



COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL DELEGATED PLANNING DECISION

1.	Reference No:	4/22/2203/OL1	
2.	Proposed Development:	LISTED BUILDING CONSENT FOR STEEL BEAMS INSTALLATION TO LOUNGE 1 CEILINGS (RETROSPECTIVE) AND REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING FRONT DOOR	
3.	Location:	SEASCALE HALL, SEASCALE	
4.	Parish:	Seascale	
5.	Constraints:	ASC;Adverts - ASC;Adverts, Listed Building - Listed Building, Safeguard Zone - Safeguard Zone, Coal - Off Coalfield - Data Subject To Change, Key Species - Potential areas for Natterjack Toads, DEPZ Zone - DEPZ Zone, Outer Consultation Zone - Sellafield 10KM	
6.	Publicity Representations &Policy	Neighbour Notification Letter	Yes
		Site Notice	Yes
		Press Notice	Yes
		Consultation Responses	See Report
		Relevant Policies	See Report
7.	Report:		
	Site and Location		
		This application relates to a Grade II Listed building, known as Seascale Hall, located approximately 350m to the east of Sellafield. The building is two storey and finished with roughcast stone.	

Historically parts of the house were used and left to become virtually derelict, however the dwelling is now being slowly brought back to good repair by the present tenants. The site is currently undergoing extensive refurbishments following the granting of Listed Building consent in 2018 (ref: 4/18/2207/OL1).

Planning History

4/18/2207/OL1 – Listed Building Consent for Internal and External Refurbishment Works

4/20/2361/DOC – Discharge of condition 3 (Engineers Report) of approved Listed Building Consent

4/18/2207/OL1 – Discharged in part in relation to barn 1 of the application – 04.11.20

4/20/2490/DOC – Discharge of condition 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12 & 13 of planning approval 4/18/2207/OL1 – 08.03.21

4/21/2244/DOC – Discharge of condition 3 of approved Listed Building Consent 4/18/2207/OL1 – Discharged in part in relation to barn 1 of the application – 28.05.21

4/21/2332/DOC – Discharge of condition 10 of approved Listed Building Consent 4/18/2207/OL1 – Discharged in part

4/21/2391/DOC – Discharge of condition 5 and 10 of approved Listed Building Consent

4/18/2207/OL1 – Discharged in part

4/21/2552/DOC – Discharge of condition 3 of planning approval 4/21/2348/OL1 - Approved

Proposal

This listed building application seeks permission for the following works:

- Installation of steel beams to lounge 1 ceilings – retrospective.
- Replacement of existing front door.

Consultation Responses

Seascale Parish Council

No comments received.

Copeland Borough Council – Conservation & Design Officer

14th June 2022

Conclusion: Request further information

Assessment: This proposal consists of two main elements:

- Installation of steel beams to support first floor suspended ceiling timbers in Lounge 1

- This consists of insertion of four no. steel beams below existing timber beams, with packing inserted for support, and fireboard boxing. The end of the beams are supported on concrete padstones set into the walls.
- This is a similar specification to that previously approved for the kitchen and is accompanied by a structural engineer's report.
- This proposal allows the retention of the timber beams, with minimal loss of historic fabric or change to appearance. The added depth of the new beam, packing and boxing will slightly alter the perceived appearance, however I would expect this to be minor and not to cause change to the way the rooms are used due to the high ceilings.
- I would therefore view this proposal as justified.

- Replacement of front door

- The existing front door is a complex item constructed from several parts of different age and condition that have been variously repaired and added to.
- I have had the opportunity to inspect the front door in detail and take photographs.
- Judging from the physical evidence, the door is composed of parts from four phases:
 - The ironmongery (excluding external knocker), which appears at least in part characteristic of the 17th century. The external knocker appears 19th century to me;
 - The upper part of the outer panelled section of the door, which appears characteristic of the 19th century;
 - The lower part of the outer panelled section of the door (scarf jointed stile bases; bottom rail; possibly lower panel). This could reasonably be from any time from about the mid-19th to mid-20th centuries and must logically postdate the upper section as it is a repair to it, likely carried out due to rotting of its lower parts. One might therefore assume it postdates the upper section by several decades;
 - The planked inner section of the door, which appears to have been stuck onto the panelled section to enable the door furniture, which due to its length would require a flat inner surface (either planking or braces). The boards are cut around the box latch, and the pintles are mounted very close to the masonry of the door reveal. Presumably this opened properly at first, but the internal lining of the house in the recent refurbishment means it now only opens about 70%.

