

**COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL
DELEGATED PLANNING DECISION**

1.	Reference No:	4/21/2305/0L1
2.	Proposed Development:	LISTED BUILDING CONSENT FOR WORKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE CONVERSION FROM OFFICES TO SERVICED APARTMENTS C1 USE
3.	Location:	AGE CONCERN, OLD CUSTOMS HOUSE, WEST STRAND, WHITEHAVEN
4.	Parish:	Whitehaven
5.	Constraints:	ASC;Adverts - ASC;Adverts, Conservation Area - Conservation Area, Flood Area - Flood Zone 2, Flood Area - Flood Zone 3, Listed Building - Listed Building, Coal - Standing Advice - Data Subject To Change
6.	Publicity Representations & Policy	See Report
7.	Report:	<p>Site and Location:</p> <p>The Application Site comprises Old Customs House, West Strand, Whitehaven.</p> <p>The building was most recently occupied by Age Concern, who used the building as offices, meeting rooms and a café. The building was sold in 2020 and is currently vacant.</p> <p>The building is Grade II Listed. The listing entry of the building states the following: <i>C18. 3 storeyed, stuccoed, old slate roof, cornice and frieze, pilasters at centre and ends of facade. 8 windows across the front; the 3 bays to the left are symmetrical, with centre segmental headed carriage entrance. The 5 bays to the right are also symmetrical, a centre porch with slender reeder 3/4 columns with frieze and cornice. All windows are 12-paned, all in wellmoulded architraves but the square windows on the top floor have been renewed.</i></p> <p>The building benefits from a limited curtilage to the rear.</p>

Proposal:

Listed Building Consent is sought for alterations to facilitate the change of use of the main element of the building to comprise 5no. serviced apartments (C1 Use Classification), with the existing café/concession area to the ground floor of the building retained.

The proposed alterations to facilitate the development include the following:

External

- Removal of existing ramp and reinstatement of steps to entrance.
- Replacement of existing metal grilles.
- Introduction of conservation roof lights.
- Re-laying of existing slate roof.
- Rebuilding of existing chimneys with lead trays.
- Replacement of two existing doors.
- Introduction of door to proposed bin store.
- Removal of existing external staircase and replacement with galvanised steel staircase with cedar clad storage area below.
- Introduction of timber sliding sash windows.
- Erection of first floor level extension above existing single storey outrigger.
- Replacement of existing two storey outrigger with enlarged outrigger including balcony with sandstone coping and glass screen.
- Repairs to cap mouldings.

Internal

- Alterations to internal layout including removal of modern stud walling, office screening and suspended ceiling with the retention of original wall fabric and introduction of new stud walling and wall finishes.
- Removal of stair lift.
- Removal of dumb waiter.

The proposals have been amended during the course of the application to respond to the comments of the Conservation Officer and Ancient Monuments Society (Georgian Group).

Consultee:	Nature of Response:
Town Council	<i>11th August 2021</i> No comments. <i>5th November 2021</i>

		No comments.
	Copeland Borough Council – Conservation Officer	<p><i>23rd June 2022</i></p> <p>Many thanks, these details look fine to me.</p> <p><i>16th July 2021</i></p> <p>Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is desirable to give this building a new use, however it is not at immanent risk of dilapidation. • As per national legislation and policy, special regard and great weight should be given to the asset’s preservation and conservation. Internally, this applies to the building only; externally the impact on the settings of neighbouring listed buildings should be considered too. • Special attention should also be paid to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. • The attachment named Heritage, Design and Access Statement does not contain any substantive heritage significance or impact analysis (the latter of which is advised rather than required in the application, though clearly still necessary for effective decision-making), and if reflective of the design process suggests that key decisions on the conversion and modification of this key listed building have happened without complete analysis. This is problematic, particularly when certain decisions, such as the addition of a flat roof section to the rear, the changes to the upper floor windows and the insertion of rooflights, do not appear to have any benefit beyond providing a more modern accommodation experience. • There is also a question mark over the decision to bisect the old carriage arch space that once led to the rear yard, in order to create a meter cupboard. The significance of this axis is not mentioned in the heritage statement. • I have previously requested a demolition plan showing the elements that will need removing internally to create the revised layout, so this should be added to the application. • I also request more detail on the new external staircase to the rear. This is proposed to be galvanised steel, from the elevation drawing annotation, but a product sheet or some other visualisation would be useful in understanding the visual impact. Having the staircase cross the rear carriage arch needs more consideration. • In the case of the upper floor window alterations, it’s unlikely an expanded heritage appraisal would conclude there is a case to be made for this as the argument in favour (that it would make for a better view out) would

be outweighed by the loss of historic fabric and alteration of the proportions of the highly regimented façade. I flag this as a likelihood, of course (as with the pre-application advice), and will reserve conclusion until a more in-depth heritage statement is received.

