

**CUMBERLAND COUNCIL**  
**CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

---

**Proposal:** Demolition and formation of storage compound

**Address:** Former Tannery Building, Haverigg Industrial Estate

**Reference:** 4/24/2145/OF1

**Date:** 29/07/25

---

**Description:** This former tannery building dates from when the site was more extensively used for leather tanning in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

**Conclusion:** Revision suggested

**Assessment:**

- This building has some heritage value architecturally as a modest example of the Art Deco style, and historically, being the location of one of the area's main employers for several decades.
- I would view this building as a non-designated heritage asset.
- It is apparent from the documentation that the building is in a poor condition, with structural defects.
- Justification for total removal is that the site can instead be modernised and used for another purpose.
- The vast majority of the building's remaining significance is architectural and lies in its frontage. Therefore, it is worth considering whether the site could be practically re-used as described, and the more problematic areas of the building removed, by retaining the frontage and sections of return and lateral walls for support, with some cleaning and fairly inexpensive repair such as crack stitching and repointing.
- This could in theory allow the heritage value the site possesses, which is notable even if not nationally, to be preserved and the site opened up to a new use. This could additionally allow the frontage to form an anchor point for construction in future.
- This would respond to the following aspects of policy (abridged here):
  - NPPF 208: Local planning authorities should [identify and take into account significance] when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
  - NPPF 210: In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:
    - a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
    - b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality;
  - NPPF 216: The total loss of the significance of this building should be taken into consideration, and a balanced judgement taken about the scale of this loss and the significance of the asset.

- Local Plan BE1: Support proposals that increase the enhancement, promotion and interpretation of Copeland’s architectural resources.
- Local Plan BE4: Development should preserve or enhance heritage assets and their setting [...] Where the scale of the loss and the significance of the asset outweighs the benefits of the proposal, the development will be resisted.
- Where the loss is accepted, the developer should make a recording to an appropriate level, and deposit it in a suitable public record office.

---

**Relevant Policies and Guidance:**

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

NPPF 208: Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

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...”

Paragraph 216 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.

NPPF 218: Local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.

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)

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

- BE1 provides for the preservation and enhancement of built heritage assets by:
  - Requiring a heritage impact assessment or heritage statement where the proposal would affect a heritage asset;
  - Giving great weight to the conservation of Copeland’s designated heritage assets when decision making;
  - Ensuring that new development is sympathetic to local character and history;
  - 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;
  - Supporting proposals that increase the enhancement, promotion and interpretation of Copeland’s architectural and archaeological resources;

- 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.
- BE4 refers to non-designated heritage assets, saying that development should preserve or enhance such heritage assets and their settings. Proposals that better reveal the significance of heritage assets will be supported in principle. Proposals affecting non-designated heritage assets or their settings should demonstrate that consideration has been given to their significance.
- 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.

Sammy Woodford

Conservation and Design Officer