

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

**REPORT TO:** Planning Committee

10 July 2019

**AUTHOR/S:** Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development

---

**Application Number:** S/1483/19/LB

**Parish(es):** Sawston

**Proposal:** Total demolition of the building known as the 'Great Eastern Drying Shed'.

**Site address:** Great Eastern Drying Shed, 163 High Street, Sawston, CB22 3HN

**Applicant(s):** Mr T Ettlting, Hutchings and Harding

**Recommendation:** Approval, subject to conditions

**Key material considerations:** The significance of the heritage asset  
Impacts upon other heritage assets

**Committee Site Visit:** 09 July 2019

**Departure Application:** No

**Presenting Officer:** Rebecca Whitney, Senior Planning Officer

**Application brought to Committee because:** Application for the demolition of a Listed Building

**Date by which decision due:** 12 July 2019 (Extension of Time agreed)

### **Executive Summary**

1. The proposal is for the total loss of the Grade II\* Great Eastern Drying Shed. The proposal itself is exceptionally unusual and it is acknowledged and emphasised that this application follows pre-application engagement and many years of collaboration with Historic England and South Cambridgeshire District Council, in a joint effort to preserve the building.
- Loss of the Heritage Asset*
2. The loss of the building will cause substantial harm to the significance of this heritage asset, which is the highest level. Paragraph 195 of the NPPF states that unless the four tests are all met, consent should be refused where substantial harm is identified.
  3. The application has demonstrated that:
    - (a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
    - (b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
    - (c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public

ownership is demonstrably not possible.

However, it is not considered that the fourth test has been met, whereby (d) requires that the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

*Impact on Nearby Listed Buildings and the Sawston Conservation Area*

4. The loss of the Drying Shed will also cause less than substantial harm to the significance of three listed buildings within the Tannery site and the Sawston Conservation Area. The identified harm is not outweighed by the minor public benefits which are associated with the proposal.
5. The proposal does not therefore fully comply with Paragraphs 195 and 196 of the NPPF.
6. Nevertheless, in this wholly exceptional case there are material considerations which indicate that consent should be granted.

*Other Material Planning Considerations*

7. Paragraph 191 of the NPPF has been found not to be applicable in this instance and therefore the condition of the building is a material consideration in determining this application. It has been demonstrated that the act of 'repairing' the building would itself cause substantial harm to significance, resulting essentially in a replica of negligible significance. It has been demonstrated that the work necessary for conversion or repair would result in a very large conservation deficit, with the total for the repair work put at £1.2million in the 2019 costings.

*Planning Balance*

8. Officers are of the view that the material planning consideration by way of the demonstrable impracticality of maintaining the significance of the heritage asset outweighs the less than substantial harm to the nearby Listed Buildings and the Sawston Conservation Area. Further, when considering the inability of the proposal to comply with Paragraph 195(d) in full and the information submitted in respect of this criterion, this material planning consideration is considered to outweigh this policy conflict.

*Conclusion*

9. In light of the above, Officers do not object to the demolition of the Great Eastern Drying Shed, a Grade II\* listed building, in accordance with the advice of Historic England and the Council's Historic Buildings Officer. Therefore, it is recommended that Listed Building Consent is granted subject to the conditions below.

**Proposal**

10. The proposal is for the total demolition of the Great Eastern Drying Shed at Hutchings & Harding, a Grade II\* listed building on Historic England's Heritage at Risk Register (2018), within the Sawston Conservation Area.

**Relevant Planning Policies, Legislation and Guidance**

**National Guidance**

11. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019  
National Planning Practice Guidance

**South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018**

12. S/1 Vision  
NH/14 Heritage Assets

## **Legislation**

13. Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

## **South Cambridgeshire LDF Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)**

14. Development Affecting Conservation Areas-January 2009  
Listed Buildings: Works to or affecting the setting of-July 2009  
Trees and Development Sites-Adopted January 2009  
Biodiversity SPD - Adopted July 2009

## **Consultations**

15. **Sawston Parish Council** – Supports.

“It was felt this has been considered for such a long time and is now at a stage beyond repair. Many attempts have been made to save the building and proven difficult.”

16. **Historic England** – No objection.

Full comments from Historic England are appended to this report as Appendix 1.

17. **Historic Buildings Officer** - No objection.

Full comments from the Historic Buildings Officer are appended to this report as Appendix 2.

18. **The Victorian Society** – Comments summarised as follows:

Notes the importance of the building and that the demolition of the shed would be harmful on account of the loss it would entail but also in terms of the negative impact it would have on the setting of the other listed buildings on the tannery site.

Requests that the Council considers whether Paragraph 191 of the NPPF applies in this case.

Requests conditions to require the careful dismantling of the structure with all material stored and protected from the elements, and the retention of the plinth in situ.

19. **Association for Industrial Archaeology** – No objection.

Supports the comments of the Victorian Society with regard to the retention of the brick plinth. Supports the careful dismantling and retention of the other elements of the building. Requests a condition to require that a high level record is made of the building.

20. **Industrial Buildings Preservation Trust** – Objects, for the following reasons:

- a. Comments that the building is capable of repair with no serious loss of significance and with the replacement of far less historic fabric, and therefore at less cost, than reports included with the application suggest.
- b. Considers that recent investigation into feasibility has been coloured by the wish to demolish.

- c. Comments that there is no evidence given that funding the work through grant aid or charity is – as stated in the application - demonstrably not possible.
- d. Comments that the decades-long history of attempted demolition of the Drying Shed suggests deliberate neglect.
- e. South Cambridgeshire District Council itself says (in a report to the Planning Committee, 5th August 2015) that the Drying Shed is an exceptional example of a tannery drying shed on account of its extraordinary scale, that it has local, regional and national significance, and that Historic England has identified it as a national priority.
- f. Comments that the repair and reuse of this building should be the key to the rescue of the whole site, which is a blight on the village. This could be done without losing a historic industry.
- g. A Freedom of Information request to Historic England shows that of entries removed from the Heritage at Risk register between 2014 and 2017, less than 0.5% were removed due to demolition or destruction, none of which were Grade I or II\*. Comments that is not a record SCDC should wish to break.
- h. Comments that it makes more sense in conservation and in business terms to retain this building on site.

