

Applicant response to The Georgian Group consultee response dated 16/10/2025 from Dr. Thomas Whitfield

The applicant has never asserted or stated that the panelling stripped out was plywood or plyboard. It has been stated that the plans from 1966 detailed plywood panelling and plaster work to the front face of the waiting room at ground floor. What was removed was not plywood or plyboard. But the applicant believes that it was a later reproduction panelling but cannot be sure of when it dated from. The photograph provided was of panelling from an upper floor, not the ground floor and should not be used to make assumptions about panelling throughout the property. No wooden panelling has been found or was present on any windows to the rear of the property when many G2 properties of the area still have original or period panelling. This is a notable fact. The applicant wishes for that to be made clear and does not accept that he has aided the destruction of any historically significant panelling.

It is incorrect to state that the radiators were installed in the 1960's. Electric storage heaters were installed in those positions in the 1960's, not plumbed in radiators. It is clear from the works documentation of the time that they were electric. It is quite probable that reproduction panelling was installed in the late 90's when the property was reverted to residential. All radiators were plumbed with pastic pipes at the front ground floor too. This is a small point but Dr Whitfield had placed quite some emphasis on this detail.

The hallway panelling and newly discovered panelling to the front room are one piece panels that are double faced. The panelling in the hallway therefore post-dates the blockwork and stencil paper dated by the Wallpaper Historical Society to the mid to latter part of the 18c. The panelling discovered would therefore be 1800's (it would seem). Matching panels to the corridor on interior walls in the front room are single faced and rough backed wood (believed pine). The Conservation Officer has recently had the opportunity to closely inspect and photograph them. This would not have been possible if the applicant had not alerted the conservation officer to their existence in the first place. The applicant notes their concern about the preservation of historic elements in the property and would welcome any contribution they can provide (financial or otherwise) for what will no doubt be expensive restoration works.

The applicant objects to the assertion that 'significant and irreversible harm' has been caused to his property by him. The applicant has at all stages engaged with the Conservation Officer in order to understand what works constitute repair works on a like for like basis and what works would require consent. When the applicant has made significant discoveries with an obvious historical interest, the applicant has informed the Conservation Officer immediately and sought guidance on its preservation and restoration. This is despite the fact that resoration will be financially cumbersome and the applicant could have said nothing if he was so minded. Ironically, these discoveries would never have been made if the applicant hadn't stripped out plasterboard and stud work inside the property. Areas of the application that have been refused at consultee stage, have already been accepted by the

applicant and those elements withdrawn (As detailed in the earlier reponse of the applicant on the 5th October addressing the Conservation Officer's response of the 30/9/25).

The applicant wishes for the above response to be noted and provided to the Georgian Group. The applicant respects the property that he now owns, that had been neglected and abused for several decades and hopes to have the support of groups that share the same aims as he does. To save an abandoned property that was already significantly harmed, from suffering irreparable harm. Another few years and this property would likely have become beyond economic repair like so many in Whitehaven. Not to mention the possible damage that would've caused to neighbouring G2 properties. It now has the prospect of significant investment in order to preserve it and make it once more, a family home.

Thank you.

Applicant response to Ross Anthony email dated 16/10/2025 from Historic Buildings and Places.

Mr Anthony states that the panelling was (my bold and underlining) in a repairable state. I am not an expert but I was told by two different joiners that it was not repairable. How can Mr. Anthony assert from his computer screen, that it was repairable upon removal in March/April 2025 from a few photographs? I can accept that in his opinion it *may* have been repairable but I feel it is unfair to assert that as a fact.

Secondly, the assertion that the panelling is circa 18c panelling would appear to be incorrect. Is Mr. Anthony aware of the discovery of original wooden panelling hidden from view in the property that would appear to be 19c due to the existence of more accurately dated 18c wallpaper behind it? I would like to make it clear that I have been the person to voluntarily inform the Conservation Officer of these historically significant finds and sought wider advice on their conservation. The panelling is in terrible condition but I am trying to find ways to restore it and preserve the heritage of this building that has been butchered over the past 60 years by unsympathetic owners.

The design of the white window panelling removed and photographed is entirely different to that of the panelling recently discovered.

I would also like to draw attention to the previous removal of panelling from the large rear kitchen sash window in 1966 (detailed in the work orders) that contained integral shutters. None of the panelling from the front walls of the house contained any integral shutters. Why would that be different?