- Details should be submitted of new doors and windows, internal and external.
- Detail of the new metal louvres to the frontage should be supplied.
- Taking down and rebuilding the chimneys with modification may require listed building consent. If this is proposed, details will need to be submitted.
- To the rear, where it is proposed to remove a mono-pitch slate roof and build up the wall in cavity blockwork, is this section already cavity blockwork? There have been some extensions to the rear in the late 20th century, so presumably these construction methods match, but confirmation would be beneficial as the majority of the building will be solid masonry.
- It would be useful to have more detail on what works will be required within the attic to fit the mezzanines, in terms of reinforcement, removal of structure etc.

Summary:

These plans have the potential to bring notable improvements for this building both in terms of appearance and use. There is not currently sufficient information with the application to be certain that decisions taken have fully considered the building's conservation. Without fully understanding the potential harm of certain courses of action, justifying and demonstrating alternatives or mitigating factors is also not fully possible, so this needs a bit more attention.

From the current information, the plan to lower the 2nd floor window sills is not supportable. Although I await more information, my suspicion is that enough is already known about this aspect that the fundamental relationship between benefit and disbenefits won't change, so it may be advantageous to revise the designs with this in mind.

23rd November 2021

Assessment:

My previous response, from July 2021, concluded that level of supporting information was not sufficient and that one or two aspects of the design were likely to be problematic. More information has since been provided.

My earlier comments are below on the first level of the list, with updates on the second level.

- Justification is needed for addition of a flat roof section to the rear.
 - Added justification has been supplied, pointing out that this aspect of the building makes a reduced contribution to the overall impression, and that the proposal will be kept subtle.
 - The current volumes to the rear are unattractive and their replacement with the proposed taller, flat roofed volume is difficult to view as other than a neutral impact in such a context.
- Justification is needed for the changes to the upper floor windows (although it is likely this will not be supported).
 - The drawings show these remaining as existing, but the D, A&H statement still refers to altering them (p6) so this should be clarified.
 - I would not request LBC for the proposed flower boxes (although there is a possibility this location may be too exposed for the flowers to stay inside them).
- Justification is needed for the insertion of rooflights.
 - Justification has been provided as these being a small level of harm necessary to allow a more pleasant interior space. There is certainly some validity to this, and if these rooflights are to be used to allow a pleasant interior with views out as an alternative to making changes to the top floor façade windows I can see this being justifiable.
 - I would view the proposed recessed heritage style rooflights as being modest in size and number, and justifiable in the context of providing illumination to the mezzanines.
- A demolition plan showing the elements that will need removing internally to create the revised layout is needed.
 - Demolition plan has been received (please refer to follow up questions below).
- Detail on the new external staircase to the rear is needed, e.g. product sheet or some other visualisation.
 - An indicative visualisation has been provided. It is not the most attractive staircase, but is a considerable improvement.
- Justification is needed for having the staircase cross the rear carriage arch.
 - Justification has been provided in the form of the staircase being a significant improvement on the existing one, and of a slimmer design that will still allow the shape of the arch to be read.
- Details of new doors and windows, internal and external are needed.
- Detail of the new metal louvres to the frontage are needed.

- Details on taking down and rebuilding the chimneys with modification is needed.
- Clarification is needed on the wall construction type where it is proposed to remove a mono-pitch slate roof and build up the wall in cavity blockwork to the rear to ensure compatibility.
 - This has been clarified as part of the modern blockwork to the rear and will be extended in similar fashion.
- Clarification is requested on works required within the attic area to fit the mezzanines, in terms of reinforcement, removal of structure etc.
 - Confirmation has been supplied that the new mezzanines will be supported from the masonry, being free spans and allowing the original roof structure to be visible.

Further thoughts and requests:

Please also refer to above highlighted sections.

- Recommend using a dark frame (e.g. dark grey) for the glazing to the carriage arch to simplify the appearance and accentuate the shape of the opening.
- Request details of existing windows to be removed from rear elevation (photos and summary).
- Confirmation of composition of internal walls enclosing first floor office to NW corner of plan requested.
- Request detail for creating 2 no. window seats to top floor. What material is being removed and how will the area be finished? Is it proposed to add insulation?
- The heritage statement has been updated to say that the building was constructed between 1993-5. Obviously this is a simple typo, but would be helpful to rectify.