Further comments were received, in response to Paragraph 2.5 of the submitted Heritage Statement. The comments include correspondence from Historic England's Head of Listing, confirming that the proposed upgrade [to Grade II\*] was considered carefully by three senior professionals within English Heritage before the decision was reached, and that they are confident that they had the necessary material before them to inform their analysis and with which to reach a decision.

21. **Cambridgeshire County Council Archaeology** – No objections, defers to Historic England and SCDC.

Requests a condition to require a programme of archaeological historic building recording equivalent to Historic England Level 4.

22. **Environment Agency** – No objections.

Requests conditions regarding a remediation strategy, a surface water disposal scheme, and regarding any contamination not previously identified.

23. **Scientific Officer (Contaminated Land)** – No response received as of 24 June 2019.

However, at pre-application stage it was commented that Officers are aware that the site is an active tannery and is very likely to have some contamination issues. Assuming demolition is simply above ground, then no objections would be raised, and given the information we have about the lack of foundations to the brick plinth, this is not a significant concern at this stage. However, if ground works are required, or a new use or building is proposed, investigation may be required.

24. **Sustainable Drainage Engineer** – No objection.

25. **Ecology Officer** – No objection, subject to an informative.

Requests an informative stating that works should stop immediately should evidence of bats be found, and that advice should be sought on how to proceed.

26. **Environmental Health Officer** – No objection, subject to conditions.

Requests conditions regarding noisy works, the burning of waste and the need for a Demolition Notice.

27. **Local Highways Authority** – No objection, subject to conditions.

Requests conditions to require that a method statement is submitted prior to the commencement of works relating to the process of demolition and any effects on the adopted public highway, and requiring the submission of a traffic management plan.

28. **Trees Officer** – No objection.

29. **Ancient Monuments Society** - No response received as of 24 June 2019.

30. **The Georgian Group** - No response received as of 24 June 2019.

31. **The Gardens Trust** - No response received as of 24 June 2019.

32. **Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings** - No response received as of 24 June 2019.

33. **Twentieth Century Society** - No response received as of 24 June 2019.

#### **Representations**

34. 2 responses were received.

35. One response objects to the proposal, querying how the current situation has arisen and urging the Council to use its powers to ensure the repair of the building.

36. One response supports the proposal on balance.

#### **Site and Surroundings**

37. The building is set within an active tannery site within the Development Framework and Conservation Area of Sawston. The site is on potentially contaminated land due to its industrial use, and is sited within the impact risk zone of the nearby SSSI at Sawston Hall Meadows.

38. The subject of the proposal is the Great Eastern Drying Shed, which is a Grade II\* Listed Building, which is one of the 4 Listed Buildings on the tannery site. The other 3 Listed Buildings on the site are Grade II Listed.

#### **Planning History**

39. There have been three previous Listed Building Consent applications seeking to demolish the building and one appeal. Applications were made in 1990, 1992 (followed by an appeal in 1993), and 2008. It is noted that the building was Grade II Listed at the time of the applications and appeal in the 1990s, and was upgraded to Grade II\* in 2000.

40. The 1990 application (reference S/0174/90/LB) was refused on the basis of inadequate structural information and insufficient evidence provided regarding feasibility. A structural report dated 22 August 1990 was carried out on behalf of (what is now) Historic England, which concluded that 'the building would respond to a

programme of repair’.

41. The 1992 application (reference S/0577/92/LB) was refused on the basis of structural evidence was not convincing, and that insufficient evidence was provided regarding feasibility. Again, a report from (what is now) Historic England dated 18 June 1992 concluded that ‘the condition of the structural members and the louvres is generally good and only minor local timber repairs are required... no convincing argument can be made for the demolition of this interesting building on structural grounds.’
42. The decision was appealed (reference T/APP/W0530/E/93/809589/P4), and was dismissed by the Inspector. The Inspector found that there was previously ‘conflicting evidence’ among relevant parties about the structural condition of the building and the measures required to alleviate this problem. It was also commented: ‘I note however, that both parties agree that given sufficient funding... an acceptable structural solution could be found’, and notes that ‘no evidence has been advanced as to the costs of restoration and future maintenance, or whether any assistance would be available through the various sources of grant aid’.
43. The 2008 application (S/1431/08/LB) was refused on the basis of insufficient justification, including insufficient evidence that the building was not capable of repair and insufficient evidence of attempts to find alternative solutions.
44. In 2015 the Council served Urgent Works Notice and also secured a grant from Historic England for scaffolding the building to provide weather protection to the roof and external timber frame, support to floor joists, and to facilitate access. A 5-year project plan was drawn up to undertake feasibility studies and repairs with a working group comprising Historic England, SCDC members and officers, and the site owners.
45. In 2018 pre-application advice was sought regarding the current proposal. The Council concluded that it would “not object to a fully evidenced application which meets the tests of the NPPF. The application must make the history, evidence, and reasoning behind the application clear and conclusive to any interested party, and not only those with previous involvement. There must be an awareness throughout that the loss of a grade II\* listed building should be wholly exceptional; the level of detail provided must reflect this.”
46. This application for the demolition of the Grade II\* Listed Drying Shed has been submitted following those studies undertaken as a part of the 5-year project plan and following many years of collaboration with Historic England and South Cambridgeshire District Council, working with the owners in a joint effort to preserve the building.

## **Background to the Application**

### *Condition of the Building*

47. The Drying Shed is in extremely poor condition. Multiple areas of the building have suffered collapse and the building is not safe to enter. It is included on Historic England’s Heritage at Risk Register 2018 where its condition is described as ‘very bad’.
48. The submitted reports are consistent in that the Drying Shed has inherent structural weakness evident since construction with undersized timbers and poor lateral stability. In 1992 structural investigation on behalf of English Heritage found that ‘*only minor local timber repairs are required*’. In 2003, partial collapse in two positions was noted but a structural report found that ‘*timbers throughout the building are generally in a*

*reasonable condition*', and the building was considered safe to enter. By 2009 the building had deteriorated considerably and no longer '*felt safe to enter*', however the 2009 Morton Partnership report concluded that '*in our view it is perfectly possible to repair the Great Eastern Drying Shed*'. By 2017, the FRR Architects reported to Historic England that '*although shoring is in place... sudden catastrophic collapse is a possibility*'.

