

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>14/1805/LBC</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	
<b>Date Received</b>	14th November 2014	<b>Officer</b>	Mr Toby Williams
<b>Target Date</b>	9th January 2015		
<b>Ward</b>	Market		
<b>Site</b>	Judge Business School Trumpington Street Cambridge Cambridgeshire CB2 1AG		
<b>Proposal</b>	Internal and external alterations to the Grade II listed former Addenbrooke's Hospital building, including the construction of links to Keynes House and to the proposed new building for the Cambridge Judge Business School.		
<b>Applicant</b>	University of Cambridge		

SUMMARY	The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:  -The fabric of the listed buildings would be preserved subject to conditions.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

**1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT**

- 1.1 The site is the old Addenbrooke's hospital (currently occupied by the Judge Business School), Nightingale and Bridget's Hostels which front onto Tennis Court Road, Keynes House and the curtilage of these buildings.
- 1.2 The old Addenbrooke's building is a large Grade II listed building in a prominent position, set back in a formal courtyard bounded by listed railings to Trumpington Street. It is visible from Tennis Court Road, in glimpse views between the hostel buildings and in longer views from Regent Street.
- 1.3 The old Addenbrooke's building was constructed as a hospital in 1766 when the first patients were admitted. It has been much extended since, notably in the 1860's by Matthew Digby Wyatt. Subsequent to the listing, it was converted for the Judge Business School (JBS) by the architect John Outram and

opened in 1996 following the relocation of Addenbrookes hospital to the south of the city. The conversion works undertaken by Outram were radical and extensive. They include two newer brick blocks called the Ark and the Castle that sit on the Tennis Court Road side of the site and extensive internal works, mainly a gallery, to the former hospital building itself that are contained within the 1860's brickwork shell.

- 1.4 The Outram works to the listed building are extremely unusual and specific to the listed building, displaying a colourful array of architectural features inside and outside the building, including new brickwork, door panelling, services and decoration which are now an intrinsic part of the character of the listed building.
- 1.5 Nightingale and Bridget's Hostels are not listed or Buildings of Local Interest. They are currently vacant, most recently occupied by Anglia Ruskin University for 121 students to the summer of 2014.
- 1.6 To the front of the site, facing Trumpington Street, is Keynes House which is curtilage listed.
- 1.7 The site and its buildings fall within the Central Conservation Area.
- 1.8 Opposite and within landscaped grounds are the Downing College buildings, the two closest of which are contemporary additions and not listed. To the north and adjacent to Nightingale Hostel is Kings Hostel, a grade II listed building. To the south, on the same side of the street as Bridget's Hostel, is the University Department of Pharmacology, a modern functional building.

## **2.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 The proposal seeks listed building consent to facilitate planning application 14/1797/FUL for additional teaching, office, breakout and dining spaces for the Judge Business School. That proposal links to the existing Ark building and the back of the old Addenbrooke's hospital building. Various alterations to the historic fabric are required, including a link to Keynes House, links and knocking through to the Ark building, removal of windows in the Ark building, its over-cladding and alterations to existing glazing and doors.

2.2 The application is accompanied by the following information.

- Design and Access Statement
- Heritage Statement

2.3 The application has been amended to address a number of issues raised by Conservation Officers. The amendments, which have been subject to further consultation, include:

-Deletion of the removal of the main exterior front door to the old Addenbrooke's building.

-Alteration to the design/interface of the new build with the Ark, in particular the revealing of the brick columns of the Ark internally to the scheme.

### 3.0 SITE HISTORY

3.1 There is no relevant planning history for the site.

### 4.0 PUBLICITY

4.1 Advertisement:	Yes
Adjoining Owners:	Yes
Site Notice Displayed:	Yes

### 5.0 POLICY

5.1 See Appendix 1 for full details of Central Government Guidance, Cambridge Local Plan 2006 policies, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations.

5.2 Relevant Development Plan policies

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	4/10
Key SPD and guidance	Planning Obligation Strategy SPD Central Conservation Appraisal

### 5.3 Relevant Central Government Guidance, Supplementary Planning Documents and Material Considerations

Central Government Guidance	National Planning Policy Framework March 2012  National Planning Policy Framework – Planning Practice Guidance March 2014  Circular 11/95  Ministerial Statement (1 December 2014) by Brandon Lewis Minister of State for Housing and Planning (Department of Communities and Local Government)
Supplementary Planning Guidance	Sustainable Design and Construction (May 2007)
Area Guidelines	Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2006)

### 5.4 Status of Proposed Submission – Cambridge Local Plan

Planning applications should be determined in accordance with policies in the adopted Development Plan and advice set out in the NPPF. However, after consideration of adopted plans and the NPPF, policies in emerging plans can also be given some weight when determining applications. For Cambridge, therefore, the emerging revised Local Plan as published for consultation on 19 July 2013 can be taken into account, especially those policies where there are no or limited objections to it. However it is likely, in the vast majority of instances, that the adopted development plan and the NPPF will have considerably more weight than emerging policies in the revised Local Plan.