I also note that neighbouring properties invariably contain panels with integral shutters which is more historically correct and panels and shutters to their rear

sashes. There were no panels or integral shutters to any of the numerous windows at the rear of the applicant's property upon purchase.

There is also ambiguity around what is shown as plywood panelling and plaster on the architect drawings from 1966 in the position of the front room panelling. It is the applicant's assertion the panelling removed due to its poor and irreparable condition was a later replica and not historically significant. If anyone has evidence to the contrary, please present that evidence.

The applicant feels that the consultee response does not reflect the discovery of period correct wooden panelling from the 1800's and woodblock and stencil handmade wallpaper from Circa 1750. The applicant has made significant steps to raise awareness of its existence and sought advice on its preservation. Has any weight been given to this when providing a 'neutral' response to the application?

The applicant would like the above response to be noted, to be forwarded to Ross Anthony, and for them to consider if they wish to update their response in light of further information.

Thank you.

(Previous response below, already submitted)

Applicant response to Conservation and Design officer response dated 30/9/2025

Conclusion: Request further information and design revision

Assessment:

Italics = Summarised applicant request on LBC

Standard font = Commentary from Sammy Woodford

Blue font = Applicant response

- *Remove panelling from under ground floor staircase.*

- Photo album refers to existing spindles of stairs behind. I am not able to see spindles behind in the photo of the cellar steps

Applicant Resonse:

Only the tan coloured triangular plywood section is proposed to be removed as this was believed to have been added to provide privacy to those in the bathroom which had been created in the 1965 conversion. The white wooden panels below will remain (Ignore crayon stating 'remove'). For clarification, this tan coloured panel is only visible at ground floor level at the rear of the main corridor that leads to the top of the cellar, not from the cellar steps itself.



- Looking at photo from ground floor stairs, it looks to me as though the wall above panelling has been added when the door across the lower rear hall was added, suggesting 1965.

Applicant Response:

Architect drawing 2a which was submitted for planning approval shows this area as solid. I believe the area below the stair spindles is original and will be retained. The tan partition ply is from 1965 and installed at the same time as the door and door frame to create the WC. It is only these elements we seek to remove.

Applicant Response: Accepted and noted. A suitable period door will be sourced if the original is not hidden behind any flat-ply possibly tacked to the current door.

- *Restore hallway panelling and re-reveal door into GF front room.*

- Original door opening into hall still exists but is covered by a large mirror, so this could presumably be opened up without risk.

- Lost details to do opening e.g. architrave, could be reinstated by a joiner.

Detail drawing would be needed.

- **Does this work include repairing or reinstating panelling on both sides of the 1965 door into the entrance lobby?**

Applicant Response: Detail drawing will be provided regarding architrave. Original Architrave on the corridor side may well be hidden behind the mirror/plasterboard. If not, intention is to match the exact style of architrave currently around the kitchen door which you have stated appears historic. The proposed work does include reinstating panelling on both sides of the 1965 door into the entrance lobby. The intention is to restore the original/historic panneling from the front wall through to corridor flat-arch. What appears to have been removed in 1965 has been found stored in the garage. The condition looks useable. NB. Any other similar panelling found behind other pieces of plasterboard will also be retained and restored.

- *Brick up 1960s back door opening from utility room; install top-opening hardwood window and sink internally.*

- No objection.

Applicant Response: Noted.

- *At cellar level, reinstate hardwood sash window with external light well.*

- No objection.

Applicant Response: Noted.

- *Open up bricked-up rear doorway at top of cellar stairs.*

- No objection

Applicant Response: Noted.

- *Re-panel window reveals at all three floors and lime plaster with casein distemper at ground floor level due to concerns about damp.*