49. As set out in the Planning Statement, in November 2015, an 'Urgent Works Notice' was issued by SCDC, with grant-funding (eventually amounting to £240,000) secured from Historic England for scaffolding the building to provide weather protection to the roof and external timber frame, support to floor joists, and to facilitate access. A 5-year project plan was drawn up to undertake feasibility studies and repairs with a working group comprising Historic England, SCDC members and officers, and the site owners.
50. It was apparent at this point that the 'repair' of the building would entail dismantling it to the brick base, and then reconstructing the building with structural alterations (insertion of a steel frame) and replacement of most of the fabric. Elements of the building were considered to have potential for salvage generally between nil and 30%; e.g: louvres - 10% salvage, timber frame - 30% salvage, roof structure – no salvage.
51. On this basis, Historic England's East of England office brought the case before the National Historic England Advisory Committee, which visited the site in November 2017. In January 2018 the Principal Inspector of Buildings and Areas for the East of England reported that '*The Historic Environment Advisory Committee (HEAC) agreed with the recommendations of the area office, particularly the key point that **the condition of the Great Eastern Drying Shed is such that its significance cannot be sustained even were it repaired.***'

#### *Repair of the Building*

52. In the 2019 Morton Partnership structural report commissioned by the applicant, an alternative approach to the insertion of a steel frame was put forward, focusing on the timber structure. This proposal would result in around 50% of the timber frame being replaced, an improvement over the 70% to be replaced under the 2017 scheme, but with no amendment to other salvage prospects, e.g. for the roof or louvres which remain as above. It was also noted that further collapsed had occurred since the 2017 HEAC visit.
53. In their response to the present application (2019), Historic England comment:
54. "*Historic England have, together with your authority, been working to find a way to secure the future of the building for many years. [Discussions] have centred around the condition of the building, the options for its repair and the implications of this on the significance of the structure, the potential for reuse and the likelihood of achieving this. ... The submitted reports show that very substantial dismantling and reconstruction would be necessary to repair the building. **If this were undertaken negligible heritage significance would remain** [own emphasis]. ... after lengthy exploration of the options to secure the future of the building we have come to the view that in this exceptional case, **the building is beyond reasonable repair** [own emphasis]."*
55. The Victorian Society, a statutory consultee, does not object to the application but emphasises the significance of the building and asks SCDC to carefully consider the application against planning policy. In their earlier letter dated March 2019 (Appendix 31 of the Planning Statement), they wrote that '*The circumstances of the Drying Shed*

*are exceptional, and we must acknowledge with regret at this stage that in principle demolition might have to be accepted...*, further recommending that a full scholarly recording be undertaken and that any demolition should be as non-destructive as possible with sound fabric retained on site. The recommendation for recording is also made by the County Council Archaeologist, and this and the recommendation for a controlled demolition is also made by the Historic Buildings Officer with both being listed as recommended conditions to any consent granted.

56. It should be noted that the Industrial Buildings Preservation Trust arranged for two conservation engineers to visit the site in May 2019. The Trust comments that it is of the opinion that 80% of the historic fabric could be retained. The comments also consider that *'recent investigation into feasibility has been coloured by the wish to demolish'*. However, no structural report has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for consideration. The reports submitted with the application clearly set out the condition of the building and the works necessary. They have been prepared by competent persons; their contents and conclusions have been accepted by Historic England. The 2017 reports which form the basis for this application were commissioned by Historic England and their results checked in-house. These reports were publicly funded through Historic England as part of the planned 5-year project seeking repair and reuse of the Drying Shed. The conclusions were accepted by Historic England's Advisory Committee. Officers therefore attach a significant weight to the reports submitted with the application, and do not consider that the Industrial Buildings Preservation Trust's statement undermines their reliability.
57. It is therefore accepted that reconstruction with majority new fabric is necessary. It is acknowledged that the significance of the Grade II\* Drying Shed lies primarily in its scale and form, and not primarily in its fabric. The scale, and even potentially the original construction, could be replicated. Nevertheless, replica buildings are not considered to equal the significance of historic buildings. This has been tested in the courts and forms a general principle in the selection of listed buildings. Paragraph 23 of the document Principles of Selection for Listed Buildings 2018 by the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport states that loss of original fabric is relevant consideration when considering special interest. Paragraph 18 sets out that most buildings before 1850 will be of special interest where they retain *'a significant proportion of their fabric'*, and after 1850 greater selection is necessary. Officers are of the view that a 'replica' building, incorporating a minority amount of historic fabric, would not sustain or enhance the significance of the Grade II\* Drying Shed, and agree with Historic England that negligible heritage significance would remain.
58. Subject to the consideration of the application against Paragraph 191 of the NPPF (as set out below), the impossibility of sustaining the significance of the Great Eastern Drying Shed due to the condition of the building is a consideration material to this application.

### **Significance**

59. The Great Eastern Drying Shed is a Grade II\* listed building, upgraded from Grade II in 2000. The building is included on the list as a building of *special architectural or historic interest*. As a Grade II\* building, it is a *particularly important building of more than special interest*. Only 5.5% of listed buildings are listed at Grade II\*. Together with Grade I listed buildings (2.5%), they are heritage assets of the *highest significance*.
60. The Grade II\* Great Eastern Drying Shed is almost 40 metres long by 6 metres deep, with three timber-framed and louvred upper floors over an arcaded brick ground floor,

and has been dated to c.1850, contemporary with TS Evans' expansion of the tannery business. The wider site has a history as a tannery documented from 1649 and remains a working tannery to this day as 'Hutchings and Harding'. The tannery and its buildings make an important contribution to the history and industrial character of Sawston village.

