



Planning Committee Date	6 th September 2023 Cambridge City Council Planning Committee
Lead Officer	Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development
Reference	20/01427/LBC
Site	Anstey Hall, Maris Lane
Ward / Parish	Trumpington
Proposal	Demolition of greenhouses and flat-roof building and erection of Orangery to house an ancillary restaurant and swimming pool connected to the hall by an existing link. Reconfiguration of wall to restore historic access onto Maris Lane.
Applicant	Trumpington Investments Ltd (Mr John De Bruyne)
Presenting Officer	Tom Gray
Reason Reported to Committee	Called-in by Cllr Hauk Third party representations in support and opposition
Member Site Visit Date	Formal visit date TBC
Key Issues	1. Impact upon the character and significance of the Listed Building
Recommendation	REFUSE

1.0 Executive Summary

- 1.1 The application seeks the demolition of greenhouses and flat-roof building and erection of Orangery to house an ancillary restaurant and swimming pool connected to the hall by an existing link. Reconfiguration of wall to restore historic access onto Maris Lane.
- 1.2 The existing site comprises a Grade II* Listed Building, located within the Trumpington Conservation Area and adjacent to the Cambridge Green Belt. The site is protected open space for its environmental and recreational qualities. It is located to the north and east of the Trumpington Meadows residential development.
- 1.3 There is mature planting within the site with statutory protected trees along the site's eastern boundaries, and the site is located in close proximity to a City Wildlife Site. The site is subject to high surface water flooding.
- 1.4 Three derelict curtilage listed greenhouses would be demolished. Whilst there is no objection to the demolition of the greenhouses nor the negative flat-roofed building in heritage terms, by virtue of the Orangery's unacceptable siting, excessive scale and incongruous design, the proposed development would result in adverse impacts upon the significance and character of the Listed Building (Anstey Hall). The identified harm to this heritage asset is identified as a moderate-level of 'less than substantial' harm and it is not considered that the public benefits arising from the scheme would outweigh this identified harm.
- 1.5 Furthermore, insufficient information has been provided for the reconfiguration of the Maris Lane wall to fully assess this element.
- 1.6 Officers recommend that the Planning Committee refuse the application.

1.7 Site Description and Context

Conservation Area	X	Trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders and within the Conservation Area	X
Protected Open Space	X	Flood Zone 1 and High Surface Water Flood Risk	X
Grade II* Listed Building and within the setting of other Listed Buildings	X	Adjacent to Green Belt	X

- 1.8 The application site comprises a Grade II* Building of Anstey Hall, a 17th Century Country House, and Historic Park and Garden. The site is Protected Open Space for both its environmental and recreational qualities.
- 1.9 The site is located approximately 4km west of Cambridge City Centre. Anstey Hall is located within the Trumpington Conservation Area and is

adjacent to the Grade I Listed Church of St Mary and St Michael and its associated Grade II Listed Vicarage. To the northeast of Anstey Hall are several curtilage Listed outbuildings that have largely been converted to businesses with the exception of the garaging and the Grade II Listed Lodge and Gate Piers, in addition to the Grade II Listed Building of Maris House.

- 1.10 The site is located to the south and Maris Lane, to the north/east of the Trumpington Meadows residential development (an area of major change) and Anstey Hall Barns and west of Waitrose supermarket and car park. There is mature tree planting, in particular on the western and eastern boundaries. The trees on the eastern boundaries in which have statutory protection (TPOs).
- 1.11 Trumpington Meadows Country Park, part of the Cambridge Green Belt is located further to the west whilst the application site is situated adjacent to the protected open space of Trumpington Church Cemetery, a public space. Grantchester Road Plantations is located 100 metres further to the northwest, which is designated as a City Wildlife Site.
- 1.12 The application site is located within Flood Zone 1 (lowest fluvial flood risk), however, 1 in 30-year (high) surface water flood risk, 1 in 100-year (medium) surface water flood risk and 1 in 1000-year (low) surface water flood risk exists within the application site.
- 1.13 Vehicular access to the site is achieved from Maris Lane. Uncontrolled parking exists on adjacent streets.
- 1.14 A planning application has been submitted for the construction of two blocks of retirement accommodation (Class C2) comprising 87 two-bedroom apartments, the change of use of land to public open space and the change of use to Anstey Hall itself. The planning merits of this application are assessed under planning application 20/01426/FUL.

