

Topic Header	Issue number	Page number (officer's report – 2022/92169) or original pre-application response	Issue	Action to Resolve
Pre-app advice not taken on board	1	4	Officers would also note that pre-application advice has been provided in relation to residential development at the site, but it appears that the advice provided by Officers has not been adequately taken on board.	All issues raised in the officer's report and <i>previous</i> ++ pre-app response have been addressed within this document. ++ i.e. in connection with previous unsuccessful proposals.
Green Belt	2	9	Two storey side extension to the gable end of the attached barn does not appear as a proportionate addition to the barn. (Contrary to national / local policy).	The proposed two storey extension has been retained for the architectural reasons set out at Point 11 below. It has been reduced in depth and width to take on board previous comments. When considered as an extension to the attached and detached barns (because they will be linked), the extensions are not disproportionate to the original structures: Volume existing attached and detached barns: 497 + 218 = 715 cu.m. Volume of extensions: 270 cu.m $270/715 = 37\%$
Green Belt	3	9 & 10	Extensive hard surfacing required in front of cottages and 'urbanising' excavations – over-intensive use of site (e.g. 7 visitor parking spaces) and urbanising effect on countryside.	Hardstanding and parking areas minimised as much as possible. Minimum parking requirements in accordance with Kirklees SPD policy (3 spaces for plot 1, 2 spaces for plot 2, 2 spaces for plot 3 and 3 spaces for plot 4, with 1 visitor space). Turning head provided to comply with 45m Building Regulations fire engine access requirements. Grasscrete geogrid has been proposed to soften the necessary parking areas.

Topic Header	Issue number	Page number (officer's report – 2022/92169) or original pre-application response	Issue	Action to Resolve
Green Belt	4	9 / 10	Rebuilding and extension of detached barn considered to be inappropriate in relation to size of replacement building (previously double in size).	Detached barn to be restored as original, and forming an annex to plot four as previously recommended by officers, with a sympathetic (simple) single storey glazed link to the proposed extended part of the attached barn (Plot4)
Heritage	5	14	Concerns about excavations into adjacent land with the loss of the small gardens.	Previously excavated areas and drystone walls to be restored.
Heritage	6	14	Concerns about excessive rooflights overly domesticating this traditional rural building. (Pre-app comments said: These should be reduced in number and limited to conservation roof lights on the less prominent aspects.”).	Significantly reduced numbers of rooflights. Proposed rooflights are now conservation style only.
Heritage	7	14	Late 20th century top hung timber casement windows at 21-23 Round Ings Road have been replaced with double side hung casements without consent. “Heritage Officers would recommend that two-over-two sash windows with glazing bars are proposed as described in the list description, unless alternative designs can be clearly justified.”	Windows to existing openings in nr.s 21/23 (ground and first floor), 25 and 27 (ground floor) to be replaced with timber framed, slim double glazed, sash windows with vertical glazing bars.
Heritage	8	14	“The single pane timber side hung casement and fixed lights at first floor at 25 and 27, prior to unauthorised works commencing, are a common window type typical of weaver's cottages and these can therefore be replicated with slim double-glazed units and no glazing bars.”	Windows recently installed at first floor level of nos' 25 and 27 (timber framed, slim double glazed, side hung casements) proposed to be retained.

