

Full Planning Committee - 19 January 2021

Agenda Update

- 5.1 **KET/2020/0295**
Mawsley Lodge, Mawsley Lane, Loddington

No update.

- 5.2 **KET/2020/0696**
Kettering Library, Alfred East Gallery and Manor House Museum, Sheep Street, Kettering

As discussed in the Reports and expected the following up to date comments have been received by Historic England based on the most recent amended scheme and are provided in its complete form:

Summary

We welcome the revisions to the scheme which address the remainder of the concerns we raised in our letters of 3 November and 30 November 2020. We have no objection to the applications on heritage grounds.

Historic England Advice

Background

This letter should be read in conjunction with our previous advice letters relating to the above applications, dated 3 November and 30 November 2020.

In our initial advice letter of 3 November, we identified that the scheme to integrate the Gallery, Library and Museum (GLaM) would cause harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets within the site as well as to the significance of the Grade I listed parish church. We noted that the scheme would contribute to the optimum viable use of the listed buildings as cultural assets and therefore had no objection to the scheme in principal on heritage grounds. However, we had a number of specific concerns regarding details of the scheme where we thought the harm had not been justified, and advised your authority to seek amendments, additional information or safeguards to address our concerns.

The scheme was subsequently revised, and in our letter of 30 November we were pleased to note that many of our concerns had been addressed and resolved through the amended submissions. However a number of concerns remained and we advised your authority to seek further amendments and safeguards.

Current amendments to the scheme

We note that the applicants have since submitted further amended drawings and a revised Heritage Impact Assessment to address the concerns raised by Historic England, other statutory consultees and your authority's officers. We also note from the Planning Committee Report that you have recommended a comprehensive list of conditions to be attached to any consents, which would act as the 'safeguards' requested by Historic England.

Having reviewed the amended submissions and draft conditions, we conclude that the outstanding concerns we raised in our letter of 30 November have now been addressed, as follows:

- 1. Impact of Art Gallery extension and café seating on views from the south: the intrusive glass balustrading has been replaced with metal railings and the view from the south has been de-cluttered.*
- 2. Replacement of Collyweston roofs on Manor House Museum: it is now proposed to retain and repair all the existing Collyweston roof coverings, including on the Blitz Café and the 1980s extension to the Manor House Museum.*
- 3. North extension to Manor House Museum: the proposed glazed extension to the Museum has been substantially reduced in size, so that it is now truly 'courtyard infill' to the north of the roofed passageway between the Blitz Café and the Museum, enclosed by walls on three sides. It no longer projects eastwards into the main pedestrian route from the Council car park to the parish church, and no changes in ground level are proposed. Therefore the impact which this extension would have on the significance of the Grade I parish church and the Grade II* Museum has been much reduced from the previous proposal and would be on the lower levels of harm.*
- 4. CCTV and lighting: we note the condition proposed to control the design and location of CCTV cameras and external lighting fixtures, which would act as the 'safeguard' we requested.*

In addition, we note that amendments have been made to the west elevation of the Gallery extension, which would further address concerns we raised in our letter of 3 November regarding views from Sheep Street. Most of the proposed glazing has been removed and a 'living wall' introduced, which would soften views from Sheep Street and be less distracting in the view above the Alfred East monument and the corridor link between the Gallery and the Library.

Therefore, we consider that all the concerns we raised in our previous advice letters regarding this scheme have been addressed. We acknowledge the considerable efforts made by the applicants to amend the scheme in line with our comments, and the efforts you have made to negotiate these amendments, under considerable time pressures and in a period when we have been unable to attend normal discussions on site due to the Covid-19 restrictions.

Harm to significance

The amended scheme will nonetheless cause some harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets, on the 'less than substantial' scale. The most harm will be caused to the significance of the Grade II listed Art Gallery and Grade II listed Library through the extension to the east, which will cause a more permanent and substantive coalescence of the two buildings. It is worth noting that the Gallery was never intended to be an entirely separate building; it was initially intended to be the first wing of a quadrangle of municipal buildings, according to the Kettering Leader of 25 July 1913 (cited in Roy Hargrave's PhD thesis on JA Gotch).

