

---

**TITLE: BUILDINGS OF LOCAL INTEREST**

Committee: Regulatory & Support Services Committee

Date: 23 January 2017

Author: Lorraine Brown

[R182]

---

1.0 ISSUE

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide detail of the results of the recent consultation on the draft Buildings of Local Interest Register (Appendix 1) and to seek approval for the adoption of the finalised register.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION(S)

2.1 It is recommended that Members :

Consider the representations received during the recent public consultation and agree on any changes to the finalised register for adoption by this committee, which include:

- The removal of properties from the list as set out in paragraph 4.2 of this report (marked in red in Appendix 1)
- The inclusion of properties on the list where concerns have been raised during the consultation period (marked in orange in appendix 1). A summary of the Consultation Responses is given in Appendix 2.

The adopted register shall be reported to Full Council to note.

3.0 BACKGROUND/OPTIONS

3.1 Policy ENV13 of the East Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan states that the Council will prepare a local register of buildings that make a valuable contribution to the local scene, local distinctiveness and/or local history, but which do not merit inclusion on the national list.

3.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) defines both designated and non-designated heritage assets. Heritage Assets are defined in the document as being *“A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. Heritage asset includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing)”*.

- 3.3 The Council sought public nominations for buildings and structures to potentially be included on the register and received a total of 196 nominations. See Appendix A for original list of nominations received.
- 3.4 The independent panel of experts assessed all nominations received against the adopted criteria for inclusion and was able to reduce the number of buildings/structures to be assessed.
- 3.5 The draft list was reduced to 94 (Appendix 1), eliminating those buildings/structures that were already a listed building, were not of sufficient quality, did not meet the nomination criteria or could not be identified.
- 3.6 During the public consultation period a total of 28 responses were received in regards to the proposed register. The majority of the responses received were positive; however there were a few objections to specific buildings being included within the register. See Appendix 2 for a summary of the consultation responses and Appendix 3 for copies of all responses received.

#### 4.0 ARGUMENTS/CONCLUSIONS

- 4.1 A number of changes are proposed to the draft register (Appendix 1), as a result of comments received from building owners. The majority of these changes are simply changes to the descriptions and details of the buildings included. The draft register includes all of the properties, including those to be removed as outlined below.
- 4.2 It is proposed to remove the following properties from the draft register (these are highlighted in red in Appendix 1):

- Mission Hall, Dullingham Ley
- Church of St Matthew, Wisbech Road, Littleport
- 17 Bridge Road, Mepal
- The Swedish Houses, Maryland Avenue, Swaffham Bulbeck

Objections were received from owners in regards to their inclusion and for the following reasons it is proposed to not proceed with their inclusion at this time:

**Mission Hall:** The building has lost much of its initial character due to significant changes to the external appearance of the building. It was converted to residential use during the 1960s with a large extension to the back completed in 1994. In 2007 the character has been further altered by the addition of a side extension

**St Matthews Church:** This property, although converted to residential use is still covered by a legal covenant with the Church Commissioners. This means that the owners need to apply to the Commissioners if they want to undertake any works to the property. The owner believes that the restrictions of the covenant provide more relevant and adequate protection than inclusion on the local register. The owner is also concerned that due to the rural and isolated

nature of their property, that inclusion on a public register could result in a risk to their security.

**17 Bridge Road:** This property was included on a previous informal register held by a previous Conservation Officer. Upon further examination and through discussions with the owner, it became clear that the property has been altered extensively in the past. Most of these alterations were not sympathetic to the historic character of the building. The property features upvc windows, an overly large porch on the side elevation, a flat roof rear extension which cumulatively results in the property not considered to be sufficiently in tact to merit inclusion on the register at this time.

**Swedish Houses:** There have been some internal alterations undertaken when the housing stock was owned by Hereward Housing. In my opinion they are long overdue for an external "facelift" and further improvements are needed to bring them up to current standards. There is no insulation in the walls, roof insulation was put in while I have been here but it is in no way satisfactory. To you they may be interesting but to us tenants they are something of a nightmare.

Largely unaltered- this is not the case concerning number 43 of which we are the owners. In November 2015 we had a planning application number 15/01124/FUL granted for a two storey extension on the rear and side of the property. This involved the demolition of the single storey section of the property. I would estimate the new building and alteration's would now constitute 75% brick and block modern day construction bringing this up to current day building regulations and requirements.

These properties were initially I understand built as a quick ten year fix to ease the housing situation post war and have clearly out lived that purpose. They are not fit for current day living... It is important that buildings of special historical and architectural interest are protected for future generations however I feel the inclusion of these properties as buildings of interest falls short of the general public's perception of such.

4.3 Due to the fact that this project is to identify buildings and structures of local interest, officers believe that this is not something that should be imposed on local homeowners. Whilst the implications of inclusion, do not change the planning constraints to the property, this is not meant to be viewed as a burden and by including properties which have been extensively altered could undermine the quality of the register.

4.4 Objections were received to the inclusion of a number of other buildings/structures on the register which are of a commercial nature. It is proposed that members consider these objections and determine whether these buildings should be included or not (these are highlighted in orange in Appendix 1).

- Dullingham Signal Box, Platelayers hut
- Ely Cathedral Centre
- Ely Railway Station

- Old Drill Hall, Barton Road, Ely
- The Anchor, Sutton Gault
- The White Horse Inn, Silver Street, Witcham

The specific objections for each building are detailed in Appendix 2.

4.5 It was explained to the objectors that inclusion on the register would not alter the planning constraints on the properties, which are already numerous due to the fact that the properties are in commercial use. Therefore the argument that inclusion on the register would be an additional burden is not a true reflection of the situation. Whilst policy ENV13 states that the demolition of a Building of Local Interest will be resisted, the policy applies the same principle as ENV11: Conservation Areas, which allows demolition if there is sufficient justification to do so.

4.6 Inclusion on the register would be a material planning consideration should an application be received for alterations or demolition of a building on the register. This does not mean that works would not be supported by the Local Planning Authority, but would ensure that any works were appropriately designed and were in keeping with the property.

#### 5.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS/EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

5.1 At this time it is not proposed to use Article 4 Directions to restrict permitted development on properties included within the draft register. Therefore there are no associated costs other than the printing of letters to notify owners of the outcome, once adopted the register will be available on the Council's website.

#### 6.0 Appendices

Appendix 1 - Draft Buildings of Local Interest Register

Appendix 2 – Summary of Consultation Responses

Appendix 3 – Consultee Responses [See separate document]

<u>Background Documents</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Contact Officer</u>
Consultation Draft Register (showing proposed changes)	Room 11	Lorraine Brown (Conservation Officer) (01353) 616 333 E-mail: <a href="mailto:lorraine.brown@eastcambs.gov.uk">lorraine.brown@eastcambs.gov.uk</a>
Consultee Response Summary Document		
Consultee Responses		