

About the application

Application number: 2021/90247	
What is the application for?:	Erection of dwelling following demolition of existing dwelling (within a Conser
Address of the site or building:	Hirst Clough, 4, Kaffir Road, Edgerton, Huddersfield, HD2 2AN
Postcode:	

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes
Dear Ms Katie Chew Re: Application No. 2021/62/90247/W 23rd March 2021 We note that the current application is a separate and independent application to that previously approved for the Proposed Extensions at 4 Kaffir Road, Edgerton (Application Ref.: 2020/91143). On that basis, we also include as part of this formal objection, our initial objection letter, within Appendix I of this letter, which needs also to be considered as part of our representation on this matter. We also include within Appendix II, drawings Ref.: 0692/001 & 002, showing as existing and proposed elevations and floor plans. Within Appendix III, we include a series of photographs taken from Lunnclough Hall, showing the partially constructed new build external elevations, up to window head height (under Application 2020/91143). Accordingly, we wish to formally object to the above application on the following grounds: - 1. The effect on the listed Lunnclough Hall and Lunnclough Lodge as per the original curtilage listing no 10 – 1125/200 1978. The original property that is No. 4 Kaffir Road is a rectangular house with an approximate floor plan area of 120 m², situated within the centre of the plot. The existing property is constructed at a scale and design that is both sympathetic and harmonious to the listed buildings that make up Lunnclough Hall and the wider Edgerton conservation area. The proposed demolition and erection of the substitute dwelling is neither sympathetic nor harmonious to the adjacent listed buildings, or the townscape of the wider Edgerton	

harmonious to the adjacent listed buildings; or the townscape of the wider Edgerton conservation area. The proposed building is both higher and substantially larger in terms of its footprint on the site. The footprint on plan is 316 m² (circa 621 m² taking into account ground, first and second floor areas). The proposed property, including the additional bedroom and en-suite bathroom within the attic/roof space, is in excess of three times larger than the existing house and associated buildings it is to replace (Please see attached photographs taken 21/03/2021 contained within Appendix III). The existing house presently has 36 normal height glazed openings within the various external elevations, along with a small, glazed conservatory at the rear. The proposed development has 72 glazed window openings, of which 36 are double height; considerably more than previous applications in both the front, rear and side elevations. We are also concerned that the re-siting of one of the roof peaks on the front elevation from above the front door detracts from the architectural merit of the design and could have been designed to facilitate a future extension over the triple garage, or later subdivision of the house.

The local plan heritage statement exclaims that:

“modern infill development should be of an appropriate scale and should be well integrated within the townscape”.

The proposed development, in our opinion, will not integrate well within this conservation area.

2. Should this application proceed as submitted, it is our firm belief that it will set a precarious precedent for future applications to be successful. There are numerous harmonious dwellings in the conservation area, which may be considered future development opportunities. Accordingly, it is not implausible that such properties be purchased, demolished and subsequently replaced with much higher, imposing modern designed houses, potentially over

3.5 times the size of the property it replaces. In time, this would, without doubt, destroy the charm and character of Edgerton; one of Huddersfield's architectural jewels

.3. Previous applications to overdevelop this site have been withdrawn, deemed too imposing, or have been unsuccessful when two dwellings were proposed in order to protect integrity of the conservation area.

4. From a safety perspective, adding an additional floor to the property will create the opportunity for an additional 54 m² of floor space, and a possible three further bedrooms

within this area. This is in addition to the six proposed bedrooms included at first floor level.

It is not unlikely that the applicant would undertake this increase in bedroom capacity, quite easily without submitting further applications as the additional rooms will be subtle, not

intruding on to the external façade. Our foundation for this opinion is that the initial application drawings included for extending further bedrooms over the garage facility. It is

therefore, certainly not inconceivable that the current bedroom capacity will create issues in terms of parking and vehicle manoeuvring on and off, what is an exceptionally small

parking/turning area. To create further vehicle capacity in terms of both parking and manoeuvring in and out of the property with the proposed attic extension will without doubt

be problematic, merely considering the vehicle movement of the residents; this does

not include mail/parcel deliveries, refuse collection and visitors. In fact, the property in its current scale has, in the past, led to difficulties with vehicles reversing out blind sighted onto the original single-track driveway. This driveway was initially designed to take the vehicle movements to and from the Hall only. Currently, the driveway

serves five separate residences and their cars. Allowing a house of such a scale and bedroom capacity is likely to lead to health and safety problems due to the number of cars that usually are associated with such a scale of house.

We are also majorly concerned regarding the existing Victorian infrastructure, principally foul and surface water drainage. There have been numerous flooding events occurring adjacent the Hall, as this sits significantly lower than the proposed development site. Foul drains also run through the boundaries of the Hall, and below the building. Should the surface foul drainage be unable to cope with a development .continued on hard copy sent to planning dep