- Panelling formerly existed in window reveals at first and second floor level; full wall was panelled at ground floor level.
- From photos of this panelling before removal, I believe it was all original to the building, highly significant and in repairable condition.
- I object to its removal, which has caused substantial harm to the building.
- As the removal has already taken place, I am not able to inspect it to confirm its condition or repairability. From the photos, it appears that there was some cracking, and that the leaking gutter had caused some localised damage. However, I believe it very likely that most of the panelling could have been saved and appropriate repairs carried out, and that at least several and perhaps all of the sets of shutters and panelling to the upper floor windows could have been saved.
- The appropriate process ought to have been as follows:
 - Inspection of the panelling to confirm its significance.
 - Repair in situ if possible.
 - If not possible, labelling and removal in the largest chunks practicable.
 - Replacement of irreparable sections in like fashion.
 - Reinstallation and repainting.
- I note that the 1965 drawings for conversion into a pharmacist's dispensary have internal elevation drawings that show "plywood panelling" to the ground floor front room, which was a waiting room. However, from the photos I have prior to its removal, as well as a photo of some of the panelling after removal, I do believe it to have been the original panelling.
- **The panelling should be re-created entirely, using the same proportions and detailing. The photos on pages 18, 19 and 22 of the Heritage Statement should be used as a pattern and a suitable joiner engaged.**
- **Detail drawings should be supplied of the locations and appearance of the panelling, shutters and shutter boxes to be recreated.**
- *Removal of plaster cornicing and replacement of historically significant part with copy.*
- This is difficult to comment on as cornicing has already been removed in the ground floor front room (as has the lath and plaster ceiling, which also shouldn't have happened) so it is not possible to say what condition it was in and whether it could have been saved.

- This is not supported in a general sense, although the outcome is the same: the cornicing to the ground floor front room should be reinstated in the same dimension and profile as it was.
- Is any of this cornicing retained, which could be copied?
- What are the locations in the house where cornicing was removed?
- *Removal of skirting boards.*
- Same comments apply as for cornicing above.

Applicant Response:

The only cornicing removed has been from the front ground floor room. It was not original. The skirting boards were also not original. Evidence below:

When the property changed from W. Fare Chemists to private hands in the late 1990's, the property was internally reconstructed to that of a private residence. The property was purchased in the early 2000's for circa 80k pounds and a few years later, sold for circa 215k pounds. It would be reasonable to assume that substantial work was undertaken at this point to reinstate period elements lost when converted to a chemist. It has not been in a period of stasis since changing use from a Chemist to residential. Significant changes have been made by owners since then including the flooding of the ground floor in 2012.

The applicant has studied the 1960's planning application in detail at the records office along with the project documentation. Documents appear extensive. Four variation orders detail work that was requested and undertaken as the works progressed outside of the original scope. The final statement from 19th August 1966 details, for example, that a green slate fireplace surround was not installed and is credited against the original quote. It is therefore felt that the planned works were carried out and substantial harm was inflicted upon the ground floor rooms at that point and external fabric, including the removal of the original panels to the waiting room, the cornicing and architraves, dado rails, picture rails, coving and other features (Please see supporting screenshots). The forming of new doorways, the blocking up of original doorways and windows also took place at this time. Indeed, the correspondence from Cumberland County Council (K.Steen), entirely focuses on the preservation of external frontal elements and no mention is given to the internal historical attributes, save for the proposed usage. It would therefore be reasonable to assume that the architect and contractor were entirely free to perform internal changes at will, as no conditions are apparent that the applicant has seen.

From submitted drawing 2a (approved), the front elevation is substantially changed. Whereas the original panelling between waiting room and corridor was covered by studwork and plasterboard after closing off the original door and removing panelling to form the new waiting room entrance, no such arrangement is detailed for the front elevation window panelling. If it was, it is not clear. With lino floor coverings, bricking up the fireplace, installation of electrical storage heaters etc, it would seem the design ethos was that toward the prevailing tastes of the 1960's and not preservation.

The recent photograph supplied by the applicant of the removed and damaged front panel was taken on the 1st floor. The panelling design appears a more simple design than that of the corridor panelling (assuming the corridor panelling is original and window panels would've been made to match). It appears to have a flat back panel and external thin beads tacked on to create some decorative effect. One would assume that all windows would have originally been fitted with wooden shutters. The photograph from the 1960's appears to show curtains at the 1st and 2nd floors. It would therefore appear that any shutters were not present, even at that time, possibly due to weight and deterioration of the panelling where hinged at the window cheeks. Unfortunately, the applicant was unable to see or photograph the ground floor panelling after removal.