The coalescence between Gallery and Library could be partly mitigated by continuing to use the separate south entrance to the Gallery, in the grand manner intended by JA Gotch, rather than turning the Gallery's main entrance into a fire egress only (as currently proposed). It would be a shame if the fine 1913 gallery rooms could only be accessed via a convoluted stair-and-corridor route from the new entrance in the east extension.

Balance of harm against public benefits

In line with paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, Feb 2019), in determining the applications your authority should weigh the less-than-substantial harm to the designated heritage assets against the public benefits of the scheme, including securing the optimum viable use of the listed buildings.

As we stated in our letter of 3 November, we understand the principle of integration which the scheme is trying to achieve, and can see that this would contribute to the optimum viable use of the listed buildings as cultural assets. There are a number of heritage public benefits including improved public access to the buildings and investment in repairs. We would also reiterate that the entire application site is within the High Street Heritage Action Zone (HSHAZ), a scheme jointly funded by Historic England and Kettering Council to bring heritage and cultural regeneration to Kettering town centre. The aims of the GLaM scheme align well with those of the HSHAZ and together the two schemes will bring considerable investment into Kettering's historic town centre cultural and heritage assets.

Historic England's position

We have no objection to the applications on heritage grounds, as we consider that the concerns we raised in our previous letters of 3 November and 30 November 2020 have been addressed through the amendments submitted and the proposed conditions.

Recommendation

Historic England has no objection to the applications on heritage grounds. We consider that the applications meet the requirements of the NPPF, in particular paragraph numbers 194 and 196.

Officer Comments: The headline is that Historic England state 'no object' to the applications having considered the amendments subject to the conditions recommended being applied and recognise the 'heritage public benefits' associated with the proposal. The comments regarding building coalescence and the desire to retain the southern Gallery entrance as a primary access point shall be provided to the Applicant in an informative.

The 'balance of harm against public benefits' in-line with paragraph 196 requirements in the NPPF mentioned has been made in the Reports and has been found to outweigh the harm identified.

Consequently, the comments of Historic England closely reflect discussions in the Reports and therefore would not result in a change to the recommendation or its conclusions, with no further conditions proposed.

5.3 KET/2020/0697

Kettering Library, Alfred East Gallery and Manor House Museum, Sheep Street, Kettering

As discussed in the Reports and expected the following up to date comments have been received by Historic England based on the most recent amended scheme and are provided in its complete form:

Summary

We welcome the revisions to the scheme which address the remainder of the concerns we raised in our letters of 3 November and 30 November 2020. We have no objection to the applications on heritage grounds.

Historic England Advice

Background

This letter should be read in conjunction with our previous advice letters relating to the above applications, dated 3 November and 30 November 2020.

In our initial advice letter of 3 November, we identified that the scheme to integrate the Gallery, Library and Museum (GLaM) would cause harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets within the site as well as to the significance of the Grade I listed parish church. We noted that the scheme would contribute to the optimum viable use of the listed buildings as cultural assets and therefore had no objection to the scheme in principal on heritage grounds. However, we had a number of specific concerns regarding details of the scheme where we thought the harm had not been justified, and advised your authority to seek amendments, additional information or safeguards to address our concerns.

The scheme was subsequently revised, and in our letter of 30 November we were pleased to note that many of our concerns had been addressed and resolved through the amended submissions. However a number of concerns remained and we advised your authority to seek further amendments and safeguards.

Current amendments to the scheme

We note that the applicants have since submitted further amended drawings and a revised Heritage Impact Assessment to address the concerns raised by Historic England, other statutory consultees and your authority's officers. We also note from the Planning Committee Report that you have recommended a comprehensive list of conditions to be attached to any consents, which would act as the 'safeguards' requested by Historic England.

Having reviewed the amended submissions and draft conditions, we conclude that the outstanding concerns we raised in our letter of 30 November have now been addressed, as follows:

- 1. Impact of Art Gallery extension and café seating on views from the south: the intrusive glass balustrading has been replaced with metal railings and the view from the south has been de-cluttered.*

2. *Replacement of Collyweston roofs on Manor House Museum: it is now proposed to retain and repair all the existing Collyweston roof coverings, including on the Blitz Café and the 1980s extension to the Manor House Museum.*

