

**Consultation Response from KC, Conservation & Design****2023/93584 and 2023/93585 - 145, Trinity Street, Huddersfield, HD1 4DZ****Erection of extensions and alterations to form 4 flats (Listed Building within a Conservation Area)****Listed Building Consent for erection of extensions and alterations to form 4 flats (within a Conservation Area)****Date Responded: 16.02.2024****Responding Officer: S Pickles****Responding Ref:**

The application relates to the Grade II 145 Trinity Street. As well as being listed, the property is within the Greenhead Park/New North Road Conservation Area. The property has been subject to previous applications to convert the building to 4 flats.

With the submitted detail there is a Heritage Statement, however, we do not consider the submitted statement to be sufficient to meet the requirements of Section 16 paragraph 200 of the NPPF. The submitted statement does not provide any form of assessment of the significance of the building, except the inclusion of the list entry. There is equally no assessment of potential impact on the building, the considered level of harm and where there is harm how the proposals are considered acceptable.

Within the statement under 'Summary' it states, *'We believe that other properties on the terrace have been extended to a similar degree over the years and this would enable the applicant to maximise the space provided for the flats.'* This is an entirely subjective statement and is not based on a sound assessment and justification.

The proposals form two main elements. Internal alterations to the building, including demolition and alterations to the fabric of the building and the addition of a two-storey flat-roofed extension to the rear.

Concerning the internal works, within the basement it is proposed to demolish/ remove the extant historic stone stairs. We object to this element of the proposal. The extant stone stairs form a part of the character of the building, which contributes to its significance. The demolition would cause harm to the building, of which there is no justification. We would therefore advise that the stairs be retained and incorporated into any proposed scheme. We would however not support their loss.

It is also proposed to incorporate a bathroom/WC into the basement area. It appears that there are extant stone flags within the basement and there do not appear to be any details as to how the fit-out would impact upon the historic stone flags. Equally, there is no detail regarding the finish to the walls.

We are generally supportive of the reuse of the basement area, this however needs to be undertaken sympathetically.

To the ground, first and second floors, there are a series of alterations proposed. We do have some concerns in this regard as the proposed changes will impact the floor plan of the building, which does contribute to the character of the building.

In addition to this, we do not currently have any details of the proposed finishes for walls, floors or ceilings. We note from a previous assessment of the building there is a good amount of associated historic fabric and finishes, including floors, skirting boards, cornice details, doors, stairs and staircases, historic partition walls, lath and plaster ceilings and windows.

We are concerned as there is no indication of how these elements will be treated and this detail is required. To the second floor (attic space) it is proposed to convert it into a bedrooms. We have no issues with the principle however, it is proposed to add 2 additional roof lights, 1 to the front and 1 to the rear.

We could support the additional roof light to the rear however, we would object to the additional roof light to the front. While there is an existing roof light to the front roof plane it is visible, and an additional roof light would cause further visual impact. In addition, it is not clear that the existing roof light and roof works ever gained consent.

The other element of the proposal is the two-storey extension. We would again highlight that there is no assessment of the impact of sound justification for the extension.

Looking along the row of terraces, there are other examples of extension, however, most of the extensions which are present are historic and are present from the late 19<sup>th</sup>/ early to mid-20th century. It appears that towards the centre of the row of terraces, extensions were not considered, and this is likely to be in part due to access through the covered passage. We are currently unconvinced by the proposed extension. We are not convinced that it would preserve or enhance the special character and interest of the building. Additionally, with the existing space in the building, there is sufficient space to allow for its reuse, so there does not appear to be any issues with the viable use of the building.

We also note from the submitted application form and plans that it is proposed to replace existing timber windows with uPVC. We would object to the use of uPVC and any replacement windows would be required to be constructed in timber. This would be subject to joinery details being submitted for assessment. This would equally apply to any proposed doors for the property.

We have also noted that rainwater goods which as existing do appear to be cast metal, are to be replaced with uPVC. We would again object to the use of uPVC. Any historic cast metal rainwater goods should be retained and repairs, if possible or replacements should be in matching detail in cast metal.

We would make it clear that while we do support the intention of bringing the building back into use, we are currently unable to fully support the proposals. As set out there are several areas of serious concern. The overall main concern is the lack of assessment and understanding of the significance and character of the building. Additionally, there are areas where we consider where amendments are required to ensure that the proposals meet the tests of both local and national policies. Currently, we consider that the proposals do not meet the test of LP35 of the Local Plan. They also do not meet the test of 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act. They would also not meet the test of 200, 205 or 208 of the NPPF.

With further assessment and amendments to the scheme, we may be able to support the proposals, however as set out, we are unable to fully support the proposals in current form.