Topic Header	Issue number	Page number (officer's report – 2022/92169) or original pre-application response	Issue	Action to Resolve
Heritage	9	15	No. 21 – “concern with the size and scale of the extension as it does not compliment the scale and form of the existing dwelling.”	Extension removed.
Heritage	10	15	Nos 25 and 27 – “A large single-storey mono-pitch extension is proposed, extending the entire width of these two properties. This will result in the loss of two pairs of historic ground floor windows as well as a considerable area of this elevation, with the introduction of large French doors (details and materials not specified). These extensions will also be unsympathetic to the linear form and the scale of the building. This extension would thereby cause harm to the significance of the listed building.”	Reduced the size of rear extensions – previously projected out approx. 4.5m, now reduced to 3.2m. Modest in size, with simple glazed frontages. (Previously approx. 6m wide each, reduced to 5.25m wide each) (NOTE in Green Belt terms, these extensions were considered to be acceptable by officers as ‘proportionate’ additions to the original dwellings).
Heritage	11	15/16	Barn Conversion “A two-storey extension is proposed to the east gable of the attached barn (dwelling no. 4 as proposed). This structure is set back slightly from the front and rear walls and is set below the ridgeline of the existing building. Although set back and lower down, this structure is a substantial addition to the terrace, as it would be the same width as the existing barn, leading to confusion and resulting in the loss of definition of the historic terrace and barn..... The window configuration of the proposed extension is overly domestic too, with incorrect detailing for the context, thereby causing further harm to the significance of the listed building..... The window configuration of the proposed extension is overly domestic too, with incorrect detailing for the context, thereby	Redesigned barn conversion now proposed – smaller extension (shorter and lower), simple, smaller glass link to detached barn, and proposed more “barn-like” style openings to retain agricultural character. Keeping glazing to barn arches as simple clear glass screens, with no divisions The option of a single storey extension has been carefully considered however the architect Natalie Garside has offered her professional opinion: “My view is that a singled storey monopitch extension would be architecturally the wrong thing to do on this end of the barn. The previous scheme had an extension which was slightly longer than the existing barn and the LPA said it

Topic Header	Issue number	Page number (officer's report – 2022/92169) or original pre-application response	Issue	Action to Resolve
			causing further harm to the significance of the listed building.”	<p>caused confusion as to which was the extension. As such, we have shortened this so that it is subservient to the host. The proposed extension is now definitely subservient by being lower, narrower and shorter than the existing barn. The fenestration is also more in keeping. If this was single storey it would make the link to the detached barn much more complex to achieve (roof connections) and I am keen to keep this very simple, small, and fully glazed and therefore transparent and unintrusive.”</p> <p>Overall, we consider that the reduced scale and improved design of the extension means it is now in keeping with the original character and appearance of the barn.</p>
Heritage	12	16	The link building partially obscures the front elevation of the barn and is too large for its context.	Link significantly reduced to a simple glazed link as per drawings.
Heritage	13	16	Barn conversion – “In terms of external alterations, a large fixed window is proposed in place of the existing inward opening timber doors in the arched entrance of the attached barn. This alteration is not considered to reflect the historic character of the site and whilst some level of glazing may be acceptable, this should be set back towards the inner edge of the opening to distinguish it from the windows and reveal the stonework. The arched head window above, also shows a timber framed arched window without infill panel....	As above - glazing to barn arches as simple clear glass screens, with only single divisions at most. Minimal, single pane new openings and more agricultural and in keeping in character.

Topic Header	Issue number	Page number (officer's report – 2022/92169) or original pre-application response	Issue	Action to Resolve
			<p>New windows have been proposed on the elevational drawings of the barn. However, they have not been designed sensitively to allow the entire structure to be read as a terrace of cottages and attached barn. Instead, the windows appear too domestic, and give the impression of a further cottage, rather than retaining the buildings identity as an agricultural building..”</p>	
Heritage	14	17	<p>Detached Barn – “No evidence has been submitted as part of this application to demonstrate that the demolition and rebuild is the only option and therefore Officers would welcome its retention and restoration. Without such information it is considered that there is harm to the significance of the listed building by reason of the removal of this vernacular barn which makes a very positive contribution to the significance of the listed building.</p> <p>In the pre-app, it was advised: “If an application is submitted, clear evidence needs to be submitted to demonstrate that demolition and rebuilding is the only option. If this is the case, full recording of the structure may need to be carried out, along with a method statement for rebuilding to ensure that it is reconstructed accurately and in the existing materials. If this cannot be demonstrated, its restoration and structural repairs needs to be detailed.”</p>	<p>An updated structural report provides full details of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - precisely what the current condition of the barn is; - the jeopardy of its future condition if left - detailed proposals to retain as much fabric as possible - a methodology in terms of how the barn can be salvaged and hence brought back into beneficial use. <p>In addition, the proposals are now to retain the detached barn in its original condition and appearance, other than in connection with the installation of two conservation rooflights and a small window to the rear.</p> <p>This barn would be used as ancillary accommodation in accordance with officers’ recommendations, and linked to the adjacent barn with a sympathetic, small and very simply glazed extension, thereby not attracting from the character and appearance of either sets of listed buildings.</p>

