

## **Committee Report**

**Item No: 5**

**Reference:** DC/18/04996

**Case Officer:** Gemma Pannell

**Ward:** Hadleigh North

**Ward Member:** Cllr Tina Campbell and Cllr Siân Dawson

---

## **RECOMMENDATION – GRANT LISTED BUILDING CONSENT SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS**

---

### **Description of Development**

Application for Listed Building Consent - Partial demolition works and internal and external alterations and extension to reinstate River View as a single dwelling and erection of 8 apartments

### **Location**

River View and adjoining buildings, Corks Lane Hadleigh

**Parish:** Hadleigh

**Expiry Date:**

**Application Type:** Listed Building Consent

**Development Type:**

**Applicant:** Babergh District Council

**Agent:** Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd

---

## **PART ONE – REASON FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE**

---

The application is referred to committee for the following reason:

The applicant is Babergh District Council.

### **Details of Previous Committee/Resolutions and Member Site Visit**

None.

---

## **PART TWO – POLICIES AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY**

---

### **Summary of Policies**

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework 2018

Babergh Core Strategy 2014:

- CS15 Implementing Sustainable Development in Babergh

Saved Policies in the Babergh Local Plan (2006):

- CN06 Listed Buildings – Alterations/ Extension/ Change of Use

## **Planning History**

There is an extensive planning history relating to the broader site that is subject to proposed redevelopment, none of which is of relevance to this listed building consent application.

To note are the applications lodged concurrently for the redevelopment of the broader development site that the subject buildings form a part of, including the applications for listed building consent relating to four other listed buildings. These applications, currently pending consideration, are as follows:

- DC/18/05018 - Malthouse and adjoining buildings, Bridge Street - demolition and internal and external alterations to form 4 ground floor apartments; 4 first floor apartments in historic section. Conversion of and erection of extension to form 16 apartments (LBC application).
- DC/18/04966 - Redevelopment to provide 57 dwellings (Use Class C3) with private amenity areas, parking, fencing, landscaping, open space and refuse facilities, access roads and associated works and infrastructure, incorporating the part demolition and part retention and conversion of the existing office buildings (including the retention and conversion of The Maltings, 21 and 23 Bridge Street, River View and The Cottage and demolition of Bridge House), site of the former Babergh District Council Offices and associated land (full planning application).
- DC/18/04971 - The Cottage and adjoining buildings, Corks Lane - Partial demolition and internal and external alterations to enable the formation of 1 dwelling as per schedule of works (LBC application).
- DC/18/04992 - 23 Bridge Street - Internal alterations to form 2 apartments (LBC application).
- DC/18/04991 - 21 Bridge Street and adjoining buildings - Partial demolition works; Internal and external alterations to form 2 ground floor apartments and 1 duplex apartment at ground and first floor level (LBC application).

The current application has been the subject of amended plans, received February 2019. The amendments to the scheme have been made largely in response to issues raised by Historic England in their original consultee response. The February 2019 changes are discussed in the assessment section of this report.

Consideration of the extent to which the proposal for the demolition of the modern offices may or may not affect the 'setting' of Corks Lane will be considered within the relevant planning [rather than LB] reports.

---

## **Consultations and Representations**

During the course of the application consultation and representations from third parties have been received. The below provides a summary of responses received in respect to the original November 2018 proposal and the amended February 2019 proposal.

### **A: Summary of Consultations**

#### **(i) Comments received in respect to the original November 2018 proposal:**

**Hadleigh Town Council** – Refusal was recommended (Voting was unanimous)  
The reason for recommending refusal was that this application would impact on a heritage asset

**Place Services – Heritage** - Generally supportive of the proposed plans within the listed buildings

#### **Historic England**

This application proposes a series of internal and external alterations to the grade II listed River View, Hadleigh. We support the majority of the proposed alterations but consider the proposed new building would result in harm to the historic significance of the listed building in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework. However, this could be mitigated by amendments to the proposed design. The application also proposes the demolition of parts of the Council offices which are currently the subject of assessment by colleagues in Historic England's listing team. We would therefore recommend that this application is not determined until that time.

The grade II listed River View dates from the late 18th century and is a three bay, two storey brick house with a tall mansard roof and formally arranged front elevation, giving a quite handsome appearance for a relatively modest house of the period. Inside the original layout is largely intact, despite its use as Council offices and role as a main entrance into the office complex.

The proposed works to being the building into residential use are acceptable but this application also contains proposals for extensions abutting the listed building on its north and east sides. These would replace part of the modern Council offices constructed by Arup Associates in 1978-82. Because of their physical attachment to River View the Council have included the demolition of these parts of the 1970s buildings in this application for listed building consent. The Heritage Statement submitted in support of this application describes this complex of modern building in some detail. It is clear that it is of some considerable architectural interest and the work of an important practice and is currently the subject of assessment by colleagues in Historic England's listing team. We cannot comment on the full impact of this demolition until this assessment has been concluded. We would therefore recommend that this application is not determined until that time or the demolition could be deleted from the application to allow listed building consent for works to River View to be granted. However, we would like to offer some advice on the proposed replacement buildings at this stage.