For the application considered in this report, there are no policies in the emerging Local Plan of relevance.

## 6.0 CONSULTATIONS

## Urban Design and Conservation Team

### 6.1 *Application as submitted*

#### *The Listed Building.*

A main change to the LB [other than minor changes to internal cellular office partitions, which are acceptable] is to alter the access between the canted rear wall of the Outram interventions and the new raised courtyard and the circulation space beneath it. Whilst changes to the means of egress & access may be acceptable as a concept, the removal of the Outram design doors is unnecessary and unacceptable. The intention appears to be to impose stylistic details from the new build onto the division/skin of the existing buildings to make the new work take visual precedence over the historic work. The existing division should remain visually clear and new work should come up to historic fabric and touch it lightly rather than impose itself upon the LB. The existing doors have the character of the LB, as altered, and replacing them with as proposed is not considered appropriate. The way in which the edge of the raised courtyard meets the back of the LB will be extremely important in structural as well as visual terms (hence proposed condition).

Similarly the linking of the new executive reception area behind the ward wing with a glazed roof section appears to be showing the chopping out of historic brickwork to accept a steel channel to support the structure spanning the gap. This seems to be unnecessarily damaging when surface fixing could be an option. In particular, the means of working around the pilasters needs to be shown and agreed.

A further intervention is the proposed cladding of a polychrome brick wall by Outram [rear external elevation of 'The Ark'] which becomes internal to the circulation space between the new block and the rear of the LB. The 'cloaking' of this feature of the LB as it stands does not make sense when the continuing brickwork at higher levels is clearly seen through the glazed roof to this circulation space. The blocking of the existing windows [if really required] in a reversible manner is entirely possible. The premise of this application is that the new building is not proposed to try to compete with either the original historic

building nor its 1990s additions [see also comments of C & D Panel], so trying to reduce the impact of its flamboyant presence cannot be right. That would be to try to make the new-build elements pre-eminent or to be embarrassed by the earlier work.

The proposed link between Keynes House and the main LB is acceptable as a concept [and seems likely to be not dissimilar to earlier such links]. Again there is little detail about the structural intrusion into the historic fabric, rainwater drainage and how junctions [glass-to-brick, for example] are made.

The proposed works to the front of the LB are limited but include replacing the front doors. Whilst they may be from Outram's alterations, they most certainly are now an integral part of the character of the building. It may not be impossible to render the doors compliant with the DDA and it is not clear why large amounts of daylight are necessary at this point in the LB. Nonetheless, there may be some scope for alterations to the doors and draught-lobby but there is inadequate detail to really assess the impact of the scheme.

#### Conclusion:

Listed Building: The proposals are not acceptable in some of their direct impacts on some of the interfaces with the Outram phase.

The means of fixing glazed roofing into the old building (especially around the pilasters) should be clarified and agreed (by condition if appropriate).

## 6.2 *Application as amended*

There have been a number of meetings with the applicant agents to discuss the proposals.

The amended/revised plans address the south elevation (to service yard/Tennis Court Road) of the new building; and the east and northern (external) elevations of the "Ark" – the Outram extension of the main building.

Three outstanding areas of concern in relation to the impact of the proposals on heritage assets were recently discussed:

1. Panelling of windows on the east wall of the Ark
2. Panelling of decorative corner pier on northern elevation of the Ark
3. Removal of doors to north entrance/lobby area

Taking each of these matters in turn we comment as follows:

1. In our view, impacts on the Ark remain in relation to the east wall (what will become a corridor) due to the proposed removal of the colourful and particular windows framing/surrounds (beside the coloured brick piers now to be retained). Such removal is, in our view, detrimental and not agreed at this stage, however we consider that this can be agreed at a later date and to address the matter we suggest a condition to enable acceptable treatment to be agreed.
2. The lower level, including decorative piers, of the northern (external) elevation of the “Ark” would be clad. We understand that the central panels are for aesthetic consideration in order to “tie” the space together with the new lobby area being created. Discussion at the 10<sup>th</sup> March meeting with the applicant, agent and architect revealed that structural constraints necessitated the placing of structural piers at either side/end of this elevation. We questioned in detail the requirement and evidence to justify such piers as they in effect “cover up” a key decorative building feature of the Ark. The agent undertook to supply the Council with further structural information to explain this requirement. We have not yet seen this information, however we now have a better understanding of why a pier is necessary in this location. While undesirable in heritage terms, it was explained that the “grid” construction of the first floor above this lobby area necessitated a pier being placed directly in front of this decorative column.
3. The proposed removal of the original Outram doors in the canted north entrance screen remains a further adverse aspect on the original Outram design – especially for the sake of plain replacements. These are not agreed at this stage so a condition is required to enable acceptable replacement.