16th February 2022

Since my last consultation response, some updated info has been received.

- The drawings show these remaining as existing, but the D, A&H statement still refers to altering them (p6) so this should be clarified.
 - It would be helpful to have this reference removed/clarified when the design and access document is updated
- Details of new doors and windows, internal and external are needed.
 - Details of windows have been supplied. There are a couple of aspect that need alteration or clarification
 - The proposed glazed unit is 20mm DG, and generally anything thicker than 12mm is likely to look too thick.
 - There is no indication of the glazing bar

arrangement/dimensions

- It would be useful to have indication of the type of timber that's proposed
- The drawing also shows what appears to be a precast concrete sill, however the window have a moulded surround already in place, including sill, so presumably this will need omitting?
- Additionally, the section shows the wall below with a DPM and external insulation down the face, which is presumably not going to be the case.
- External and internal door details, showing hardwood fielded panel door provided. These appear fine, however this doesn't include the glazed door to the carriage arch, so this should be added.
- Detail of the new metal louvres to the frontage are needed.
 - Detail has been provided showing a new stainless steel grille with a timber fixed light window behind. The stainless steel may possibly look rather bright and shiny, however, given the exposure of the location and pale colour of the background, these are likely to appear quite neat and subtle.
- Information has also been received on various internal modifications, with photos, and
- I have not been able to find detail on taking down and rebuilding the chimneys with modification.
- Information has been provided on surviving historic fabric within the building left by removing studwork, partitions, dry-lining etc.

Other requested details:

- Colour of glazing framing to carriage arch (inc. detail of door, if it's a new one).
- Detail for creating 2 no. window seats to top floor. What material is being removed and how will the area be finished? Is it proposed to add insulation?
- The heritage statement has been updated to say that the building was constructed between 1993-5. Obviously this is a simple typo, but would be helpful to rectify.

Apologies if I've missed any of the above in the revised details. If not, I look forward to seeing the updates.

12th April 2022

Since my last consultation response, some updated info has been received.

- The drawings show upper floor windows remaining as existing, but the D, A&H statement still refers to altering them (p6) so this should be clarified.

- This reference has been removed
- Details of windows have been supplied. There are a couple of aspects that need alteration or clarification:
 - A 12mm heritage DG unit has been specified with solid glazing bars, which should minimise visual impact.
 - Iroko hardwood has been specified
 - The pre-cast cill previously shown has been updated to reflect the sandstone surrounds for the existing window openings.
 - Section detail has been updated to reflect the masonry wall construction.
 - This also includes detail for the new window seat and insulation. This will entail a removal of some historic fabric, which would imply less-than-substantial harm, and offset that harm by providing an architecturally and functionally enriching detail to these rooms.
 - However, the detail as drawn contains a cold bridge at the internal cill, just inside the base of the window, where the masonry is likely to be cold and any small defects in the external finishes may additionally lead to moisture penetration when the building receives wind-blown rain, which is likely to occur regularly given the location. This makes it likely that condensation will form under (or possibly even on) the internal cill.
 - Additionally, the solid insulation runs the risk of exacerbating the problem by proving hermetically sealed cold pockets between itself and the masonry where condensation may again be a problem.
 - I'd suggest detailing this with insulation extending to the base of the window, beneath the cill, making use of something like lambswool that will be highly breathable and resilient to moisture changes, and adding a small hidden air gap between the top of the wainscot and the underside of the cill (e.g. 5mm) to allow any moisture that comes from the masonry to evaporate to the room.
 - It may also be prudent to continue the insulation under the seat itself as at the point where the rear of the seat meets the wainscot, the temperature gradient across the full thickness of the wall will be at approximately its halfway point i.e. in the absence of factors such as insulation or heat absorbed from the room, the temperature at that point will be about halfway between the internal and external wall face temperatures.

- Detail drawing for the glazed door to the carriage arch has been submitted. This appears of suitable detail and to essentially be very similar to the current door and in the same location. I do not believe, therefore, that there is any more than a slight impact on the significance of the building, and this will be a positive change.
 - White painted finish has been specified. I know it is a popular choice these days, but is distinctly modern in appearance. A darker colour may bring out the shape of the arch better. The current white painted option seems to be a good opportunity to make an improvement. I'd be grateful for comment on whether an alternative colour could be used (maybe grey?)
- I have not been able to find detail on taking down and rebuilding the chimneys with modification.
 - Precise works to chimneys not yet known. I'd suggest picking this up in future when more information is available. Possible LBC will be required, or possibly it won't. A method statement may be sufficient to control works if there is ambiguity to the scope or approach.

