1774.PL12 Window and Door detail. The drawing demonstrating the proposed Yorkshire horizontal sliding sash depicts vertical timber boarding at the lower portion. This is not supported as it does not fall in line with the HPBC Design Guide SPD, similarly, timber boarding is not a traditional material for a building of this vernacular. It is therefore not seen as an enhancement to the listed building status. An alternative is advised.

- A condition to be introduced to require demonstration of material (timber) type, colour code, glazing type, putty type, technical drawing demonstrating construction including unit position in reveal, details of fixtures and fittings, mechanism type.

The same drawing also depicting the proposed double kitchen door in enlarged (converted) window to side elevation;

- A condition to be introduced to require demonstration of material (timber) type, colour code, glazing type, putty type, technical drawing demonstrating construction including unit position in reveal, details of fixtures and fittings, mechanism type, lintel stone detail and source if reclaimed.
- A condition to be introduced to secure that the final size of this unit at side elevation will remain at the revised width size of 1530mm.

In relation to these and concerning new opening at rear elevation see drwg ref: 1774.PL09 proposed elevations;

- A condition to be introduced to require demonstration of material (timber) type, colour code, glazing type, putty type, technical drawing demonstrating construction including unit position in reveal, details of fixtures and fittings, mechanism type, lintel and cill stone detail and source if reclaimed.

Page 9. Glazed rear canopy.

- A condition to be introduced to require details of method of construction, attachment type and method to existing masonry and ground, material type, colour code, glazing type, sizes, drainage details, accompanied with a detailed section of the proposed structure within this space depicting listed building in situ for context.

Page 10. Response to other points:

- a) I do not support the use of Kingspan irregardless of its location within a building. Please provide details of an alternative insulation type and an alternative of an

insulated plasterboard to be secured by condition. For example, cork or woodfibre with insulated lime or hemp plaster, sheeps wool etc. Foil backed insulation prone to extensive sweating, not appropriate for a listed building.

b) Conditions to secure joinery details as noted above.

c) Ill-advised materials already appear to be in situ from this information. Modern generic plasterboard is not vapour permeable. Temperatures fluctuate in solid stone walled masonry subject to intensive humidity and moisture from modern functions; the internals will sweat. This is due to the solid stone being much colder than internal temperatures. Plastic based paints atop modern skim plaster and plasterboard encourage damp, mould and deterioration. Lime plaster and compatible boarding at one portion of a room or space with modern materials at another is counterproductive. Limes are sacrificial in behaviour and in reaction to temperature and moisture, naturally fungicidal and a traditional method. Modern gypsum is not vapour permeable and by its nature absorbs moisture, they are too hard and brittle meaning they do not flex and move meaning the surface spalls and breaks, flakes, exacerbates mould and spores when paired with plastic paint coatings and in worse scenarios the layers expand and contract leaving orange marks where condensation has occurred. Similarly, differing colours show the salts that are left from the plaster which are also physically damaging to masonry. I note it is stated there are modern partitions in situ – irregardless – moisture and humidity require a means of escape to protect the health of the listed building. Use of contrasting materials noted above at applicants discretion. Advised condition of details drawing/s to demonstrate ventilation type, method of installation.

d) I am concerned a manufacturer has been selected that has been noted cannot provide the construction details for the relevant building fabric? Noted on page 12. Introduce condition to require details of conservation roof light unit demonstrated compatible with existing building fabric.

e) Condition to secure this. Use of plastic based modern paints on limes counterproductive and ill advised.

f) Details received with thanks.

g) See above under Page 6: A condition to be introduced to secure that the final size of this unit at side elevation will remain at the now revised width size of 1530mm.

h) Condition to require details of construction, including method of affixing to stone walling.

OFFICER COMMENTS

Principle of Development

The applications propose works to a dwelling, which is a Listed Building, that lies within the Green Belt, within the Central Sub Area as defined by the Local Plan Policies Map.

Policy E3 relates to rural development and states that extensions to existing dwellings may be acceptable provided that it is subsidiary to the building and do not have an adverse impact on the character of the landscape. Policy E4, which relates to Green Belt development, states that development in these locations will not be permitted unless it is in accordance with national planning policy.

The NPPF identifies that the construction of new buildings within the Green Belt will be considered to be inappropriate development and will only be allowed where it meets one of the exceptions identified within paragraph 149. Paragraph 149 allows for extensions to an original building, provided they do not result in disproportionate additions to the dwelling as originally constructed.

The original dwelling is that which existed on 1st July 1948 or, if built after that date, as originally constructed. Save for some modest additions, the dwelling as existing has been largely unaltered in terms of scale and massing and, for the purposes of any Green Belt assessment, it is reasonable to be considered as the original building.