61. The Great Eastern Drying Shed is the largest example of its building type recorded. While a larger comparable drying shed has been identified (at Hayes Mill, Grade II\* and 10 metres longer), this building formed part of a paper mill and not a tannery. The comparative exercise serves to highlight the rarity and scale of the Great Eastern Drying Shed as an example of its building type.
62. The significance of the Great Eastern Drying Shed is found primarily in its '*exceptional scale and ambition*' (as Historic England comments). It is also considered to be a relatively unaltered example, with the Listing Inspector describing it in 1991 as '*a complete example of functional architecture dating from the mid-nineteenth century*' and the Victorian Society writing in 2019 that '*the very specific function of drying sheds leads to a distinctive typology, which the Great Eastern Drying Shed represents without any of the compromises caused by later alterations and adaptations that affect similar buildings*'.
63. There is a consensus that the building does not display technical innovation in its function or construction. The basic structural form is associated with '*earlier, smaller scale drying sheds*' examples of which remain in use on the Hutchings and Harding site.
64. The applicant questions the circumstances around the upgrade in 2000, i.e. whether the building merits its II\* grading. A representation received from the Industrial Buildings Preservation Trust include correspondence from the Head of Listing at Historic England which rebuff this, and in considering the application at hand there must be no doubt over the status and significance of the Drying Shed as a Grade II\* listed building.
65. The significance of the Great Eastern Drying Shed has nevertheless been assessed by the applicant in a Heritage Statement which complies with the requirements of the NPPF. The statement is supported by the portfolio of documents submitted with the application, including a 2009 PCA report which provides a detailed assessment of the historical background, and development of the building.

### **Requirements of Planning Legislation and Policy**

66. Any decisions relating to listed buildings must address the statutory considerations of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as well as satisfying the relevant policies within the NPPF and Local Plan; applications should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
67. In considering whether to grant Listed Building Consent, Section 16(b) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires Local Planning Authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building; 'preserving' is equated to doing no harm. There is a strong statutory presumption in favour of preservation and therefore refusal of consent where harm is identified.
68. The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan recognises that heritage assets are irreplaceable and vulnerable to both neglect and unsympathetic change, and confirms

the Council's commitment to ensuring the future viable use of assets within the district (as set out in Paragraphs 6.44 and 6.51, in the supporting text to Policy NH/14 regarding Heritage Assets). There is no specific local policy setting out tests for the demolition of Listed Buildings, however Policy NH/14 regarding Heritage Assets sets out that proposals will be supported where they sustain the significance of heritage assets, as appropriate to their significance, and in accordance with the NPPF.

69. Section 16 of the NPPF seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment.
70. Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF) sets out that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets, and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be.
71. Paragraph 194 of the NPPF sets out that any harm to significance should require clear and convincing justification.
72. Paragraph 194(b) sets out that substantial harm to assets of the highest significance should be wholly exceptional. As a Grade II\* listed building, the Drying Shed is an asset of the highest significance as set out within this paragraph.
73. Paragraph 195 of the NPPF sets out that where substantial harm to, or total loss of, significance is identified Local Planning Authorities should refuse consent, unless the harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits or four tests are met.
74. In this case the identified benefits are not substantial, and therefore to be compliant with Paragraph 195 of the NPPF the application should demonstrate that all the following apply:  
Paragraph 195(a): the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and  
Paragraph 195(b): no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and  
Paragraph 195(c): conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and  
Paragraph 195(d): the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

Assessment against Paragraph 195(a) of the NPPF: Does the nature of the heritage asset prevent all reasonable uses of the site?

75. The test under Paragraph 195(a) of the NPPF is whether the nature of the heritage asset prevents reasonable use. The current condition of the building is material to this, although the effect of the condition of the building on its significance is considered separately above. The viability of conversion, which would change the 'nature' of the Drying Shed, is also considered separately.
76. It is clear that the Drying Shed in its current form cannot be used in any way. Multiple areas of the building have suffered collapse and the building is not safe to enter. In their 2017 report commissioned by Historic England, FRR Architects found that *'although shoring is in place... sudden catastrophic collapse is a possibility'*. In 2019 the Morton Partnership noted the collapse of *'part of the roof to the south side linked to collapse of the wall below and associated loss of floor structures,'* and found that while imminent collapse didn't appear likely, this couldn't be guaranteed.
77. Were the building 'repaired' to a safe condition, its highly specialised form presents difficulties which severely restrict use of the building. Its original use is no longer

relevant to the processes of the tannery. The building is, by design, open to wind and rain yet admits little natural light. The floor to ceiling heights are very low (2.08m, 1.8m), an obstacle to both a storage use and human occupancy. Difficulties accessing the upper floors further restricts a storage use, which has been identified as possible only at ground and first floor levels. The building is situated within a working tannery, with no guarantee that access would be possible other than through the wider tannery site. This context is noted by multiple parties as a major obstacle to finding a use for the Drying Shed, including in the Marketing Report, the Commercial Valuation, and by the Industrial Buildings Preservation Trust which in its objection submitted May 2019 wrote of its 2002 withdrawal that *'with the site in its then (and continuing) state ... the chances of finding a tenant or buyer to take on a historic building on that site were almost nil'*.

78. Officers consider that the test of Paragraph 195(a) of the NPPF is met.

Assessment against Paragraph 195(b) of the NPPF: Has a viable use of the heritage asset itself been found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation?

79. Planning Practice Guidance sets out that *'it is important that any use is viable, not just for the owner but also the future conservation of the asset'*. The guidance warns against harmful changes in the interest of speculative uses, and notes that some heritage assets will have limited or no economic end use (guidance document ID: 18a-015-20140306). Guidance further sets out that appropriate marketing is required to demonstrate redundancy, and the aim of such marketing is to reach all potential buyers who may be willing to find a use for the site that still provides for its conservation to some degree (guidance document ID: 18a-016-20140306).
80. A three-year marketing exercise (2010-2013) undertaken in discussion with English Heritage concluded that the Drying Shed had no viable commercial use. The 2013 report sets out the marketing initiatives undertaken and reports four 'notable enquiries' but no offers and no 'serious interest'. The report found that the property was not suitable for commercial uses due to difficult access and location within a working tannery, restricted ceiling heights, an existing 'over-supply' of commercial/storage units in the vicinity, refurbishment timescales, and refurbishment costs which *'are prohibitive to making it viable for commercial uses'*.
81. Conversion has been explored since 1995, though no end user was ever identified. As explored under the 2002 Feasibility Study, with conversion to an 'office/craft workshop space' the Drying Shed was given a potential end value of £350,000 - £500,000 (Commercial Valuation 2002) *on the basis that* the whole site would be developed, including relocation of the factory area and provision of access and car parking, and that owner buy-in, a clear contamination status and planning permission would be secured. However there remained a projected shortfall which would require grant funding; a conservation deficit of between £465,000 and £615,000 was identified.
82. In 2019 the repair of the building was costed at £1,200,000. The cost does not include conversion or fit-out and the resulting building would be without services such as electricity and would not be wind or water-tight due to the louvred storeys above the brick base. A 2009 commercial valuation identified that a repaired building may be suitable for storage, but only to the ground and first floor, and may have a rental value of £1 per square foot over 2,250sf – amounting £4,500 per annum. It was demonstrated that a repaired building would have nil market value. Unrepaired, it was assessed as having neither market value nor rental value.

