

**Consultation Response from KC,
Conservation & Design****2024/91199 140A, Manchester Road, Longroyd Bridge, Huddersfield, HD1 3JA****Demolition of existing building and erection of student accommodation with ancillary spaces,
associated garden area, store and landscaping, access and car parking****Date Responded: 10.06.2024****Responding Officer: S Pickles****Responding Ref:**

The application site relates to the plot of No.140A Manchester Road. The site is located immediately off Manchester Road. The site is located to the immediate south of the Grade II Spring Lodge. It is also located to the south of the Grade II 14 and 15 Woodthorpe Terrace. Further to the east is the Grade II* Church of St Thomas which can be clearly seen from the site along the street scene.

As existing the site holds a small two-storey former red brick dwelling, which having reviewed OS maps was constructed in the 1950's. The building was constructed to the left-hand side of the plot with views of Spring Lodge and 14-15 Woodthorpe Terrace still visible off Manchester Road.

To the west of the site, there is a row of terraces, historically back to backs with two dividing covered ginnels. The end terrace further to the west was likely once a shop or commercial premises and this can be seen from the extant flanking pilasters and stone cornice.

Further to the west is a further row of terraces of which is made up of Grade II 160, 162 and 164 Manchester Road. Further along and detached by Well Street is the Grade II 166 and 168 Manchester Road. Looking along the Street view to the west you get long views of the Grade II Paddock Railway Viaduct.

It is evident that the area has a reasonably high degree of sensitivity, and any proposed development has to be closely considered.

With the application, there is a brief Heritage Statement. We are however not convinced by the submitted Statement and not convinced that it would meet the requirements of 200 of the NPPF. The statement provides a brief section outlining the context and setting of the site however it does rely heavily on the list entries for the noted Listed Buildings and does not provide any real form of assessment of their setting or of the potential impacts of the proposed development. The submitted statement does not pick up or mention Grade II 14-15 Woodthorpe Terrace and the proposed development does have a potential impact on the setting of the Listed Buildings.

The submitted statement provides a very brief assessment, however, the assessment provided does appear to be heavily subjective and seems to provide reasons why the proposed design is considered acceptable and how it provides some form of mitigation, rather than acknowledging any impact on setting. The assessment for Spring Lodge in concluding comments 5.0 states 'It is also likely that there was previously other built form on the site, replaced by the single red brick building that is currently located there. This is an entirely false statement and shows that there is a lack of understanding of the site.

When looking at the historical development of the site, it is clear that historically the plot of land was formerly connected to Grade II Spring Lodge. Looking at the historic map regressions Spring Lodge is noted as being the Vicarage likely connected to the Grade II* Church of St Thomas. The lands to the south can clearly be seen to be a historic gardens/ grounds to the former Vicarage with a winding path leading off Manchester Road, lined with trees leading up to the Vicarage. This appears to be the case until the 1950's when the land to the south saw the development of the existing two storey dwelling. While there is nothing to confirm this, it does appear that consideration was given to the development,

ensuring that it was set to the left-hand side of the plot and was only a modest two stories, ensuring that the historic connection was retained. It is therefore clear that the site forms part of the setting of the Grade II Spring Lodge.

The site also forms a part of the wider setting of the Grade II 14-15 Woodthorpe Terrace. The Listed building can be experienced off Manchester Road.

The proposed development would near enough fill the plot and also extend further back. The development would entirely interrupt the views and appreciation of Spring Lodge 14-15 Woodthorpe Lodge and have a significantly harmful impact on their setting and the historic grounds associated with Spring Lodge.

In consideration of the impact on the listed buildings 160, 162 and 164 Manchester Road. While the site is detached from the site, the Listed Buildings are experienced off Manchester Road when looking along Manchester Road from the west and the east. The proposed development is of a considerably greater height and scale than the existing surrounding development. The development would be clearly visible in long views along the row of terraces. The submitted statement tries to set out that with similar and contemporary materials, maintaining a strong continual eave line and simple façade with pitched roofs that the proposals reflect and respect the character and setting of the listed buildings. We would disagree with the assessment, which is subjective. While the building may make use of similar materials, the design elements are entirely incongruous and in no way reflect the character or setting, even in a contemporary style.

Conservation and Design object to the proposed development. We consider that the development would have a harmful impact on the setting of the Grade II Spring Lodge and Grade II 14-15 Woodthorpe Terrace. The development would also have a harmful impact on the wider setting of the Grade II 160, 162 and 164 Manchester Road as it would create development which is disproportionate and incongruous with the streets scene and setting.

We consider that the proposals would not accord with Policies 124 (a) and LP35 (a) of the Kirklees Local Plan. We would equally set out that the proposals owing to the harmful impact on the setting of the Listed buildings would not meet the test of 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act. We would further add that we are not convinced that the proposals have provided a clear or justification for the proposed development which would therefore mean it fails the test of 206 of the NPPF. We consider that the proposals would cause harm to the setting of the Listed Buildings introducing development which is entirely disproportionate in scale, height and design to the setting of the noted listed buildings and the character of the local area and we do not consider that there is sufficient evidence or justification of benefits which would outweigh the harm. We therefore consider that the proposals should either be withdrawn or refused.