



## COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL DELEGATED PLANNING DECISION

|    |   |   |            |
|----|---|---|------------|
| 1. | <b>Reference No:</b>                          | 4/22/2152/OL1   |            |
| 2. | <b>Proposed Development:</b>                  | LISTED BUILDING CONSENT FOR THE EXTERNAL WALLS TO BE REPAIRED TO FOUR SIDES, LOOSE MORTAR TO BE RAKED OUT & REPOINTED IN LIME MORTAR TO ALL SIDES, INTERNAL WALLS TO BE CLEANED & REPOINTED; ROOF TIMBERS TO BE REPAIRED ON A "LIKE FOR LIKE" BASIS, STRIP OFF EXISTING ROOF SLATES AND RELAY & REPLACE WHERE NECESSARY, LIFT & RELAY LOWER GROUND FLOOR STONE FLOOR; REMOVE ROTTEN ROOF JOISTS ON UPPER GROUND FLOOR & REPLACE WITH NEW SOFTWOOD TREATED TIMBERS |            |
| 3. | <b>Location:</b>                              | HENNERY/PIGGERY AT BARWICKSTEAD, BECKERMET  |            |
| 4. | <b>Parish:</b>                                | Beckermest with Thornhill   |            |
| 5. | <b>Constraints:</b>                           | ASC;Adverts - ASC;Adverts,<br>Conservation Area - Conservation Area,<br>Flood Area - Flood Zone 2,<br>Safeguard Zone - Safeguard Zone,<br>Coal - Off Coalfield - Data Subject To Change,<br>DEPZ Zone - DEPZ Zone,<br>Outer Consultation Zone - Sellafield 10KM,<br>Listed Building - Listed Building   |            |
| 6. | <b>Publicity Representations &amp; Policy</b> | Neighbour Notification Letter   | No         |
|    |   | Site Notice   | Yes        |
|    |   | Press Notice  | Yes        |
|    |   | Consultation Responses  | See Report |
|    |   | Relevant Policies   | See Report |

7. **Report:**

**Site and Location**

This application relates to the Hennerly/Piggery at Barwickstead, located off Morass Road within the centre of Beckermest. The building is Grade II listed and lies within the Beckermest Conservation Area. The small sandstone building is located adjacent to the access for the site along its northern boundary.

**Relevant Planning History**

4/20/2265/0F1 – Barn conversion to residential dwelling and conversion of detached barn to annex accommodation – Approved

4/21/2124/0L1 – Listed Building Consent for works associated in converting a barn into a residential dwelling – Approved

**Proposal**

This application seeks Listed Building Consent for the following works:

- External walls to be repaired to four sides, loose mortar to be raked out and repointed in lime mortar to all sides;
- Internal walls to be cleaned and repointed;
- Roof timbers to be repaired on a 'like for like' basis;
- Strip off existing roof slates and relay and replace where necessary;
- Lift and relay lower ground floor stone floor;
- Remove rotten roof joists on upper ground floor and replace with new softwood treated timbers.

**Consultation Responses**

Beckermest with Thornhill Parish Council

No comments/objections to this application.

Copeland Borough Council – Conservation Officer

*14<sup>th</sup> April 2022*

Conclusion: Request further information

Assessment:

I'm supportive of efforts to arrest further decay of this regionally important building.

- Sandstone is difficult to clean, so care needs to be taken. Water based cleaning is generally not very effective, clays within the stone can cause natural variation in colour, and the stone itself is soft. Additionally, surface deposits are likely to reoccur fairly quickly given the same conditions. Pressure washing and sandblasting both had the potential to cause damage.
- The replacement of roof and suspended floor timbers appears to be justified on the basis of the photo evidence supplied, which shows a mixture of historic and modern timbers all in a poor state of repair.
- Spliced in repairs to door appear necessary and supportable.
- I'm not able to tell whether the rendered gable end would have been historically rendered so as to convey a particular appearance, perhaps to give a look more like the house and to contrast with the red sandstone dressings, or alternatively whether render was recently applied to an otherwise un-rendered wall to make it more watertight. It would be useful to know more about what contribution the rendered gable end makes the building's significance, if any.

