

Consultation Response from KC, Conservation and Design
2021/92734 Various Locations - A629 Halifax Road, Huddersfield

Improvement and widening of the A629 to include junction improvements, re-positioning of footways and footway improvements, pedestrian crossing provision, the alteration, demolition and erection of walls, construction of retaining walls, erection of fencing, hard and soft landscaping to include the removal of trees and replacement planting, replacement street lighting, change of use of land to highway and change of use to and formation of car parks at Edgerton Cemetery and land adjoining 103 Halifax Road (within a Conservation Area)

Date Responded: 25.10.2023

Responding Officer: S Pickles

Responding Ref:

Having assessed the submitted details, Conservation and Design offer the following.

We recognise that the proposed improvement works are necessary and that there are potential impacts to the historic environment. We welcome the submission of the Historic Environment Assessment which provides a comprehensive assessment of the key areas along the route of the proposed improvements.

Having assessed the development of the scheme we are aware that section A of the proposals has been removed, which we strongly welcome as this section would have had a significant impact on the historic environment. With this section being removed there are 3 further sections for consideration.

Area B

It is noted that the proposals have the potential to impact the setting of 3 listed buildings located in East Street, as well as the Edgerton conservation area. Having reviewed all submitted documents we agree with the concluding comment in the HIA, that it acknowledges that the impact is limited and so should be weighed against the wider public benefits of the scheme. We are mindful that there are changes to boundary treatments and public realm/ footway improvements that have the potential to impact the character and wider setting of the conservation area and as such it is necessary that any such features are carefully conditioned to ensure sensitive and matching materials.

Noting the contribution of trees to the setting of the conservation area we would defer to our Arboricultural and Landscapes colleagues in this regard.

Area C

We agree that the proposed Development has negligible potential to have a direct physical or setting impact on the Grade II Listed Buildings within the immediate area. However, from a design perspective, in order to preserve and enhance local distinctiveness, it is necessary to ensure that all materials and finishes including boundary treatments are appropriate and are reflective of the local character. As such, we would strongly advise the imposition of carefully worded conditions to secure the required materials and finishes in order that the details accord with Local Plan policies LP24 and LP35.

Noting the contribution of trees to the area we would defer to our Arboricultural and Landscapes colleagues in this regard.

Area D

We concur with the submitted HIA that there will be negligible impact on the historic environment. It is acknowledged that there are no standing designated or non-designated heritage assets which would be impacted by the proposals, however, it is noted that they may be archaeological potential and we would defer to WYAS Colleagues in this regard, but we would support any suggested conditions in this regard. As per Area B, we would therefore advise that any identified harm should be weighed against

the wider public benefits of the scheme and any necessary conditions imposed to protect and or preserve the historic environment.

Given the omission of Area A which we consider would have had the greatest level of harm to the historic environment, the remaining 3 areas are of limited impact in relation to heritage assets and where impacts have been identified we are satisfied that this can be mitigated through the imposition of carefully worded conditions to minimise the harm to the heritage assets and the character and appearance of the conservation areas. In line with 194 of the NPPF, we would advise that any harm is less than substantial and should therefore be weighed against the wider public benefits of the proposed scheme.