83. It seems clear that no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found, and that appropriate marketing has been undertaken to demonstrate this. Officers consider that the test of Paragraph 195(b) of the NPPF is met.

Assessment against Paragraph 195(c) of the NPPF: Is conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership demonstrably not possible?

84. Grant or charitable funding appears to have first been seriously considered in the 1995 Feasibility Study commissioned by Hutchings & Harding. English Heritage (which became Historic England in 2015) was not able to provide grant funding as the building was then listed at Grade II and no Conservation Area Partnership Scheme was established. SCDC was able to provide Conservation Grants at the time out of an annual budget of £80,000, but only covering up to 40% of the cost of the work, and not if the building was to have a commercial use following repair. Under the 1995 whole site scheme proposal, the Drying Shed was proposed to be a 'Heritage Centre' which would have qualified, and a request for grant aid was placed on the committee agenda to be considered under the Conservation Budget and the Museums Budget. There is no record of this having been successful.
85. Following the upgrading of the building to Grade II\* in 2000, the 2002 Feasibility Study was funded by Sawston Parish Council, the Architectural Heritage Fund (AHF) and the Industrial Buildings Preservation Trust (IBPT). The IBPT became closely involved and a whole site scheme was again considered (as noted in the assessment of the proposal against Paragraph 195(b) of the NPPF above). The Drying Shed was to be converted to commercial use, precluding much eligibility for grants, and in costing the works a conservation deficit (the subsidy required to secure the project) of £465,000 to £615,000 was identified. The IBPT later withdrew from the project.
86. The SCDC Conservation Manager wrote in December 2003: '*I understand that while [English Heritage] may support the scheme, it is considered likely that the extent of alteration required to make the building re-useable would now preclude their grant support*', but goes on to discuss seeking Member support for urgent works by SCDC which were deemed necessary to the brick base, roof and to 'stabilise the structure'. Minutes from a subsequent 2004 meeting are included at Appendix 19 of the Planning Statement. It was identified that grants from SCDC were unlikely to be forthcoming; a Local Member expressed concern about spending public money on 'holding repairs' without a viable use identified.
87. In 2006 the applicant contacted Andrew Lansley MP who corresponded with English Heritage Chief Executive Simon Thurley; Dr Thurley wrote that English Heritage would not be able to fund conversion, though '*we may be able to facilitate its reuse by grant-aiding its repair*'. Over the next two years there followed correspondence between the applicant and SCDC, including a 2008 letter from SCDC to the applicant noting discussions between SCDC and EH to serve a notice '*in order to stabilise the building, make it wind and weather tight, carry out any urgent works, etc*'. It is not clear why an Urgent Works Notice was not served at this time, however it may be that in the economic climate of 2008 neither SCDC nor English Heritage were able to grant fund the works required.
88. The applicant notes that English Heritage's 2011 'Saving Industrial Heritage at Risk' campaign did not touch on the Drying Shed, and that a 2014 approach to the Architectural Heritage Fund failed to lead anywhere.
89. Following site visits in 2013 and 2015, English Heritage/Historic England confirmed in

August 2015 the availability of the grant to support an Urgent Works Notice. The SCDC Planning Committee authorised the issuing of a notice, which was then served by SCDC in November 2015.

90. A significant amount of public money (approaching £240,000) has been spent via Historic England grant funding since 2015, on scaffolding (to protect and shore up the building), surveys and feasibility studies. It must be noted that Historic England's consultation response makes it clear that further public funds will not be made available '*in the absence of any viable option to return the building to an appropriate and self-sustaining use*'.
91. With a conservation deficit of £1.2million identified in 2019, the Council is not able to guarantee that it would be able to take the Drying Shed into public ownership or fund the work upfront, either at this time or in the future.
92. With no viable use identified, significant charitable or grant funding would be necessary not just for the initial project, but in an ongoing fashion for the maintenance of the building. The 2019 Structural Report by The Morton Partnership found that a repaired building would '*remain vulnerable to water ingress*' and that '*maintenance requirements are likely to be high and ongoing*'.
93. It seems clear that an open ended seven figure restoration project resulting in a redundant building of negligible significance will not attract funding. Feasibility studies including structural reports have been charitably or grant funded on occasion, but it has been shown not to be possible to secure charitable or grant funding beyond this initial step. The application at hand clearly demonstrates that the conservation of the Great Eastern Drying Shed by grant-funding, not-for-profit, charitable or public ownership is not possible, and has not been possible, over a period of at least 25 years.
93. Officers consider that the test of Paragraph 195(c) of the NPPF is met.

Assessment against Paragraph 195(d) of the NPPF: Is the harm or loss outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use?

94. The Planning Statement outlines that the hard standing, which is not proposed to be removed, will be used for open-air storage of manufacturing products and equipment. It states that this will increase the proximity of storage and main production areas, prevent current encroachment on the staff car parking area and rationalise forklift movements, making the wider site safer, tidier, and more efficient. The Planning Statement goes on to say that the increased space may allow for improvement to the effluent treatment plant on site, as the quality of discharged water from the site could bear improvement. The applicant further argues that removing the liability of the Drying Shed would facilitate investment into the business and commitment of funds to the other listed buildings.
95. Officers do not consider that the investment argument can be applied to 195(d) as the benefits referenced are more broadly applicable and do not directly relate to bringing back into use the area on which the Drying Shed stands. Nevertheless, it does seem clear that the removal of the Drying Shed structure would facilitate business operations. However, Officers are in no way convinced that this is a benefit with significant weight, much less one which outweighs the harm or loss, per the wording of Paragraph 195(d) of the NPPF.
96. Further, Historic England advise in their consultation response that in the absence of

a planning proposal for a new use (and none has been submitted), this test cannot be met.

