

## Appendix 1 – Additional Detailed comments by the Conservation Officer

### Design Details:

#### 1. GLAZED LINK

- The application form notes that the roof to link corridor will be pitched however, this is not indicated on the scale drawings. The scale drawings all appear to indicate that the roof of the link and extension would be flat and the applicant has not provided any images or drawings of the link attachment at first floor level (i.e. where it meets the principal building on the exterior).
- Similarly, the application form stipulates that the glazed panels to the link corridor will be of wired glass. This would be a poor design choice and would have the effect of creating a municipal aesthetic into a sensitive historic setting and would be at odds with the contemporary design of the modern structure, introducing a very dated effect on the appearance of the glazed link extension. Equally, the submission documents do not indicate in detail which panels would be glazed and which would have the Zinc spandrels or of what materials the plinth would be constructed from. The detailed design of the glazed link has not been given proper full consideration by the applicant in terms of materiality and design (including lighting, noise, heating and privacy arrangements). Nor has there been proper consideration of the longevity of these materials in such a context and how they will age in appearance.
- Given that the current structure (Annex) has gone some way in trying to empathise with the aesthetic appearance of the extant buildings through a relatively traditional design, the current proposals indicate a marked departure in design terms and have provided a modern contemporary design specification but in such a way that it does not enhance the current built environment nor is it informed by the design principles of the existing buildings. The existing link, by reason of its design/ materials provides the necessary connection between the hall and the annexe in a manner that is light-weight and maintains views through from the car park to the rising bank to the rear. It reads as a smaller and contemporary element between the two buildings that does not compete with the historic building and keeps the physical interface with the grade II\* building to just 1.8m wide and 3m high.
- Notwithstanding applications 2010/683 & 2010/684LBC permitted, the alteration of the link will introduce a higher roof line, of possibly flat construction (according to the plans) and on an extended footprint, being closer to the hall. The existing approved permissions for the demolition and re-erection of an extended glazed link (as detailed in traditional style using the same materials) taken on its own merits, would not have added significantly to the size of the link then permitted or to its form. The summary reason for approval was that the proposed development was considered acceptable having regard to the scale

and form of the link approved by application 2010/683 & 2010/684LBC, being set back from key vantage points and screened by existing mature landscaping and therefore was not thought to unduly harm the open and rural character of the countryside, the character and appearance of this grade II\* listed building; or impact neighbour amenity. The previous approval was based on the dimensions and materiality and its relationship as subservient structure to the principal building. The design maintained the key views and therefore the Hall and annex structures read as two separate buildings, with one as modern counterpart and secondary to principal building. Unfortunately flat and solid elements have been introduced gradually which negate the effect of it being a light-weight structure and therefore justifiable.

## **2. VISUAL INTRUSION/ VISUAL SEPARATION**

- Planning Application (ref: 89/600) for the construction of the (20 bed) Medical centre annex block and glazed link cites the use of traditional materials in its construction as a condition of its acceptability with respect to the visual amenity and in order to ensure a satisfactory degree of harmony within the development. In this case, the applicant did not submit a detailed design for the proposals in advance of the application being determined and the construction and appearance of the glazed link corridor was stipulated by condition.
- The aesthetic and conservation imperatives should take precedence in considering the appropriateness of the extension details. The medical centre annex was granted consent based on the design, materials and massing as currently built. It was intended to be viewed as an integral part of Crawshaw Hall and as such, was required to reflect the architectural styling of the principal building (through architectural detailing such as hood moulds, copings and gothic panelled external doors). This was an attempt to architecturally sympathise and harmonise the two structures, which were already proposed in close proximity. The concession of the medical centre annex to the listed building was that it took on the style, mantle and was also visibly subordinate to the principal building, being recessed and stepped back on its southern extent. The applicant putting forward the argument that the design detailing of the annex was intended to mitigate the adverse effect upon the hall and would blend in. At this time officers were recommending refusal of the application on the grounds that the new building would 'adversely affect the setting and character of the present building'. The recommendation was overturned by committee on the basis of the financial and economic arguments in support of his application, namely the repair needs of the listed building and that it would provide employment for 30 members of staff. That said, clearly there was a reason for recessing the current annex block back and therefore retaining most of the north elevation of the listed building in full view (as approached from the drive).
- It is concerning the relatively new annex has been found to be unfit for purpose within several years of its construction. It is my concern that without taking a long-term view of the changing requirements of the CQC and the owner's business needs the current proposals, should they be recommended for approval, could require the annex to be extended yet again in the near future in