Summary:

- Window seat needs altered detailing to reduce cold bridging and risk of condensation.
- An alternative colour to white may look better for the carriage arch frame, so I'd be grateful for comment on possible alternatives.
- As work for the chimneys is not yet known, I suggest further discussion happens in future when it is known.

17th June 2022

Conclusion: No objection (See summary)

Assessment:

Updated information has been received to address the following points raised previously:

Summary:

- Window seat needs altered detailing to reduce cold bridging and risk of condensation.
 - The relevant revised doc appears to be Fenestration 2, however it was Fenestration 1 that showed the window seat detailing, and the revised sheet seems to be identical to the one submitted in March

		<p>anyway (they're both Fenestration 2 revision A).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I wonder if this is the right document, and would be grateful for clarification. I would be happy to see this detail submitted via a condition, if that would be preferable. ● An alternative colour to white may look better for the carriage arch frame, so I'd be grateful for comment on possible alternatives. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed colour for this has been updated to grey ● As work for the chimneys is not yet known, I suggest further discussion happens in future when it is known. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The information provided is that they will be inspected and a decision taken on whether they need rebuilding. This may require listed building consent, so I'd request the agent get back in touch as soon as they know. ○ If there is a risk of missing the window of time in which scaffolding will be up, I'd urge as much certainty in advance as possible. If a drone inspection or use of a cherry-picker could clarify the work to the chimneys, that may be worthwhile. ● I'd additionally suggest the following should be submitted, and would be happy to see these covered by conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A render specification for areas of new render for the building ○ Specification for rooflights ○ Sample of replacement slate ○ Specification for new materials and surfaces to entryway. <p>Summary:</p> <p>I am supportive of this work, subject to the following being resolved by condition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Window seat needs altered detailing to reduce cold bridging and risk of condensation; ● A render specification for areas of new render for the building; ● Specification for rooflights; ● Sample of replacement slate; ● Specification for new materials and surfaces to entryway.
	<p>Ancient Monuments Society - The Georgian Group</p>	<p><i>16th July 2021</i></p> <p>Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It is desirable to give this building a new use, however it is not at immanent risk of dilapidation. ● As per national legislation and policy, special regard and great weight should be given to the asset's preservation and conservation. Internally, this applies to the building only; externally the impact on the settings of

neighbouring listed buildings should be considered too.

- Special attention should also be paid to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.
- The attachment named Heritage, Design and Access Statement does not contain any substantive heritage significance or impact analysis (the latter of which is advised rather than required in the application, though clearly still necessary for effective decision-making), and if reflective of the design process suggests that key decisions on the conversion and modification of this key listed building have happened without complete analysis. This is problematic, particularly when certain decisions, such as the addition of a flat roof section to the rear, the changes to the upper floor windows and the insertion of rooflights, do not appear to have any benefit beyond providing a more modern accommodation experience.
- There is also a question mark over the decision to bisect the old carriage arch space that once led to the rear yard, in order to create a meter cupboard. The significance of this axis is not mentioned in the heritage statement.
- I have previously requested a demolition plan showing the elements that will need removing internally to create the revised layout, so this should be added to the application.
- I also request more detail on the new external staircase to the rear. This is proposed to be galvanised steel, from the elevation drawing annotation, but a product sheet or some other visualisation would be useful in understanding the visual impact. Having the staircase cross the rear carriage arch needs more consideration.
- In the case of the upper floor window alterations, it's unlikely an expanded heritage appraisal would conclude there is a case to be made for this as the argument in favour (that it would make for a better view out) would be outweighed by the loss of historic fabric and alteration of the proportions of the highly regimented façade. I flag this as a likelihood, of course (as with the pre-application advice), and will reserve conclusion until a more in-depth heritage statement is received.
- Details should be submitted of new doors and windows, internal and external.
- Detail of the new metal louvres to the frontage should be supplied.
- Taking down and rebuilding the chimneys with modification may require listed building consent. If this is proposed, details will need to be submitted.
- To the rear, where it is proposed to remove a mono-pitch slate roof and build up the wall in cavity blockwork, is this section already cavity blockwork? There have been some extensions to the rear in the late 20th century, so presumably these construction methods match, but

confirmation would be beneficial as the majority of the building will be solid masonry.

- It would be useful to have more detail on what works will be required within the attic to fit the mezzanines, in terms of reinforcement, removal of structure etc.