- Based on this, one might assume that either:
 - The internal ironmongery pre-dates the early 18th century re-fronting of the house and was re-used at that time for a new door. Given the datestones of 1579 and 1606, apparently from previous iterations of the house, it is plausible that the ironmongery is Elizabethan, or from shortly after;
 - Or, the internal ironmongery dates from c.1710 and was fitted to a new boarded door at that time.
 - From its appearance, I would assign more likelihood to the first possibility.
- In either case, that early-18th century door has apparently been replaced at some subsequent point with the panelled outer and planked inner example, presumably either because the original had decayed, fashions had changed, or both.
- If I were to speculate on dates, based on the evidence I've seen I'd suggest:
 - The ironmongery dates from a late-16th or 17th century phase of the house, at which time the front door would have been where the staircase is now. This would have been a double plank door;
 - The major rebuild in c.1710 reused this ironmongery on a new double-plank door in the current location;
 - This double-plank door was replaced in the middle part of the 19th century (e.g. c.1840-80) with a three- or four-panelled door, to which were attached horizontal boards internally to allow the ironmongery to be remounted;
 - The bottom of the panel door rotted and was replaced at some point between the late-19th and early-20th centuries. If the door was originally four-panelled, the bottom two panels were likely at this time replaced with the current single panel.
- Due to the apparently 19th century origins of the current door, its poor condition, lack of insulative and security properties, and the fact it doesn't open properly and can't be made to do so without substantial alteration, there would seem to be a case for replacement. I am satisfied that the existing archaeological evaluation provides sufficient record of the existing door. I request that the Lanpro Heritage Statement Addendum document be deposited alongside Greenlane Archaeology's 2021 Building Recording report in the appropriate repositories.
- The replacement of the front door, however, raises some further questions:
 - Given that the ironmongery appears to be the most significant part of the door, how safely can it be removed without damage, both from the door and from

the masonry doorway reveal?

- As the door is to be made narrower, will this potentially conflict with the length of the strap hinges? (Reference is made to altering the ironmongery in the application, although isn't specific)
- How will the door itself be constructed inside and out? Timber will be specified, but what type of timber? Oak would likely be appropriate. Similarly, how will the ironmongery be mounted to the inner face? Would the door be panelled outside and planked inside?
 - Rather than recreating the existing external panelled door face with a planked inner face, a better alternative may be to create a new double-planked door, potentially with moulded fillets over the external vertical joints to protect them from water ingress and provide a more decorative appearance. This would pair well with a flat planked inner surface that would make positioning the straps, bolts, box latch and Suffolk latch easier. With or without external moulded fillets, an alternative for the internal face might be to use braces instead of horizontal boards.

Summary:

I would be grateful if the following could be supplied:

- Likelihood of being able to safely remove the ironmongery from the door, and the pintles from the door reveal, whole and undamaged;
- Clarification on what modifications are anticipated to the ironmongery to enable it to be fitted to the new door;
- Comment on whether a double-planked door or a plank-and-brace door, with or without external moulded fillets, would be more suitable than a replica of the existing panel door;
- A drawing of the internal face of the new door, with locations of the ironmongery shown.

19th July 2022

Conclusion: Request design revision and further information

Assessment: In my previous consultation response, I requested details of the following:

- Likelihood of being able to safely remove the ironmongery from the door, and the pintles from the door reveal, whole and undamaged;
- Clarification on what modifications are anticipated to the ironmongery to enable it to be fitted

to the new door;

- Comment on whether a double-planked door or a plank-and-brace door, with or without external moulded fillets, would be more suitable than a replica of the existing panel door;
- A drawing of the internal face of the new door, with locations of the ironmongery shown.

Since then, updated information has been received.

