

MEMORANDUM

To : Consultee
From : Ms Heather Carlisle, Planning Services, Blueschool House - H31
Tel : 01432 260453 **My Ref** : 230385
Date : 27/06/2023

APPLICATION NO & SITE ADDRESS: Planning Re-consultation - 230385 - Museum, Hereford Library, Broad Street, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR4 9AU
DESCRIPTION: Proposed renovation and adaptation of the existing Hereford Museum and Library to become a dedicated and enhanced facility for Herefordshire Museum Service and viable for the future. This would comprise a museum, education space, galleries, cafe, and staff facilities.
APPLICANT(S): Mr Roger Allonby
GRID REF: OS 350882, 239840
APPLICATION TYPE: Council Development Reg 3
WEBSITE LINK: <http://www.herefordshire.gov.uk/searchplanningapplications>

Amended Additional Amended and Additional Re-Consultation

Plans and/or documents have been received for the proposal described above which are now available in Wisdom. If you have any further comments to make please respond by **11/07/2023**.

Should you require further information please contact the Case Officer.

Any comments should be added below and actioned in Civica to Ms Heather Carlisle.

Comments:

230385/F (2) Proposed renovation and adaptation of the existing Hereford Museum and Library to become a dedicated and enhanced facility for Herefordshire Museum Service and viable for the future. This would comprise a museum, education space, galleries, cafe, and staff facilities.

230386/L (2) Proposed renovation and adaptation of the existing Hereford Museum and Library to become a dedicated and enhanced facility for Herefordshire Museum Service and viable for the future. This would comprise a museum, education space, galleries, cafe, and staff facilities.

Policy and Documents

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Historic England – Historic Environment Good Practise Advice in Planning – Note 3 The setting of Heritage Assets.

Historic England – Historic Environment Good Practise Advice in Planning – Note 2 Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment.

National Planning Policy Framework

Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2011 – 2031 – Policies LD1, LD4

Thanks you for consulting me on the additional information. For ease of reference, I have tabulated the response with cross reference to my previous comments with the original numbering and the additional information which I trust is helpful.

Item	HBO Comments of 02/05/2023	Additional information received	Agent Comments	Agent Status based on Tracker	HBO comments on additional information 18/07/2023	Further Information/request for amendments	Could be conditioned
2 Basement							
2.1 (a)	Full details of the new steelwork are required before that this detail can be considered	Structural report received		For discussion/ further review			
		HFM-BML-XX-01-DR-S-0102 Rev T03	Ground Floor Plan annotation Masonry piers to be tested to ensure they can support additional loading. Allow 2No. UC254x254x73 columns full height & foundations with piles if masonry does not have capacity.		Noting the archaeological sensitivity of the site, and the ground conditions – details of the type of foundations would be required at this stage See also 3.1 (a)	Comments from HCC Planning Archaeologist suggested to assist in the consideration of these works within the AAI	

		HFM-BML-XX-BO-DR-S-0300 T03	indicative underpinning shown. Shows basement floor removed and 1000mm hardcore laid beneath finishes, tanking and insulation to architects specifications		Noting the condition of the building the details comments that the piles shown indicatively only subject to designed and detailed by Specialist.		
		HFM-BML ZZ DR S 0170 Rev T03	New Steel Frame extension.		The Pile foundations are noted		
2.1 (b)	Internal wall insulation details of the basement	Agent Comments in Tracker	Request that IWI and window details conditioned	Request to be conditioned	In this instance there is work to be undertaken in the cellar, both in terms of possible archaeology and also the revealing of the walls behind current storage which cannot as yet be removed as dependant on other factors. The walls were not previously visible as the area was utilised for storage. However I note that the building is soon to be closed to the public and as such the opportunity to inspect this area hopefully will arise in the near future. See also 2.1 (e) and 2.1 (f)		Y if access not possible prior to determination.
2.1 (c)	Clarification in respect of the strong room door	Agent Comments in Tracker	Planned to be removed, however whilst a lesser ideal in terms of movement, the new opening could be repositioned to retain the door in situ	For discussion/ further review	Whilst the door will no longer be a strong room door with a new opening next to it, this approach is welcomed as the door will remain in its original location, the purpose of	Amended plans welcomed	