Summary:

These plans have the potential to bring notable improvements for this building both in terms of appearance and use. There is not currently sufficient information with the application to be certain that decisions taken have fully considered the building's conservation. Without fully understanding the potential harm of certain courses of action, justifying and demonstrating alternatives or mitigating factors is also not fully possible, so this needs a bit more attention.

From the current information, the plan to lower the 2nd floor window sills is not supportable. Although I await more information, my suspicion is that enough is already known about this aspect that the fundamental relationship between benefit and disbenefits won't change, so it may be advantageous to revise the designs with this in mind.

23rd November 2021

Assessment:

My previous response, from July 2021, concluded that level of supporting information was not sufficient and that one or two aspects of the design were likely to be problematic. More information has since been provided.

My earlier comments are below on the first level of the list, with updates on the second level.

- Justification is needed for addition of a flat roof section to the rear.
 - Added justification has been supplied, pointing out that this aspect of the building makes a reduced contribution to the overall impression, and that the proposal will be kept subtle.
 - The current volumes to the rear are unattractive and their replacement with the proposed taller, flat roofed volume is difficult to view as other than a neutral impact in such a context.
- Justification is needed for the changes to the upper floor windows (although it is likely this will not be supported).
 - The drawings show these remaining as existing, but the D, A&H statement still refers to altering them (p6) so this should be

clarified.

- I would not request LBC for the proposed flower boxes (although there is a possibility this location may be too exposed for the flowers to stay inside them).
- Justification is needed for the insertion of rooflights.
 - Justification has been provided as these being a small level of harm necessary to allow a more pleasant interior space. There is certainly some validity to this, and if these rooflights are to be used to allow a pleasant interior with views out as an alternative to making changes to the top floor façade windows I can see this being justifiable.
 - I would view the proposed recessed heritage style rooflights as being modest in size and number, and justifiable in the context of providing illumination to the mezzanines.
- A demolition plan showing the elements that will need removing internally to create the revised layout is needed.
 - Demolition plan has been received (please refer to follow up questions below).
- Detail on the new external staircase to the rear is needed, e.g. product sheet or some other visualisation.
 - An indicative visualisation has been provided. It is not the most attractive staircase, but is a considerable improvement.
- Justification is needed for having the staircase cross the rear carriage arch.
 - Justification has been provided in the form of the staircase being a significant improvement on the existing one, and of a slimmer design that will still allow the shape of the arch to be read.
- Details of new doors and windows, internal and external are needed.
- Detail of the new metal louvres to the frontage are needed.
- Details on taking down and rebuilding the chimneys with modification is needed.
- Clarification is needed on the wall construction type where it is proposed to remove a mono-pitch slate roof and build up the wall in cavity blockwork to the rear to ensure compatibility.
 - This has been clarified as part of the modern blockwork to the rear and will be extended in similar fashion.
- Clarification is requested on works required within the attic area to fit the mezzanines, in terms of reinforcement, removal of structure etc.
 - Confirmation has been supplied that the new mezzanines will be supported from the masonry, being free spans and allowing the original roof structure to be visible.

Further thoughts and requests:

Please also refer to above highlighted sections.

- Recommend using a dark frame (e.g. dark grey) for the glazing to the carriage arch to simplify the appearance and accentuate the shape of the opening.
- Request details of existing windows to be removed from rear elevation (photos and summary).
- Confirmation of composition of internal walls enclosing first floor office to NW corner of plan requested.
- Request detail for creating 2 no. window seats to top floor. What material is being removed and how will the area be finished? Is it proposed to add insulation?
- The heritage statement has been updated to say that the building was constructed between 1993-5. Obviously this is a simple typo, but would be helpful to rectify.

16th February 2022

Since my last consultation response, some updated info has been received.

- The drawings show these remaining as existing, but the D, A&H statement still refers to altering them (p6) so this should be clarified.
 - It would be helpful to have this reference removed/clarified when the design and access document is updated
- Details of new doors and windows, internal and external are needed.
 - Details of windows have been supplied. There are a couple of aspect that need alteration or clarification
 - The proposed glazed unit is 20mm DG, and generally anything thicker than 12mm is likely to look too thick.
 - There is no indication of the glazing bar arrangement/dimensions
 - It would be useful to have indication of the type of timber that's proposed
 - The drawing also shows what appears to be a precast concrete sill, however the window have a moulded surround already in place, including sill, so presumably this will need omitting?
 - Additionally, the section shows the wall below with a DPM and external insulation down the face, which is presumably not going to be the case.
 - External and internal door details, showing hardwood fielded panel door provided. These appear fine, however this doesn't include the glazed door to the carriage arch, so this should be added.
- Detail of the new metal louvres to the frontage are needed.