Topic Header	Issue number	Page number (officer's report – 2022/92169) or original pre-application response	Issue	Action to Resolve
			<p>“We would recommend ... the building used as an ancillary building for one of the houses, such as a garage and home office, or attached to the existing barn by a single storey link.”</p> <p>In addition, concern is raised by the proposed use of this building and the design complications in which this brings. As the plans show the historic cart entrance to be missing from the proposed plans, existing openings to be altered and new openings to be created, as well as an extension running all the way to the existing detached barn, this would further detract from the buildings’ agricultural heritage and would further domesticate the site and would therefore cause further harm to the significance of the listed building.”</p>	
Heritage	15	17	<p>External – “The proposal is to extend beyond the curtilage of the listed buildings into the surrounding landscape to the south-east to provide grassed and gravel parking bays (total 17no). The dry-stone boundary wall and stone gate posts facing the south-east elevation of the properties has already been demolished without listed building consent, with the excavation of the adjacent field and gardens carried out without planning permission.</p> <p>The removal of this curtilage wall has considerably opened-up this space and changed the setting of the buildings, with the former access track previously running</p>	<p>As detailed at Point 3 above, the excavated areas and drystone walls previously taken down will be restored.</p> <p>Hardstanding and parking areas are minimised as much as possible. Minimum parking requirements in accordance with Kirklees SPD policy. A turning head is provided to comply with 45m Building Regulations fire engine access requirements.</p> <p>Grasscrete geogrid has been proposed to soften the necessary parking areas.</p>

Topic Header	Issue number	Page number (officer's report – 2022/92169) or original pre-application response	Issue	Action to Resolve
			<p>between the facade of the cottages and the boundary wall to the south which leads to the cart building. Beyond this wall were small garden areas which have been excavated. Therefore, the number of additional parking spaces is considered to be too large in scale and urbanises what was a pleasant setting for the listed building and harms the significance of the Grade II listed building.”</p>	
Heritage	16	18	<p>“Officers do not consider the assessment and justification submitted to fully assess the significance of the heritage asset and weigh it up. It does not consider alternative less harmful options that would achieve modern living requirements without the need for significant alterations and additions to the buildings, loss of boundary features or excavation of the surrounding land.”</p> <p>“Furthermore, the Heritage Statement produced by Urban Glow (dated 2021) has not been updated since the pre-application request. It has therefore not taken into consideration the advice provided or included subsequent amendments to the proposal...”</p>	<p>A site meeting between the applicants, myself as agents, Natalie Garside of A & DP and Urban Glow recently took place. The Heritage Statement is informed by the changes to the proposals and is fully updated accordingly. It also properly addresses the significance of the heritage assets, and the public benefits.</p>
Heritage	17	19	<p>“It is considered that the proposal would cause less than substantial, but very serious, harm to the significance of the Grade II listed building, as well as detrimental harm to the visual amenities of the locality. Public benefits to outweigh such harm have not been demonstrated.”</p>	<p>We now consider that the harm is at the lower end of ‘less than substantial’ and the public benefits outweigh any limited harm through: (a) bringing the disused listed cottages back in beneficial use; (b) proposing a viable long-term use for the attached barn; and (c) rescuing the curtilage listed detached barn from almost certain collapse in the near</p>

