

Consultation Response from KC, Conservation and Design		
2021/91601 The Cottage, Snowgate Head Lane, New Mill, Holmfirth, HD9 7DH		
Listed Building Consent for erection of single storey rear extension, replacement front door and associated alterations		
Date Responded: 13.7.21	Responding Officer: Sue Brooks	Responding Ref:
The Cottage is one of a terraced pair of Grade II listed houses dating to the late 18th century and located within a small settlement to the east of New Mill. They are constructed from hammer dressed stone with a pitched roof and ranges of mullioned timber framed windows on the front elevation, with the rear elevation of The Cottage rendered and visible from Acre Lane to the north due to its elevated location. The rendered rear elevation has with a short range of three mullioned timber framed windows and a single window on the first floor, with a later opening with French doors on the ground floor. To the right of this is a substantial two-storey gabled extension approved in 2000 and projecting to the north west into the rear garden. The proposal is for a single storey flat roofed rear extension with a lantern light in the roof and aluminium bi-fold doors. The structure is set below the three first floor mullioned windows and abuts the two-storey rear extension, with an entrance leading into this extension. The existing ground floor doorway on the original house will be hidden from view, although as this is a later insertion it has no significance. However, the addition of a further extension on the building with an expansive opening in modern materials and design will obscure a large area of the original rear elevation and change the character of this simple historic building. Paragraph 193 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. In this case, the proposal for a flat roofed extension with aluminium bi-fold doors on a rural vernacular building where pitched roofs and timber windows are typical is considered to lead to less than substantial harm. Paragraph 194 states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. This justification for a garden room, in addition to the existing living room and snug, has not been provided. Paragraph 196 requires that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. The harm has not been assessed and no public benefits have been provided to support this application. Policy LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan requires development proposals affecting a designated heritage asset to preserve or enhance the significance of the asset. This further piecemeal addition to a visible elevation of a simple vernacular dwelling does not preserve or enhance the significance of the heritage asset. Despite the rear elevation being rendered, the original cottage was simple in design and typical of weaver's cottages of this age. The gabled extension approved in 2000 has resulted in the partial loss of significance by adding a large two-storey element to an otherwise simple building. The proposal to add a further extension leads to less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building by		

further reducing the legibility of the original building form, adding an extension in a different style which is at odds with the vernacular character of the cottage, and obscuring the entire ground floor level of this elevation. The Conservation and Design Team are therefore unable to support this element of the application.

In addition to the extension, the replacement of a uPVC front door with a timber stable door is proposed. This is an enhancement on the existing and is traditional in design and is therefore supported.

The existing windows are black, and the proposal drawing (025-21-PL02 rev C) states that the windows will be painted cream. This is a more traditional colour than the existing is therefore a welcome improvement. The Design, Access and Heritage Statement refers to grey as shown on the previous drawing (revision B), and as C is a later revision it is assumed that cream is the proposed colour. This should be clarified.