

**Consultation Response from KC,
Conservation & Design**

2025/93126 The Coach & Horses, Eastgate, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6PA

**Demolition of rear block, erection of rear extensions and alterations to existing building to form
9.no apartments including associated works and alterations (within a Conservation Area)**

Date Responded: 14/1/26

Responding Officer: SC

Responding Ref:

The former Coach and Horses pub is a prominent undesignated heritage asset, close to a lodge house which is listed by virtue of being within the curtilage of the larger Honley House. The 2 pairs of gate piers on both sides of River Park are likely to be related to that (so could also be classed as curtilage listed), so should be retained and protected. The whole site is in a prominent location within Honley Conservation Area and this building would be classed as a key unlisted building within the Conservation Area. This former pub appears to date from around 1800, it is not listed but it retains much of its original external character and the frontage makes a very positive contribution to the street scene within the Conservation Area.

The features that make a positive contribution are the pair of gate piers, stone boundary walls, the natural stone walls and stone slate roof including stone copings/kneelers, chamfered corners, string courses, stone window surrounds, timber windows in Georgian style 6 panes over 6 pane sliding sash, stone corbels, metal/timber rainwater goods, chimneys, stone setts at the frontage and mature trees at the sides and rear. All these features should be retained and maintained using appropriate methods of repair including use of appropriate lime mortar to be flush or slightly recessed.

The proposal to retain the main building and frontage are welcomed. The above features are very important to retain. The existing and proposed plans have omitted the stone roof copings and a chimney on the left which should all be retained. The roof to the left appears to be proposed to be extended in height and omits the chimney which should be retained. It should be demonstrated that the character of the front elevation would not be altered, by the roof extension. It would be hard to obtain sufficient natural stone slates to match. Please seek confirmation that the front masonry walls would not be extended in height. The gable end is proposed to be constructed in natural stone masonry. Can the chamfer feature at the end be retained? The stone must be conditioned to match existing as closely as possible in terms of stone source, colour, texture, size of coursing, finish and the courses to line through.

The proposal to demolish the later and much smaller rear extension is considered acceptable in this case. However, the new proposed extension is large and needs to be more subservient in terms of length and width. The length could partly be reduced further by omitting the balcony section. This high-level balcony area contributes to an increase in the footprint of the extension causing a larger scale, bulk, massing and form than is appropriate or proportionate to the original building. There are linked concerns around privacy/overlooking issues caused by the high-level balcony in relation to existing properties too. Therefore, it is requested that a reduction in size of the extension length and width be sought including omission of the high-level balcony.

Proposals should aim to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area. The retention of the character of the existing front block is expected and this should retain the small paned Georgian style windows ie 6 panes over 6 panes. Original windows could be repaired, and use secondary glazing, or if the windows are in poor condition, a good quality timber slim-lite double glazed sliding sash using the correct proportions could be considered. Archive research could confirm the original window pattern for the left building which could be Georgian style to match existing. Good quality timber Georgian style doors at the front should be encouraged and conditioned. A 6-panel door is appropriate on the left, and similar should be proposed on the right

The windows in the extension do not need to copy the Georgian style windows but could use a similar but simpler arrangement with fewer glazing bars. The use of a good quality matching natural stone for the rear extension would be encouraged and conditioned. The existing natural stone slates should be retained for the front building and if needed re-laid in diminishing courses to match existing.

Front boundary treatment would be important and archive images could be researched for the frontage. A new low stone boundary wall with coping could be appropriate including some appropriate soft landscaping at the front. Allocation of some landscaped outdoor amenity/sitting space for

residents at the rear would be encouraged. Retention and or re-use of stone setts at the front could be considered appropriate. Could more bins be sited at the side or rear to reduce the clutter and impact on the front elevation and Conservation Area?

In conclusion, if the scale (length/width) of the extension is reduced further and the design details clarified and enhanced then it is considered there is potential for a conversion and development to preserve and enhance the Conservation Area. I note that this vacant pub has remained empty for a number of years and therefore, a scheme to re-use the building with a proportionate extension and appropriate details could be acceptable to secure the optimum viable use of this heritage asset.

The proposals need to accord with Paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework, **“215. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.”**

The proposals also need to accord with Policy LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan, “Development proposals affecting a designated heritage asset should conserve those elements which contribute to its significance. Harm to such elements will be permitted only where this is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. Substantial harm or total loss to the significance of a designated heritage asset will be permitted only in exceptional circumstances.”

Subject to amendments being sought and confirmed, I also recommend the following conditions;

1. Landscaping scheme to enhance the boundary and setting with native trees and shrubs, and use of appropriate paving around the entrances.
2. Retention of natural stone boundary walls and gate piers.
3. Retention of original external architectural features including stone copings, chimneys, chamfers, natural stone slates. Stone slates from rear extension to be retained securely and re-used on the front building if needed.
4. Stone masonry samples to be submitted.
5. Sample panel of end wall and pointing to be approved.
6. Metal or timber rainwater goods.
7. Timber sliding sash windows on the existing building to match existing, details to be submitted.
8. Details of windows on extension to be submitted and approved. All windows to be recessed by 100-150mm.
9. Door details to be submitted and to be recessed by 100-150mm.
10. Details of roof materials for rear extension to be submitted and approved, could include a non-local natural stone slate.
11. Details of zinc materials to be submitted and approved.
12. Details of gates to be submitted.
13. Pointing to be an appropriate lime mortar to be finished flush or recessed, not strap pointing.
14. Bin storage to side or rear.