

DCAdmin

From: Jason Hammond
Sent: 28 January 2019 09:18
To: DCAdmin
Subject: FW: 2018/93554 Christ Church, Sude Hill conservation response

Hi,

Could this be put on the web as a consultation response please, application 2018/93554.

Cheers,
Jason

From: Sue Oakley
Sent: 25 January 2019 11:53
To: Jason Hammond <Jason.Hammond@kirklees.gov.uk>
Subject: 2018/93554 Christ Church, Sude Hill conservation response

Hi Jason,

I have considered this revised proposal for a two storey side extension on the north west corner of Christ Church in Sude Hill. This church is a highly prominent Grade II listed Gothic Revival 'Commissioners' Church designed in 1830 by Peter Atkinson of York and constructed with large gritstone blocks with fine joints and simple detailing. The church is on a hillside location with retaining walls on the north and west sides of the churchyard and although the building is prominent in the landscape, the north west corner is less visible than the other elevations.

The proposed extension is set slightly lower than the roofline of the main church, while following the same roof pitch and reflecting the edge details of the main roof, and it is set in from both the west corner tower buttress and the corner of the main building so that it is clearly distinguishable as an addition. The proposed new doorway on the west elevation of the extension reflects the design of the existing arched doorway in the west wall of the main building, while the proposed arched window on the north elevation of the extension reflects the style of the windows on the north elevation of the church.

The proposed materials for the extension are dressed gritstone to match the existing as close as possible, Welsh slate on the roof which is typical of the local vernacular while distinguishing the extension from the historic building which is roofed in Burlington slates. Pre-finished aluminium framed windows set into stone rebates are proposed, giving a slight contrast to the existing leaded windows, and the proposed west door within the extension is painted vertical boarded timber.

Material samples should be submitted for approval including stone, slate and rainwater goods along with details of the proposed roof light. Details should be submitted showing where the first floor level of the extension interacts with the proposed window including the finish of the floor edging. Details of the junction of the extension and existing building should be submitted for approval. Where a first floor doorway is proposed between the existing building and extension, the intervention should be kept to a minimum and where the stone is altered all exposed surfaces should be fair faced with tooling, coursing and finish to match the existing stone – details should be submitted for approval. The colour of the new external door should be confirmed.

The applicant has stated that the west end of the gallery has previously been converted into a meeting room which is well used, along with a small kitchen and single WC, but this space is not accessible for people with physical disabilities. The insertion of a hoist within the church to provide access to the gallery has been investigated but this would result in the loss of part of the meeting room and would seriously restrict and compromise the main entrance to the building. The provision of a lift within the proposed extension would allow physically disabled people to access the gallery meeting room and facilities without compromising the space within the church, and the provision

of an accessible WC on the first floor of the extension will provide adequate facilities. On the basis of this justification I consider that the principle of constructing this simple extension is acceptable.

The construction of an extension on this church clearly causes less than substantial harm by the addition of an element which alters the design and symmetry of the building. I consider that the public benefits of providing access to the gallery with minimal intervention to the interior of the building is an acceptable solution and as the gallery meeting room is well used, I support a proposal which helps to retain a viable and sustainable use for the building. The use of sympathetic external materials, the design which complements the existing building whilst being subservient to it, and the minimal intervention to the main building with the retention of the existing doorway and stonework is considered acceptable.

I have no objections to this proposal subject to the conditions outlined above.

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