2.0 The Proposal

- 2.1 The proposed development would comprise the demolition of the greenhouses and flat-roof building and replacement with an Orangery to house an ancillary restaurant and swimming pool connected to the hall by an existing link.
- 2.2 Internally, Anstey Hall's floorplans would remain as existing with no internal changes proposed.
- 2.3 The curtilage listed wall onto Maris Lane would be reconfigured to allow for pedestrian access.
- 2.4 The application has been amended to address representations and further consultations have been carried out as appropriate.

3.0 Relevant Site History

Reference	Description	Outcome
21/02332/FUL & 21/02333/LBC	Change of use of Anstey Hall from a wedding venue Use Class formerly D2 (now sui generis) with associated guest accommodation (Use Class C1) which is now collectively sui generis, to use as student accommodation (Use Class C2) for Sixth Form students taught at Dukes Education's St Andrews College, Cambridge	Withdrawn
21/01696/FUL	Change of use of Anstey Hall from Wedding Venue (D2, now F2) and Hotel (C1) to Residential Institution (C2) with ancillary visitor accommodation	Refused
20/01426/FUL	Construction of two blocks of retirement accommodation (Class C2) comprising 87 two-bedroom apartments. Change of use of land to public open space. Change of use of Anstey Hall to mixed uses including ancillary use on the lower ground, ground and first floor to serve the residential retirement community, 5x staff accommodation on the second floor, a C3 private flatted dwelling on the second floor, and 7x short -term guest accommodation on the ground and first floor. Demolition of greenhouses and flat-roof building and erection of Orangery to house an ancillary restaurant and swimming pool connected to the hall by an existing link, provision of pedestrian access onto Maris Lane and reconfiguration of wall, hard and soft landscaping, car parking and pedestrian access onto Old Mills Road	Pending Decision
19/5091/PREAPP	87 retirement apartments, new orangery containing catering and support services, use of Anstey Hall as central facilities and new vehicular and pedestrian accesses.	Advice Given

18/1537/FUL & 18/1538/LBC	Convert existing store rooms into bedrooms with ensuite on ground and first floor loft space, including a roof extension with dormer window on the south elevation. Two new conservation rooflights and internal chimney removed.	Permitted
16/0586/FUL	Installation of a new pedestrian link between Waitrose Store and Barratt development and associated works.	Permitted
15/0871/LBC	Form new door opening within bookshelves of the west wall of the library. Install "art nouveau" stained glass screen in passage.	Permitted
15/0101/ADV	External Seating Banners & Stainless Steel Posts	Permitted
14/0159/FUL & 14/0160/LBC	Demolition of modern barn and outbuildings and removal of temporary structures to allow conversion of barns, cart sheds and stables to eight residential units and erection of four dwellings, the creation of a spur access drive from Anstey Hall Drive and associated works.	Permitted
13/0950/FUL	Extension to front of store building (Use Class A1) and associated works and improvements.	Permitted
12/0504/FUL	Retrospective change of use from B1 (offices) to (D2) wedding venue and associated (C1) hotel and guest use for 12 bedrooms.	Permitted
12/0456/FUL	Request permission to continue use of Marquee for Wedding ceremonies etc for a period of at least 3 years.	Permitted
10/0180/FUL & 10/0181/LBC	Formation of extended vehicular driveway and new opening in boundary wall.	Refused, Appeal Dismissed
08/0631/FUL & 08/0708/LBC	Refurbishment and change of use of storage and greenhouse to office/light industrial.	Permitted