Confirmation of the omission from the overall scheme of the removal of the Outram front doors from the main front façade is welcomed and supported.

## Conclusion

The revised drawings go some way to ameliorating the concerns set out in our original comments in respect of the impact the proposals on the listed building. However, it remains that conditions are required to still control certain changes as set out above. Finally, before the application is determined it would be helpful to see the promised justification by way of illustration of the structural requirements of the first floor construction outside the canted north screen and to agree same as evidence for the pier referred to in section 2 above.

In addition to these conditions, standard conditions as set out in our previous comments dated 31 December, 2014, are also required.

With the conditions outlined in sections 1 and 3 above and the further evidence requested in section 2, we conclude that the applications are acceptable in design terms and comply with policies 4/10 (Listed Buildings) and 4/11 (Conservation Areas) of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

## **English Heritage**

- 6.3 No Objection: English Heritage consider the existing nurses hostel buildings on Tennis Court Road make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Central Cambridge Conservation Area and are satisfied that the scale, massing, design and materials of the proposed replacement building, together with the proposed internal and external alterations to the grade II listed Old Addenbrooke's Hospital (now the Judge Business School) building and the proposed link building to Keynes House would not cause harm to the conservation area and are therefore contextually appropriate for this sensitive site. We would have no objection should your authority be minded to approve the application.

## **7.0 REPRESENTATIONS**

- 7.1 I have not received any representations from third parties.

## **8.0 ASSESSMENT**

8.1 From the consultation responses received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issue is whether the proposed loss of listed fabric to the Ark building is justified.

8.2 Four key issues are highlighted by Conservation Officers. I outline how these issues have been addressed by the applicants below:

*1: Front Door*

8.3 The applicants originally proposed the removal of the external front door to the old Addenbrooke's building. This is part & parcel of what appears to be Outram's conversion and visually signifies the vibrancy of the architecture contained behind it. The proposal would have removed an important visual component of the building in favour of a glazed entrance door. The applicants have removed this element of their proposal from the scheme.

*2: Eastern Elevation of the Ark*

8.4 This elevation currently exhibits multi-coloured brickwork columns. The columns were originally proposed as being over-clad. Officers considered the brickwork, by Outram, was of importance and required being revealed rather than hidden. The applicants have responded by revealing the brick columns of the Ark building and providing a light-weight glazing system above. I have recommended condition 4 to ensure that agreement is reached regarding the extent of loss of the window frames between the brick columns.

*3: Northern and Western Elevations of the Ark*

8.5 The applicants also propose the brickwork in this location to be partially clad. The plans have been amended to lessen the extent of cladding and officers have met with the applicants to clarify the structural constraints of new columns having to be placed in front of old. Further information has been provided on this which justifies the positioning of the structural columns and I am confident that the interface is satisfactory.

*4: Outram Doors on the Canted Elevation*

- 8.6 The proposal includes the removal of the original Outram doors in the canted north entrance screen. This removal remains a concern to officers and does not appear necessary. Plain glazed replacements are proposed which would open up internal views of the new foyer area. The removal of these doors is not agreed at this stage. Condition 3 is recommended to enable an acceptable replacement.

## **9.0 CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 Conservation Officers were originally concerned with regard to the cumulative loss of listed fabric and the over-cladding of elements of the Ark building. The issues they have raised reflect a desire from Conservation Officers to value more and retain more of the Outram new build and to only lose elements of its visual setting to the proposed extensions if necessary. The applicants have made amendments to try and address those concerns and the amendments have been acknowledged by officers. Subject to conditions, the fabric of the listed buildings would be preserved. The proposal is compliant with policy 4/10 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2006.

## **10.0 RECOMMENDATION**

**GRANT CONSENT** subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this consent.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Building & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended by section 51(4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed on this decision notice.

Reason: In the interests of good planning, for the avoidance of doubt and to facilitate any future application to the Local Planning Authority under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 19

3. Notwithstanding the approved plans, prior to the removal of the rear doors on the canted north elevation of the Outram conversion, details of the replacement doors shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

4. Notwithstanding the approved plans, prior to the removal of any listed fabric, the extent of the removal of windows, brick columns and the cladding of the external brickwork of the Ark building, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building by ensuring that the minimal extent of removal of listed fabric is achieved (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

5. Prior to the commencement of the development of the raised courtyard, full details of the junctions between it and the adjacent listed buildings, including cross-sections, fixings, rainwater disposal, etc. shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

6. Prior to the installation of the link structure to Keynes House, full details of the means of 'building in' structural support to the fabric of the historic building(s) including, pad-stones, bolted or other fixings, in situ lintels, etc. shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).

7. With the exception of details required by condition 6, prior to the installation of any other such intervention, full details of the means of 'building in' structural support to the fabric of the historic building(s) including, pad-stones, bolted or other fixings, in situ lintels, etc. shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To avoid harm to the special interest of the listed building (Cambridge Local Plan 2006, policy 4/10).