The following documents detailing the works of 1965 are included to support the hypothesis that all key features pre-dating 1965 were removed as part of the works in the ground floor rooms. The applicant proposes to recreate and procure new, but period correct architraves, skirting and cornicing for the front room by using what appears to be original items remaining in the house as the pattern to sample. The applicant also wishes to reinstall wooden shutters to all windows despite these not being present at purchase. It would appear that only one window shutter was removed in 1965 (on the ground floor) and none were present in any window when the applicant purchased the property in 2024. **Detailed drawings will be supplied for all elements requested.**

Photograph of plan 2a detailing front elevation design from 1965

CARPENTER, JOINER AND IRONWOMAN

All timber to be 'Tanalized'

Garage. Cut off protruding ends of purlins to

Take out doors, frames and architraves, windows, etc. to openings to be filled in or altered and clear away.

Take out picture rails, dado rails, architraves, skirtings, etc. affected by the works and clear away.

Take out any fittings, etc. not required.

Securely fix door between Hall and Waiting Room, remove architraves on Waiting Room side and prepare to receive wall linings.

Fill in openings in timber partitions as required using fir-framed studding of required thickness.

Form new timber partitions where shown of 3" fir-framed studding securely fixed to existing.

Make good to flooring where new door openings formed, all to match adjoining.

Do. where hearth in Waiting Room removed.

Cover all wood floors with $\frac{1}{2}$ " Weyroc to receive lino coverings.

Line out walls of Waiting Room and Dispensary with 2" x 1" battens to receive wall linings.

Build up backings for shelves in Waiting Room, on either side of chimney breast in windows and along window wall, in 2" x 1" softwood framing.

Provide the P.C. sum of One Hundred and Twenty Pounds (£120. 0. 0.) for lino floor coverings to all rooms on Ground Floor, including Ferodo nosings to steps and add for profit and attendance.

Provide the P.C. sum of Ninety Pounds (£90. 0. 0.) for lino to Landings and Staircase, including Ferodo nosings to Stairs, and add for profit and attendance.

Demolition of plaster cornices and plaster ceiling roses, removal of window shutters, lining and architraves in dispensary (kitchen sash)

DEMOLITIONS

Take all necessary precautions and take out walling and partitioning for new openings Waiting Room/Dispensary, Waiting Room/Vestibule, W.C./Cloaks 1, Cloaks 1/Exterior, chimney breast in Dispensary.

Take out combination range and hearth in Dispensary and clear away.

Take down plaster cornices and plaster ceiling roses in Dispensary and Waiting Room and clear away.

Take out fireplace and hearth in Waiting Room and clear away.

Take out window shutters, lining and architraves, etc. to Dispensary and Cloaks 2 windows, and shelving and door in Cloaks 1.

Hack off tiling from walls of Dispensary.

Hack off plaster to walls and ceilings of Cloaks 1 and 2 and W.C.'s 1 and 2.

Final Statement from Contractor showing omissions and additions

		NO. 8, SCOTCH STREET, WHITEHAVEN		FOR W. FARE, ESQ.			
		FINAL STATEMENT - 19th AUGUST 1966					
		For carrying out Alterations to		provide Pharmacist's Dispensary			
CONTRACTOR:		Messrs. A. Jenkinson & Son.		OMISSIONS		ADDITIONS	
				£	s	d	£ s d
		Amount of Tender					3163 6 8
		Adjustment of P.C. Sums					
		Contingencies		200	-	-	
		Floor Coverings		120	-	-	
				90	-	-	168 3 -
		Photograph		20	-	-	
		Door Gear, etc.		30	-	-	22 4 10
		Ironmongery		40	-	-	25 4 9
		Sanitary fittings		55	-	-	56 7 10
		Electrician		250	-	-	569 19 7
				15	-	-	34 8 -
		Mirror glass wall linings and plate in hatch.		25	-	-	41 9 6
		Variation Orders and Additional Work					
No.	1	Add	Build up Cellar window and insert vent.				8 18 3
			New window to Dispensary.				26 1 0
			Mortice deadlocks to front and Vestibule / doors.				3 4 -
	2		Calor gas and tubing for Bunsen burner in Dispensary.				13 8 5
	3		Provide Poison Cupboard with lock, etc.				12 14 7
	4		Take out grating to Cellar and fill in.				6 12 6
			Clearing out Cellar and upstairs rooms.				12 2 -
Item	6L	Omit	Not done - Slate surround to fireplace.	15	-	-	
	13G	"	Ventpipe above Bathroom.	14	16	2	
Carried Forward£				874	16	2	4164 4 11