07/1335/FUL	Change of use of redundant carriage house to offices.	Permitted
07/1354/LBC	New south elevation wall and windows, replacement of floors, partitions and roof.	Permitted
07/1092/LBC	Form an opening of 6 metres wide with two new brick pillars constructed from the reclaimed bricks, stone plinths and two reclaimed stone balls.	Permitted
07/1094/FUL	Forming an opening 6 metres wide with two new brick piers in wall on west boundary of Anstey Hall.	Permitted
C/03/1090	Internal and external alterations to building within curtilage of Grade I Listed Building.	
C/03/1092	Retrospective application for the removal of an internal wall within grade I listed building.	
C/03/1093	Internal and external works to grade I listed building.	
C/03/0575	Internal and external alterations to stables (retrospective).	Permitted
C/03/0130	Change of use of ground floor unit of coach house building from B1 offices to D1 clinical practice.	Permitted
C/02/1160 & C/02/1090	Replacement entrance gates adjacent to Anstey Hall annexe retrospective.	Permitted
C/02/0118	Replacement of entrance gates and internal and external alterations to main hall and stable blocks.	Withdrawn
C/01/1031	Change of use of outbuilding within the grounds of Anstey Hall from retail (Class A1) to Ophthalmic Laser Clinic (Class D1) and external alterations to building.	Permitted

C/01/1032	Internal and external alterations to outbuilding within the grounds of Anstey Hall.	Permitted
C/00/0224	Internal alterations to Anstey Hall and part demolition of outbuildings.	Permitted

4.0 Policy

4.1 National

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

National Planning Practice Guidance

National Design Guide 2019

Circular 11/95 (Conditions, Annex A)

4.2 Cambridge Local Plan 2018

Policy 61: Conservation and enhancement of historic environment

4.3 Supplementary Planning Documents

N/A

4.4 Other Guidance

Trumpington Conservation Area Appraisal 2010

5.0 Consultations

5.1 County Highways Development Management – No objection

5.2 Drawing number ZA961-PL-SK-001 P1 is sufficient to overcome objection.

5.3 Previous comments (23rd January 2023) – Comments remain the same.

5.4 Previous comments (17th January 2023) – Objection. Proposed access point off Maris Lane needs to be shown in more detail. Access width must be shown. Conditions recommended.

5.5 Previous comments (9th April 2020) – Objection. Lack of suitable transport assessment. Inter-vehicle visibility splays required. Recommends Traffic Management Plan and construction vehicle weight conditions.

5.6 Conservation Officer – Objection

- 5.7 Elevations now consistent with roof plan. However, scant level of detail in what the appearance/level of quality of the orangery building would be and given its close proximity to the house, this is not an acceptable level of information. Overall level of harm deriving from these applications remains unchanged and in common with Historic England's assessment.
- 5.8 Previous comments (24th February 2023) – Anstey Hall has been regraded to Grade II* and according to the listing description has a group value with the now Grade II listed lodge and gate piers which, along with the other (unlisted) associated outbuildings, form an important architectural and historic context to the Hall.
- 5.9 Agent has confirmed that no physical adaptations are required to facilitate the future use of the rooms with the Hall. The original idea for an internal lift is now not included.
- 5.10 The listed building consent application comprises the following:
- The demolition of the greenhouses and flat roofed building
 - Erection of orangery (because of the link attachment to the hall)
 - Reconfiguration of the front boundary wall to restore an historic access.
- 5.11 Three free-standing greenhouses are intended to be demolished. They have a small role in evidencing the purpose/former function of the kitchen garden/walled garden area's relationship to the house.
- 5.12 Existing flat roofed building is otherwise unrelated in materials, form or appearance to the house and is a negative feature.
- 5.13 Demolition of the flat roofed building and replacement with the proposed Orangery would result in a different and very close relationship with the house.
- 5.14 The architectural detail and information provided is insufficient to demonstrate a harmonious addition to the listed building in terms of quality of design or of suitable materials. Plans are also inconsistent.
- 5.15 It has not been demonstrated how the Orangery's west return with the house would relate in terms of quality of design or materials. No drawings of convincing design/materials. Do not follow the existing building footprint. Link with the existing hall is not clear.
- 5.16 Proposals also comprise forming a new opening in the curtilage boundary wall along this road which is a half-height wall in brick and is probably contemporary with the Listed Lodge built in 1865 through a curved section to the more westerly, Church Lane junction, entrance gateway was rebuilt in 2014/15. The pair of gate piers at that junction were rebuilt and repositioned in 2016 to widen the entrance and consequently have been delisted.

