

DCAdmin

From: William Simcock
Sent: 11 January 2019 12:26
To: DCAdmin
Subject: FW: Updated consultation response 92 New North Rd 2018/92348 conservation response

From: Sue Oakley
Sent: 10 January 2019 16:32
To: William Simcock <William.Simcock@kirklees.gov.uk>
Subject: 92 New North Rd 2018/92348 conservation response

Hi William,

I have considered this revised proposal to convert vacant ground and lower ground floor apartments into offices along with a new rear access to the existing flats on the 1st and 2nd floors. This imposing ashlar stone building is a Grade II listed mid-C19 former villa which is located within the Greenhead Park / New North Road Conservation Area. The building has an ashlar stone façade with raised quoins and ranges of large sash windows carved stone detailing. The less prominent elevations are finished in fair faced stone walling, including the rear elevation which has a venetian window located centrally at first floor level. Below this is a projecting annexe on cast iron columns which dates back to the C19, and below this is a basement entrance doorway. To each side of the annexe is an ornate cast iron balcony, one of which has been converted into an escape route with an added metal staircase.

I have no concerns about the proposed internal alterations at basement level, which include the reconfiguring of internal partitions and partial demolition of a masonry wall. I do not consider these alterations to cause harm to the character and significance of the listed building.

I also have no concerns about the reconfiguration of the layout of the ground floor rooms and the alteration of internal walls, the majority of which are later partitions with no heritage significance. Additional partitions are proposed and the heritage statement confirms that existing architraves and decorative cornices will not be damaged during their installation. Re-hanging the internal lobby door within the existing frame will not cause harm as the frame is of low significance and the insertion of a new doorway from the rear room to the reception area is a minimal intervention which does not impact on the architectural detailing within the space.

I consider the staircase from the ground to first floor to have low to medium aesthetic value and I would suggest that this may not be an original feature. Although the plan form of the ground floor will be altered with the reconfiguration of the staircase, the existing ground floor doorways with their ornate surrounds will be retained without any interventions, with the partition wall to the staircase chamfered to avoid damage to the doorways. The existing balustrade components from the dismantled staircase will be re-used on the new staircase. The rear of the hallway does not add greatly to the character and significance of the building and I consider that the public benefits of separating the ground and upper floors to ensure a viable and sustainable use for the building outweigh the less than substantial harm caused by this alteration. The staircase and landings to the upper floors will not be altered. A full record of the existing staircase, as required by Historic England, should be provided prior to the alterations.

The applicant proposes the refurbishment and repair of the existing windows, with the replacement of the existing single glazing with slim double glazing 'Spacia' glass. The applicant should confirm in which windows the double glazing is proposed and should submit details of how this work will be carried out, including interventions to the frames to accommodate the thicker glazing units.

The applicant proposes alterations to the rear of the property to provide a separate rear access to the apartments on the upper floors. The heritage statement states that the existing wrought iron balconies at the rear of the

building will be repaired and restored, with a short addition to extend the right hand balcony to a new entrance door inserted into the side of the rear annexe. The drawing shows a replacement balcony, wider than the existing, with the existing decorative infills incorporated into the handrail design. As the existing balcony is relatively low, a new handrail will be installed above the existing to ensure compliance with building regulations. This rail should be painted black to match the existing. The proposed door is acceptable and should be painted black to match the existing. I consider these interventions to be acceptable as historic fabric will be restored and retained with minimal intervention, while providing a reasonable width access to the apartments.

I have no concerns about the proposed parking arrangements on the site as there will be no alterations to the boundary walls or architectural features.

Details of the proposed freestanding signboard adjacent to the building on the south east boundary, along with its position, should be submitted for approval.

The heritage statement should be amended to omit the demolition of the rear annexe and the provision of a rear ramped access which is shown on the proposed drawing as an external staircase.

Subject to the comments above I have no objections to this proposal and I welcome the conversion of this building to provide a sustainable use with minimal interventions to the historic fabric. I consider the public benefits of bringing the vacant floor space on the lower floors into a viable sustainable use, along with the associated enhancements to the rear of the building, to outweigh the slight harm of the proposed alterations .

Regards
Sue

Sue Oakley
Senior Conservation Officer
Conservation and Design
Economy, Regeneration & Culture
Kirklees Planning, PO BOX B93, Civic Centre III, Huddersfield, HD1 2JR

External: 01484 221000

Internal: 74037

E sue.oakley@kirklees.gov.uk

W www.kirklees.gov.uk/planning