Should the Arup buildings be cleared and new buildings abutting River View erected we have concerns about the proposals contained in the current application. The existing buildings immediately beside River View are low, partly hidden from Cork's Lane and covered in pitched tile roofs. On the western side they form a small yard between River View and the grade II listed The Cottage where they appear like modest service ranges, appropriate to the scale and style of these traditional buildings. By contrast the proposed new buildings would challenge both listed buildings in scale and affect River View in

particular because they would abut the listed building on two sides. One proposed building would join the rear wall of River View, be as tall as the historic building and with a somewhat bulky appearance and vertical emphasis would almost dominate it. A two storey building could be erected at the rear of River View but should either be set apart from it or clearly read as subordinate to it.

The proposed replacement building to the east of River View would be set back behind the present boundary wall to Corks Lane and have a similar pitched tiled roof. If the roof terrace balustrade were formed from metal railing rather than more eye-catching glass and roof lights limited this range could be a suitably understated neighbour to the listed building. However, the proposed roof would wrap around the gable end of River View to join the range to the rear with the most unfortunate effect of encasing the listed building in a tall roof which detracts from the simple form of the historic house. As with the rear range there is definite potential for new building here but the proposed designs of both ranges would diminish an appreciation of River View as an historic building and we would recommend they should be revised.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that the purpose of the planning system is to achieve sustainable development and that protection and enhancement of the historic environment is an overarching objective in this (paragraphs 7 and 8). The significance of listed buildings and conservation areas can be harmed or lost by alteration to them or development in their setting. The

NPPF states that clear and convincing justification should be made for any such harm and that 'great weight' should be given to the conservation of listed buildings and conservation areas irrespective of the level of harm caused (paragraphs 193 and 194). This weight and the justification for harm should be especially convincing where harm to buildings of a high grade of listing is concerned.

We have considered this application in terms of this policy and while we would not object to the proposals in principle are concerned that while the proposed internal works to River View are acceptable the replacement buildings could result in harm to significance of the listed building in terms of the NPPF, paragraphs 194 and 196. As noted above the NPPF requires a clear and convincing justification to be found for any such harm. Paragraph 196 requires local planning authorities to weigh less than substantial harm to listed buildings against any public benefit delivered by the proposed development. In this case the proposed new housing contained within the replacement extensions could be such a benefit and we would leave it to the Council to make that judgement. However, we consider this can be provided in new building which would have a less harmful impact. Amended designs should therefore be considered which would achieve this and so the aims of the NPPF to promote sustainable development. However, because of the on-going assessment of the elements of the Council offices constructed by Arup Associates in 1978-82 for listing we recommend that this application is not determined until that process is completed. Alternatively, the elements of demolition and rebuilding could be withdrawn from the application to allow listed building consent for works to River View to be granted.

Recommendation Historic England has concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds, in particular the proposed replacement buildings to the north and east sides of River View. We would recommend the justification for this is carefully considered along with alternative approaches that would reduce this impact. This application also proposes the demolition of parts of the Council offices constructed by Arup Associates in 1978-82 which are currently the subject of assessment by colleagues in Historic England's listing team. We would therefore recommend that this application is not determined until that time. Alternatively, the elements of demolition and rebuilding could be withdrawn from the application to allow listed building consent for works to River View to be granted.

---

We consider that the issues and safeguards outlined in our advice need to be addressed in order for the application to meet the requirements of paragraphs 7, 8, 193 and 194 of the NPPF.

### **Hadleigh Society**

The proposal involves substantial demolition of the 1970/80s Arup designed Council complex to which the Society objects. Also, whilst it is proposed to reinstate the listed building 'River View' to a single dwelling, it is proposed it will be engulfed on two elevations by a large and bulky 2/3 storey block of flats with a somewhat odd and contrived roof design. Regrettably the proposed flats would dominate and overshadow the very modest dimensions of 'River View' and the nearby listed 'Cottage' and thus if permitted would cause considerable harm to both those listed buildings and the setting of the Conservation Area, particularly from Corks Lane and adjoining greensward.

The design of the flats have a further unfortunate feature of proposing two, first floor domestic terraces adjoining the eastern wall of River View and overlooking Cork Lane and the Greensward through reflective glazed balustrades. This feature both in the use of inappropriate materials and allowing the display of domestic garden furniture and clutter seriously conflicts with the simple architectural character of River View. If a terrace with balustrade is to be provided the balustrade should be constructed as a continuation of the ground floor brick wall.