- 5.17 The submitted site plans indicate an outline layout of what is proposed – a wide opening with a curved section boundary and a route back towards the house. However, there is no other application drawing denoting the scale, design or materials of what is proposed and how these would transition from the existing wall.
- 5.18 Historic mapping indicates an earlier entrance to the house from approximately this point but without details of the proposal it is not demonstrated that it would be a sympathetic alteration.
- 5.19 Conclusion: Without demonstrably appropriate, detailed, design proposals for a building addition as large and of such close proximity to the house as the proposed Orangery, or for reconfiguring the wall onto Maris Lane, the proposal may result in adverse impact on the significance or character of the Listed building. The flat-roofed building and greenhouses are secondary considerations.
- 5.20 There is no detail in the Listed building application of the physical changes (such as external extractor ducts) for the adaptation from offices to a kitchen. I note there are currently no such vents or chimneys on this building, and it is likely that adding such would have an adverse visual impact.
- 5.21 In summary, the application fails to demonstrate that the proposals would meet Cambridge Local Plan 2018 Policy 61 (c) and guidance within the NPPF.

5.22 Historic England – Objection

- 5.23 Comprehensive schedule of renovations and repairs to the Hall and outbuildings no longer forms part of the application.
- 5.24 Anstey Hall is a fine late 17th century house with good interiors from this period and from the 18th century. The surviving landscape illustrates the status of the building and how it functioned, contributing to its significance. It is located on the site of a Medieval manor which had been rebuilt by Edmund Bacchus in the early 17th century. The Hall and grounds make an important contribution to the Trumpington Conservation Area.
- 5.25 Previous concluded that the scheme to build on land to the south of the Hall (one of the surviving elements of the historic grounds) would cause a high level of harm to its significance. The proximity of these blocks would compromise the appreciation of the Hall in what survives of its open setting.
- 5.26 Principle objection to the two new build residential blocks on residential blocks are maintained. They would encroach upon the open space and would cause a high level of less than substantial harm to the Hall's significance and setting.

- 5.27 Anstey Hall is listed as Grade II* for the following principal reasons: Its historic interest being a country house of considerable architectural distinction; its architectural interest including its principal façade, rear garden elevation, panelling and plasterwork; and its group value with the Grade II listed Lodge and other unlisted outbuildings.
- 5.28 Anstey Hall as a mansion house was designed to be seen in a landscape setting with immediate pleasure grounds, beyond which was a wider, largely parkland landscape grazed by cattle. Formal pleasure gardens in the area north of the ha-ha had a functional, domestic relationship with the Hall providing an area of recreation, reflecting the status of the Hall. The area to the south was open landscape space, reflecting how the Hall was used and providing an attractive setting to the building.
- 5.29 Hall is adjacent to the Grade I Listed Church and associated Grade II listed Vicarage. The conservation area is characterised by the grand manor houses of Trumpington Hall and Anstey Hall and a mixture of smaller buildings of different ages, including 19th century houses under the ownership of Trumpington Hall. The LPA's Character Appraisal states that there are a total of 25 Listed Buildings and nine Buildings of Local Interest in the conservation area. There are several notable walls within the area.
- 5.30 The grounds and surrounding landscape of Anstey Hall form an important element of the character of Trumpington Conservation Area. The views into the grounds are an important characteristic of the conservation area, as well as the views along Grantchester Road and Maris Lane towards the listed building, which are bordered by boundary walls and the walls of the ancillary buildings.
- 5.31 This contributes to the narrow and enclosed nature that defines the streets within this part of the conservation area. As such, Anstey Hall is considered to make a major positive contribution towards the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 5.32 The proposed Orangery building would have a moderate impact on the significance of the Hall, which would be mitigated to a certain extent by the 'replacement of a detrimental feature by a new and more harmonious one' (Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3).
- 5.33 New residential blocks would cause a high level of less than substantial harm to the immediate setting of the Grade II* Listed Building, as the development would encroach into one of the only surviving elements of the historic grounds which continue to contribute to the significance of the Hall. The proximity of the proposed large residential blocks and their contextually inappropriate design would compromise the appreciation of the Hall in what survives of its open setting.
- 5.34 Whilst it is accepted that the wider setting of Anstey Hall has been incrementally eroded over the last 20 years, any development that would