97. Officers do not consider that the test of Paragraph 195(d) is met.
98. It should be noted that this means a decision to grant consent would not be in full accordance with the NPPF, or the Development Plan in which Policy NH/14 sets out that proposals should be determined in accordance with the NPPF. Applications should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
99. It is also noted that in March 2019 in the neighbouring district of North Hertfordshire, consent was given (in accordance with the consultation response from Historic England) to demolish a listed building where this fourth test was also not met (reference 18/03263/LBC). The circumstances of the case were found to be such that *'there would be no purpose served by refusing consent'*, notwithstanding that the tests of Paragraph 195 of the NPPF were not met.

**Assessment against Paragraph 191 of the NPPF: Weight given to the deteriorated state of the building**

100. The deteriorated state of the building and extent of repairs necessary underlies this application for demolition and will be a material consideration in determining the application, unless NPPF Paragraph 191 is found to apply.
101. Paragraph 191 of the NPPF states that where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.
102. Planning policy guidance explains that disrepair and damage and their impact on viability can be a material consideration in deciding an application, but the deteriorated state should be disregarded *'where there is evidence of deliberate damage to or neglect of a heritage asset in the hope of making consent or permission easier to gain'* (guidance document ID: 18a-014-20140306).
103. The Drying Shed has been in the ownership of Hutchings & Harding since 1976 and has come to be in its current condition under their ownership. The 1986 listing was appealed and lost. The owners then made two consecutive applications for demolition in 1990 and 1992, the latter refusal was appealed and the decision upheld. The planning history of the site at this time provides a strong indication that the owners' intent was to remove the redundant building from the site, but there is no evidence of deliberate neglect or damage in pursuit of this goal.
104. The Planning Statement asserts that *'attempts to find a viable use for the building that would ensure its long-term maintenance and preservation... has been an actively pursued goal since the 1992 Appeal'*, and this does appear to be the case. In 1995 the applicant commissioned a Feasibility Study which considered the whole site. The applicant sought opportunities for funding and alternative access to the Drying Shed. Unfortunately, access negotiations were inconclusive, funding was not forthcoming, and SCDC were not able to support the scheme due to the proposed proximity of residential and industrial areas. The scheme was not progressed.
105. The applicant did not appeal the 2000 upgrade to Grade II\*. The following project was led by the Industrial Buildings Preservation Trust (IBPT). The project to find a solution for the building itself was not progressed following the withdrawal by the IBPT.

106. Following two failed projects, it does not seem unreasonable that a further application for demolition was submitted in 2008. Following refusal of consent, the applicant has engaged with SCDC and English Heritage/Historic England up to the present day, has commissioned most of the reports produced over the past decade, and between 2010 and 2013 marketed the building for sale or rent.
107. However, in 2009, an Enforcement Notice was served as roof slates and louvre panels were being removed from the building. This work followed the refusal of consent and is likely to have contributed to the ongoing deterioration of the building. The Notice required the cessation of work and proper storage of the material but did not request reinstatement. The Notice was complied with (the material was properly stored) but was appealed on the basis that the work was carried out on health and safety grounds. The hearing did not take place and so it was never determined if the grounds of the appeal were sound. Evidence that suggests that the grounds were sound include reports from 2003 and 2008 (prior to the works). The 2003 report noted *'there are a few local areas where the tiles have become dislodged'*, an observation amended in 2008 to note *'significant loss of slates'*. In 2003 it was noted that *'non-structural framing to the louvres is in some areas loose and could become dislodged.'*
108. Reports from 1990, 1995, 2002, 2003, 2008, 2009, 2017 and 2019 document the progressive deterioration of the Drying Shed. The building has continued to deteriorate even while scaffolded. On balance, these reports and the behaviour of the owners over the past three decades are not considered to be consistent with 'evidence of deliberate damage to or neglect of a heritage asset in the hope of making consent easier to gain'. On this basis Officers are of the view that the condition of the Drying Shed and its impact on viability can be a material consideration in deciding this application.

#### **Brick Base**

109. The building has a brick base to the ground floor which is referred to under different descriptive terms in the reports which accompany this application. This element is referred to as the masonry base, the plinth, brick structure, brick arches and brick arcading amongst others; for the purposes of this report, this element is referred to as the brick base.
110. The reports prepared in 2017 did not consider the brick ground floor, and HEAC considered that a case for the demolition of this brick base had not been justified. In relation to the current proposal Historic England commented that the retention of the masonry base could be considered further. The retention of the brick base has also been raised by the Victorian Society. In light of the evidence presented to Officers up to the time of the request for pre-application advice and the comments received, SCDC advised the applicant that further investigation would be required to assess the retention of the brick base. The current application includes a structural survey, schedule of repairs, and costings, together with an assessment of significance which all consider the brick base.
111. Though the retention of the base would reduce the level of harm from 'total loss', the harm to the significance of the building would remain substantial. Divorced from the rest of the building it would not sustain the significance of the Grade II\* Drying Shed, serving only as a 'marker' for the footprint of the Drying Shed. The floor slab of the building is to remain following demolition and will serve a similar purpose. The brick base is of no particular historic or architectural interest by itself and repairs and some rebuilding would be necessary throughout if it were retained, amounting to £20,000 in addition to six-figure scaffolding and site costs. It is identified that the only possible

use of the structure would be as a storage area for Hutchings & Harding, but that the nature of the arcaded structure with blocked and low openings would restrict use. There would be no viable use for a retained brick base. The retention of the brick base would not meaningfully mitigate the harm to the Drying Shed, and would still result in a conservation deficit. It is considered that the brick base has been adequately investigated, and it has been demonstrated that its retention is not a reasonable alternative to the proposed demolition.

