

**Consultation Response from KC,
Conservation & Design**
2022/92883 and 2022/92882 - 749, New Hey Road, Outlane, Huddersfield, HD3 3YL
Listed Building consent for partial demolition, internal and external works and extension of an existing Barn to form 1no. dwelling
Conversion and extension of existing Listed barn to form one dwelling, part demolition and conversion of existing barn to form one dwelling and erection of one new-build dwelling with associated car parking and external works [Listed Building]
Date Responded: 15.11.2022
Responding Officer: Sebastian Pickles
Responding Ref:

The applications relate to the site of the Grade II, 747 House and attached barn. The building dates to the late 18th, early 19th century. The building is constructed in hammer dressed stone with the roofs finished in pitched stone slates. The house is formerly of a longhouse style, with the main farmhouse to the north and the barn being attached to the south. The barn has a elongated catslide roof and projects forward of the main farmhouse.

There have been a series of additions to the farmhouse, including a lean-to addition to the southern gable of the barn and a small flat roof extension to the western elevation. To the south of the barn is a detached outbuilding and additional corrugated lean to. This building is of the 20th century and is of no merit and has a negative impact on the setting of the Listed farmhouse.

The proposals are for works to the farmhouse, barn and proposed new development to the east and south of the Listed assets.

We have concerns in respect of the works to the farmhouse and barn. The submitted Heritage Assessment is somewhat dismissive of the significance of the Listed Farmhouse and Barn, setting out that the main focus is on the exterior, only picking up on some details of the interior. As is set out in guidance, the list entry is only the start pointing for understanding the significance of the asset. We are not convinced that the submitted assets clearly sets out the significance of the assets and it setting as required by policy 194 of the NPPF.

The works to the main Farmhouse appear to be lesser, in terms of there being less new insertions being created. One of the external changes to the Farmhouse is with the removal of the existing flat roof extension to the western elevation and the erection of a new lean-to extension. The new lean-to appears to be of a slightly reduced footprint. The window openings are trying to give the appearance of mullions, however on plan form they fail to do this and it is likely that when fitted they would give a poor visual appearance. We consider that the window detail should be amended to include stone mullions.

To the right hand of the western elevation, it is proposed to increase an existing window opening and insert a large sliding door. We would object to this alteration. It removes an existing window opening and looks to create a detail which does not preserve or enhance the character of the building. The existing opening should be retained as existing.

The existing western elevation is rendered, and it is proposed to remove this render and reinstate, as set out on plan, a white render. We would support the removal of the existing render, which is cementitious and locking in moisture. We would however set out that it should be conditioned for the render to the western elevation to be of lime render only and of a colour which is close in colour to stone. We may be able to accept a toned-down shade of white, this would however need to be agreed and can be secured via condition is required. We would however no accept the use of any modern render product, or any cementitious render.

To the northern elevation there is proposed removal of a small lean extension. There is limited assessment provided for this element and having reviewed the historic maps, this appears be shown on the 19th century OS maps. We consider that the lean-to should be retained. There is no justified reason for its loss, and it therefore cannot be supported.

To the southern elevation, the barn, it is proposed to remove the 20th century structures. We would raise no concerns to the removal of these structures, as they are of little merit and neither preserve nor enhance the Listed asset. We would however raise concerns to the proposed extension. The extension would be of two floors, with the roof line set below that of the barn roof. This would however require the removal of the existing barn window and stone cill. The addition also includes the removal of a large section of the barn wall at ground floor level, creating a more open plan feel. We cannot support the details as currently proposed, as this would remove the features of the barn and see the loss of too great an amount of historic fabric, which would not be supported by policy 16 (2) or 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act. We consider that the extension should be reduced in height to a single storey, and the proposed opening at ground floor to the gable wall of the barn be reduced to no more than a door width. This would allow for the legibility of the plan form, while allow for the access into the new addition.

Internally there is limited detail provided for the proposed finishes and detail. We required further detail of the existing floor finishes, within the barn and house, to establish if there are extant historic finishes. We would not support the use of concrete screeds. Any new floor layers required should be of a lime, such as limecrete which can be insulated. We would equally not support the use of stud walling and plasterboard, which will cover over the detailing and create a void area. We consider that insulated lime plaster should be used, which would allow for the improved thermal performance and provide a more appropriate finished and also ensure the movement of moisture as required

The proposals show all windows and doors being replaced. The only detail provided is they are to be of aluminium frames. We would not support this detail. Aluminium frames will be of a greater thickness in depth and will have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the building. We consider that timber frames and doors would be more appropriate as they would allow for the detail of the frames and doors and provide a more appropriate finish. Full details of all windows and doors would be required.

In consideration of the proposed new development to the south and east of the farmhouse and barn. The existing site is of little merit, however it is proposed to retain the main structure and convert it for residential use. We consider the principle to be acceptable, however we are not entirely convinced by the proposed design detail. It may be that with a darker stained timber cladding the visual impact would be reduced. We consider that this needs some further consideration. We also have concerns to the proposed glazing detail, which shows very thick frames and elements of metal cladding above and around the glazing. Reducing the thickness of the frames would assist with the detail and create a more seamless finish, which would provide some further mitigation.

As to the proposed development to the east. This would see an entirely new structure erected, with surrounding stone walling and hard standing. We are not supportive of this element of the proposal, as it does not consider the setting of the Farmhouse and proposes development which fails to respect the setting of the farmhouse. We do not consider that with minor amendments to the design that the harm could be overcome and consider that this element of the proposals should be omitted from the scheme. There is no clear and convincing justification for allowing such development and we are unable to support this element of the proposals.

As set out Conservation are supportive of the adaptations and reuse of the attached barn to the Farmhouse, however there are substantive amendments and additional details required, in order to make this element of the proposals acceptable. Certain details can be secured by conditions, however the more fundamental elements need to be addressed through the application. Details for mortars, renders, insulations to be used, paint types and other details can all be secured via condition, or provide up front through the application to be assessed.

Additionally, we could support the reuse of the structure to the south, subject to some minor details for the proposed cladding and consideration of the glazing detail as set out. We are however unsupportive of the development to the east and consider this would have a harmful impact on the setting of the Farmhouse. As set out we consider this element should be omitted from the proposals. We would however reiterate that we do not support the development to the east and consider it to be contrary to Policy LP35 and 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act.