I request the following:

- A survey or report from a heritage cleaning specialist, to identify extent and methods. Such a specialist will be required to carry out the work, so their involvement should be sought in formulating the proposal. This should extend to the cleaning of the ironwork too.
- Specification for replacement lime pointing. Hot mix with aggregate to match existing in appearance and texture would likely be compatible.
- Clarification whether any elements of stone moulding are broken or missing, e.g. kneeler at roadside SE corner. In such cases, is it proposed to instruct a mason to create a replacement piece?
- Confirmation as to the approach for the timber feed hatches and access doors at the pig stys (e.g. new timber or retention of existing? Retention of ironmongery?)
- Confirmation that new rain water goods needed will be cast iron of section and appearance to match existing.
- Clarification on whether the ground floors are graded or fitted with gutters in a way that contributes to the significance of the building, e.g. by demonstrating its functional ability serve as a piggery?

*18<sup>th</sup> May 2022*

Conclusion: Request further information

Assessment: Thank you for this update.

- Confirmation has been provided that the cleaning has already taken place. Historic England guidance on this topic is helpful, via Advice Note 16 on when LBC is needed:
  - *Exposed timber, brick- and stonework, etc, both internally and externally, and features such as tool marks, carpenters' marks, smoke blackening, decorative painting, pargetting or sgraffito work are always likely to be damaged by abrasive cleaning methods. Such work to timber and to other substrates is always likely to affect special interest, to need LBC and therefore full expert assessment before consent is granted, as well as expert handling.*
- Cleaning certainly can require LBC; a useful test is to consider the potential for impact on significance. However, in this case the cleaning appears to have been limited and mild, and not to have damaged the stone surface.
- A specification has been provided for the lime mortar. This will be hot mix with a pozzolan. It would be possible to create an overly hydraulic set this way, and produce a mortar harder than the soft local red sandstone, so care should be taken to keep it as weakly hydraulic as needed. Brick dust would probably be a good choice for frost resistance. Remember that pointing is meant to be sacrificial – it should degrade so the masonry doesn't.
  - I would be grateful if the type and proportion of pozzolan to be added to the mix could be confirmed.
- The missing carved kneeler may be on site, but if it can't be found a matching copy will be ordered from a mason.
- Confirmation has been provided that a splice repair will be undertaken if the unviable timber is less than 50% of the total, and the timber will be replaced if it's more. The ironmongery for the hatches will be sandblasted, cleaned and repainted.
- Confirmation has been received that new rain water goods needed will be cast iron of section and appearance to match existing.
- Confirmation has been provided that the renewed ground floor will be laid to falls without gutters to aid drainage in the confined space.
  - Is there any such drainage already built into the stalls at the front? I seem to recall a shallow sandstone gutter laid into the flagstones, parallel with the front of the hennery-piggery, with the flags sloping slightly down to it on either side.
  - I'd be grateful for confirmation whether this is so, and if so whether it will be retained?
- Confirmation has been provided that the roadside elevation render will be removed, the

condition assessed, and a proposal formed.

*1<sup>st</sup> August 2022*

Conclusion: No objection

Assessment: In my last response, I raised the following two queries:

- I would be grateful if the type and proportion of pozzolan to be added to the mix could be confirmed.
- Is there any such drainage already built into the stalls at the front? I seem to recall a shallow sandstone gutter laid into the flagstones, parallel with the front of the hennery-piggery, with the flags sloping slightly down to it on either side. I'd be grateful for confirmation whether this is so, and if so whether it will be retained?

Since then, new information has been received.

Confirmation has been provided that the pozzolan used will be brick dust at a 1:9 ratio.

Confirmation has also been provided that the sandstone paving within the piggery is laid to falls, to a central dished channel, an arrangement that will be retained.

I believe both of these proposals are supportable.

#### Historic England

Historic England provides advice when our engagement can add most value. In this case we are not offering advice. This should not be interpreted as comment on the merits of the application.

We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers. You may also find it helpful to refer to our published advice at <https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/find/>

It is not necessary to consult us on this application again, unless there are material changes to the proposals. However, if you would like advice from us, please contact us to explain your request.

#### National Amenities Societies

No comments received.

#### Cumbria County Council – Historic Environments Officer

Whilst noting that any sympathetic scheme that secures the long-term survival of the listed building is to be supported, I defer to any forthcoming comments that your conservation officer may make regarding the acceptability of the scheme.