					the room will be apparent due to the door style. Amended plans welcomed		
2.1 (d)	Clarification in respect of the external stone string course	Agent Comments in Tracker	Confirmation stone string course to be retained and the concrete lintel to be replaced with new stone course	For discussion/ further review	Clarification welcomed could be conditioned – however if amended elevation details received an annotation on the elevation plan would be desirable	if amended elevation details received an annotation on the elevation plan would be desirable	Y
2.1 (e)	Clarification in respect of the tanking of the cellar.	Agent Comments in Tracker	Request to be conditioned – following further investigation by specialist but historic value of walls acknowledged.	For discussion/ further review	The historic value could also extend to the floor.. Could not readily be conditioned as the principle of the waterproofing has not been established. But the issues regarding investigation noted. Suggested that investigations continue where possible and if the matter not resolved at the time of a determination if favourable, that this matter be removed from the application for ease of consideration. OR if a condition imposed it would need to be notwithstanding and without prejudice to the findings of the investigation without a guarantee that tanking is even acceptable	Noting the plans submitted that confirm works are proposed. However the details as to the works proposed as requested have not been provided. Further information required in respect of the tanking.	Notwithstanding and without prejudice
		Tender Drawing HFM-BML-XX-00-DR-S-0101 rev T03			I note the reference to basement tanking details tbc confirmed by architects, however for the avoidance of doubt as these details have not		

				<p>been finalised and as such discussed they should not form part of the approved plans, and ideally the details should be agreed or reference removed from the submitted drawings for the avoidance of doubt as to what has been approved, as without the investigations being completed the principle has not been agreed, therefore the details cannot be conditioned.</p> <p>Details of the plates supporting the pavement to be provided – potentially could be conditioned in isolation The works to the cellar have archaeological potential and as such would need the involvement of the planning archaeological advisor.</p>		
		HFM-BML-XX-BO-DR-S-0100 T03	<p>Water tight basement Construction - requirements to satisfy the waterproofing strategy for the design of the basement are to be confirmed to the Project Engineer prior to any fabrication or works on</p>	<p>These details would need to accompany the listed building consent application</p>		

			<p>site. For the avoidance of doubt the Contractor (or Specialist Water-Proofing Consultant) is responsible for the design, specification and implementation of the basement water-proofing system.</p>				
		HFM-BML-XX-BO-DR-S-0100 T03	<p>Indicates underpinning of all foundations at 1m max pits</p> <p>Additional allowance to be made throughout the basement for taking up & replacing the existing slab to install new drainage. Subject to drainage survey report.</p> <p>Contractor to allow for localised breaking out of slab sufficient areas to allow for safe installation of underpinning & new lift pit</p>		<p>Given the site is within the AAI and above a recorded archaeological feature The Kings Ditch – the planning Archaeologist would need to advise on this matter.</p> <p>However it appears that the details may be left to the contractor, and these details should accompany the LBC and be agreed at least in principle prior to determination.</p> <p>The significance of the cellar has yet to be established</p>	Comments from HCC Planning Archaeologist suggested to assist in the consideration of these works within the AAI	
2.1 (f)	Confirmation as to the age and interest of the front cellar, and potentially after the removal of some plasterwork	Agent Comments in Tracker	Noted	To be conditioned	As with 2.1 (b) and 2.1 (e)		Y
2.1 (g)	the reuse of the existing bricks to block up the existing rear pedestrian	Agent Comments in Tracker	noted	To be conditioned			Y

	door.						
3. Ground Floor							
3.1 (.a).	Full details of the new steelwork are required before these works can be considered, and with particular reference to the steelwork in the current library and the relationship with the existing pilasters	Tender Drawing HFM-BML-XX-00-DR-S-0121 Rev T01 Tender Drawing HFM-BML-XX-00-DR-S - 0102 Rev T03		For discussion/ further review	Noting the submitted drawings Tender Drawing HFM-BML-XX-00-DR-S-1121 Rev T01 and Tender Drawing HFM-BML-XX-00-DR-S - 0102 Rev T03, which indicate the location of the steels, on the floor plan and on the axiomatic view, however this does not adequately illustrate the relationship with the ornate pilasters that are a feature of the room, as requested. I would refer to paragraph 3.6.3 of my original comments for the rationale behind this request.	Requested Information not provided	
		HFM-BML-XX-01-DR-S-0102 Rev T03 HFM-BML-XX-02-DR-S-0103 Rev T02 HFM-BML-XX-03-DR-S-0102 Rev T03 HFM-BML-XX-	Floor Plans annotation Masonry piers to be tested to ensure they can support additional loading. Allow 2No. UC254x254x73 columns full height & foundations with piles if masonry does not have capacity		HFM-BML-XX-01-DR-S-0103 Rev T03 indicates that the steel will be directly adjacent to and within the IWI for the pilasters between the windows, and appears to be suggesting that the pilasters will be tested to see if they can accommodate additional load bearing. Clarification required	Clarification required	

