Statement

Planning App No: 2018/93603
Address: 250 Deighton Road, Deighton, Hudds, HD2 1JJ
Proposal: Listed Building Consent for Alterations and Extension to dwellings to extend Office Accommodation

This is a response to the comments from the Conservation & Design Officer Craig McHugh dated 22/11/2018.

As stated in the D & A Statement, the applicants require extra office space to accommodate an increase in personnel, the exact numbers of which are not at this time fully known. Some will be full time, some part time and also some of the space is intended to be used as "drop in" office lets for people wishing to rent space on a short term basis.

Consultations with the applicants over a period of time, with numerous layouts being considered, have resulted in the layout as submitted being the one that resulted in the least disruption to the on going business.
The Officer has suggested that the extension would be better placed on the opposite elevation to that as shown. This would result in major disruption to the to the premises by virtue of there being further openings to form in the walls of the Listed Building and re siting of part of the existing offices causing large scale interruption to the business as is. Neither would it provide the internal access necessary at Ground Floor and the flow of personnel from ground to first floors etc to use facilities. Forming a larger space in 248 & 248A for the existing business, is a complete non-starter also, as again this would mean moving servers, computer equipment etc, totally unviable.

Should it be agreed that the extension be sited as shown, the applicants are happy to amend the materials to those as suggested, i.e. blue slate roof with glazed panels and a painted timber frame/stone construction. He also states that an extension on the Eastern Elevation would provide level access to the premises. No 250 has a door to the Southern Elevation which can be readily amended to provide that access. However, the staff/visitor car park is on the West of the property, so both of these options would mean that non ambulant people would have to find their around the buildings, which is far from ideal. The proposed extension is shown with two sets of ambulant steps, one of which could be amended to form a ramped access which should satisfy DDA requirements.

With regard to the removal of the internal wall at the ground floor of no 250, this is a load bearing element supporting first floor joists over. The applicants would be happy to remove only part of this wall and block up the existing door, forming a larger central opening through, supported by a steel beam over, sited below ceiling level, so as not to damage any cornice etc.

As to the Public benefits of the proposal, I'm not entirely sure just what the Officer is implying, as these are private premises with no public access. I would be pleased to receive clarification.

The applicant are a company who are trying to get on in difficult times and expand their operation by the use of buildings that are vacant at present and are falling into disrepair, whilst at the same time providing employment, albeit on a small scale to an area that is in need of an

uplift. The alternative to which is to let the properties fall into an even more dilapidated state, or even to look for premises elsewhere, neither of which they really want to do.

Should it be felt necessary, I am happy to meet to discuss these matters if required.

With regard to the relevant sections of the NPPF:-

Paragraph 127. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;

as stated in the text above, by the addition of the extension in the position shown the property will function cohesively and will definitely add to the quality of the area.

b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;

the main external feature of the existing property is the Front or Southern Elevation, the proposed alterations will have little or no impact on the appearance of the property. The extension is small in scale in relation to the host building and is to be constructed using local natural materials.

c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);

it could be argued that the local area is devoid of character being as it is a mish mash of differing styles and materials. The development of the two adjoining dwellings to form office space will be a continuation of the historical development of the property and will bring back into use redundant dilapidated buildings.

Paragraph 189. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

Until somewhere between 2002 & 2009 the site formed part of an Industrial site, being as it was the offices for the company operating at the time, which was later demolished to make way for a new residential estate and terraced housing. Also, as stated previously, the main architectural feature of the property is its frontage, which will remain as is.

Paragraph 194. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of

a) grade ll listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;

given that No 250 has been operating as Offices for a number of years, and that 248 & 248A have been empty for some time, it is our opinion that no harm has been created in the creation of this development, indeed the inclusion of a small scale extension set into the recess of the adjacent buildings has minimal impact and has in fact improved this asset by maintaining its usage for the foreseeable future.