# Planning Conservation & Design Consultation

**Consultation on Application Number:** 2018/93603
**Address:** 250, Deighton Road, Deighton, Huddersfield, HD2 1JJ
**Proposal:** Listed Building Consent for alterations and extension to dwellings to extend office accommodation
**DC Officer:** Laura Yeadon

**Conservation & Design Officer:** Craig McHugh
**Date of consultation response:** 22/11/2018


**Summary**
**250 Deighton Road is mid-19th century house, which is of national architectural and historical interest and is listed grade II. The proposed alterations would be harmful to its significance, alternatives should be considered and any harm clearly justified. There is no objection in principal to converting 248 and 248a to office use but as currently presented, Conservation and Design have concerns on heritage and design grounds, the proposed development fails to meet the requirements of paragraphs 127, 189 and 194 of the NPPF.**


**Significance of the heritage assets affected**
250 Deighton Road is mid-19th century house, which is of national architectural and historical interest and is listed grade II. It is constructed of local stone, with an ashlar finish to the front elevation and a slate roof. The property is designed in a classical style. It appears that 248 and 248a were built as an extension to the property as the 1893 OS Map illustrates the building as one property with associated outbuildings, a large glasshouse and landscaped gardens. 248 and 248a may have provided servants accommodation or other ancillary facilities. By 1922 the property appears to have been split into two dwellings and by 1955 it had the present configuration of three properties.

**Impact of the proposals on significance**
It is proposed to remove an internal ground floor wall between the hallway and front room, this will alter the plan form of the building, which illustrates the building's historic function as a house. No internal photographs have been included to help assess the impact of the removal of the wall (it may feature decorative joinery or plasterwork) and the drawings are unclear as to whether the wall is load-bearing or not. This change would be harmful.

It is proposed to build a small extension to form a reception area, this forms part of proposals to convert 248 and 248a from residential to office use. The alterations will have a direct impact on the listed building (attachment of the porch to 250) and affect its setting by changing the appearance of 248 and 248a. The creation of the porch will result in the loss of the rear door to no. 250, it will be built of natural stone and oak framing with a concrete tile roof. This change would be harmful.

**Relevant Policies/Guidance**
The supporting information supplied with the application is poor, the heritage statement shows a limited understanding of the significance of the property, 248 and 248a are not entirely devoid of significance as claimed. It is unclear if the West Yorkshire Historic Environment Record has been consulted. The applicant has failed to meet the requirements of NPPF paragraph 189.

We should seek to avoid or minimise any conflict between the conservation of the listed building and the proposal to convert 248 and 248a to office use.

The need for the alterations is poorly explained. If they are required to enable the expansion of the business this should be explained. Consideration should be given to alternative less harmful alterations. The application does not provide clear and convincing justification for the proposals, it is unclear why they are necessary. The application does not meet the requirements of NPPF paragraph 194.

A significant investment is being proposed in the building to expand the office accommodation. A new entrance to the premises is proposed on the west elevation, but this do not provide for level access. If the entrance was created on the east elevation, this would be readily achievable, consideration should be given to improving access in accordance with NPPF paragraph 127(f).

**Conclusion**
There is no objection in principal to converting 248 and 248a to office use, but alternative less harmful solutions should be considered, specifically not building and extension and not removing an internal wall. Consideration should be given to improving access to the building or at least parts of it for all users. If these alterations are necessary then they require clear and convincing justification.

As currently presented, Conservation and Design have concerns on heritage and design grounds, the proposed development fails to meet the requirements of paragraphs 127, 189 and 194 of the NPPF.

**Recommendations**
The proposals require further justification, the applicant should consider alternative less harmful changes and set out the public benefits of the proposals that can be weighed against the harm caused.

Photographs of the internal wall to be removed should be requested and clarification sought on if it is a load bearing wall. Where alterations to a listed building include the demolition of any load bearing wall Historic England and the National Amenity Societies should be notified of the proposals. If a larger office suite is required then consideration should be given to locating it in 248 or 248a, where the interiors have less significance.

To minimise the impact of the extension natural slate roofing and a painted timber or metal frame should be used. Oak framing is not consistent with the aesthetic of the listed building.

Consideration should be given to improving access to the building, by providing a ramp to the new entrance of level access on the east elevation.