### **Impact upon other Designated Heritage Assets**

112. Paragraph 190 of the NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities to take into account the significance of any heritage asset affected by a proposal, and to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
113. The following designated heritage assets will be affected by the proposal to demolish the Great Eastern Drying Shed:
- a. Sawston Conservation Area
  - b. Brooklands (Grade II listed building)
  - c. The Crust Warehouse (Grade II listed building)
  - d. Former Engine House (Grade II listed building)
114. Paragraph 196 of the NPPF states that where less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset is identified, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

#### *Listed Buildings within the Tannery site*

115. The Great Eastern Drying Shed has group value with three other listed buildings on the tannery site. The group value of the tannery buildings is considerable, as noted in Historic England's comments, and makes a large contribution to the significance of each Listed Building. The loss of the largest building in the group will cause harm, to a less than substantial degree, to each of the remaining buildings. The applicant has assessed that the scale of harm to the significance of each Listed Building will be 'moderate' as the tannery as a whole will continue to function in its original use and there will still be a strong sense of group value amongst the remaining buildings; Officer are in agree with this assessment.

#### *Sawston Conservation Area*

116. The demolition of the Drying Shed will also cause 'less than substantial' harm to the significance of Sawston Conservation Area. The Conservation Area is designated in part due to the industrial heritage of Sawston, to which the tannery is a principal contributor. The loss of the largest and most significant building on the tannery site will cause harm to the industrial character of Sawston Conservation Area. However, the continued operation of the tannery and use of the remaining listed buildings on site will limit the degree of harm. There will be limited impact on the appearance of the Conservation Area, given the location of the Drying Shed. The Conservation Area also includes the High Street, The Baulks, and Church Lane, area of distinct character and appearance which all contribute to its significance. Therefore, while the proposal will cause a moderate degree of harm to the industrial character of Sawston, the overall impact on the significance of the Conservation Area will be a lower degree of less than substantial harm.
117. The Planning Statement outlines several environmental, social, and economic benefits that the applicant considers will arise from the demolition. These include enabling the owners to commit funds and salvaged materials to the preservation of

the other listed buildings on site, to focus on sustaining the business as the last working tannery in Sawston and last chamois tannery in the UK, and improving the safety of the Hutchings and Harding site to both authorised and unauthorised persons. While these benefits should be given some weight. Officers do not consider that benefits presented are sufficient to outweigh the 'less than substantial harm' to the four designated heritage assets listed above.

118. The proposal will cause less than substantial harm to four designated heritage assets, which is not outweighed by public benefits.

#### *Archaeology*

119. The Cambridgeshire County Council Historic Environment Team has assessed the application in terms of the impact upon archaeology and has raised no objections, stating that it defers to Historic England and SCDC to assess whether the application meets the tests of Paragraph 194 of the NPPF. The Historic Environment Team has requested that a condition is attached to any consent granted to require a programme of archaeological historic building recording equivalent to Historic England Level 4.
120. Confirmation has been sought, and this condition relates to recording of the building rather than below ground investigations. This is in line with the condition requested by the Historic Buildings Officer and agreed to by the Applicant in the Planning Statement under Section 5.4. Should consent be granted, a programme of recording should be required by condition in order to ensure that an accurate record of the building is made in accordance with Section 16 of the NPPF and NH/14 of the Local Plan.

#### **Highway Safety**

121. The Local Highway Authority has commented on the application and requests that conditions are attached to any permission granted to require that a method statement is submitted prior to the commencement of works relating to the process of demolition and any effects on the adopted public highway, and requiring the submission of a traffic management plan.
122. Whilst this application is for Listed Building Consent and the above conditions would usually be attached only to Planning Permission, Officers note that Section 5.4 of the Submitted Planning Statement offers agreement to a condition requiring a traffic management plan. Given that the building is of such significant scale and that its demolition would require contractor movements and parking, and the transport of a large amount of material, this condition is considered to be reasonable in this instance, noting that highway safety is a matter of fact rather than being strictly a planning policy requirement.

#### **Residential Amenity**

##### *Noise and Disturbance*

123. The Environmental Health Officer has assessed the application in relation to noise and disturbance and raises no objections. The Environmental Health Officer requests conditions regarding noisy works, the burning of waste and the need for a Demolition Notice are attached to any permission granted. It would usually be recommended that the condition regarding noisy works is attached to any Planning Permission granted. However, as this application is for Listed Building Consent, the condition cannot be attached. It is instead recommended that this wording is attached as an informative, for the attention of the applicant. The two conditions requested regarding the burning of waste and the need for a demolition notice are not considered to be reasonable, necessary or enforceable, as well as not being appropriate for attachment to a

decision for this application time. It is recommended that this wording is instead attached as informatives.

#### *Air Quality*

124. No response was received from the Air Quality Officer in relation to this application. However it is noted that consultation with the Air Quality Officer took place as a part of the pre-application advice and no objections were raised at that time.

#### **Ecology**

125. The application is supported by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Bat Inspection Survey.
126. The Ecology Officer was consulted on the application and has requested that an informative is attached to any consent granted stating that works should stop immediately should evidence of bats be found, and that advice should be sought on how to proceed. This is considered to be reasonable and it is recommended that an informative to this effect is attached.

#### **Trees**

127. The Council's Trees Officer has assessed the application and raises no objection, commenting that there are trees on or adjacent to site with legal protection through the Conservation Area, however it is not considered that the trees would be detrimentally affected by the proposal.

#### **Contamination**

128. A response to the application has not been received from the Council's Scientific Officer, however comments were provided alongside pre-application advice. At that time, it was commented that Officers are aware that the site is an active tannery and is very likely to have some contamination issues. Assuming demolition is simply above ground, then no objections would be raised, and given the information we have about the lack of foundations to the brick plinth, this is not a significant concern at this stage. However, if ground works are required, or a new use or building is proposed, investigation may be required.
129. Due to the nature of this application, conditions to this effect could not be attached to any Listed Building Consent granted.

#### **Drainage**

130. The Environment Agency has commented on the application and requests conditions regarding a remediation strategy, a surface water disposal scheme, and regarding any contamination not previously identified. Due to the nature of this application, conditions to this effect could not be attached to any Listed Building Consent granted.
131. The Council's Drainage Consultant has commented that the development proposed is acceptable and that there are no flood risk or drainage issues associated with the application.

