

**Consultation Response from KC,  
Conservation & Design****2023/93539 Land adj, Ledgard Bridge Mill, Back Station Road, Mirfield, WF14 8NZ****Outline application, including the considerations of access appearance, layout, and scale, for the erection of a six-storey building to host 76 residential apartments (C3 use) and ancillary works comprising demolition of vacant building, formation of new access, parking areas, open space and landscaping; erection of cycle and bin refuse storage structures****Date Responded: 11.02.2023****Responding Officer: S Pickles****Responding Ref:**

The application site is within the immediate setting of the former Ledgard Bridge Mill. While the Mill is not listed, it does have merit as a non-designated heritage asset. The Mill has been formerly converted to residential use and included an extension to the southwest.

To the north east is the Grade II Ledgard Bridge and just beyond this is the Grade II Railway Bridge over river Calder. We do not consider there will be any impact on the designated asset.

The proposals will have an impact on the setting of Ledgard Bridge mill, which while not being designated should be afforded consideration as a non-designated asset. The site can be experienced off Calder Road, Back Station Road and from within the site. There are also some views of the historic mill from Hopton New Road. Ledgard Mill, is a local landmark building.

We do have concerns regarding the height and width of the proposed buildings. We consider that the building should be subservient to the historic Mill building and also reduced in width to ensure that some of the site lines and views on the historic mill are retained. We are equally not convinced by elevational treatment, which appears overly fussy and jarring with the host historic mill. We are not considering a pastiche of the historic mill, however, we would expect a design which has a better harmony with the historic mill and helps to enhance the mill rather than trying to create statement buildings. We would not support the large number of balconies on the river elevation. Juliet balconies may be appropriate, however, this would be subject to detail.

We are equally unconvinced by the proposed material palette. Within the Design and Access Statement, it sets out that it is proposed to use brick similar to a London stock brick. The statement discusses the use of natural stone, however, it suggests that the use of stone would create a bland appearance focusing on a nearby development which makes use of stone. We would not agree with this assessment, and we would advise that the main elevational materials should be natural stone, either pitch or rock-faced. Elements of brick could be incorporated, as there is evidence of this within the surrounding area, however, the brick should be more of a traditional red brick. This could be used on end or more discreet elevations. It could also be used as a means of breaking up the elevations.

As set out while we are not against the principle of the proposals, there are several elements which need to be addressed in order to make them acceptable to ensure they meet the requirements of LP24 and LP35.