- further encroach on the grassed open space to the south of the Hall would detract from its overall setting, causing a high level of harm to the significance of the listed building.
- 5.35 Supportive of the high-quality landscaping proposals but the benefits would be wholly undermined by the presence of the large-scale residential blocks, with the result that they would not succeed in mitigating against their impact.
- 5.36 Discrepancy between the DAS and supplementary HIA regarding level of harm is noted.
- 5.37 Policy considerations for these proposals include NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development, Para 197, 199, 200, 202. Setting of a heritage asset is not fixed and its surrounding evolve. More advice in Historic Environment planning notes.
- 5.38 Recommendation is that whilst the wider setting of the Hall is now urbanised, it would not be appropriate to treat the Hall as a town house, and we emphasise the importance of retaining the surviving garden setting. Remaining land in the ownership of the Hall makes a strong contribution to the setting and significance of the Hall itself and it is important that this is not further compromised by additional development.
- 5.39 Positive elements of the proposal including landscaping and connectivity. However, concerned that the refurbishment of the Hall involving works to both the interior and exterior of the Hall and outbuildings which would assist in safeguarding their historic fabric into the future are no longer included in the proposals.
- 5.40 High level of less than substantial harm. Historic environment benefits resulting from the proposal would in no way outweigh the level of harm caused by the new build residential development.
- 5.41 It is for the LPA to weigh up the public benefits of the scheme however in our view it has not been demonstrated that providing central facilities for the proposed retirement community would constitute optimum viable use of the Grade II* listed Hall, consistent with conservation.
- 5.42 NPPF states that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). The Grade II* listing places it in the top 5.8% of all listed buildings and therefore advise that the weight afforded should be very great indeed.
- 5.43 Substantial encroachment of new buildings and do not meet the requirements of the NPPF, in particular paragraphs 197, 199, 200 and 202. Should bear in mind the statutory duties of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

5.44 If minded to approve the listed building consent in its current form, in light of our objection you should treat this letter as a request to notify the Secretary of State of this application, in accordance with the above Direction.

5.45 County Archaeology – No Objection

5.46 Very high archaeological potential. Due to the scale of development comprising the orangery only, recommend pre-commencement condition.

6.0 Third Party Representations

6.1 Representations from 12 addresses have been received (11 in objection, 1 in support)

6.2 Those in objection have raised the following issues:

Internal alterations

- No details/revised floor plans
- Insufficient information
- Support demolition of greenhouses and clearing of area

Other matters

- Principle of dedicated housing is supported
- Very large addition to listed building
- Roofline of blocks is monotonous
- Scale incompatible with listed building and an overdevelopment
- Would destroy the garden and view permanently altered
- Landscaping will take a while to establish
- Belvedere would affect privacy of neighbouring houses
- Access road would be intrusive to neighbours
- Welcome public access to park but concerned about security
- Block C very close to neighbours along Piper Road
- No room for landscaping to hide access road
- Confusion over whether facilities would be open to the public
- New opening conflicts with road safety considerations
- Inadequate parking provision
- Local roads offer little capacity and would put pressure of road network
- Insufficient room within the site for vehicle circulation and pedestrian/vehicle separation
- Overshadowing of neighbouring properties
- Insufficient maintenance of the drive
- Retirement accommodation not considered necessary
- Fumes and air pollution
- Neighbouring properties' vista would be compromised
- Waste collection not thought through
- Protected open space would be diminished
- Woodland destroyed and plans not representative of existing trees
- Would fulfil a need
- Concerned about construction traffic