order to provide the necessary care required by the CQC and proposals already approved for the third storey would be implemented. The applicants should fully consider all options to reconfigure the existing internal arrangements of the annex block in order to maximise their potential capacity. I would also recommend that the long-term sustainability of the current arrangements need to be reviewed as there appears to be a more endemic issue in terms of the viability of the existing accommodation block as a whole. Perhaps the potential to extend to the right of the annex block (north elevation) should be explored more fully which would mitigate somewhat the impact on the designated heritage asset.

- The Applicant maintains that the proposed extension to the south of the medical centre is 'small'. However, the current submission documents indicate that the footprint of the proposed extension would be greater than that of the extant decked area (constructed without consent and in breach of planning controls). The size and massing of the proposed extension in the proposed location, regardless of scale, will have a harmful impact on the grade II\* listed property. Previously approved designs for the glazed link have addressed this issue of maintaining the visual separation by reducing the height of the adjoining structures, minimising the visual impact through the use of 'lightweight' timber-framed and glazed structures of a traditional design which mitigate the impact somewhat by harmonising with the principal building. The current proposals make no such concession.
- The Applicant states that after discussions with the LPA a glazed extension was recommended to him as a solution and a means of mitigating the harmful impact of the extension on the setting of the listed building. At no point did the LPA recommend this approach nor did it suggest that an approval would be more forthcoming as a result. In fact, the LPA has maintained that 'in principle' development in such close proximity to the listed building would be contrary to policy as a result of its detrimental impact on the listed building. The glazed design which has been provided as part of the current submission does not provide a detailed visual explanation of how this proposed structure will 'work' both in design terms and physically. The zinc spandrel panels and glazed portions are not indicated in their exact positions, nor does there appear to be an obvious 'entrance' into the building at this point – a location which is currently used as the main access into both the Medical Centre annex and Hall.
- In terms of functionality, it is unclear how the glazed extension would work at first floor level as bedroom accommodation. Certainly there would be issues with privacy as a result of its construction but also the rooms may be uncomfortably hot in summer and cold in winter. Noise from the lounge below may also be a cause for concern. In order to retain the sleek and 'lightweight' appearance of a glazed extension, insulation and cladding would have to be kept to a minimum and therefore the design approach for this extension would not perform in any aspect – both in achieving a minimalist approach to the infilling of this discrete and small area, nor would it function well as living accommodation for residents on the upper floor – their view and light levels also being restricted by the close proximity of the north elevation of the listed building. Indeed the effect of the lighting in the extension after daylight hours will alter the setting and appearance

of the site and has not been addressed in the heritage impact assessment. The proposed first floor plans also show the current lift void re-titled as stair lobby 3. This requires further explanation as the application form asserts that there will be lift access to this floor. This may require additional plant on the roof which has not been detailed in the submitted drawings.