In conclusion it is considered that the proposed block of flats should be considerably redesigned to limit the embracing of River View, reduce its height and bulk, and amend the impact of any terraces that may be proposed.

### **Twentieth Century Society**

Object on grounds of loss of Arup building elements would cause substantial harm to non-designated heritage assets.

### **Suffolk Preservation Society**

Demolition of Bridge House would result in substantial harm.

Former Bridge House site townhouses have fundamental design flaws. Large scale gardens are inappropriate and represent an inefficient use of the land.

44 car spaces within the greensward is wholly unacceptable.

Apartment block east of River View – materially harmful to the setting and appearance of both designated heritage assets.

The Cottage – removal of modern accretions is welcomed. Proposed bin and bike store undermines the attempts to create more open setting. The crass location of service areas in such a sensitive location is testament to the insensitive disregard for the historic environment demonstrated by these proposals and should be fundamentally reconsidered.

Lack of affordable housing.

### **(ii) Comments received following submission of amended plans (amended February 2019 proposal):**

#### **Hadleigh Town Council**

Recommend refusal as the application would impact on a heritage asset.

**Place Services – Heritage** - Generally supportive of the proposed plans within the listed buildings

---

## **Historic England**

Thank you for consulting us on the amendments to the suite of applications concerning redevelopment of the Corks Lane site and Bridge House, Hadleigh. I do not have any comment to make on the majority of these, though do note the amendments made to block 6 and Bridge House in application number 18/4966 and are content with these. In our advice to the Council concerning the proposed alterations to the listed buildings at the Corks Lane site we asked for amendments to the design of the extension to River House. The amendments to application 18/4996 show a simplification of the rear extension to the listed building combined with setbacks in the line of development which break up the mass of building seen from the west. These are positive changes and while we retain some reservations about the massing of building around Riverview are also content with these amendments.

We noted in our advice on the applications which affected the existing Council buildings designed by Arup that the Council should wait on the decision to list the building before determining the applications. The decision has now been made not to list so we would have no objection to the applications being determined.

## **Hadleigh Society**

The amendments to the design are considered inconsequential and do not alter the Society's strong objections to the scheme on the grounds of design, poor and inadequate parking provision, and serious damage to the setting, appearance and special character of adjoining listed buildings and the Conservation Area.

## **B: Representations**

One submission received from a local resident making the following summarised comments: "Would like to see this development in keeping with the history of part of the building and that it is private housing, as social housing could make a lovely part of Hadleigh less desirable."

---

## **PART THREE – ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION**

---

### **1. The Site and Surroundings**

- 1.1. The site is located on the northern side of Corks Lane, to the north of the Hadleigh town centre. The subject Grade II listed building forms part of a much broader site proposed for redevelopment, comprising the former Babergh District Council offices complex.
- 1.2. The two storey building directly fronts Corks Lane. To the west is The Cottage, a Grade II listed building. To the rear and adjoining the eastern side of the building is the Arup building. Further east is 23 Bridge Street, a double storey Grade II\* listed building.
- 1.3. The site is within Hadleigh Conservation Area and in close proximity to a number of Grade II\* and Grade II listed buildings beyond the wider former Council offices site.

### **2. The Proposal**

- 2.1 Listed Building Consent is sought for the demolition of the rear and eastern side additions and replacement with two storey rear and eastern side additions. The rear additions incorporate traditional (pitched clay pantile clad roof) and modern (flat roof) design detailing. The traditional addition is finished in brick with aluminium windows, the flat roofed addition is finished in a mix of render and vertical timber cladding. The eastern side addition is finished in brick and incorporates a pitched clay pantile clad roof, all to match River View. The first floor of the side addition is set back from Corks Lane, providing a terrace for dwellings 3.1.1 and 3.1.2. The terrace perimeter is treated in metal railings which will sit atop the existing wall at the Corks Lane boundary frontage. The existing wall fronting Corks Lane east of River View is altered by the insertion of two new openings, treated with aluminium windows. An existing opening, currently occupied by a traditional timber window, will be opened up to provide pedestrian access between the proposed eastern addition and the rear of 21 Bridge Street.
- 2.2 The additions will accommodate eight dwellings (the original scheme proposed 10 dwellings over part two and three storey additions). Conversion works are proposed to River View, to reinstate it as a single dwelling. The conversion works are predominantly internal, with the majority of works relating to the removal and insertion of partition walls.
- 2.3 With regard to openings, all existing windows will be retained and refurbished, with a new system of replacement secondary glazing installed.
- 2.4 A detailed schedule of works supports the application.