		OMISSIONS			ADDITIONS		
		£	s	d	£	s	d
<u>Add</u>	Brought Forward	874	16	2	4764	4	11
	New gate and cheeks to Yard entrance.				26	11	10
	Renewing sash cords and reglazing windows.				5	17	6
	Notice Board/ with name slides.				8	12	-
	R.H. Cowper's account for lettering to ditto.				3	15	-
	Draught excluder to Vestibule door.				1	2	6
	Counter support and fixing.				5	10	-
V.O. 5	Cement fillet to Garage door to prevent water driving in.				3	7	10
					4	17	10
		874	16	2	4223	19	5
					874	16	2
	TOTAL ...				4	3349	3 3

AGREED TO BY:-

CONTRACTOR'S
SIGNATURE

Mr. A. WENKINSON, Secy

DATE

With Danny 1967.

Glazing changes and removal of glazing bars to waiting room windows

PAINTER AND GLAZIER

GLAZIER

Glaze new windows to W.C.'s 1 and 2,
Cloaks No. 2 in narrow reeded obscured glass
in putty.

Provide the provisional sum of Twenty
Five Pounds (£25. 0. 0.) for mirror glass wall
linings in Waiting Room fixed complete by an
approved Sub-Contractor and add for profit
and attendance.

Hack out existing glazing to windows to
Waiting Room and Dispensary and reglaze in putty
after removal of glazing bars. Upper sashes to be
in 24 oz. clear sheet. Lower sashes to be in
Major Reeded obscured glass.

Glaze Waiting Room/Vestibule door in $\frac{1}{4}$ "
clear polished plate in beads and washleather.

Take out existing glazing to Hall/Vestibule
door, sidelights and fanlights and reglaze in
broad reeded obscured glass in ditto.

Plastering works to make good removals and possible ceiling replacement and window shutter in dispensary.

PLASTERER

Render and set on new brickwork to infillings, wall - facings, jambs etc. all to match adjoining plasterwork and make good next same.

Plaster on plasterboard to timber infillings to openings where necessary and make good.

Do. to new partitions and do.

Do. to ceiling where chimney breast removed and do.

Do. on wall linings in Waiting Room above dadoes.

Plaster up and make good after removal of cornices and ceiling roses, all to match existing. Allow for renewing ceilings complete if thought advisable.

Ditto after removal of window shutter and architraves in Dispensary.

Re Replaster walls of Cloaks 1 and 2 and W.C.'s 1 and 2 on and including 'Newtonite' lathing.

Plaster skim on plasterboard to ceilings of ditto.

EXTERNAL

Hack off and renew cement rendering to W.C. No. 1 in cement/lime/sand 1:1:6 with float finish. Cement render to walls of Garage similarly.

Lining walls, shelves and window boards in waiting room with plywood.
New skirting, dado rails and picture rails in waiting room.

Lining		
e.	Existing modified	Existing one side, 2" x 1" one side.
		1 Mortice lock 1/2 set Satin C.P. L.H. 1/2 set BMA levers R.H.
f.	1 1/2" rebated mahogany	3" x 1" mahogany both sides.
		1 Fr. Satin C.P. pull handles. 1 Overhead door spring 1 Roller bolt 1 Mortice deadlock
g.	1 1/2" rebated softwood	2" x 1" one side.
		1 Mortice lock 1 set levers.
Provide and fix the following windows:-		
Position	Size	Description
W.C. No. 1	1'6" high width to suit opening.	B.S.S. Stormproof section. Bottom hung vent.
W.C. No. 2	Ditto	Ditto.
Provide and fix 'Up-and-Over' door to		
Line walls of Waiting Room, shelves, window boards of selected 1/4" plywood (P.C. 8/-d per sq. ft.) and fix with fine butt joints, without cover fillets. Angles to be mitred.		
Provide and fix 4" x 3/4" mahogany skirting and 1 1/2" x 3/4" mahogany dado rail and picture rail to ditto.		
Form openings in window boards and panelling for vents to 'Nightstor' heaters and provide and fix decorative expanded metal grilles with neat beads all round.		
Provide the P.C. sum of Twenty Pounds (£20. 0. 0.) for mounted wall photograph approximately 7'6" x 3'4" and add for profit and fixing to plywood lining.		
Form pelmet in Waiting Room of 7" x 1 1/2" 'Weydec' with 'Formica' exposed edging, fixed to 4" x 1" softwood batten screwed to ceiling.		
Provide and fix 'Silent Gliss' double curtain track along window wall behind pelmet.		
Hatch and window between Waiting Room and Dispensary to have 1" mahogany linings, 4" x 1" architrave, 3/4" 'Weydec' apron panel and counter, grooved for sliding windows.		