#### **Other Matters**

132. It is noted that the Applicant undertook pre-application consultation with a number of third parties which are not statutory consultees to the application. These third parties

have been consulted on the application.

133. If any consent is granted, it is recommended that the time limit for the starting of works is to be one year rather than three as is standard. This was agreed with the Applicant's Agent in writing on 01 July 2019. The limited timeframe is due to the deteriorating state of the building and the need to ensure that action is taken in the short-term if a consent is to be implemented.

### **Conclusion**

#### Conclusion

134. The proposal is for the total loss of the Grade II\* Great Eastern Drying Shed. The proposal will cause the maximum level of substantial harm to the significance of this heritage asset. Paragraph 195 of the NPPF states that unless the four tests are all met, consent should be refused where substantial harm is identified.
135. The application has demonstrated that:
- (a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
  - (b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
  - (c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible.
136. However, it is not considered that the fourth test has been met, whereby (d) requires that the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.
137. The loss of the Drying Shed will also cause less than substantial harm to the significance of three listed buildings and the Sawston Conservation Area. The identified harm is not outweighed by the minor public benefits which are associated with the proposal.
138. The proposal does not therefore fully comply with Paragraphs 195 and 196 of the NPPF.
139. Nevertheless, in this wholly exceptional case there are material considerations which indicate that consent should be granted.
140. Paragraph 191 of the NPPF has been found not to be applicable in this instance and therefore the condition of the building is a material consideration in determining this application. It has been demonstrated that the act of 'repairing' the building would itself cause substantial harm to significance, resulting essentially in a replica of negligible significance. It has been demonstrated that the work necessary for conversion or repair would result in a very large conservation deficit, with the total for the repair work put at £1.2million in the 2019 costings. It has been demonstrated that the Drying Shed has no potential viable use as required by Paragraph 195(b) of the NPPF, and that grant-funding, or not-for-profit, charitable or public ownership is not possible as required by Paragraph 195(c) of the NPPF.
141. There does not appear to be a future wherein the Great Eastern Drying Shed can be preserved as a building of special architectural or historic interest and this material consideration is to be balanced against the conflict with Paragraphs 195(d) and 196. Officers are of the view that the material planning consideration by way of the demonstrable impracticality of maintaining the significance of the heritage asset outweighs the less than substantial harm to the nearby Listed Buildings and the Sawston Conservation Area. Further, when considering the inability of the proposal to comply with Paragraph 195(d) in full and the information submitted in respect of this

criterion, this material planning consideration is considered to outweigh this policy conflict.

142. In light of the above, Officers do not object to the demolition of the Great Eastern Drying Shed, a Grade II\* listed building, in accordance with the advice of Historic England and the Council's Historic Buildings Officer. Therefore, it is recommended that Listed Building Consent is granted subject to the conditions below.

### **Recommendation**

Approve, subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of one year from the date of this consent.  
(Reason – To ensure that the consideration of any future application for development in the area will not be prejudiced by permissions for development, which have not been acted upon.)
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan:  
Site Location Plan drawing no.16.076-SP-050  
(Reason – For the avoidance of doubt.)
3. No demolition/development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work, to include Historic Building Recording, in accordance with a written scheme of investigation (WSI) which has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no demolition/development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI which shall include:
  - a) The statement of significance and research objectives;
  - b) The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works;
  - c) The programme for the analysis, publication & dissemination, and deposition of resulting material. Part (c) of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.  
Developers will wish to ensure that in drawing up their development programme, the timetable for the investigation is included within the details of the agreed scheme.  
(Reason - To ensure that the significance of historic environment assets is conserved in accordance with Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 and Policy NH/14 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018).
4. Prior to the commencement of any demolition, a demolition implementation programme and schedule of works, to include details of salvage, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
  - a. The programme for the salvage, storage, and reuse of materials, shall include but not be limited to:
    - i. slates,
    - ii. louvres,
    - iii. boards,
    - iv. structural members,
    - v. bricks,

- vi. rain water goods.
  - b. Material to be salvaged must be identified on scaled plan and elevation drawings and on site. Potential for reuse within the Tannery site must be identified.
  - c. The programme is to include a written programme for dismantling the building and concurrent removal of salvageable material.
  - d. The programme must include plans for appropriate weathertight storage of materials.  
(Reason – To ensure the use of appropriate methods and to ensure the salvage and reuse of historic material where possible, in accordance with Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 and Policy NH/14 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018).
5. No demolition or construction works shall commence on site until a traffic management plan has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The principle areas of concern that should be addressed are:
- i) Movements and control of muck away lorries (all loading and unloading shall undertaken off the adopted highway).
  - (ii) Contractor parking, for both phases all such parking shall be within the curtilage of the site and not on the street.
  - (iii) Movements and control of all deliveries (all loading and unloading shall be undertaken off the adopted public highway)s.
  - (iv) Control of dust, mud and debris, in relationship to the functioning of the adopted public highway.  
(Reason - In the interests of highway safety.)

### **Informatives**

#### *Ecology*

Works should proceed with caution and in the event of bats or evidence of them being found, work must stop immediately and advice taken on how to proceed lawfully from one of the following: a bat consultant, the UK Bat Helpline: 0845 1300228, Natural England: 0300 0603900, or the Cambridgeshire Bat Group  
[www.cambsbatgroup.org.uk](http://www.cambsbatgroup.org.uk)

#### *Environmental Health*

No demolition works shall be carried out on site except between the hours of 0800-1800 Monday to Friday, 0800-1300 Saturday and not at any time on Sundays or Bank or Public holidays in order to protect the amenity of the locality, especially for people living and/or working nearby .

There shall be no burning of any waste or other materials on the site, without prior consent from the environmental health department, in order to ensure nuisance is not caused to local residents.

Before the existing building is demolished, a Demolition Notice will be required from the Building Control team establishing the way in which it will be dismantled, including any asbestos present, the removal of waste, minimisation of dust, capping of drains and establishing hours of working.

### **Background Papers:**

The following list contains links to the documents on the Council's website and / or an indication as to where hard copies can be inspected.

- South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018
- South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's)
- Planning File References: S/1483/19/LB

**Report Author:**

Rebecca Whitney  
Telephone Number:

Senior Planning Officer  
01954 713029