

**Conservation Response.**

Date: 05/10/2023.

File/Application ref: HPK/2023/0342.

Case Officer: Pet Twigg.

Proposal: 'Listed building consent reroof, replacement windows and repointing'.

Site Address: Laneside Cottage, Charley, Lane, Chinley, Derbyshire, SK23 6DY.

Dear Pet,

Objection. Recommended refusal.

The Heritage Statement is weak and does not appropriately assess the significance or character of the heritage asset. There are no surveys or assessments done by Conservation Accredited professionals to justify this extent of works. It is therefore seen there is lack of clear and convincing justification for the proposal. The level of harm arising from the scheme is not mitigated.

There is ambiguity within the supporting information which I am concerned with. This includes but is not limited to:

- It appears mortar analysis has not been undertaken to identify what is original and existing to ensure a correct match.
- There is no method or schedule of works.
- There is no clear assessment for the roof to ensure matching tiles are used, accurate quantity identified that have deteriorated, those to be replaced, and what their original material type is. Similarly this is not demonstrated on drawings.
- There are no details on roof construction, photographs of the roof space, details of the battens, pegs, torching and or laths where relevant, and no information on current conditions including level of deterioration.
- Original windows where surviving are not identified.
- There is no window schedule or proposed window details.
- There is no details regarding 'breathable felt' or how and where this will be installed in the roof space. This is to be approached with caution.
- Photographs of roof show negligible areas and do not portray entire roofscape. These photographs show approximately 11 tiles to be missing or damaged with some mortar loss at ridge tile level.
- Photograph showing gable end does not clearly depict mortar issues and blackened stone falling consistent with form of chimney breasts and flues should not be confused with mortar decay.

Other items to note:

The photographs provided show a satellite dish to principal elevation. Due to this property being a Listed Building the installation of this item would not constitute permitted development and its removal and reorientation requires attention.

The photographs show some works within the setting of the Listed Building including works adjacent to footings. Please advise.

To conclude; I cannot see clear and convincing justification for this scheme. I therefore cannot see how the scheme would preserve the special interest of the listed building, nor how will it preserve the character of the asset. I cannot provide full support at this time.

Regards,

Miss E Holland.  
**Principal Conservation Officer.**