

Consultation Response from KC, Conservation and Design
2020/90949 169, Halifax Old Road, Birkby, Huddersfield, HD2 2RL
Erection of first floor rear extension and front and rear dormers (within a Conservation Area)
Date Responded: 11.5.20 Responding Officer: Sue Oakley Responding Ref:

169 Halifax Old Road is an unlisted mid-terraced property in a short terrace of five within the Birkby Conservation Area, directly in front of Norman Park and diagonally opposite the Grade II listed 128 Halifax Old Road. The terrace is characteristic of worker's housing within this conservation area with a strong repetition of design on the facades and roofscape with very few dormers breaking up this repetition.

The houses on this terrace and those surrounding it are constructed in hammer dressed stone with blue slate roofs and chimney stacks, although grey render has been applied to 169 Halifax Old Road. At present, this two-storey house has a large roof light on the front pitch, a small roof light in the rear pitch and an arrangement of single storey extensions at the rear.

The proposed rear extension is in render with a slate catslide roof and uPVC windows. I have no concerns about this proposal as the rear elevation makes a limited contribution to the character of the conservation area, although I would prefer the existing kitchen extension roof to be altered to a lean-to to reduce the different roof pitches on the rear.

To the front and rear of the building two small dormers are proposed on each roof pitch, clad in slate with slate roofs and uPVC windows. Although they are of a traditional design, I consider that inserting dormers will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area (NPPF paragraph 196), by altering the original form of the roof and detracting from the characteristic repetition of the terraces. The harm will be particularly pronounced on the front roof pitch facing Halifax Old Road. Although the harm to the rear will be less, there is no justification for this, and I would prefer other options to be considered. Rooflight windows on the rear would be acceptable.

The Design, Access and Heritage Statement does not assess whether there is harm to the character and significance of the conservation area or provide justification for the proposal. There are two existing bedrooms on the second floor of the house, and I would question the need for a study and additional bathroom on this floor. No public benefits have been given to outweigh the harm, and I do not consider the proposal to be necessary to secure the optimum viable use for the building.

LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan requires development proposals affecting a designated heritage asset to preserve or enhance the significance of the asset, retaining those elements of the historic environment which contribute to the distinct identity of the Kirklees area and ensuring that proposals maintain and reinforce local distinctiveness. Proposals within conservation areas should conserve those elements which contribute to their significance.

In this case, the repetition of the terraces and clean roof lines are an important part of the character of this conservation area and contribute to its significance.

I have no concerns about the proposed rear extension although I do not support dormer windows and would welcome amendments.