Cornicing and picture rail as present in front ground floor room 2024. Note the lack of paint layers allowing fine contour definition. Applicant believes replaced circa late 1990's, early 2000's as it fits the enlarged stud work around the chimney breast formed in 1965. Pre-1965 would not be long enough to encapsulate the studded chimney breast.



Believed to be original style cornicing in corridor and as such, applicant would prefer to follow replacement with this design. It is logical that this cornicing would remain original if the panel it sits on is also original and the corridor itself has not changed width. Cornicing is absent from all rooms except the corridor, kitchen and rear 1st floor bedroom. All are non-matching.

All skirting is substantially matching and modern. Drawings can be supplied of any replacement.



- *Repair and replace second floor ceiling joists as necessary.*

- No objection.

Applicant Response: Noted.

- *Remove floor boards from 2nd floor bathroom and use to repair other floors through the house.*

- There is some harm in this, as the boards are large and historic, and their relocation would require at least partly cutting them up. I would view this as less-than-substantial.

- I would be grateful for more information about the specific areas where new floorboards are required, the total surface area of those areas, the surface area of the bathroom, and any information about what will be done with surplus material.

Applicant Response: The first floor front room only requires minor attention. There are two small areas where original board is missing and pine ceiling type board has been inserted. These are 310x290 and 150x90. Both are in areas that might largely be covered by a bed and bedside table. It is not crucial that these are addressed.

The more affected area is on the 2nd floor front room where one full board has been partially replaced by a non-matching board (3620x1750) and one area of approximately 3500x400 has been removed across the width of the room and approximately 15 boards are detrimentally affected.

It would not be desirable from a heritage and aesthetic perspective to simply cut 15 small pieces of original board to 400mm long and insert into the space the MDF currently occupies. A correct looking repair would necessitate using the longest lengths of wood possible to bridge the beginning of the MDF section, all the way to the wall. This distance is 2560mm.

Any leftover boards are proposed to be used to replace rotten boards where the basement stairs are located (area approx 2.5 sqm) as these are currently overboarded by MDF and sodden along with the joists.

If the Conservation Officer is not agreeable to this approach, the applicant will keep the affected rooms in their current condition as it will be difficult, if not impossible, to source reclaimed boards of matching appearance and patina.

Bathroom floor. Current condition. 14 full length boards, longest is 4200mm. All between 19 and 21mm wide. 3 boards are much shorter.



MDF In-fill in 2nd floor front room. MDF is 3620x1750. Boards running from the right side of the MDF to the wall will be retained for the repairs in the longest lengths possible.



Badly repaired single board in 2nd floor front room



- *Lime plastering and casein distemper to walls between window surround architraves at first and second floor level.*

- No objection.

Applicant Response: Noted.

- *Demolish garage.*

- I note that there is no planning application for this, and it will be submitted in future. I question whether this could be consented without a planning application as there would be the opportunity for the details to differ between the two applications.

- No objection to removal of garage. A positive impact is expected from this.

Applicant Response: The application at this stage is only to demolish the existing garage. Any replacement structure will be submitted for full planning approval at a later date. No details have been offered or proposed at this stage so the applicant is unsure how it might differ? The applicant notes that no objection is raised to the removal of the existing garage.

• *Removal of brick wall adjacent to cellar stairs and replacement with vertical timbers.*

- *No objection if stair treads are left in place.*

Applicant Response: Noted. Original stair treads will be left in place.

• *Insertion of new joists adjacent to cellar stairs to support rear hall floor above.*

- *No objection*

Applicant Response: Noted.

• *Removal of recent dropped ceiling and replacement of attic floor joists.*

- *No objection*

Applicant Response: Noted.

