Consultation Response from KC, Conservation & Design
2024/91820 The Message, 2-4, Crescent Road, Birkby, Huddersfield, HD2 2TF
Erection of lean-to single story front extension (within a Conservation Area)
Date Responded: 08.08.2024 **Responding Officer: S Pickles** **Responding Ref:**

The application site is located with the Birkby Conservation Area. The site is located close to the boundary of the Conservation Area and is on one of the entry points into the area. The building is on a prominent corner position located on the corner of Crescent Road, Norman Road and King Cliffe Road.

The building has undergone a series of minor changes over time. The original corner doorway has been retained however a new side ramped access has been created.

The proposal is to create a front partial wrap-around extension. With the submitted detail there is a report titled Heritage Statement, however, it makes no mention of the site being within the Birkby Conservation Area, nor does it provide any form of assessment of the potential impact of the proposals.

While it is recognised that the assessment needs only be proportionate to the level of development, the currently submitted report does not provide a sufficient level of assessment. It does state that consideration is given to the surrounding context, however, 1 of the examples looked at is domestic in form and the other example of the of the commercial market building opposite is of an open canopy, which has since been removed.

The proposed extension would wrap from the front left-hand side, cover the side entrance door, and extends round to the right-hand side.

While we recognise that consideration has been given to the proposed material palette, we are not convinced by the proposed extension. The extension, while making reference to architectural details and making use of an appropriate material palette does have a feel of a more domestic extension, something akin to what would be found at the rear of a dwelling.

The example noted of the former canopy to the commercial market has a marked difference in that the former canopy was open, except those hours where the shutters were down. We note that there was a further application to apply glazing to the front of the canopy, however again, this was more of a lightly weight structure which had the feel of a natural extension to the building. The proposed extension, while having some positive detailing, does feel heavy in form and does not reflect the character of the host building. If a modest open or glazed/ partially glazed canopy was being proposed, then this is something which could be given further consideration to. We are however not convinced that the proposed extension forms a natural extension to the building.

As proposed, we are not convinced that the extension meets the test of LP24 or LP35 of the Local Plan. If the proposal was made to be more of a canopy-style extension, more lightweight and less obtrusive then we may be able to support the proposal, subject to further assessment and consideration. As set out we are unconvinced by the current proposals.