- Light pollution
 - Security implications of public access to the park at night and cut-through to Piper Road would encourage anti-social behaviour
 - No notice of public meetings
- 6.3 Those in support have raised the following issues:
- Much needed accommodation for retired people
- 6.4 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations are available on the Council's website.
- 7.0 Assessment**
- 7.1 Heritage Assets**
- 7.2 The application site is located within the Trumpington Conservation Area. The proposed orangery would link with Anstey Hall, a Grade II* listed building. which is described within the Conservation Area Appraisal as "characterized by the grand manor houses of Trumpington Hall and Anstey Hall and a mixture of smaller buildings of different ages..."
- 7.3 The Appraisal continues by adding that Anstey Hall is set in substantial private grounds... "The gardens and the grounds of Anstey Hall are vital to the setting of the buildings and the character of the Conservation Area as a whole. However, there is no public access to these private grounds."
- 7.4 In addition, the Trumpington Conservation Area Appraisal identifies a number of protected and significant features on the site that make up the special character and setting of Anstey Hall. This includes the Grade II* listed Anstey Hall, Walls of Townscape Significance, TPO areas, individual TPOs, significant tree groups, 8 individual significant trees and a significant viewpoint from the southern boundary of the site looking north towards Anstey Hall.
- 7.5 The setting of the Hall makes an important contribution to its significance. There are panoramic views of the Hall and grounds from the southern end of the application site. Anstey Hall was designed to be seen in a landscape setting with immediate pleasure grounds to the north of the ha-ha, beyond which was a wider largely parkland landscape. Following a formal consultation with Historic England, the reasons for this listing is its historic interest (a country house of considerable architectural distinction), its architectural interest and its group value with the Grade II listed Lodge which along with the other (unlisted) associated outbuilding, form an important architectural and historic context for the Hall.
- 7.6 Whilst the setting of the Conservation Area has changed to an extent over recent years, nonetheless, following a formal consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer and Historic England, the historical significance of the house and its grounds is based in a village context

being a country house rather than that of a town house. Overall, the Hall and grounds make an important and major contribution to the Trumpington Conservation Area.

- 7.7 Indeed, the setting of Anstey Hall and the identified significant view on site was a key consideration in the master planning for the Trumpington Meadows development, which through the site layout, building form and appearance, responded directly to this view and the special character of the historic core of Trumpington Village. This is described in Appendix D of the Local Plan 2018.
- 7.8 Policy 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018 states that to ensure the conservation and enhancement of Cambridge’s historic environment, proposals should:
- a. preserve or enhance the significance of the heritage assets of the city, their setting and the wider townscape, including views into, within and out of conservation areas;
 - b. retain buildings and spaces, the loss of which would cause harm to the character or appearance of the conservation area;
 - c. be of an appropriate scale, form, height, massing, alignment and detailed design which will contribute to local distinctiveness, complement the built form and scale of heritage assets and respect the character, appearance and setting of the locality;
 - d. demonstrate a clear understanding of the significance of the asset and of the wider context in which the heritage asset sits, alongside assessment of the potential impact of the development on the heritage asset and its context; and
 - e. provide clear justification for any works that would lead to harm or substantial harm to a heritage asset yet be of substantial public benefit, through detailed analysis of the asset and the proposal.
- 7.9 Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that a local authority shall have regard to the desirability of preserving features of special architectural or historic interest and in particular, listed buildings.
- 7.10 Paragraph 199 of the NPPF requires that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation, and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Paragraph 200 (NPPF) goes on to state that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset [from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting] “should require clear and convincing justification”.

Demolition of greenhouses and flat roofed building and proposed erection of an Orangery

- 7.11 The applicant proposes to demolish three of the four curtilage-listed free-standing greenhouses within the walled kitchen garden which appear to have had some small historic role in the function of the kitchen garden area and its relationship to the house in the past. In addition, a flat roofed building is to be demolished which is otherwise unrelated in materials, form and appearance and is considered to be a negative feature. Third party comments regarding insufficient information are noted.
- 7.12 The applicant proposes to replace the existing flat roofed building and greenhouses with the proposed Orangery. There is no objection to the negative flat roofed building whilst although the greenhouses date back to the mid-20th Century and do hold some significance to Anstey Hall, there is no objection raised to the principle of their demolition and replacement subject to an acceptable design and scale.
- 7.13 The Conservation Officer comments concerning the lack of acceptable information and lack of high-quality design for the Orangery are noted. Following a formal consultation with Historic England and the Council's Conservation Officer, by virtue of the Orangery's excessive scale, siting forward of the southern elevation and incongruous design, it is considered that the proposed Orangery would have an adverse impact upon the character and significance of the Listed Building.

