

Consultation Response from KC, Conservation and Design		
2020/90989 14, Edgerton Road, Edgerton, Huddersfield, HD1 5RB		
Erection of single storey extensions and rear dormer and alterations (within a Conservation Area)		
Date Responded: 08/07/20	Responding Officer: Craig McHugh	Responding Ref: Edgerton
Significance of the heritage assets affected No.14 Edgerton Road dates from c.1851 and was built as an investment for Benjamin Casson, who was high bailiff at Huddersfield County Court. Its design takes its inspiration from the 16th century, when English architecture was influenced by both French and Flemish styles and existing English traditions. The result was a composite and richly decorated style. It makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Edgerton Conservation Area. The particularly fine group of Victorian and later villas set in spacious grounds on Edgerton Road illustrate the affluence and taste of Huddersfield's middle-classes in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Relevant Policies/Guidance Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that the Local Planning Authority shall pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. 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. Policy LP35 of the Local Plan requires that development proposals affecting a designated heritage asset should preserve or enhance the significance of the asset. The NPPF requires that we avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal, give great weight to the conservation of designated heritage assets, require clear and convincing justification for any harm and that any harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal (paras. 190, 193, 194 & 196). Impact of the proposals on significance There is no concern with regards to the installation of rooflights to the front elevation, providing that conservation rooflights are conditioned. The proposed alterations and extensions to the existing building are not in keeping with the original building. The removal of the existing glass extension on the east elevation is welcomed and there is no objection to the principle of an extension in this location, however, the proposed design relates poorly to the existing building. It would cover the quoin stones to the corner of gabled wall and the north east corner of the building. Any extension should be pulled in from these key features. The cill and head height of the windows and doors does not relate to those of the building, both should be raised. The extension should sit on a masonry plinth matching the height of the existing. The bi-folding doors and windows do not relate to the proportions of the existing windows and doors, which are narrow with mullions and transoms. The canopy is not in keeping and should be omitted. The rear of the extension requires some revision in line with the above, to avoid the contrast between a large void at		

basement level and an unbroken wall above. In summary this extension does not relate to the scale, materials or details of the original building.

The existing extension to the west elevation does not respond to the character of the existing building. The proposed extension would compound that impact. The externally expressed chimney stacks should not be built across, the canopy and window proportions do not relate to the existing building. The need for a further entrance has to be questioned, could shower facilities not be located near a basement door at the rear of the building if needed?

To the rear the glass balcony at ground floor would be out of keeping with the existing building, as would the flat roofed dormer. A traditional pitched roof dormer would be acceptable. The existing and proposed drawings appear to show that the long staircase window is to be moved, this may be a drawing error as the floor plans indicate otherwise.

The need for the flat-roofed dormer spanning the double pile roof should be questioned, it is not evident how these spaces are accessed at present. Maintenance could be improved by the additional of rooflights providing for inspection and access to the valley gutter.

In summary, the proposed development would cause moderate harm to the character and appearance of the Edgerton Conservation Area.

With regards to the impact on amenity and privacy of neighbouring properties, I defer to your judgement.

Conclusion and recommendations

Conservation and Design have concerns about the proposed development on heritage and design grounds, it would cause a moderate level of harm to the character and appearance of the Edgerton Conservation Area. That harm would be less than substantial harm, it should be avoided or minimised through revisions to the design. Great weight should be given to the conservation of the character and appearance of Edgerton Conservation Area. Any remaining harm should be justified and weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.