

Consultation Response from KC, Conservation & Design**2023/90488 Land north of, Halifax Road, Hartshead Moor, Cleckheaton, BD19 6PE****Demolition of existing buildings, erection of 9 dwellings and alterations to convert existing barn to 1 dwelling****Date Responded: 15.05.2023****Responding Officer: Sebastian Pickles****Responding Ref:**

The application relates to a former commercial site which is in part located within the Hartshead Moor Conservation Area and within the immediate setting to the west.

The boundary of the site does include some existing buildings, some of which would be considered of merit and possibly considered non-designated heritage assets. Additionally, the site also includes several areas of key green space which contribute to the setting of the Conservation Area. Having reviewed historic mapping certain areas have since become greens space, however certain areas have historically been open green areas. This includes the large garden/ green space behind no's 1018 – 1010 Halifax Road.

As set out the site is located within the immediate setting of the Conservation Area. Conservation and Design fed into comments at pre-application stage. At pre-application stage we set out that we could in part support the proposals however raised several areas which needed further consideration, or justification.

Having compared the details submitted at pre-app and the current application, there have been some changes. There has been a slight reduction in the number of proposed units from 14 to 10, which includes the converted barn. In the location of units 6 & 7 it was previously proposed to have a row of 3 terraces. The plans now show two large, detached units. The proposals now also show that units 6,7,8 and 9 have detached garages, with units 8 and 9 being paired.

As set out at pre-application stage, we considered that the extant brick workshop is of merit and offers a positive contribution to the setting of the Conservation Area. The building as shown from the map regressions shows the development and change of the area. The submitted Heritage Statement does recognise the building as being of merit however suggests the building is in a poor condition and therefore has a negative impact to the setting of the Conservation Area. While the building may require repair, this does mean that the building could not be repaired and brought back into use. There is no detail of clear justification why the building could not be retained and reused. We did clearly set out that additional units could also be considered as well as retaining the brick workshop. The building could have additional extensions added to allow for the reuse of the building. As set out previously and in these comments, we consider that the building is of merit historically, socially and architecturally and offers a positive contribution to the setting of the Conservation Area and should be repaired and converted.

The proposed line of terraces to the south could still be considered, these would however need to be set toward the road, which would actually better reflect the previous historic row of back to backs which were in place in this location until around 1960. This would therefore allow for a greater number of units and see the retention of the historic brick workshop.

There does appear to be some ambiguity on the plans. Looking at the individual plans they show details such as projecting bays, porches and dormer windows on some of the buildings, however this is not reflected on the proposed site plan. The site plan needs to be amended to fully and accurately reflect the detail of the proposed units.

We are not convinced by the introduction of the detached garages. The addition of the garages adds further built form and interrupts the remaining sense of openness within the site and views looking into the site from along Scholes Lane. We consider that the garages should be omitted from the plans.

Under the pre-application comments we raised concerns regarding development to the north and centre of the site, which is now covered by units 4,5, 6 and 7. We still have concerns in this respect. While there has been changes in the number of units, this does see a high number of units proposed which will erode the historic open/ green space, which has had a long-standing contribution to the area. It might be that a reduction of the number of dwellings in these locations could reduce the impact. It would however be subject to further assessment.

We are unconvinced by the proposed design for House type C. While there are examples of hipped roofs in the area, the proposed House type C has the feel like an attempt to replicate a 1940 style of detached house and feel incongruous to the area. It may be possible to retain the hipped roof, however further consideration would be needed for the treatment of the elevations and the detailing for the projecting bay window and porch details, which appear at odds with the design of the house. It could be that units 8 and 9 need to become semi-detached, which could lend to the design and reflect other examples in the immediate area and allow for better use of the space on the site. It would also allow for existing site lines to be retained.

We are equally not entirely convinced by the detail for House types A and B. While there are some positive features, including chimney stacks there are certain elements which introduce detail which do not reflect the local vernacular, including covered porch details for House type B and lean to porches for House type A. The fenestration detail also appears poorly considered for House type A with small window to the ground floor and large windows to the first floor. We could be stratified with the introduction of the dormer to House type A, but consider that the cheeks should be finished in slates rather than lead.

We are entirely supportive of the retention and conversion of the barn. We are however not convinced by the detail of how this is to be achieved. The main elevation facing Halifax Road is to remain unaltered, save the first-floor door is to be infilled. We understand the rationale behind this however, we do consider this is a missed opportunity. It would be an enhancement for the main arch to be opened up and would additionally provide additional light.

To the rear, the existing large extension is to be removed. The plans show that the ground floor wall is to be entirely removed and a full-length extension added. To the upper floor, the existing openings on the rear elevation are to be infilled and then 3 new openings are to be created.

The barn is highly visible off Halifax Road and off Scholes Lane, especially from the rear/ Car Park of the Stafford Arms.

We do not support the proposals for the barn, which are entirely out of character with the building and do not respect its historic vernacular. We are supportive, as set out of bringing the building into a better use and there is the opportunity to enhance the building, however the proposals as presented fail to do this. The proposals create a highly urbanised and standardised feel to the building. We are not opposed to an extension to the barn. The extension needs to be more subservient to, ensuring it is set in from either side and works in harmony with the building. We encourage that less of the ground floor wall is removed. The extension does have a large amount of glazing, which we are not opposed to, and this could be taken further.

Equally we consider the existing openings at first floor should be retained and any new openings proposed should be irregular and of a nonstandard size to better reflect the character of the building.

We would want to see greater detail of the proposed new stone wall which would line the route of the site, entering past the barn. We do however accept the principle, but further detail is needed to ensure this is acceptable.

The proposed new dwellings are stated as being constructed in artificial stone. We are not supportive of this and consider it is necessary for them to be constructed in natural stone to ensure they reflect the character of the area. We consider it would be necessary for this detail to be conditioned. We would also add that the proposed slates to the roofs should be conditioned to be natural slates.

We are equally unsupportive of the intention to use composite for windows and doors. Not only is this an unsustainable material, but it also provides a poor visual impact. We consider the most appropriate material would be timber, however we could consider the use of aluminium, this would however be subject to further consideration.

As set out we are generally supportive of some development in this location. To a degree allowing for some development could have a positive impact. However, as set out there are elements of concern. As set out at the start of our comments the site is part in the Conservation Area and within the immediate setting. As proposed, we are not convinced that the proposed meets the requirements of Policies LP24 and 35 of the Local Plans. Nor paragraph 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act. We do however consider that these could be overcome with amendments and further consideration to the proposed scheme.