		04-DR-S-0105 Rev T03					
3.1 (b)(i)	Relocation of the new wall to express the pilasters or a cross section illustrating how the pilasters are to be incorporated into the wall at a scale not less than 1:10	Agent Comments in Tracker	This wall is located to align above an existing retained beam in the mezzanine below (A). The exhibition side of this wall will have a service ductwork bulkhead (B) which is replicated on both sides of the room to provide symmetry, the 2 beams in this space will contribute to this symmetry. The 3rd beam and pilaster will remain fully exposed in the adjoining rooms instead of trying to build a new wall directly under. See supporting information. Plan submitted		The comments appear to be in relation to the corbelling in Exhibition 01 – See comments below However the request was in respect to the new wall in Exhibition space 02, where a new wall is proposed and appears to come off pilasters. I would reference paragraph 3.6.2 of the previous comments for the request in full. Comments in respect of the corbelling are within 3.1.(n)	Additional information not received.	
		Tender Drawing HFM-BML-XX-00-DR-S - 0102 Rev T03			Notwithstanding the information on Tender Drawing HFM-BML-XX-00-DR-S - 0102 Rev T03 a cross section of the wall at the required scale has not been provided as previously requested		
3.1 (b)(ii)	Relocation of the new wall to express the pilasters or a cross section illustrating how the pilasters are	Agent Comments in Tracker	This wall is located to align above an existing retained beam in the mezzanine below (A). The exhibition side of this wall will have a service ductwork bulkhead (B) which is replicated on both sides of the room to provide	For discussion/ further review	The request was made in respect of the pilasters in exhibition space 2 and not the corbels in exhibition space 1. I would refer to paragraphs 3.5.4 and 3.5.5 of the previous comments where the	Additional details required not supported.	

	<p>to be incorporated into the wall at a scale not less than 1:10</p>		<p>symmetry, the 2 beams in this space will contribute to this symmetry. The 3rd beam and pilaster will remain fully exposed in the adjoining rooms instead of trying to build a new wall directly under. See supporting information. Plan submitted</p>		<p>request to either open the tracery window OR relocate the wall slightly to expose the corbel in exhibition space 01 was made.</p> <p>I would refer to 3.1.(n) The location of the ducting next to the new wall is not ideal in that location and would compromise the architectural detail of the corbelling. Whilst noting the location of the existing non original beam, as a non supporting wall could the wall be set back to expose the corbelling in the public room and retain the beam.</p>		
		<p>LBC additional information REF 10265 section 1.9</p>	<p>In addition to the above, the wall was not positioned to the right of the existing beam and corbel due to the constraints of the Changing Places facility which has strict minimum size in order to comply with the regulation, reducing the width of the Kitchenette would make it impractical for use.</p>		<p>The service ductwork bulkhead was not indicated on any previous plans, and as such was not given consideration at that time. Could the eastern service bulkhead be relocated to be sited within the non public rooms above the mezzanine ? details of the visual appearance of the bulkhead within this space would need to be submitted. However if the location is agreed, and the general design/</p>		

					<p>materials this may be able to be conditioned. The relocation of the wall to expose the corbel – a significant architectural feature would mean relocating the wall by a small amount, and as such it is not considered that this would compromise the kitchenette to a degree to render it unworkable. The request is repeated.</p> <p>I note the details for the re-glazing of the window. However given the floor level the reason for just glazing the upper section with the quatrefoils and not the upper section above the transom is not readily understood. It would seem possible to relocate the wall and glaze the upper part of the tracery window which will enable light to enter the staff kitchen. However as the current proposal is for no light to the kitchenette, the balance would have to be on the exposure of the corbel to the public space and not the limited glazing proposed.</p>		
3.1(c)	The Conservation Management Plan identifies	Agent Comments in Tracker	Steelwork will be used to form the opening. This will be boxed in to be hidden and appear as a continuation of		As a significant alteration to the original section of the building, it is not considered that this		N