### **Enabling Development**

- The applicant has indicated they have made significant investment has been made converting and refurbishing the property. However, outstanding repair issues remain for which have culminated in the loss of architectural stonework to the exterior of the listed building.
- The financial information submitted by the applicant alongside the current application states that the addition of two bedrooms is essential to maintain business viability. As already stated, the net gain in bedrooms would be three as opposed to two (from 21 to 24) and it is unclear how the addition of so few bedrooms would necessitate a net increase in staffing levels of nine staff. If the viability of the business hangs on such a knife edge then this would suggest that an analysis of the current residential and care provision requires a comprehensive and wholesale review going forward to ensure that the business is sustainable in the long term. The Medical Centre has only been in operation for a relatively short period of time and has been found to be inadequate in terms of its configuration and viability, with the main care facilities of Crawshaw Hall in fact supporting and supplementing the Medical Centre and exceeding current CQC requirements.
- If the applicant is citing financial and economic reasons for the extension of the Medical Centre in that it would provide revenue to undertake repairs to the principal listed building then this may form the basis for assessment in terms of Enabling Development, which by definition is contrary to policy. NPPF (para 140) states that local authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal in this case, assessed against the recommended 'test criteria' set out in the PPS 5 Practice guide, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the dis-benefits of departing from those policies (having regard to the requirements of section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004), taking into account whether it would:
  - Materially harm the significance of the heritage asset or its setting;
  - It will secure the long term future of the asset and its continued use for a purpose sympathetic to its conversion;
  - It is necessary to resolve problems arising from the inherent needs of the asset, rather than the circumstances of the present owner;
  - There is a source of funding that might support the heritage asset without the need for enabling development;
  - The level of development is the minimum necessary to secure the future conservation of the heritage asset and of a design and type that minimises harm to other public interests.

- Owners of historic buildings are advised to employ a regular maintenance regime, ideally based on a conservation management plan (CMP) in order to fulfil the maintenance needs of the historic building. The CMP should be informed by a thorough condition survey which records the condition of critical element factors and identifies, where possible, building elements which may need repair and conservation work. The owner/ applicant has been advised that he should look to commissioning a CMP and condition survey which would indicate where funds should be focused in the short, medium and long term. Based on this information, the owner could thereafter submit a case for enabling development judged against these criteria, but at present there is no indication of a mounting conservation deficit for the principal building, only a mounting repair deficit.
- The applicant has recently been granted consent for the removal of high level stonework to the principal building on the proviso that they install like-for-like replacements in due course. However, they have since indicated that they may not wish to comply with some of the conditions attached to the consent.
- The applicant has stated that the Medical Centre annex was constructed in 1995 beside the listed building 'so that business viability could be maintained'. I would strongly advise the applicants that, in going forward, consideration of the viability of the business would necessitate some thought as to the repair needs of the principal listed building. According to the heritage statement submitted by the applicant, Crawshaw Hall exceeds the CQC minimum standards and regulations. This would suggest that the up-keep and maintenance of this asset, which contributes to the unique selling point of the business, is essential in continuing the high standards required. A substantial part of this unique selling point is also the distinctive setting and accommodation provided by the historic building and its grounds and therefore its conservation and protection, including the architectural details, should be a high priority for the owners in future-proofing their business needs.
- I would recommend that the applicant/ owners produce a conservation management plan, in liaison with a suitably qualified person, so that they can identify future repair works and maintenance costs for the building and build a contingency budget for such works into their business plan. This would secure the viability of the business and the building in the long-term rather than continuing with ad-hock inappropriate interventions which ultimately harm and erode the special interest of the building rather than sustain it for future generations.

## **POLICY**

Listed Buildings receive statutory protection under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and any impact on their setting or substantial harm to heritage assets of the highest significance should be 'wholly unacceptable' (NPPF, para 132).

When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or

lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification ... **Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably ... grade I and II\* listed buildings ... should be wholly exceptional.**

NPPF section 7 requires good design for new development proposals that also responds to local character and promotes sustainability. NPPF also states within its Core Planning Principles (para 17) that high quality design, recognising character and conserving heritage assets should always be sought. New development should seek to better reveal or enhance this significance and preserve elements of the asset's setting and as such would be more favourable.

NPPF (Para 59) LPAs should concentrate on guiding the overall scale... layout, materials of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally. NPPF (Para 64) states that 'permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area'.

