

**Consultation Response from KC, Conservation and Design**
**2020/94055 Land opposite, 4, Coalpit Lane, Upper Denby, Huddersfield, HD8 8UF**
**Erection of 7 dwellings and associated access works**
**Date Responded: 25.2.21      Responding Officer: Sue Oakley      Responding Ref:**

I have considered this proposal to develop land opposite 4 Coalpit Lane. This linear site is located near the boundary of Upper Denby Conservation Area, separated by a plot of land and extending north towards the countryside. 4-10 Coalpit Lane, a short group of Grade II listed dwellings and formerly two cottages, is located to the south east of the site.

The dwellings at 4-10 Coalpit Lane are dated 1770 and are typical two storey vernacular cottages of this area, constructed in stone with stone slate roofs. The front of the cottages faces south into the village, with the rear elevation including outshuts and small yards facing north towards the recreation ground.

Land to the west of the site, also outside the conservation area, was developed in the late 20th / early 21<sup>st</sup> century and although the buildings reflect the local vernacular, they have no heritage value. To the east is a play area and recreation ground which provides distance views of the rural landscape from the rear of the listed cottage and conservation area. To the east of the field is a housing development, Fairfields, a cul-de-sac of short terraces constructed in the mid-twentieth century at the same time as the recreation ground.

The east and west boundaries of the proposal site, and those of the recreation ground and Fairfields all follow the lines of historic field boundaries shown on the map of 1854, with Coalpit Lane following its historic route. If the proposal is considered acceptable all site boundaries should be constructed in dry-stone walling to reflect the historic materials and construction. There are discrepancies between the application form which refers to dry stone walling and the supporting statement which does not, and this should be clarified.

I consider the proposal to cause less than substantial harm to the setting of the conservation area and listed buildings by development within their setting, however there is some degree of separation between this site and these designated heritage assets and therefore the harm is relatively minor. Public benefits need to be demonstrated to outweigh this slight harm.

In addition, limited consideration has been given to Kirklees Local Plan policies LP24 and LP35. Although the overall scale and design of the properties broadly reflect the local vernacular, I would suggest that some revisions are made to the detailing, with more detail shown in the proposal drawings. Examples would be pitched roofs for the porches and rear annexes rather than flat roofs, stone gutter corbels, artificial stone slates and chimneys. Clarification should be sought to ensure that the window surrounds are constructed in natural and not artificial stone. I would request that some design changes are made, particularly to the properties at the southern end of the site.

The Conservation and Design Team does not object in principle to a sensitively designed development on this site subject to the comments above. If the application is supported, we would suggest that external material samples and full details of boundary treatments and landscaping are submitted for approval.