

Planning Conservation & Design Consultation

Consultation on Application Number: 2017/90240

Address: 50 Causeway Side, Linthwaite, Huddersfield, HD7 5NL

Proposal: Erection of extensions and alterations to form first floor accommodation (within a Conservation Area)

DC Officer: Nick Hirst

Conservation & Design Officer: Anna Blaxall

Recommendation:

It is considered that this application does not satisfy the relevant UDP and NPPF policies and therefore cannot be supported by the Conservation & Design Team.

Relevant Policies/Guidance

The property which this application is concerned with is a single storey dwellinghouse sited within the Linthwaite Conservation Area, therefore the proposal needs to be considered in the context of the policies and guidance set out below.

BE1 – Design principles
BE2 – Quality of design
BE5 – Conservation Areas
BE11 – Materials
BE13 – Extensions to dwellings

NPPF: Paragraph 17 (Core Planning Principles)

NPPF: Section 7 (Requiring good design)

NPPF: Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment)

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Planning

Impact assessment

This application is seeking Planning Permission for the erection of extensions and alterations to form first floor accommodation.

In providing comments on an application which affects a Conservation Area Conservation & Design has regard Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which sets out that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Consideration also needs to be given to the relevant UDP policies mentioned above and guidance contained within Chapters 7 & 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

In order to fulfil the applications objectives of providing additional first floor accommodation the following alteration to the host dwelling are proposed:

- Increase and set back the ridge height of the roof, increasing the height to 7.5m
- 2 storey rear extension which measures 3m(l) x 7.7m(w) x 6.8m(h)

The application also proposes:

- A small single storey side extension which measures 7.5m(l) x 1.5(w) x 5.3m (h)

- Alter the roof design of the porch and increase its height to 4m

The existing dwelling is not of any architectural merit but equally does not detract from the overall character of the street scene nor the special character and appearance of the Linthwaite Conservation Area. Having assessed the proposed alterations Conservation & Design consider that there are fundamental issues with the proposals to the roofs of both the main body of the host dwelling and the porch, as well as the application of timber cladding to the gable elevations, which would detrimentally prejudice the architectural character and appearance of the host dwelling.

It is deemed that the ridge height increase of 1.9m to the main roof would significantly increase the scale and bulk of the original roof form, as it would increase the overall surface area by 13.8m^2 (increasing from 22.33m^2 to 36.13m^2), which is approximately a 38% increase. Such a significant alteration and distortion would appear extremely incongruous and fundamentally would be detrimental to the street scene and the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

When it comes to the alterations to the porch, its incongruous nature is formed by the eaves line sitting significantly (0.5m) above the existing eaves line of the host dwelling, thereby resulting in a very dominant feature which is completely out of proportion with the rest of the elevation in which it will be read with.

The concern with the addition of timber cladding is not with the use of the product, but specifically to do with the patchwork way that it will be applied to the original gable ends of the development, essentially only being applied to those areas which are being extended/altered. Elevations B and D on the proposed drawings illustrates clearly how the languid design approach fails in the basics of good design, how it fails to respond to the prevailing architectural character of the host building and how it fails to respond to both the street scene and the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Conclusion

Taking account of the above, Conservation & Design therefore advise that the application fails to comply with Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, UDP policies BE1, BE2, BE5, BE11 & BE13 and guidance provided in the Chapters 7 & 12 of the NPPF, particularly paragraphs 131, 132 & 137. As such this application can be supported by the Conservation & Design Team.