- There appears to be no likelihood of removing the ironmongery safely with the current proposal, which is to cut the straps off the strap hinges parallel with the edge of the door, dispose of the eye and pintle, and reattach the straps to a new door as decoration.
 - This would destroy the hinges and I'm not convinced that sticking part of the hinge back on would offset that.
 - Based on what is deducible about the door, I believe that the strap hinges are both more significant and saveable. It would be worth making a serious attempt to recover them in a state where they can be reused. If the timber could be removed from the straps in situ, potentially the strap hinges could be individually lifted up off the pintles and the pintles then carefully removed from the wall.
 - Alternatively, if the hinges cannot be removed from the pintles, it may, with the timber itself gone, be possible to remove each hinge/pintle as a unit from the wall.
 - They could potentially then be remounted onto a new door and the pintles reset into the holes at a shallower depth, so that they don't foul the jamb when opened.
- The proposal to retain a three-panelled style of door could not be objected to if the principle of replacing the timber itself is reasonable, as this would entail little aesthetic change to the building externally. I do not believe that the panelled inner face contributes greatly to the significance of the building, but it does provide a suitable surface for mounting the ironmongery.

Regarding the above, I've been referred to image IMG_2108 to illustrate the internal surface of the door and locations of the ironmongery, however this is a photo of the existing door, which is horizontally boarded on the inner face to provide a flat surface for mounting the long ironmongery such as strap hinges and bolts. If the new door is to be a panelled door inside and out, presumably only the horizontal rails will provide suitable surfaces for mounting onto. I'd be grateful for clarification on this point.

9th August 2022

I've been sent the following by SPAB. I presume this can't be considered a consultation response from them, so I guess the thing to do is put it to Olivia and Ste and see what they

think. The red bits are my thoughts.

My Technical colleagues offer the following two solutions:

- i. remove the delta/newlath membrane from the reveal and return to original reveal depth, then repair the door. This is the least invasive remedy and touches no original fabric.
This could work, however it creates a hole in the membrane that might lead to localised damp. It doesn't solve the condition of the door and the gaps in and of itself, so would need employing in conjunction with at least a new timber door jamb.
- ii. when repairing the door, get a blacksmith to crank the original strap hinges to offset the strap sufficiently to counter the depth they are sunk into the new reveal. This would require the hinges to be removed from the door, cranked, and then refitted (slightly off from their original fixings due to the crank 'stealing' some of the strap length, but could stay in the original locations but the door reveal (timber?) would have to be remodelled to reciprocate the offset. This would need a bit of thought by whoever takes on the job, but is doable and worth it if the membrane has to stay.
This might be an option. Cranking means bending the strap. I've made some diagrams showing how I think this could work, with the existing door and a new arrangement in open and closed positions. I think this would necessitate replacing the door itself (perhaps inevitable, given the condition of the current one), but could in theory retain the c. 400 year old ironmongery. A difficulty of this method is that the door would be slightly further forward when closed so would hit the jamb, which I believe is a profile in the masonry rather than a timber insert. However, if a new door is being made, this could perhaps be shorter and narrower than the existing so it would sit within the masonry jamb and close against a new external timber jamb. It might be doable. Please refer to attached diagrams, which show my idea of how this might work, although alternatives may be possible/better.

The building owner needs to agree that this needs to be done before sending a specialist to look at/repair the door.

The following company may be able to help/undertake the work. We are aware that they did very similar repairs to a door in Windermere.

Contact – Spencer Samson – Kendal – Cumbria (spencerrsamson.co.uk)

We would need comment from Olivia and co. but following that I could contact Spencer Samson with the photos and attached diagrams, see what they think and invite a visit, which I'd of course be happy to accompany.

The Society hopes that this response is helpful and assists in securing the retention and repair of the historic door and ironmongery.

18th August 2022

Conclusion: Request design revision

Assessment: Having attended another site visit and had an opportunity to discuss the options for the door in person, and following the feedback from SPAB, the following approach has been suggested as a workable and satisfactory solution for the problem presented by the front door:

- Recover late-16th/early-17th century strap hinges and pintles as a pair.
- Set aside bolts, latches etc. from current door for reuse.
- Transfer strap hinges to NDA's archive storage in Scotland, where they will be safe, and from which they could in theory be returned later.
- Put note in Seascale Hall's health and safety file that refers to the presence of the original hinges at the storage facility. This file stays with the house.
- Fabricate new straps to match existing.
- Build new door to match existing in appearance, in new frame, which will solve the security, weathertightness and vermin ingress problems presented by the current one.
- Refit bolts, latches etc. to new door, along with new replica straps.

