

**Consultation Response from KC,
Conservation & Design**
2022/91378 15, Lower Park, Park Lane, Berry Brow, Huddersfield, HD4 6TR
Listed Building Consent for erection of single and two storey rear extensions, rendering of existing stone to front and internal alterations
Date Responded: 17.06.2022
Responding Officer: Sebastian Pickles
Responding Ref:

The application relates to the Grade II No.15 Lower Park. No.15 forms a part of a row of buildings. The List entry sets out that a house is shown on the site dating from 1694. It is unclear whether the former house was entirely demolished, or incorporated into a remodelled house.

As existing the building forms 3 terraces dwellings. Looking at the historic mapping the site clearly shows that the building was historically one building. It is highly likely that the building was the main farmhouse for the historic complex, with the barn and outbuildings to the west of the main house.

The submitted Heritage Statement is somewhat lacking in detail and makes the statement '*It is my understanding that the front of the property SE elevation of the main highway Park Lane is predominately the listing with the most significance and will remain unchanged (except for the removal of Sky dish, burglar alarm cover and flood lights) and the rear NW elevation is not mentioned, however still forms part of the listed building but offers no real heritage interest.*' This assessment is entirely subjective. As set out the List entry for buildings is only the start point for understanding their significance and further assessment should be made to fully understand the significance of the building.

There is no further assessment of the building, saved some detail referring to previous alteration and changes to the building. There is additional no assessment provided for the significance and character of the interior, which is required given that a series of alteration are proposed. It should be made clear that the List for the building covered the exterior and interior of the building, unless it expressly set out that sections are not included. Through assessment and phasing of the building it may be shown that certain elements hold a lesser significance, however this has not been evidenced.

It should be made clear that while previous approvals have been granted including the side extension, there has been policy change since the last decision and most notably the introduction of the Local Plan in 2019.

The proposals are for the addition of a single and two storey rear extension and internal alterations which include knocking through and loss of historic fabric.

The proposed extensions are in a highly contemporary design. It is recognised that sometimes the use of contemporary design can be considered to create a contrast between the historic and new additions. This is however very much dependent on the level of intervention and whether it would enhance the character of the historic form. In this instance we would not consider it to be the case. The proposed would see additions which are entirely alien and conflicting with the historic form and character of the building. We accept that part of the proposed impact the more recent 2006 side extension, however the proposed are not considering the overall impact to the building.

There is also no consideration of the impact to the setting and views onto the building. While being located to the rear, the proposed extension would be experienced in the immediate context of the site. There are also views onto the site when looking from the north off Park Lane and there are long views off Cold Hill Lane. The proposed extension would be entirely incongruous, and they have a feel of something which may be found within a more urban context, apposed to the rural, countryside setting of the site.

Looking at the proposed internal alterations. As previously set out there is no assessment of the impact which the proposed works would have to the significance of the building and therefore there can be no assessment made at this time until a further detail assessment has been made.

As currently presented, Conservation would raise an objection to the proposed extension to the rear of the property. The concerns stem from the lack of understanding and assessment of the building. We do not consider the submitted Heritage Statement to be sufficient to meet the requirements of Policy 194 of the NPPF. The proposed extensions would have a harmful impact on the Listed Building. The proposals would not be supported by Policy LP24 of or LP35 of the Local Plan. The design is entirely alien to the building and would have a harmful impact to the building. There is no sufficiently justified reason for the proposed extensions. We are also not in agreement that the proposals are reversible. The proposed extension would not accord with Policy 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act.

Focusing on the proposed internal works. As set out there is currently no assessment for the impact of the works and how they will impact the significance and character of the Listed Building. To reiterate the Listing covers the whole building. At this stage a full assessment of the internal works can not be completed. If further detail is provided then this can be undertaken. We are however currently not satisfied with the submitted detail and assessment.