Consultation Response from KC, Conservation and Design		
2020/92303, 2020/92092 Oakwood House, 2, Hungerford Rd, Edgerton, Huddersfield, HD3 3AL		
Erection of fence on existing wall (Listed Building within a Conservation Area)		
Date Responded: 25.8.20	Responding Officer: Sue Oakley	Responding Ref:

2 Hungerford Road is a Grade II listed detached two storey villa in extensive grounds, now used as a children's nursery. The entrance gate posts on Hungerford Road are also Grade II listed and attached to one of these is a stone wall which runs along the boundary of both Hungerford Road and Halifax Road. As an attached structure the boundary wall is also listed, and the site is located within the Edgerton Conservation Area. The boundary wall is around 1m in height on the footway elevation.

This part of the conservation area is in a leafy suburban setting and includes Halifax Road, one of the main routes into Huddersfield. It is characterised by large Victorian villas set within extensive gardens planted with mature trees and shrubs and bounded by low stone fair-faced boundary walls. Behind some walls are hedges which increase the boundary height, and others have wall-top railings where they have survived. Wall-top fences are not a characteristic feature in the immediate vicinity.

The applicant proposes (retrospectively) to fix a timber hit and miss fence to the rear of the boundary wall as a security feature, although the reason has not been specified in the application. The length specified in the heritage statement is 20m along Halifax Road and 4m along Hungerford Road, although the site plan indicates a much longer fence which also extends along the boundary of 7 Halifax Road. The height of the fence is stated as 600mm above the existing wall height although it appears to be higher than this.

Although I do not consider the fence to harm the setting of the listed villa itself due to the extent of mature planting between the wall and house, this feature does have an impact on the character of this part of the conservation area and, more importantly, the listed boundary wall itself.

I consider the fence to cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the wall by the introduction of a tall and highly visible, almost solid and impermeable structure on top of the listed wall. It detracts from the good quality stonework of the wall, particularly the tooled copings, and the leafy character of this suburb. Paragraph 194 of the NPPF requires clear and convincing justification for any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, and paragraph 196 requires this harm to be weighted up against the public benefits of the proposal. LP35 requires proposals to maintain local distinctiveness and preserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets.

The applicant has not specified what the security requirement is, although I understand that they may not wish this to be made public, and why a fence set within the site was not an option. Therefore, at the present time I am unable to weigh up the harm against the public benefits. Before I comment further, I must request additional details and clear public benefits, along with any mitigation measures that could be put in place if the benefits do outweigh the harm. In addition, I would like clarification of the length and height of the fence as this is not clear in the application.