NPPF (Para 58) states that local authority planning decisions should aim to ensure that developments:

- 'respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials' and;
- 'are visually attractive as a result of good architecture' and;
- 'establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit';
- Planning policies should also 'seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness' and 'the integration of new development into the... built and historic environment' NPPF (Para 61).

### **NPPF (2012) Policy 12: Conserving and enhancing the Historic Environment**

The National Planning Policy Framework sets out in Section 12 government policies on conserving and enhancing the historic environment clearly stating that heritage assets are irreplaceable, and the preference for sustaining and enhancing them and the positive contribution they make to local character and distinctiveness.

NPPF expresses a presumption in favour of sustainable development which meets the objectives and policies of NPPF; one of the 12 core principles is the conservation of heritage assets (p17).

When considering the impact of a proposal, great weight should be given to conserving the asset's significance, 'the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be' (NPPF, para 132).

In determining applications, the local authority should require the applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting (NPPF, para 128). As part of the current submission in support of the application we have received no further information specifying in reasonable detail, the impact of the proposals on the significance of the heritage asset or its setting. As a minimum the County HER should have been consulted.

Rossendale Core Strategy Para 266: states that... *all new development should be based on a thorough understanding of the context, significance and local distinctiveness of the site and its surroundings and should be of a high quality in terms of its urban, landscape and architectural design and use of materials.*

NPPF (para 129) also requires that the local authority should 'avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal' by considering this assessment of significance when considering the impact of a proposal. There has been insufficient information provided by the applicant on the nature of the proposals, in terms of materiality and design, and the nature of the heritage asset affected

**NPPF (Para 132)** states that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration of the heritage asset or development within the setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, therefore all 'harm' (including development within the setting of a designated heritage asset) requires clear and convincing justification.

The applicant has provided very brief information on the significance of the heritage assets affected (in the form of a heritage statement) which lacks proportionate investigation and assessment of the heritage significance. Equally they have not adequately explored the potential impact of the proposals on that significance (in the form of a heritage impact assessment).

Other details, such as the method of attachment of the glazed link to the historic building, and the drainage arrangements for rainwater goods have not been submitted and only indicative roof-scapes have been provided.

**NPPF (Para 126)** states that LPAs should recognise that heritage assets are an ***irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance***, taking into account:

- The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation
- The wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring;
- The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and
- The opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of place.

The current application has made no attempt to integrate, enhance or conserve extant historic features of the heritage asset, nor does it display any use of innovative design integrating the requirements of the commercial use with the architectural special interest of the principal building.

### **Rossendale Borough Council Core Strategy:**

**Policy 1: General Development Locations and Principles** (p63): states that the overall development approach of the Council will be to:

- Complement and enhance the surrounding area(s) of the development through the use of inclusive design and locally distinctive materials which enhances the character and heritage of Rossendale; and
- Para 175 also states that the 'use of high quality materials, the enhancement of historic buildings and places ... are all particularly important in the local context'.

**Policy 16: Preserving and Enhancing Rossendale's Built Environment** states that The Council will protect, conserve, preserve and enhance Rossendale's historic built environment including listed buildings (et al). Their futures, including their settings will be safeguarded and secured by:

*'promoting the positive management of the Borough's heritage assets, avoiding unnecessary loss and requiring appropriate mitigation of any negative impacts'* (16.1) and *'ensuring that all development is (a) located in a way that respects the distinctive quality of the historic landscape and setting and retains or enhances the character and context'* (16.5(a)); (b). Of a high standard of design, reinforcing the local distinctiveness of Rossendale; by encouraging innovative new design(s), where it responds to the character, scale and setting of historic buildings and areas and maximising the potential for the re-use of buildings of historic or local interest for appropriate uses to ensure their future longevity. However where this is not possible/ appropriate, considerate and sensitive redevelopment will be supported, subject to advice from the Council's conservation team and English Heritage.

