

## **Item 6f Appendix 1 – June 4<sup>th</sup> Development Committee.**

### **Conservation Officer comment on application 25/00417/LBC.**

“The listed building subject of the application is 5-7 Mankinholes Bank, a former pair of cottages, now in single occupation. It dates to the mid-18th century and is built in hammer-dressed stone with a stone slate roof. The building is of T-shaped plan with the existing number 5 oriented south and being taller and larger with more prominent architectural features including quoins, gables with kneelers and large chimney stacks to each end. The existing number 7 is attached to the rear. It had 2-light windows to both floors (lacking mullions). The ground floor window is now hidden by a porch extension. There is a historic porch to the right with coping and kneeler, the entrance to which is blocked by the porch. There is also a historic and characterful chimney stack on the gable.

The part of the building proposed to be altered dates to the 1980s. The 1980s extension was designed to be subservient to the listed building, but is nonetheless wider than it. It is noted that the porch at the front of the building is not built in accordance with the Listed Building Consent granted in 1989 (89/01479/LBC - Erection of storm porch). This consent was for a smaller porch than the existing. The built porch runs across to the historic porch on the right, obscuring views of it.

There are no concerns with the proposed demolition of the conservatory as this does not contribute to special interest. There does not appear to be Listed Building Consent in place for this conservatory.

It is proposed to raise the ridge of the existing extension and introduce a gable to the rear. This would hide much more of the historic part of the listed building than the existing design which is clearly subservient. This would reduce the ability to read the historic part of the building, thereby reducing understanding of which parts of the building were original by eroding its prominence. The listed building and in particular the historic part of 7 Mankinholes Bank would become further wrapped in newer extensions.

Additionally, the proposed gable with Venetian window would compete for attention with the more simple architecture of the side elevation of number 5 and the rear elevation of number 7 when viewed from the rear. The Venetian window would introduce a feature of historic design not present on this listed building which could in future mislead understanding as to the historic phasing of the building. Venetian windows are more typically found on barns in Calderdale. The proposed Venetian window would also be overly large compared to traditional proportions of such windows, resulting in a dominant appearance. The proposed large area of glazing and French windows below would further contribute to the dominant appearance which would distract attention from the historic parts of the building.

The proposed extension would increase the prominence of the 1980s extension at first floor by building over the footprint of the single storey, unconsented, conservatory. This would obscure views of part of the listed building from the north, as would the creation of the gable roof. The proposal would result in a far less subservient extension than the existing one.

The proposed extension would be considered to result in a low to moderate level of less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building and a low level of less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of Lumbutts and Mankinholes Conservation Area.

National and local planning policies require any harm to or loss of significance of a listed building to have a clear and convincing justification. Should there be a clear and convincing justification, the harm should be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. National and local policy also require the impact of proposals on the significance of listed buildings to be set out in heritage statements.

The heritage statement argues that the proposal would assist in making the building viable family accommodation in future. The impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the listed building has not been adequately set out in the heritage statement, nor a clear and convincing justification given as to why the existing second bedroom requires change. Should there be a justified rationale for alterations, the proposal should aim to minimise harm to the listed building, with the least harmful option selected.”