<p>that the walls in the foyer are load bearing, however it is proposed to remove 2 large sections of walls, whilst retaining the upper parts of the wall, no details as to how that will be achieved has been submitted. It is assumed that a RSG or similar is required to span the opening created. Full details including elevational details of these walls and the necessary works to create the width of openings proposed should be provided before this</p>		<p>the bulkhead wall. The full detail of this will need to be developed at the next design stage - can this be conditioned? See supporting information</p>		<p>element can be conditioned and would be required at this stage as the principle of the works cannot be considered favourably without the necessary information</p>		
	<p>LBC additional information REF 10265 section 1.19</p>			<p>The details on section 1.19 of LBC additional information REF 10265 noted and the extent of wall removal is difficult to justify, noting the average door height. A smaller opening is requested with more of the wall retained. This may also assist in the opening and closing of any doors or screens. Which would be smaller in size replicating the height of the existing doors more readily.</p>		
	<p>Tender Drawing HFM-BML-XX-00-DR-S-0121 Rev T01</p>			<p>I note the bi-fold doors on the plans and for clarity the method of screening has not been agreed</p>		

	element can be considered.						
3.1 (d)	Clarification of IWI around windows and pilasters in the current library and further consideration of the IWI in this room in respect to the expression of the pilasters.	Agent Comments in Tracker	Details of the IWI strategy are provided on submission information. Comments around insulation being omitted to pilasters and set back to express the depth are noted however this would seriously compromise the thermal performance. This strategy has been used sparingly in certain more sensitive locations although cannot work as a strategy throughout. Please see HMAG-ART-XX-XX-RP-A-65810_EnerPHit Overview-S4-P01 included in the supporting information. The document sets out the procedures to be followed at RIBA Stage 4 detailed design where the opportunity to carry out additional sampling and obtain the information required to finalise the details will be possible. We therefore request that all internal wall insulation and window details solutions are conditioned.	Request to be conditioned	It is a requirement to submit the appropriate level of information to consider the works proposed to a listed building. Where the extent of the works are understood and accepted but not the finer details, these finer details can be conditioned. However in this instance the IWI illustrated on the plans would comprise the architectural legibility of the architectural details that are particularly relevant in a building of this nature. To condition such fundamental issues would be contrary to; (i) section 194 of NNPF (ii) Herefordshire Core Strategy Policies SD1 which requires distinctive features of existing buildings are safeguarded (iii) Herefordshire Core Strategy Policies SS6 which requires Development proposals to be based upon sufficient information to determine the effect upon each where they are relevant i.e listed buildings.	Further information required at this stage	N
		HMAG-ART-XX-XX-RP-A-65810 Enerphit			Contents noted and the exemptions in section 3.4. The requirement for a		

		Overview S4-P01			reduction in fossil fuels is acknowledged and supported, however this has to be balanced against protection of designated assets. This is especially relevant of a building of this quality and architectural features. Alternative less visually damaging methods of IWI again requested in this location.		
3.1 (e)	The internal wall insulation is noted, on Heritage plans Ground Floor Entrance Area, XX-00-DR-A-16000 rev P02, however how that relates to the cornicing has not been detailed. The photograph on XX-00-DR-A-16000 rev P02 is of a cornice above suspended ceiling to be removed, however the removal of the suspended ceiling to	Agent Comments in Tracker	Information is still required to ascertain the current window reveal detail due to the internal timber wall lining, it is hoped that the insulation can be within the existing void behind the timber wall cladding. No insulation is proposed to wrap into the reveals. A consistent insulation thickness and therefore relationship between the cornice and IWI could be sought with a view to reducing the thickness of the external wall IWI (changing to aerogel) HMAG-ART-XX-XX-RP-A-65810_EnerPHit Overview-S4-P01 document sets out the procedures to be followed at RIBA Stage 4 detailed design where the opportunity to carry out additional sampling and	Request to be conditioned	The absence of IWI in the window reveals is welcomed, as is the consideration of a thinner IWI such as Aerogel. However for the reasons identified in 3.1 (d) these details cannot be conditioned as they are fundamental to the consideration of the listed building consent application	Further information required at this stage	N

	<p>restore the original height and the relationship with the windows would be welcomed, however the internal wall insulation on the side elevations would be 40mm, and the relationship with the cornice should be detailed, and 100mm IWI is proposed on the front elevation, however the walls are actually quite minimal around the windows. A detailed plan indicated how the IWI will be addressed in the window reveals should be submitted as XX-00-DR-A-16000 rev P02 seems to suggest that the 100mm</p>		<p>obtain the information required to finalise the details will be possible. We therefore request that all internal wall insulation and window details solutions are conditioned.</p>				
		<p>HMAG-ART-XX-XX-RP-A-65810 Enerphit Overview S4-P01</p>			<p>Contents noted and the exemptions in section 3.4. The drive for a reduction in fossil fuels is acknowledged and supported, however this has to be balanced against protection of designated assets. This is especially relevant of a building of this quality and architectural features. Alternative less visually damaging methods of IWI again requested in this location.</p>		