There is no definition of what constitutes disproportionate additions to a dwelling, and such an assessment is dependent on factors relating to footprint, floorspace, volume and general proportions. In this instance, the additional built form arising from the development relates to the construction of a canopy to the rear elevation. The overall scale of the canopy is relatively modest in the context of the size of the original building, and would not appear visually or spatially out of proportion with the original building. Other external alterations, which include openings, do not add to the scale or mass of the building and as such do not affect its proportionality.

For the above reasons, it is considered that the proposals represent appropriate development within the Green Belt.

Design Considerations (including impact on Heritage Assets)

This site is a Grade II Listed Building. There are also a number of other Listed Buildings within close proximity to the application site. S.66(1) of The Town and Country Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the LBCA), requires that special regard be had to the desirability of preserving the building, its setting, and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

The application site also lies within the Brookbottom Conservation Area which is a designated heritage asset, and S.72(1) of the LBCA, requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. The site lies within the setting of all of these heritage assets.

Policy S1 states that new development will be expected to make a positive contribution towards the sustainability of communities and where possible enhancing the environment which would be achieved by, inter alia, securing high quality and locally distinctive design. Policy EQ6 states that all development should be well designed and of a high quality and that this will be achieved by requiring development to be well designed to respect the character of the townscape, and requiring development to contribute positively to an areas character, identity and history in terms of scale, height, density, layout, appearance, materials and relationship with adjacent buildings.

Policy EQ 7 states that the council will conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance and that particular protection will be given to designate heritage assets and their setting.

Further guidance for extensions is contained within the High Peak Residential Design Guide SPD (2005), and the Design Guide SPD (2018).

Effect on Listed Building

Externally the proposal includes a glazed canopy which would be sited to the rear. This would be a lightweight structure which would allow for the existing elevations to remain visible. Views of the canopy would be limited from public vantage points. As such, subject to appropriate means of attachment and detailing, this intervention would not have a negative effect on the Listed Building.

New or replacement openings are proposed on the rear and side elevations of the building. The replacement door with a sliding sash window on the rear elevation would be provided within the proportions of the existing opening. While some limited boarding at a lower level would be provided within this opening, it is considered acceptable as this would replicate the extent of the existing opening in proportions and detailing.

Subject to additional details other openings within the side and rear elevations would be appropriate in terms of location and proportion.

The scheme includes three new roof lights. Only the rearmost rooflight would likely be visible from the surrounding public and private realms. These are small scale and minor and, subject to the use of conservation style rooflights would be acceptable.

Internally, various alterations are proposed including alterations to stairs, floors, walls and ceilings along with partial reconfiguration of the internal layout. Overall, the changes seek to remove inappropriate interventions to the building and seek to make good numerous elements. It is not considered that these works would have a negative effect on the architectural features or elements of significance. However, this would be subject to specific conditions to confirm finer details, as required by the Conservation Officer's response.

Effect on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area

The Brookbottom Conservation Area encompasses the hamlet of Brookbottom and its surrounding countryside. There is no conservation area appraisal, however its significance lies within its rural setting and its character as a traditional rural hamlet which has been largely unaltered through modern additions to the buildings which lie within it. The application dwelling contributes positively towards this significance.

The proposed alterations are generally limited in scale and located to the rear of the property. The visibility of the proposed canopy is single storey nature and modest in terms of its overall projection, height and depth. In terms of its overall scale and design, it is considered that the extension would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, in general terms, or the character or appearance of

the Conservation Area. Other alterations are limited and in scale with the alterations being relatively discrete.

Given the modest scale of the alterations it is not considered that the proposals would visually compete with other Listed Buildings in the vicinity of the site and, as such, the effect on their setting would be limited.

Amenity

Given the scale and positioning of the works in the context with neighbouring properties, no adverse harm would arise through loss of daylight, privacy, overbearing or overshadowing. No adverse amenity issues are foreseen from the proposed development.

Taking the above into account, this application is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy QE6 of the Local plan.

Highway Safety

The does not result in the loss of any parking space, nor does it result in an uplift of bedrooms at the site. No parking or highway safety issues would arise.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

It is considered, as conditioned, that the proposals would comply with the policies contained within the Development Plan, guidance within the NPPF and relevant legislation, and as such it is recommended that the applications for planning permission and Listed Building Consent be approved, subject to conditions.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE PLANNING AND LBC

Case Officer: Declan Cleary
Recommendation Date: 14/09/23

X 

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of High Peak Borough Council