- Detail has been provided showing a new stainless steel grille with a timber fixed light window behind. The stainless steel may possibly look rather bright and shiny, however, given the exposure of the location and pale colour of the background, these are likely to appear quite neat and subtle.

- Information has also been received on various internal modifications, with photos, and
- I have not been able to find detail on taking down and rebuilding the chimneys with modification.
- Information has been provided on surviving historic fabric within the building left by removing studwork, partitions, dry-lining etc.

Other requested details:

- Colour of glazing framing to carriage arch (inc. detail of door, if it's a new one).
- Detail for creating 2 no. window seats to top floor. What material is being removed and how will the area be finished? Is it proposed to add insulation?
- The heritage statement has been updated to say that the building was constructed between 1993-5. Obviously this is a simple typo, but would be helpful to rectify.

Apologies if I've missed any of the above in the revised details. If not, I look forward to seeing the updates.

12th April 2022

Since my last consultation response, some updated info has been received.

- The drawings show upper floor windows remaining as existing, but the D, A&H statement still refers to altering them (p6) so this should be clarified.
 - This reference has been removed
- Details of windows have been supplied. There are a couple of aspects that need alteration or clarification:
 - A 12mm heritage DG unit has been specified with solid glazing bars, which should minimise visual impact.
 - Iroko hardwood has been specified
 - The pre-cast cill previously shown has been updated to reflect the sandstone surrounds for the existing window openings.
 - Section detail has been updated to reflect the masonry wall construction.
 - This also includes detail for the new window seat and insulation. This will entail a removal of some historic fabric, which would imply less-than-substantial harm, and offset that harm by providing an architecturally and functionally

enriching detail to these rooms.

- However, the detail as drawn contains a cold bridge at the internal cill, just inside the base of the window, where the masonry is likely to be cold and any small defects in the external finishes may additionally lead to moisture penetration when the building receives wind-blown rain, which is likely to occur regularly given the location. This makes it likely that condensation will form under (or possibly even on) the internal cill.
 - Additionally, the solid insulation runs the risk of exacerbating the problem by proving hermetically sealed cold pockets between itself and the masonry where condensation may again be a problem.
 - I'd suggest detailing this with insulation extending to the base of the window, beneath the cill, making use of something like lambswool that will be highly breathable and resilient to moisture changes, and adding a small hidden air gap between the top of the wainscot and the underside of the cill (e.g. 5mm) to allow any moisture that comes from the masonry to evaporate to the room.
 - It may also be prudent to continue the insulation under the seat itself as at the point where the rear of the seat meets the wainscot, the temperature gradient across the full thickness of the wall will be at approximately its halfway point i.e. in the absence of factors such as insulation or heat absorbed from the room, the temperature at that point will be about halfway between the internal and external wall face temperatures.
- Detail drawing for the glazed door to the carriage arch has been submitted. This appears of suitable detail and to essentially be very similar to the current door and in the same location. I do not believe, therefore, that there is any more than a slight impact on the significance of the building, and this will be a positive change.
 - White painted finish has been specified. I know it is a popular choice these days, but is distinctly modern in appearance. A darker colour may bring out the shape of the arch better. The current white painted option seems to be a good opportunity to make an improvement. I'd be grateful for comment on whether an alternative colour could be used (maybe grey?)
 - I have not been able to find detail on taking down and rebuilding the chimneys with modification.

- Precise works to chimneys not yet known. I'd suggest picking this up in future when more information is available. Possible LBC will be required, or possibly it won't. A method statement may be sufficient to control works if there is ambiguity to the scope or approach.

Summary:

- Window seat needs altered detailing to reduce cold bridging and risk of condensation.
- An alternative colour to white may look better for the carriage arch frame, so I'd be grateful for comment on possible alternatives.
- As work for the chimneys is not yet known, I suggest further discussion happens in future when it is known.