I would request that case file documents (cover letter, heritage statement, Proposed Front Door sheet) be updated so the proposal reflects the above details.

13th September 2022

Conclusion: No objection

Assessment: Following previous discussion, updated details have been included with the application file.

Cover letter, heritage statement, and Proposed Front Door sheet have been updated to reflect the discussed details. I am satisfied that this represents a justifiable way forward and am happy to support it.

National Amenities Society

No comments received.

Public Representation

This application has been advertised by way of a site 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 ST2 – Spatial Development Strategy

Policy ENV4 – Heritage Assets

Development Management Policies (DMP)

Policy DM27 – Built Heritage and Archaeology

Other Material Planning Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

National Design Guide (NDG).

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Conservation Area Design Guide SPD (Adopted December 2017)

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.

Assessment

The main issues raised by this application are the principle of development and impact on the heritage asset.

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)].

NPPF para. 197 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).

As part of the initial consultation for this application the Council's Conservation Officer confirmed that the installation of the steel beams at this site was justified as similar specifications had been approved in other rooms in the property and the proposal allows for the retention of timber beams with minimal loss of the historic fabric. Concerns were however raised by the Officer regarding the replacement of the front door. The Officer states that there seems to be a case for a replacement given its poor condition, and lack of insulation and security properties, however he has concerns regarding the existing ironmongery and design of the door.

Following extensive discussions between the agent and the Council's Conservation Officer the proposed works to replace the front door were amended to include a design change for the proposed door, the reuse of the bolts and latches from the current door, and the recovery and transfer of stop hinges to NDA archive storage. Based on these amendments the Council's Conservation Officer has confirmed that the submitted documents have been updated to include the details agreed with the agent, therefore the scheme represents a justifiable way forward and he now supports the proposal. In order to ensure the works to the door are carried out as specified an appropriately worded planning condition is proposed.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

The proposed works to the Heritage Asset are considered to be justified and would have a low impact on the Grade II Listed Building. Further to extensive discussions with regard to the replacement door, no objections have been raised by the Council's Conservation Officer and a condition can be included to ensure the works to this element of the building are carried out as agreed. 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.

8.	<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Approve Listed Building Consent</p>
9.	<p>Conditions:</p> <p><u>Standard Conditions:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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"> - Location Plan, Scale 1:1250, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 10th May 2022. - Covering Letter & D&A (Amended), received by the Local Planning Authority on the 8th September 2022. - Listed Consent Front Door (Amended), Scale 1:20 & 1:100, Drawing Number LBC-09, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 8th September 2022. - Listed Application Lounge 1 Beams, Scale 1:50 & 1:100, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 10th May 2022. - Heritage Statement Addendum (Amended), Prepared by Lanpor Services, September 2022, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 8th September 2022. - Structural Survey Letter Report, Prepared by WDS Ltd April 2022, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 10th May 2022. - Structural Survey Letter Report, Prepared by WDS Ltd June 2022, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 10th May 2022. <p>Reason</p> <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.</p> <p><u>Other Conditions:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The replacement of the existing front door hereby approved must be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Covering Letter & D&A (Amended), received by the Local Planning Authority on the 8th September 2022.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Listed Consent Front Door (Amended), Scale 1:20 & 1:100, Drawing Number LBC-09, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 8th September 2022. - Heritage Statement Addendum (Amended), Prepared by Lanpor Services, September 2022, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 8th September 2022. <p>The replacement door and storage of existing ironmongery must be carried out and maintained in accordance with this approved detail at all times thereafter.</p> <p>Reason</p> <p>In the interest of protecting the heritage asset.</p> <p>Statement</p> <p>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.</p>	
Case Officer: C. Burns	Date : 27.09.2022	
Authorising Officer: N.J. Hayhurst	Date : 27.09.2022	
Dedicated responses to:-		