Topic Header	Issue number	Page number (officer's report – 2022/92169) or original pre-application response	Issue	Action to Resolve
				<p>future, and again bringing this back into beneficial long-term use.</p> <p>The planning and Heritage impact statements provide full justification in connection with the above matters.</p>
Heritage	18	Pre-app letter page 13	<p>Regarding internal alterations, the Council stated: “A Council grant application was approved in 1982 for extensive works including new windows, re-roofing, new fireplace, floors, skirtings, re-plastering. This demonstrates that there have been substantial alterations to the interior of the cottages in the past and goes some way to justifying internal alterations to the properties. Archive planning application files indicate that permission was granted for works to 25 and 27 Round Ings Road and further details can be obtained from the planning archives on request.”</p> <p>“Internal alterations to the cottages - We accept that internal alterations have been made in the past, although this is difficult to understand as significant unauthorised alterations have been made prior to this pre-app being submitted. We are therefore only able to comment on the evidence available. All historic masonry walls, staircases, stone fireplace surrounds, chimney breasts and historic trusses should be retained unless their removal can be justified.</p>	<p>Work has stopped anyway since the previous application was refused. However, it is important to add that no changes internally have been carried out, or are proposed, which would affect any features or areas of historic interest detrimentally (i.e. anything that contributes to the special character of the buildings as listed buildings).</p> <p>The revised Heritage Impact Assessment addresses these matters in more detail. For example, original fire places have been retained alongside mullions and original window surrounds.</p>

Topic Header	Issue number	Page number (officer's report – 2022/92169) or original pre-application response	Issue	Action to Resolve
			<p>That said, it should be noted that we are aware of Listed Building Consent 80/07640 from 1980 which shows the refurbishment of 25 and 27. The comments state that the building was derelict and it's clear that the interior was completely stripped out and reconfigured so internal works on the current application are likely to be acceptable in the knowledge of this evidence, and this provides you with some justification for the internal works proposed."</p>	
Lighting	19	17	<p>"No details of proposed lighting have been submitted, and therefore, Officers have not been able to assess the impact this would have on the visual amenities of the area, and the wider green belt in terms of openness. This could be conditioned should permission be granted."</p>	<p>No specific lighting is proposed at this stage, however the applicant would be content to have this conditioned if necessary.</p>
Amenity space	20	20	<p>"However, in terms of outdoor amenity, the gardens for dwellings 2 and 3 are insufficient and would not provide a good level of amenity for the future occupants. These gardens are very small and therefore contrary to Principle 17 of the SPD and Policy LP24 of the KLP...."</p>	<p>The size of the extensions have been reduced which allows for more outdoor amenity space to the rear of the cottages. It is noted that these existing cottages already had fairly minimal amounts of curtilage previously and their re-occupation would not need planning permission.</p>
Highways	21	21	<p>"Officers are not satisfied that the development would prevent conflict with other highways users, due to the lack of improvements proposed to the access, no sight lines and gradients being shown on the submitted plans and that safe internal refuse vehicle turning can be provided."</p>	<p>The previous pre-app response said: "The waste strategy section may not wish a refuse vehicle to enter what will be a private driveway to collection waste and a communal refuse vehicle collection point may be preferred at the site access"</p>

Topic Header	Issue number	Page number (officer's report – 2022/92169) or original pre-application response	Issue	Action to Resolve
				<p>It has been decided that the provision of a refuse turning head would be too large and hence potentially damaging to the listed building setting, trees, and Green Belt openness.</p> <p>However due to building regulations normal requirements, a turning head and access is needed for a fire tender.</p> <p>Betterment is also provided (see Paragon Highways Access Plan and Visibility Drawing) in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Existing access widened to 4.5m to allow two cars to pass. Gradients are shown on the plan. b) Bin storage and collection points. c) Provision of turning head for fire tender and other cars / delivery vehicles (where previously they would have not been able to enter and leave the site in a forward gear) d) Entrance area widened to allow better pull-in for bin waggon (noting that this has been the previous arrangement for the three cottages when they were previously occupied, and the fact that Waste Services would prefer this arrangement). e) The available visibility is shown on the visibility, and whilst admittedly not being to normal standards, the betterment provided for the three existing dwellings is considered to outweigh any harm / risk created by the single additional dwelling.

Topic Header	Issue number	Page number (officer's report – 2022/92169) or original pre-application response	Issue	Action to Resolve
Trees	22	23	<p>“In this case, there appear to be a number of trees on or within close proximity to the site, including those near to the access. As these trees appear to be mature and works to the access is proposed, it was highlighted within the pre-application advice that a tree survey and impact assessment in accordance with BS5837:2012, would be required.”</p>	Tree Survey and AIA submitted with the planning application.