Unfortunately this application does not attempt to reconcile the need to preserve, enhance or better reveal the significance of the heritage assets it will impact upon, nor does it observe design standards which seek to respond to local character or distinctiveness.

### **Setting of Heritage Assets:**

**Setting:** Harm to a heritage asset through development within its setting is assessed against the same policies as for physical harm to the significance of designated heritage assets generally. Therefore, harm should be judged against the public benefits delivered by the proposal (para 133 & 134) and decision-makers should look for opportunities to enhance or better reveal the significance of the asset through development within the setting (para 137).

Setting is the surrounding in which an asset is experienced and elements of an assets setting may affect the ability to appreciate that significance. The careful management of change



within the surroundings of heritage assets makes an important contribution to the quality of life in which we live. The extent of the setting is not fixed and encapsulates all of the surrounds from which a heritage asset can be experienced from or within the asset and may change over time as the asset becomes better understood.

Setting is distinct from curtilage, character or context. It can make a contribution to significance which does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting.

Some assets were intended to be seen from one another for aesthetic, functional, ceremonial or religious reasons and may include deliberate links to other nested or overlapping settings, as epitomised in the group value shared by Crawshaw Hall, Sunnyside House and St John's Church Crawshawbooth, irrespective of the landscape setting of these assets.

The immediate setting of Crawshaw Hall has influenced its subsequent built form, with adjoining grounds laid to formal lawn at the front aspect, with views down the wooded valley. This provides a contextual hierarchy for the grandiose Gothic house which is reinforced by the tangential views provided by the approach from the drive. In addition, the current proposals could seriously restrict views from within the heritage asset, particularly on its western extent, generating the sense of encroachment and confinement within what was formally a lofty and spacious building with large grandiose rooms.

Unfortunately steady accretion of the setting through the construction of ancillary buildings within the immediate setting of the Hall, namely the Medical Centre annex, have interrupted and obscured rather than enhanced the important views of the principal elevation and its extended setting. The annex building, although attempting to mimic some of the Gothic detailing of the principal building, has superimposed itself on the site and now occupies a dominant position in an already constrained approach.

This has had a damaging effect on the setting of the listed building and its zone of visual influence. Any further accretion and development, particularly on the elevation closest to the principal building, would only serve to constrain and interrupt the views and architectural interest of this highly graded listed building further.

The approved permission for the erection of the double-height glazed link will further constrain the views in this area of the site and provide further build-up of structures within the immediate setting of the listed building. The visual separation of the principal building and Medical centre will be reduced, with no views of the landscaping beyond to imply the original setting of the historic building.

In addition, the provision of the glazed-link appears to be a relatively redundant structure as residents from the two buildings do not utilise this route and the internal space of the glazed corridor is so constrained as to make it an unusable and uncomfortable area with no clear purpose. The current proposals do not enhance this area of the complex and do not provide for a coherent design approach, failing to accommodate an obvious formal entrance into the building at this point.

## **POSITION**

Generally, the Council seeks to preserve listed buildings, their settings and any features of architectural or historic interest. We would not normally approve an application to allow alterations that would involve the loss of historic parts of the building; obscure the original plan form, layout or structural integrity; or otherwise diminish the historic value of listed buildings.

The Council also aims to keep listed buildings in their original use, or if this use no longer exists, in another use that causes least harm to the building. Many buildings can sustain some sensitive alterations or extensions to accommodate continuing or new uses however, listed buildings vary greatly in the extent to which they can be changed without harm to their special architectural or historic interest and in this case, I feel that the proposals would have a highly adverse effect on the special interest of one of Rosendale's highly graded designated heritage assets.

Based on the current proposals, the effect of the development on the significance of the asset can be reckoned by its impact through its location and siting; form and appearance; appropriateness; permanence and its as yet unknown additional effects (such as parking, lighting, access and its suitability or 'fit for purpose'). Any proposals in such a highly sensitive context should seek to maximising enhancement and minimising harm. The further cumulative impact through this proposal will not achieve this objective.