

Consultation Response from KC Conservation and Design
2019/93488 3, Two Gates, Holme Lane, Slaithwaite, Huddersfield, HD7 5UG
Listed Building Consent for erection of two storey side extension and detached garage, demolition of existing garage and side extension
Date Responded: 27/11/19
Responding Officer: Craig McHugh
Responding Ref: CV 5/169
Summary

No 3. Two Gates forms part of a grade II listed building. It is a former farm house with attached barn dating from the late 18th century, it is a good example of vernacular architecture and illustrates origins of Two Gates as a settlement separate from the centre of Slaithwaite. The relationship between the building and surrounding farmland is an important feature of its setting. There are some significant shortcomings in the heritage statement, which does not meet the requirements of paragraph 189 of the NPPF. The internal alterations would cause harm to the listed building. The extension and garage would have a neutral impact. Conservation and Design have concerns about the proposed development on heritage grounds, specifically with regards to Policy LP35 of the Local Plan and paragraphs 189, 194 and 196 of the NPPF. The proposals would cause harm to the listed building, which would be less than substantial harm. That harm should be reduced in accordance with paragraph 190 of the NPPF.

Significance of the heritage assets affected

Nos.3 and 4 Two Gates form one grade II listed building. No.3 is a former farm house and dates from the late 18th century and has an attached barn and mistal to the rear. They are constructed with local stone with a stone slate roof, they have traditional details such as quoins stones and mullioned windows. The mullions to the ground floor are recessed, a detail common to the Colne Valley.

The house has a simple plan with two rooms on the ground floor separated by a load bearing masonry wall (recently removed without consent) and a fireplace to each end of the building. The original entrance was in the eastern gable end beside the fireplace. The western fireplace is likely of a later date as the chimney breast on the first floor blocks a window in the gable end. The western chimney stack was removed prior to 2000(?) without consent. A staircase of unknown date has recently been removed from the rear wall of the listed building without consent. There is a lean-to on the western gable. This has a vaulted ceiling internally and may be of some age. Externally it has rendered walls and a thick concrete roof.

The barn and mistal were converted to form additional accommodation to the house after 1995. The drawings submitted for listed building consent show that the barn and mistal comprised a full height open area to the south end with a sliding door. The northern end was divided into three stalls with the floor level sloping down towards a (mucking out?) passage and doorway at the rear. This suggests it was used for keeping livestock. Above was a loft accessed via a stair with a square window in the gable end, this indicates that it was used as a hayloft. The roof had a single king post truss with struts, the same as the two still existing in the house. The approved alterations retained the same basic layout (omitting the stalls). The truss was replaced with a new one made to the same design.

Nos. 3 and 4 Two Gates is a good example of vernacular domestic and agricultural architecture. Together with nos. 1, 2 and 5 Two Gates they illustrate the origins of Two Gates as a settlement separate from the centre of Slaithwaite. As a former farm house, the relationship between No. 3 Two Gates and the surrounding farmland is an important feature of its setting. The modern garage and concrete hardstanding to the front (recently demolished and removed) detract from the setting of the listed building.

Impact of the proposals on significance

Paragraph 189 of the NPPF requires that we 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.

The application falls short on these tests in that the significance of the listed buildings has not been described and the West Yorkshire Historic Environment Record has not been consulted. Specifically a staircase has been removed and no evidence has been provided about its age, materials, design and significance and a load bearing wall has been removed leaving two historic ceiling beams temporarily propped and no information has been provided on if or how these will be retained. An extensive strip out has been undertaken with no information provided on the significance of what has been removed.

The applicant should be required to undertake these steps, the High Court found in *James Hall v City of Bradford* that failure to comply with the requirements of Paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework was grounds for quashing a grant of planning permission.

The West Yorkshire Historic Environment Record can be contacted by email wyher@wyjs.org.uk or telephone 0113 535 0157.

As the proposals include the demolition of principal internal elements (load bearing wall, staircase, floor structure) Historic England and the National Amenity Societies should be consulted.

Notwithstanding the lack of submitted information, it is apparent that there are several aspects of the proposals that would cause harm to the significance of the listed building. The complete removal of the load bearing wall to the ground floor would substantially alter the plan of the building and would appear to result in the loss of the historic ceiling beams since they would have nowhere to rest. The gable window would be blocked by the new extension.

The demolition of the existing lean-to extension and its replacement with a new extension would have a neutral impact.

The demolition of the existing modern garage would be beneficial to the setting of the listed building. The new garage is of a substantial size and may impact on the visual relationship between the former farm house and the farmland beyond.

The opportunity should be taken to reinstate the chimney previously removed without listed building consent.

From pre-application discussions it is understood that part of the gable wall and part of the rear wall requires rebuilding, but no details have been provided on these works.

Relevant Policies/Guidance

Policy LP24 of the Local Plan requires that extensions are subservient to the original building, are in keeping with the existing buildings in terms of scale, materials and details and minimise impact on residential amenity of future and neighbouring occupiers. The proposed design for the extension is in accordance with policy.

Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act requires that the Local Planning Authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Policy LP35 requires that development proposals affecting a designated heritage asset should preserve or enhance the significance of the asset.

The proposed internal alterations would cause harm to the significance of the listed building by altering its floor plan. The impact of other internal works including the removal of the stairs cannot be assessed on the basis of the information submitted. Demolition of the existing lean-to extension and replacement with that proposed would have a neutral impact.

The impact of the proposed development on the setting would be neutral. The demolition of the modern garage would be beneficial but its replacement with a larger structure set further back may impact on the visual relationship between the former farm house and the farmland beyond.

Paragraph 190 of the NPPF requires that we avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal. Harm to the interior of the listed building should be minimised through amendments to the proposed layout.

Paragraph 194 requires that any harm to heritage assets requires clear and convincing justification. None has been provided.

Paragraph 196 requires that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. No public benefits have been demonstrated.

Conclusion

Conservation and Design have concerns about the proposed development on heritage grounds, specifically with regards to Policy LP35 of the Local Plan and paragraphs 189, 194 and 196 of the NPPF. The proposals would cause harm to the listed building, which would be less than substantial harm. That harm should be reduced in accordance with paragraph 190 of the NPPF.

Recommendations

The West Yorkshire Historic Environment Record should be consulted and any relevant information should be incorporated into a revised Heritage Statement. The statement should also include:

- Information on the staircase removed
- Information on any other features removed during the strip out works
- Justification for the proposals
- Any public benefits of the proposals

The ground floor layout should be revised to retain the existing historic ceiling beam, at least part of the load bearing wall should be reinstated to support them and to indicate the layout of the listed building.

The unauthorised works to the chimney should be reinstated whilst the works to the extension and gable wall are being undertaken. This is described in the list entry as an 'Ashlar chimney to western end' and is illustrated below



S.ELEV

1256 N26