3. *North extension to Manor House Museum: the proposed glazed extension to the Museum has been substantially reduced in size, so that it is now truly 'courtyard infill' to the north of the roofed passageway between the Blitz Café and the Museum, enclosed by walls on three sides. It no longer projects eastwards into the main pedestrian route from the Council car park to the parish church, and no changes in ground level are proposed. Therefore the impact which this extension would have on the significance of the Grade I parish church and the Grade II* Museum has been much reduced from the previous proposal and would be on the lower levels of harm.*

4. *CCTV and lighting: we note the condition proposed to control the design and location of CCTV cameras and external lighting fixtures, which would act as the 'safeguard' we requested.*

In addition, we note that amendments have been made to the west elevation of the Gallery extension, which would further address concerns we raised in our letter of 3 November regarding views from Sheep Street. Most of the proposed glazing has been removed and a 'living wall' introduced, which would soften views from Sheep Street and be less distracting in the view above the Alfred East monument and the corridor link between the Gallery and the Library.

Therefore, we consider that all the concerns we raised in our previous advice letters regarding this scheme have been addressed. We acknowledge the considerable efforts made by the applicants to amend the scheme in line with our comments, and the efforts you have made to negotiate these amendments, under considerable time pressures and in a period when we have been unable to attend normal discussions on site due to the Covid-19 restrictions.

Harm to significance

The amended scheme will nonetheless cause some harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets, on the 'less than substantial' scale. The most harm will be caused to the significance of the Grade II listed Art Gallery and Grade II listed Library through the extension to the east, which will cause a more permanent and substantive coalescence of the two buildings. It is worth noting that the Gallery was never intended to be an entirely separate building; it was initially intended to be the first wing of a quadrangle of municipal buildings, according to the Kettering Leader of 25 July 1913 (cited in Roy Hargrave's PhD thesis on JA Gotch).

The coalescence between Gallery and Library could be partly mitigated by continuing to use the separate south entrance to the Gallery, in the grand manner intended by JA Gotch, rather than turning the Gallery's main entrance into a fire egress only (as currently proposed). It would be a shame if the fine 1913 gallery rooms could only be accessed via a convoluted stair-and-corridor route from the new entrance in the east extension.

Balance of harm against public benefits

In line with paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, Feb 2019), in determining the applications your authority should weigh the less-than-substantial harm

to the designated heritage assets against the public benefits of the scheme, including securing the optimum viable use of the listed buildings.

As we stated in our letter of 3 November, we understand the principle of integration which the scheme is trying to achieve, and can see that this would contribute to the optimum viable use of the listed buildings as cultural assets. There are a number of heritage public benefits including improved public access to the buildings and investment in repairs. We would also reiterate that the entire application site is within the High Street Heritage Action Zone (HSHAZ), a scheme jointly funded by Historic England and Kettering Council to bring heritage and cultural regeneration to Kettering town centre. The aims of the GLaM scheme align well with those of the HSHAZ and together the two schemes will bring considerable investment into Kettering's historic town centre cultural and heritage assets.

Historic England's position

We have no objection to the applications on heritage grounds, as we consider that the concerns we raised in our previous letters of 3 November and 30 November 2020 have been addressed through the amendments submitted and the proposed conditions.

Recommendation

Historic England has no objection to the applications on heritage grounds. We consider that the applications meet the requirements of the NPPF, in particular paragraph numbers 194 and 196.

Officer Comments: The headline is that Historic England state 'no object' to the applications having considered the amendments subject to the conditions recommended being applied and recognise the 'heritage public benefits' associated with the proposal. The comments regarding building coalescence and the desire to retain the southern Gallery entrance as a primary access point shall be provided to the Applicant in an informative.

The 'balance of harm against public benefits' in-line with paragraph 196 requirements in the NPPF mentioned has been made in the Reports and has been found to outweigh the harm identified.

Consequently, the comments of Historic England closely reflect discussions in the Reports and therefore would not result in a change to the recommendation or its conclusions, with no further conditions proposed.

5.4 KET/2020/0742

26 Ise Vale Avenue (land adj), Desborough

An additional condition relating to construction noise as referred to in the report is proposed:

Works audible at the site boundary will not exceed the following times unless with the written permission of the Local Planning Authority or Environmental Health. Monday to Friday 08.00 to 18.00 hrs, Saturday 08.30 to 13.30 and at no time whatsoever on Sundays or Public/Bank Holidays. This includes deliveries to the site and any work undertaken by contractors and sub contractors.

REASON: In the interests of safeguarding residential amenity in accordance with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.