

About the application

Application number: 2026/90119	
What is the application for?:	Listed Building Consent for installation of replacement door and frame (within a
Address of the site or building:	26, Swallow Lane, Golcar, Huddersfield, HD7 4LU
Postcode:	HD7 4LU

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes
The cottage is one of three with the same front elevation arrangement. All three have matching leaded windows on the front, and timber entrance doors (until this retrospective applicant). The cottages are all grade II listed and in a conservation area. The group identity and value is the fact they are all weavers cottages, mid 19thC or earlier, and a grander variation of what you see elsewhere in the CA. The leaded windows are later but historic, and show prevalence to the occupants therein. Note, the reporting provided simple copies the listing description with no expansion to assess the significance of the heritage asset nor address any contribution of the property to the conservation area. Categorically, the doors (and windows) as building elements have a moderate (if not higher) level of interest in the contribution to the architectural and historic values of the heritage asset. The door contribute to the significance of the heritage asset (no.26) and by group to the three cottages. The cottages also contribute positively to the conservation area. For example, there are no similar examples visible from the conservation area of this types with leaded windows and matching doors. Loss of windows or doors will be concerning and cause harm to all three. A timber door has more akin to the special interest of a period cottage than upvc, especially when the buildings are listed and a key contributor to a leading street of the conservation area, Swallow Lane. There is also a key view facing the cottages heading into the village from scapegoat hill, historic photos show this. The proposed door (already installed as this retrospective) is already a loss of fabric albeit 20c, the last was timber and a sympathetic panelled design. The proposed door is inappropriate materials, 'cottage' design but not similar to the neighbouring or	

is inappropriate materials, cottage design but not similar to the neighbouring or previous door, and is assessed as detrimental to the heritage asset therefore simply harmful. Alternatively solutions such as a repair or replacement timber door to match the previous if justified, with a similar arrangement, which cause no harm. Upgrades to the door to improve the energy efficiency and operation is also available.

The heritage statement does not provide enough of a robust justification to suggest otherwise. For example, there is no evidence of the condition of the 'existing' door, which is absolutely required, no evidence of the 'mould', saying the door sticks because its timber is not suffice to offset the proposed harm - the cottage is nearly 200 years old and by nature is not a new build. Some modern interventions are proven to make historic buildings environmentally worse.

The detail doesn't demonstrate if the position of the door is similar to the last - which is therefore impossible to assess if it's harmful.

There are many methods to improve energy efficiency without causing harm. There is also no public benefit here to argue the proposal, nor enough data to suggest the owner has made effort to reduce fossil fuels through other less harmful options.

To approve this would be sacrificial and harmful the heritage asset, the adjacent heritage assets, and the conservation area. A new timber door with a similar arrangement or slight variation to the last is the only route in my opinion.