



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2022

by Michael Boniface MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4718/Y/21/3280656

Jerk Hut, 160 Manchester Road, Longroyd Bridge, Huddersfield, HD1 3JA

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Cardtronics UK Ltd, trading as CASHZONE against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/65/91672/W, dated 22 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2021.
 - The works proposed are the retention of an automated teller machine and associated signage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appeal documents suggest that the automated teller machine (ATM) has already been installed but it was not in situ at the time of my site visit. As such, I have considered the appeal on the basis of the submitted information and drawings provided.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the works would preserve the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses in accordance with S.16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Reasons

4. The appeal property is Grade II listed. At ground floor level it is currently in commercial use and stands amongst other commercial uses. The building does not fully accord with the listing description, many modern interventions apparently having taken place, from the insertion of plastic windows on upper floors, to the installation of a modern aluminium shop front and roller shutters at ground floor level in lieu of the C19 shopfront recorded.
5. These modern interventions have undoubtedly harmed the character and appearance of the appeal property and the wider terrace, but the building is nonetheless a fine stone-built property with slate roof and interesting architectural detail, such as the stone gutter brackets and window surrounds. This is evident despite the insensitive alterations undertaken to date.

6. It is unclear to what extent the various changes have been authorised, but the Council confirms that the modern shop front has not been granted planning permission or listed building consent. As such, there is no certainty that it will remain in situ. The shop front does not form part of this appeal and is not for my consideration but nor should it be used to justify inherently inappropriate and unsympathetic modern installations, as is proposed here.
7. The proposed automated teller machine is overtly modern in its appearance and materials, as are the incorporated plastic illuminated advertising panels. Whilst their proposed insertion within the modern glazed shop front means that no historic fabric would be affected, the visual effect on the historic character of the building is nonetheless significant. It would contrast with the traditional design and materials of the existing building, appearing visually intrusive and resulting in less than substantial harm to the listed building. The fact that the works would, theoretically, be reversible does little to mitigate the harm that would arise.
8. Great weight should be given to the heritage asset's conservation. The works would facilitate access to cash for members of the public and may have a positive effect on expenditure at local businesses. However, these public benefits would not outweigh the harm that I have identified to the listed building and its special architectural features.
9. The works fail to preserve the listed building and would harm its significance contrary to the Act.
10. In light of the above, the appeal is dismissed.

Michael Boniface

INSPECTOR