17th June 2022

Conclusion: No objection (See summary)

Assessment:

Updated information has been received to address the following points raised previously:

Summary:

- Window seat needs altered detailing to reduce cold bridging and risk of condensation.
 - The relevant revised doc appears to be Fenestration 2, however it was Fenestration 1 that showed the window seat detailing, and the revised sheet seems to be identical to the one submitted in March anyway (they're both Fenestration 2 revision A).
 - I wonder if this is the right document, and would be grateful for clarification. I would be happy to see this detail submitted via a condition, if that would be preferable.
- An alternative colour to white may look better for the carriage arch frame, so I'd be grateful for comment on possible alternatives.
 - The proposed colour for this has been updated to grey
- As work for the chimneys is not yet known, I suggest further discussion happens in future when it is known.
 - The information provided is that they will be inspected and a decision taken on whether they need rebuilding. This may require listed building consent, so I'd request the agent get back in touch as soon as they know.
 - If there is a risk of missing the window of time in which scaffolding

	<p>will be up, I'd urge as much certainty in advance as possible. If a drone inspection or use of a cherry-picker could clarify the work to the chimneys, that may be worthwhile.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I'd additionally suggest the following should be submitted, and would be happy to see these covered by conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A render specification for areas of new render for the building ○ Specification for rooflights ○ Sample of replacement slate ○ Specification for new materials and surfaces to entryway. <p>Summary:</p> <p>I am supportive of this work, subject to the following being resolved by condition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Window seat needs altered detailing to reduce cold bridging and risk of condensation; • A render specification for areas of new render for the building; • Specification for rooflights; • Sample of replacement slate; • Specification for new materials and surfaces to entryway.
<p>Cumbria County Council – Historic Environment Officer</p>	<p><i>2nd July 2021</i></p> <p>I defer to any forthcoming comments that your conservation officer may make regarding the acceptability of the proposals on the listed building. I do not consider that the proposal will impact upon any archaeological assets, however.</p> <p><i>2nd November 2021</i></p> <p>I defer to any forthcoming comments that your conservation officer may make regarding the acceptability of the proposals on the listed building.</p>
<p>Neighbour Responses:</p>	
<p>The application has been advertised by way of a planning application site notice, press notice and notification letter sent to 15no. neighbouring properties.</p> <p>No representations have been received.</p>	
<p><u>Copeland Local Plan 2013-2028 (Adopted December 2013):</u></p> <p><u>Core Strategy (CS):</u> Policy ST1 – Strategic Development Principles</p>	

Policy ENV3 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity
Policy ENV4 – Heritage Assets

Development Management Policies (DMP):

Policy DM25 – Protecting Nature Conservation Sites, Habitats and Species
Policy DM27 – Built Heritage and Archaeology

Other Material Planning Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (CHSR).
Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) (PLBCA).
Cumbria Development Design Guide (CDDG).

Emerging Copeland Local Plan 2017-2035 (ELP).

The emerging Copeland Local Plan 2017-2035 has recently been the subject of a Publication Draft Consultation. The Publication Draft Consultation builds upon the previously completed Issues and Options and Preferred Options consultations. Given the stage of preparation of the Copeland Local Plan 2017-2035 some weight can be attached to policies within the Publication Draft where no objections have been received. The Publication Draft provides an indication of the direction of travel of the emerging planning policies, which themselves have been developed in accordance with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Assessment:

Heritage

Policy DM10 of the DMP and Policy DS6PU of the ELP expects high standards of design and the fostering of quality places. It is required that development responds positively to the character of the site and the immediate and wider setting and enhance local distinctiveness. It is required that development incorporate existing features and address vulnerability to and fear of crime and antisocial behaviour.

Policies ENV4 and DM27 of the CS and DMP and Policy BE1PU of the ELP seeks to protect, conserve and where possible enhance listed buildings, conservation areas and their settings.

The LBCA sets out a clear presumption that gives considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving a heritage asset and its setting.

Section 66.1 of the LBCA requires that: *'In considering whether to grant planning permission for*

development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses’.

Section 72 of the LBCA requires that: *‘special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance’ of a conservation area’.*

Paragraphs 199 – 208 of the NPPF in respect of heritage include a requirement that when considering the impact of development proposals on designated heritage assets such as a conservation area, great weight should be given to the conservation of the asset’s significance; however, less than significant harm should be weighed against the public benefits of a development.

A limited Heritage, Design and Access Statement has been prepared in support of this planning application.

The Application Site is a Grade II Listed building located within the Whitehaven Town Centre Conservation Area.

The Ancient Monuments Society - Georgian Group and Copeland Borough Council – Conservation Officer initially raised objections and sought revisions to the development on grounds of the lack of detailed justification for certain aspects of the development; however, both now raise no objection following the receipt of additional information and justification.

The significance of the building principally relates to the social history that the building represents, its developed form and its relationship to the harbour.

The proposed development retains the external form and materials of the building, with minor interventions to the later additions to the rear of the property, the introduction of a window and the introduction of roof lights. In the context of the existing additions to the building, the proposed additions to these elements are appropriate in form and do not cause unacceptable harm. The proposed windows are sought to facilitate the creation of additional accommodation within the roof structure, which is required to make the development viable and to remove the requirement for alterations to the primary features of interest within the primary elevation. The reinstatement of existing stepped entrance comprises a significant positive enhancement of the building.