• *Construction of a blockwork inner wall to cellar front wall window reveals, supporting edge of main floor beam above and masonry between front windows.*

- This is necessary given the poor design and condition of the existing arrangement, which is concentrating load onto an unstable inner lintel over the cellar window.
- This work will entail less-than-substantial harm to the building through introduction of a flat, blockwork surface in the cellar, and there will be some minor loss of historic fabric such as lintels.
- However, I view the work as urgently necessary to secure the stability of the front wall, and have no objection to it being carried out as described in the note from WDS.
- Externally, the cellar window itself will be removed but the sandstone surround retained and infilled, then rendered and painted to match the rest of the wall face.

Applicant Response: Noted.

Summary:

- Drawings of new windows and doors requested. - **Will be provided**
- Timber panelling to cheek of cellar staircase is likely original and should be retained. - **Agreed and understood**
- Door from hallway into kitchen has some significance and is part of the proportion of the spaces. Enlarging it would entail less-than-substantial harm and it should therefore remain as-is. **Agreed and understood**
- Detail drawing of reinstated door and surround from front room into hall should be submitted and approved. **Will be provided**
- Clarification should be provided as to the alterations/repairs proposed to the doorway that was inserted from the lobby into the front room in the 1960s. **Contained in this response**
- The loss of the panelling and shutters appears, from the limited information I have, to constitute substantial harm. Justification has been provided that it was irreparable and needed removing to access the wall, however the photos suggest it was very much repairable and accessing the wall should certainly have been a lower priority than keeping it from damage. **Detailed response provided in this response**
- This cannot be supported, however it has happened and the pragmatic option in my opinion is to require it to be faithfully reinstated. This also applies to the removed cornicing and skirting boards. **Applicant will reinstate full front elevation window panelling at ground floor, window cheeks and bay panelling at 1st and 2nd floors. All with shutters. Also to any rear sash windows that may have had these features hidden by plasterboard studwork. Applicant will provide drawings for all elements mentioned here.**

- Drawings should be supplied showing where panelling, shutters and shutter boxes, cornicing and skirting boards have been removed. **Contained in this response**
- Drawings should be supplied showing the layout, design and detailing of the replacements for these elements. **Will be provided**
- Clarification should be provided on the area of floor boarding to be removed from the second floor rear room, and where it will be used. A photograph or two to illustrate the boards to be dismantled would be helpful too – I mention this as historic boards can be significantly larger than modern ones, and if this proposal necessitates cutting them up into smaller pieces it would be of higher impact. **Contained in this response**

Relevant Policies and Guidance:

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 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) asserts that “Development that is not well designed should be refused”.

NPPF para. 210 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. 212 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. 215).

Where harm to a designated heritage asset is substantial, consent should be refused unless certain conditions can be demonstrated (para. 216).

Opportunities should be sought for new development within conservation areas and the settings of heritage assets that enhances or better reveals their significance. (para. 219)

- Referring to assets in a conservation area, NPPF para. 220 states that loss of an element that makes a positive contribution to a conservation area

should be treated as either substantial (under para. 213-14) or less-than-substantial harm (under paragraph 215).

The Copeland area's Local Plan contains a number of relevant policies:

- BE1 provides for the preservation and enhancement of built heritage assets by:
 - o Requiring a heritage impact assessment or heritage statement where the proposal would affect a heritage asset;
 - o Giving great weight to the conservation of Copeland's designated heritage assets when decision making;
 - o Ensuring that new development is sympathetic to local character and history;
 - o Supporting proposals for the appropriate reuse of vacant historic buildings, recognising that putting buildings into viable uses consistent with their conservation can help sustain and enhance their significance;
 - o Supporting proposals that increase the enhancement, promotion and interpretation of Copeland's architectural and archaeological resources;
 - o Strengthening the distinctive character of Copeland's settlements, through the application of high-quality design and architecture that respects this character and enhances the setting of heritage assets.
- BE2 states that development should preserve or enhance designated heritage assets (or important archaeological sites) and their settings. The more important the asset, the greater weight that will be given to its conservation. Proposals that better reveal the significance of heritage assets will be supported in principle. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset will require clear and convincing justification.
- DS4 outlines the Council's expectation that all new development will meet high-quality design standards that contribute positively to the health and well-being of residents.
- DS5 refers to the importance of achieving good standards of design in both hard and soft landscaping.

The Conservation Area Design Guide is a supplementary planning document adopted in 2017 that is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications within conservation areas in the legacy Copeland area. It is therefore applicable to this application.

Sammy Woodford
Conservation and Design Officer