### **3. Historic Character of the Listed Building**

- 3.1 Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires local planning authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings and their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.
- 3.2 Policy CN06 states that alterations to listed buildings should, amongst other things, be of an appropriate scale, form, siting and detailed design to harmonise with the existing building and its setting.
- 3.3 Paragraph 192 of the NPPF states that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:
- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
  - the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
  - the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
- 3.4 The demolition works do not raise any heritage concerns given the limited heritage value of the fabric proposed for removal. Although the amount of fabric being removed is not insignificant, including the long single storey side addition, it does not contribute to the significance of the listed building. The removal of the eastern side addition enhances the setting of the listed building.
- 3.5 The revised extensions to River View are of a significantly lesser scale than that proposed as part of the original scheme, noting that the third storeys on both the rear

and side additions have been removed. As a result, the extensions now read as subordinate additions to River View. The proposed ridgeline of the additions are set at or below the ridgeline of River View.

- 3.6 Officers agree with the supporting Heritage Statement (as amended) in that the new building to the north has been massed so that part of it reads as a traditional extension to a historic building. The northernmost addition is overtly modern, incorporating a flat roof and vertical timber cladding. The contemporary approach is acceptable given its separation from River View by the proposed traditionally designed addition, its more central siting (in the context of the overall development site), and the more modest two storey massing. Visibility of the extension will be limited from Corks Lane and Bridge Street. Although the rear additions combine both traditional and modern profiles, they offer a simplified rear elevational treatment compared to the original proposal.
- 3.7 The Corks Lane elevation of the eastern addition is far simpler than the original proposal. The rooflights and glass balustrading have been omitted. The first floor terrace facing Corks Lane is treated with a simple railing design, a more sympathetic design detail. The eaves of the eastern building are set slightly below the eaves of River View, and although wider than River View, the eastern building achieves an appropriate degree of subordination. The first floor setback from Corks Lane assists in this regard. The distinctive eastern gable of River View remains largely exposed (the western gable remains unaltered) and the additions no longer have the engulfing effect that the original proposal created. It is acknowledged that the additions are taller than much of the existing Arup building, however they have been designed and sited in a manner that ensures the pre-eminence of River View is maintained.
- 3.8 The retention of the frontage wall linking River View and 21 Bridge Street is a welcome element of the scheme. Retention of this wall serves to soften the new build effect of the eastern addition on River View, part concealing the addition.
- 3.9 The internal works are relatively minor, raise no heritage issues and will return the building back to its original single dwelling use, a positive heritage outcome that will better reveal its significance. The proposed system of replacement secondary glazing to River View is an acceptable heritage response. The absence of any other changes to the principal façade and original roof form is a pleasing element of the scheme.

#### **PART FOUR – CONCLUSION**

##### **4. Statement Required By Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015**

- 4.1 When determining planning applications The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 requires Local Planning Authorities to explain how, in dealing with the application they have worked with the applicant to resolve any problems or issues arising.
- 4.2 Council officers have worked with the applicant through the life of the application.

##### **5. Identification of any Legal Implications and/or Equality Implications (The Equalities Act 2012)**

- 5.1 There are no known legal implications derived from the determination of this application.

## **6. Planning Balance**

- 6.1 The listed building is being conserved and great weight is attached to this conservation consistent with paragraph 193 of the NPPF. The works will not result in substantial harm and so paragraph 194 of the NPPF is not engaged. The proposed conversion works have been designed in a sensitive manner, respectful of the building's valued historic integrity and setting. The bulk, height and scale of the additions have been significantly reduced, addressing the initial concerns raised by Historic England. An appropriate level of subordination is now achieved. The revised appearance of the additions are more respectful and sympathetic to River View. Historic England do not raise objection to the amended scheme on heritage grounds and the impact is therefore considered as less than substantial. [paragraph 196 of the NPPF therefore applies in terms of assessing whether the wider public benefits outweigh harm].
- 6.2 The scheme of works do not conflict with local policy CN06 or paragraph 192 of the NPPF. The proposal facilitates the conservation of heritage assets, consistent with the overarching objective of achieving sustainable development as set out at paragraph 8 of the NPPF.
- 6.3 The re-use of the building secures its long term future and in so doing preserves the building, together with its special architectural features and historic interest. The proposal is therefore consistent with section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- 6.4 Any harm to the significance of the heritage asset brought about by the works, such as the alterations to the existing front boundary wall, is less than minor and therefore not substantial, and is demonstrably outweighed by the heritage benefits identified above.
- 6.5 Members are advised that the wider planning benefits expected to arise from the development [and the other elements across the wider site] and the impact on the character of the conservation area will be appropriately considered in associated relevant planning application reports.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

(1) That the Acting Chief Planning Officer be authorised to grant Listed Building Consent subject to conditions including:

- Standard time limit
- Window, door and railings details
- Details of repairs
- All materials/fixtures to new build elements
- Landscaping and public realm details
- Level 3 Archaeological building recording
- Joinery colour
- Rainwater goods