#### Public Representation

This application has been advertised by way of a site notice, and press notice. No comments have been received in relation to the statutory notification procedure.

### **Planning Policy**

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

### **Development Plan**

#### **Copeland Local Plan 2013 – 2028 (Adopted December 2013)**

##### Core Strategy

Policy ST1 – Strategic Development Principles

Policy ENV4 – Heritage Assets

##### Development Management Policies (DMP)

Policy DM27 – Built Heritage and Archaeology

### **Other Material Planning Considerations**

National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

##### Emerging Copeland Local Plan (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.

Strategic Policy DS1PU: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development

Strategic Policy BE1PU: Heritage Assets

Policy BE2PU: Designated Heritage Assets

Policy BE3PU: Archaeology

Policy BE4PU: Non- Designated Heritage Assets

### **Assessment**

The main issues raised by this application relate to the principle of the development and the impact

on the Heritage Asset and Conservation Area.

Principle of Development and Impact Heritage Asset and Conservation Area

Policy ST1, ENV4, DM27 of the Copeland Local Plan seek to protect, conserve and where possible enhance the historic, cultural and architectural character of the Borough's historic sites.

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 establishes a need "in considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works [for the Local Planning Authority to] have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest" [Section 16(2)]. This requirement also applies to the granting of planning permission affecting a listing building or its setting [Section 66(1)].

Section 72 of the 1990 Act states that "special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of [a conservation] area."

Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) asserts that "Development that is not well designed should be refused".

NPPF para. 194 states that "In determining 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..."

NPPF para. 199 states, in the case of designated heritage assets, "great weight should be given to the asset's conservation", irrespective of whether potential harm is substantial, less-than-substantial, or total loss. Where harm to a designated heritage asset is less-than-substantial, it should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal (para. 202).

Paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states the effect on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account when making decisions.

Referring to assets in a conservation area, NPPF para. 207 states that loss of an element that makes a positive contribution to a conservation area should be treated as either substantial (under para. 201) or less-than-substantial harm (under paragraph 202). In new development, opportunities should be sought to enhance or better reveal the significance of conservation areas (NPPF para. 206).

The building occupies a prominent location within the centre of Beckermest Village and its Conservation Area. The proposed works to the building will enhance the overall appearance of the heritage asset and will help protect the asset for the future. From an initial review of the information submitted the Council's Conservation Officer requested additional information to support the application. Based on the submission of this amended information the Officer has stated that he has no objections to the proposal.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with the relevant policies of the Copeland Local Plan

|    |   |
|----|---|
|    | <p>and NPPF.</p> <p><u>Planning Balance and Conclusion</u></p> <p>The proposed works to the building will enhance the overall appearance of the heritage asset and will help protect the asset for the future. The Council's Conservation Officer has offered no objections to this proposal. The proposed development will have an overall positive impact on the Grade II Listed building.</p> <p>In all aspects, the proposed development is compliant with the objectives of Policies ST1, ENV4 and DM27 of the Copeland Local Plan 2013-2018 and the relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and LBCA Act.</p>   |
| 8. | <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p>Approve Listed Building Consent (start within 3yr)</p>   |
| 9. | <p><b>Conditions:</b></p> <p><u>Standard Conditions:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The works hereby permitted must be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this consent.</li> </ol> <p>Reason</p> <p>To comply with Sections 18 and 74 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. This permission relates to the following plans and documents as received on the retrospective dates and development shall be carried out in accordance with them:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Site Location Plan, Scale 1:1250, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 29<sup>th</sup> March 2022.</li> <li>- Block Plan, Scale 1:500, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 29<sup>th</sup> March 2022.</li> <li>- Works Schedule, Scale 1:100, Dwg No: 15, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 29<sup>th</sup> March 2022.</li> <li>- Design/Heritage Impact Assessment (Amended), March 2022, Rev A, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 19<sup>th</sup> July 2022.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>Reason</p> |



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.

**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 planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Case Officer:** C. Burns

**Date :** 01.08.2022

**Authorising Officer:** N.J. Hayhurst

**Date :** 04.08.2022

**Dedicated responses to:-** N/A