

Address: The Carr 3 Carr Lane Huddersfield HD8 8BR

Search application details

Application number: 2022/62/90484/E	
What is the application for?:	Erection of detached garage
Address of the site or building:	Shepley Carr House, Carr Lane, Shepley, Huddersfield, HD8 8BR
Postcode:	HD8 8BR

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	No
Application number 2023/CLD/90153/E Context The property is considered by Kirklees council to be a Non-Designated Heritage asset. It is firmly believed by 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 in the Huddersfield area, 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. Historical and Architectural Significance Due to the historical significance of the property, and it being identified by planning officials as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset, I strongly believe that the application more than warrants serious thought, and possibly an 'article 4 direction', when considering if the proposed development should constitute Permitted Development. Misleading Documentation The Planning Statement submitted with the application is misleading, it states "Other than neighbouring dwellings located directly north of the property, the property is surrounded by open fields and countryside." This is untrue, my property and dwelling is located directly to the West, looking out on to the proposed development site, and there are further dwellings to the North. The Planning Statement is claiming that it is permitted development under Class E Permitted Development, stating. "The proposed development is for a domestic garage which is required for a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse"	

The proposed development would serve a detached garage with parking provision for two vehicles. There is already adequate parking provision to the front of the dwelling and there is a historic detached garage, originally a Coach House, to the side of the property. Therefore, the proposed garage is not necessary in terms of parking provision.

The property previously benefitted from garaging for four vehicles, housed in the original Coach House, in recent times this provision has been eroded by the material change of use of these garages, without planning permission, to form additional habitable space. Two of these former garage spaces are shown on the submitted plans with hinged garage doors, however these are in fact only a facade- there is a staircase and showroom for the converted annexe above. It is believed that the remaining garages were converted to habitable space within the last 12 months, when the applicant previously sought approval for a different detached garage (which was refused).

The property has already very recently been significantly extended both to the North and to the West.

Lack of Architectural Merit

The proposed garage continues to show the same lack of architectural detail with formed part of the reasons for refusing the previous application for a detached garage at the same address.

Not only does the proposed garage display a lack of architectural detail, it would in fact be built directly in front of the facade of the original architect-designed Coach House and would obscure significant architectural details of the original Coach House which forms an important part of the Non-Designated Heritage Asset, specifically by covering up the majority of the lancet windows to the upper storey, the Reformed Gothic window below and the chamfered stone door case.

As the original Coach House forms part of the Non-Designated Heritage Asset and the proposed development is planned to be built directly in front of the facade, surely this negates the possibility of this development being considered permitted development?

Inappropriate materials and specifications

The roof design of the proposed structure is not in keeping with the host dwelling and does not reflect the architectural features of this historically significant building, and surrounding character of historic buildings and is therefore inappropriate for an ancillary building within this setting.

The application specifies that the garage would have a blue slate roof, I can understand the applicant specifying a blue slate roof to match the main building and in order to reduce the costs but all the surrounding cottages and outbuildings, including the original Coach House have traditional Yorkshire stone slate roofs. The use of blue slate would make the new building appear less subservient than it might otherwise appear, if it were to have a York stone roof. The design also lacks the skew stones which are an important architectural feature of Shepley Carr House, being present on both the main house and the Coach House, illustrating that the application does not take into consideration the setting or vernacular features of its surroundings

Furthermore, the specified sectional garage door would be incongruous within the historic setting, particularly on the front facade of a heritage asset.

Further risk to Heritage Asset

The dry stone wall forming the boundary of the site and which forms part of the Heritage Asset is currently on a fragile state and would inevitably fall down due to the undermining caused by both the proposed garage block and the erection of the proposed telegraph pole.

Telegraph pole

The Planning Statement states that the structure is not proposed to be built within 2 metres of the boundary however the accompanying plans show the re-siting of the existing telegraph pole to be directly on the boundary with my property and approximately 3.5 metres closer to my dwelling than its current position and immediately to the front of my house. Currently the telegraph pole is unobtrusively sited against a backdrop of mature trees, this proposal would have a negative impact in terms of Visual amenity not only for the appli