

Consultation Response from KC, Conservation & Design**2023/91970 and 2023/91971 - 114A Fitzwilliam Street, Huddersfield, HD1 5PH****Change of use, alterations, part demolition of boundary wall and erection of two storey side extension to convert from hot food takeaway to residential (Listed Building within a Conservation Area)****Listed Building Consent for Change of use, alterations, part demolition of boundary wall and erection of two storey side extension to convert from hot food takeaway to residential (within a Conservation Area)****Date Responded: 16.08.2023****Responding Officer: SP****Responding Ref:**

The application relates to the Grade II listed 114 Fitzwilliam Street. No.114 is an example of a mid-19th century building, constructed in Ashlar Stone, with a raised parapet to the principal elevation, which hides the hipped roof. No.114 is attached to No.116 which is Grade II listed. To the immediate right of No.114 is the Grade II Commerce House (No.112), which also includes the Grade II Wall in front of No.112.

Along with No.114 being Grade II listed the site is also within the Greenhead Park, New North Road Conservation Area. The site is visible from the west along Fitzwilliam Street however, the site and the side elevation is highly visible from long views along Fitzwilliam Street and also when looking off New North Road.

Conservation and Design provided comments in March 2023 for a similar scheme of works (2023/90172 & 2023/90252) and the applications were refused. We clearly set out that we could support the possible change of use of the building, subject to greater detail being provided. We however raised a strong objection to the proposed two-storey side extension, which was unsupported by policies 16(2) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act, policies LP24 and LP35 of the Local Plan and 199, 202 and 206 of the NPPF.

The new submission is very similar to the previously refused scheme. The submitted Heritage Statement is a nearly identical copy to the previously submitted report, which did not provide sufficient detail or assessment and would not meet the test of 194 of the NPPF.

The proposal still lacks detail regarding the internal changes. As previously stated, this can be overcome with additional images and details provided for the interior of the building.

The new proposal still seeks to erect a large two-storey side extension. There have been some minor changes from the previous submission. The front boundary wall is now shown as being retained and the extension has been slightly reduced in size, but this isn't a significant reduction. The height has also been slightly reduced, but again, this is only a minimal reduction. While there have been some minor changes, they do not overcome our overriding concern, which was the principle of such an addition. As we previously set out the side elevation could be enhanced and tidied up without the need for development. The building could also be reused and repurposed without the need for such substantial alterations and additions.

As we previously established, the proposed side extension would not form an enhancement or better reveal the significance of the building but would create a highly obtrusive element for which there is no justification or substantial benefit that would outweigh the considered harm to the building.

We would again set out that we could support the principle of the change of use of the building. We would however restate our objection to the proposed two-storey side extension. While there have been

some minor amendments, these do not overcome our objection to the overall principle of such an addition. There is no clear convincing public benefit or justification for the proposed extension We consider that in its current form, the proposals are unacceptable and do not accord with policies LP24 or LP35 of the Local Plan. Equally, the proposed are contrary to policies 16(2) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act. The proposals also do not meet the requirements of Sections 16, 199, 202 or 206 of the NPPF.

As expressed, we could support the change of use of the building, subject to further detail and understanding of the internal works. However, we would again set out that the side extension should be omitted from the proposals, or the application should be withdrawn or refused.