

18th March 2022

To whom it may concern,

I am writing with regard to the planning application number 2022/62/90484/E

I am the owner and occupier of the property directly adjoining the site to the West and North West, as such, I am hereby officially objecting to the proposed development for the reasons set out below.

The proposed development:

- has been submitted with misleading documentation
- poses a permanent Loss of Amenity Value for residents
- poses a permanent Loss of Light to other adjoining property
- is of a size that is unnecessarily large for a domestic garage
- poses a severe loss of significant Architectural Heritage
- poses a permanent loss of Amenity Value for the larger public
- poses a long lasting detrimental impact to the environment and loss of trees
- would adversely affect the character and dominance of the original dwelling
- poses a permanent detrimental impact to the openness of the Green Belt and surrounding countryside
- is of an incongruous style to the surrounding buildings

MISLEADING DOCUMENTS

Along with not fully identifying the extent of my house on the submitted plans, and as you will see from the documents, section A-A on the submitted plans (which again neglects to show my house) shows a view looking Due West, whilst Section B-B has been created to show a view slightly to the North West which gives the false impression of the proposed building appearing to have less impact on the approach of Shepley Carr House and the front facade. In fact, the proposed building would entirely block the original coach house which, being designed as part of the original Victorian complex, does have significant architectural merit in its own right.

LOSS OF LIGHT & AMENITY VALUE

This proposed building would also have a severely negative and permanent impact on my own garden and house which is located to the N.W. of this proposal, but which has not been fully identified on the submitted site plans. My house in fact extends a further 6m to the south than what has been indicated and my garden further still to the south, right up to the gateway which is proposed to be widened, and in the shadow of the proposed building.

As such this massive and incongruous warehouse-like structure would undoubtedly have a detrimental effect on my property and both a loss of light and amenity value.

DESIGN, LOCATION, IMPACT :- This proposal if permitted would have a massive impact on the historic hamlet of Shepley Carr and in particular Shepley Carr House, being well forward of the main front elevation and at the size as indicated. The five mature and historic trees identified on the site plans, and shown as remaining in place, are perilously close to the proposed new building and would be severely affected by the foundation and construction work, they would most certainly not survive- the trees would be undermined to the East and the South meaning that they would fall and cause damage to my property. The proposal to replace the historic gates, which have an original registration date mark of 1862, the date of the present Shepley Carr House, with a modern automatic gate is in my view a proposal detrimental to the history and style of the entrance and area resulting in further loss of public amenity within the green belt.

SIZE :- This proposal is very large and unattractive having a floor area of 68 sqm and a ridge height of 7m which incidentally is not indicated by any dimension on the submitted plans. This gives the false impression of a modest building which it is not, in fact the proposed building has a ground floor area larger than a two bedroom single-storey dwelling— (according to Energy performance Certificates, the average new build flat in 2014 was 65.5 sqm). If the proposed building were to be a domestic garage it seems strange that the vehicle access door is on the N.E. elevation which would then require at least a three point turn by any vehicle to access the building. This size and design suggests to me that this would not be used a domestic garage.

HISTORICAL IMPACT & LOSS OF PUBLIC VISUAL AMENITY

The proposed development is situated on the edge of a historical hamlet which is surrounded entirely by land with a green belt allocation. There is a public footpath running directly down the West side of the proposed development. If the application were approved it would result in loss of public visual amenity.

It is firmly believed by local historians and architectural scholars that Shepley Carr House is one of approximately fifty Huddersfield buildings designed by Edward Hughes and is one of the few not currently listed by Heritage England. A pupil of George Gilbert Scott, Edward Hughes designed, among other significant buildings, the now demolished Market Hall on King Street,

Midland Bank on Cloth Hall Street, also demolished and the extension to Huddersfield Parish Church. Edward Hughes is buried in Shepley. He was believed to have built Shepley Carr house for the original owner, his uncle Benjamin Senior Armitage in 1862.

QUALITY OF DESIGN

Along with being disproportionately large in both footprint and ridge-height when compared to surrounding buildings, the generic design and lack of architectural merit of the proposed development does not take into consideration the setting or vernacular features of its surroundings.

I can understand the applicant specifying a blue slate roof to match the main building in order to reduce the costs but all the surrounding cottages and outbuildings have traditional Yorkshire stone slate roofs. The use of blue slate would be incongruous and inappropriate for an ancillary within this setting.

It should be noted that I have approached the applicant with my concerns in an email, a copy of which I include below. Despite being on good terms with the applicant my comments have gone ignored, prompting me to ask directly if he had received the email, which he confirmed he has.