Reconfiguration of wall onto Maris Lane

- 7.14 The applicant proposes to introduce a new opening in the curtilage listed boundary wall along Maris Lane. Whilst the existing wall is half-height in brick and likely to be contemporary, insufficient information has been provided including elevational drawings of the wall denoting the scale, design or material and how these would transition from the existing wall and therefore this element cannot be fully assessed.

Harm v public benefits

- 7.15 The NPPF states that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). Given the Grade II* listing of Anstey Hall which places it in the top 5.8% of all listed buildings, the weight given to the asset's conservation including its setting should be great indeed.
- 7.16 Taking into account consultee comments including Historic England's comments, it is considered that the proposal would result in a moderate-level of 'less than substantial' harm upon the character and significance of Anstey Hall, contrary to Policy 61 of the Local Plan 2018 and the NPPF 2021. Paragraph 202 of the NPPF is therefore engaged and the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
- 7.17 The applicant has submitted a list of public benefits which include the following:
- Removal of flat-roofed building by a more harmonious one.

- Restoring views of the Hall from Maris Lane
- Heritage benefits of the scheme for the listed lodge and piers
- Provision of indoor facilities for the retirement community

7.18 Whilst these public benefits are noted in so far as removal of the negative flat roof building and potential for maximising the use of the existing asset to ensure optimum viable use, the removal of the flat roof building whilst it would be demolished would be replaced by an Orangery which notwithstanding the lack of detailed design information submitted, by virtue of its excessive scale and lack of high quality design, is not considered to be of an appropriate addition.

7.19 Overall, on the above basis, it is not considered that the public benefits arising from the scheme would outweigh the moderate-level of 'less than substantial' harm upon the character and significance of this Listed Building, contrary to Paragraph 202 of the NPPF and Policy 61 of the Local Plan 2018.

7.20 In addition, the proposed development would fail to accord with Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which requires that a local authority shall have regard to the desirability of preserving features of special architectural or historic interest and in particular, listed buildings.

7.21 Other Matters

7.22 The application has also been subject to a formal consultation with the Archaeological Officer, and subject to a pre-commencement condition to require a written scheme of investigation given the small-scale nature of the proposed Orangery, there is no objection to this proposal in archaeological terms.

7.23 Other third party and consultee comments received under this listed building consent application are noted, however, as these relate to material planning considerations rather than the listed building assessment, these are therefore dealt with under application 20/01426/FUL.

7.24 Heritage Balance

7.25 Having taken into account the provisions of the development plan, NPPF and NPPG guidance, the statutory requirements of section 66(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the views of statutory consultees and wider stakeholders, as well as all other material planning considerations, it is recommended that the application for listed building consent be refused.

7.26 Recommendation

7.27 **Refuse** for the following reasons:

1. The proposed Orangery, by virtue of its unacceptable siting, excessive scale and incongruous design would result in adverse impacts upon the significance and character of the Grade II* Listed Building (Anstey Hall), contrary to Policy 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018. The identified harm to this heritage asset is identified as a moderate-level of 'less than substantial' harm and it is not considered that the public benefits arising from the scheme would outweigh this identified harm, contrary Policy 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018, Paragraph 202 of the NPPF 2021 and the provisions of section 66 of Planning (LBCA) Act 1990. Furthermore, insufficient information has been provided for the reconfiguration of the Maris Lane wall to fully assess this element and therefore this is contrary to Policy 61 of the Cambridge Local Plan 2018, the NPPF 2021 and the provisions of section 66 of Planning (LBCA) Act 1990.

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.

- Cambridge Local Plan 2018
- Cambridge Local Plan SPDs