Owed to the extensive internal alterations to facilitate the previous use, limited original fabric of significance remains to the interior of the building. The proposed internal alterations to the building are extensive; however, these principally relate to the removal/alteration of the interventions completed in the conversion to the previous use and so the resulting impact upon the significance of the building is limited. The existing historic fabric is to be retained with some small alterations.

Insufficient detail has been provided in relation to the repair of the chimney, proposed window seat

	<p>and replacement of the existing ramped access; therefore, planning conditions are proposed to secure these details.</p> <p><i>Ecology</i></p> <p>Policy ENV3 of the CS and Policy N1PU of the ELP seeks to ensure that new development will protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity.</p> <p>The building by virtue of its age and construction is identified as a building with the potential for the presence of bats in the Bat Conservation Trust Bat Surveys Good Practice Guidelines; however, given the location of the building in an extremely exposed coastal position and the presence of extensive artificial sources of light, there is considered to be 'negligible' potential for roosting bats to utilise the building; therefore, a Bat Survey has not been requested.</p> <p>Planning Balance</p> <p>In applying the statutory duties of the LBCA and the relevant provisions of the NPPF and the Development Plan, it is considered that as proposed the development will result in impacts at the lower end of less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area and Grade II Listed Building. It is however considered that this less than substantial harm would be outweighed by the resulting benefits of returning the building to an active use and the economic benefits to the local economy.</p>
8.	<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Approve Listed Building Consent (start within 3yr)</p>
9.	<p>Conditions:</p> <p>1. The works hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.</p> <p>Reason</p> <p>To comply with the requirements of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</p> <p>2. Permission shall relate to the following plans and documents as received on the respective dates and development shall be carried out in accordance with them:-</p> <p>Planning Application Form received 8th June 2021</p>

Site Location Plan at scale 1:1250 received 8th June 2021
Site Block Plan at scale 1:500 received 8th June 2021
Existing and Proposed Floor Plans – Drawing No. 1234 04 Rev. F received 22nd May 2022
Existing and Proposed Elevation Plans – Drawing No. 1234 05 Rev. F received 22nd May 2022
Demolition Plans – Drawing No. 1234 06 Rev. – received 28th October 2022
Window/Door Detail – Drawing No. 1234 10 Rev. A received 22nd May 2022
Door Detail – Drawing No. 1234 11 Rev. – received 25th January 2022
Louvre Detail – Drawing No. 1234 12 Rev. - received 25th January 2022
Archway Door Detail – Drawing No. 1234 13 Rev. – received 13th March 2022
Heritage, Design and Access Statement Rev. B March 2022 received 13th March 2022
Heritage, Design and Access Statement Supplementary Information received 22nd May 2022
Schedule of Internal Views of the Property – 10th February 2022 received 11th February 2022
Job No 1234 – 22 June 2022 - Addendum document to support Planning and LBC Application for The Old Customs House, Whitehaven received 22nd June 2022

To conform with the requirement of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

3. No works to the chimney hereby approved shall commence unless and until a detailed schedule of repair works or have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason

To protect and preserve the heritage asset in accordance with the provisions of Policy ENV4 and Policy DM27 of the Copeland Local Plan 2013-2028.

4. No works relating to the replacement of the existing access ramp and the reinstatement of the steps to the main access shall commence until a detailed specification of the proposed paving and reinstated steps have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason

To protect and preserve the heritage asset in accordance with the provisions of Policy ENV4 and Policy DM27 of the Copeland Local Plan 2013-2028.

5. Notwithstanding the submitted details, no works to the proposed window seat shall commence unless and until a detailed specification of the window seat including the proposed means of insulation have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason

To protect and preserve the heritage asset in accordance with the provisions of Policy ENV4 and Policy DM27 of the Copeland Local Plan 2013-2028.

Informative

The proposed development lies within a coal mining area which may contain unrecorded coal mining related hazards. If any coal mining feature is encountered during development, this should be reported immediately to the Coal Authority on 0345 762 6848.

Further information is also available on the Coal Authority website at:

www.gov.uk/government/organisations/the-coal-authority

Statement

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received, and subsequently determining to grant listed building consent in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Case Officer: Chris Harrison

Date : 24/06/2022

Authorising Officer: N.J. Hayhurst

Date : 27/06/2022

Dedicated responses to:-