	IWI will continue on the window reveals which will obscure a high proportion of the window frame and a substantially slimmer IWI if required is suggested such as aerogel for the internal front wall.						
3.1 (f)	A detailed plan indicated how the IWI will be addressed in the window reveals should be submitted as XX-00-DR-A-16000 rev P02 seems to suggest that the 100mm IWI will continue on the window reveals which will obscure a high proportion of the window	Agent Comments in Tracker	Please see HMAG-ART-XX-XX-RP-A-65810_EnerPHit Overview-S4-P01 included in the supporting information. The document sets out the procedures to be followed at RIBA Stage 4 detailed design where the opportunity to carry out additional sampling and obtain the information required to finalise the details will be possible. We therefore request that all internal wall insulation and window details solutions are conditioned.	Request to be conditioned	However for the reasons identified in 3.1 (d) these details cannot be conditioned as they are fundamental to the consideration of the listed building consent application. Alternative less visually damaging methods of IWI again requested in this location.	Further information required at this stage	N

	frame and a substantially slimmer IWI if required is suggested such as aerogel for the internal front wall.						
3.1 (g)	The large timber skirting boards identified in the Conservation Management Plan appear to be lost and replaced with new hardwood square profile skirting as identified on the proposed floor finishes 1 of 2 XX-XX-DR-A-15100 rev P02. The rationale for the loss of the skirting boards appears to be the IWI, however a slimmer IWI could retain the skirting boards or they could be re-used. Further information is	Agent Comments in Tracker	The large timber skirtings are only present in very small areas, and those that are there are very damaged so they key driver for new skirtings is a high quality and consistent aesthetic. Internal wall insulation doesn't impact to much on this area. Square profile hardwood skirting has been proposed as a high quality replacement but these could be painted softwood matching the historic profile if desired?	For discussion/ further review	The large timber skirting boards identified in the Conservation Management Plan, with the justification for their loss appearing to be the thickness of the IWI. The loss of historic fabric should be justified, and in this instance the condition and extent of the area of the skirting boards could be a consideration, however no details of their extent or condition has been provided. Without justification for their loss a thinner IWI is again requested	Further information required at this stage	

	required in this detail.						
3.1 (h)	Clarification why the existing plaster cannot be retained	Agent Comments in Tracker	"EnerPHit report HMAG-ART-XX-XX-RP-A-65810 P01 S4 Section 7.1.2 refers to plaster testing. Plaster to be removed if not original as likely to be non-breathable, cement based. Elsewhere original plaster could be assessed for retention. Approach set out in EnerPHit report outlines 7.1 Stage 4 Development, 7.2 Systematic and iterative approach to refining early-stage assumptions. Request details be conditioned.	For discussion/ further review	The retention of original plaster is welcomed. Clarification is required in respect of the degree of plaster to be lost and the degree of plaster to be retained, as just a statement confirming retention of original plaster where found would be sufficient.	Further information required at this stage	
		EnerPHit report HMAG-ART-XX-XX-RP-A-65810 P01 S4	Paragraph 7.1.3		The contents of 7.1.3 are noted and the retention of original lime plaster is supported and the replacement of cement plaster not opposed in principle. However I note in the EnerPHit report that the current proposal in Detail 1, and 3 was for 80mm of pavatherm on top of the current plaster, however the enhanced proposal appears to be for the removal of all the plaster.		

					Some areas can accept thicker IWI and some areas have to be considered with more care where there are architectural features that area designed to have relief such as pilasters that would be severely compromised by thick IWI. However the Broad Street internal elevation also has to be considered with care, given the wall to window ratio there is little wall to insulate.		
		IWI and fabric Strategy summary in the Enerphit report	The outline strategy proposes the removal of the existing plaster to the internal walls of the external facade with the exception of the Woolhope room. A base layer of 15mm Diathonite insulation will then be applied to the external walls		Apparent discrepancy with tracker which suggests plaster testing and lime plaster retained. As the documents differ, the approach proposed should be confirmed in order that it is understood what it being applied for under the listed building consent.	Discrepancy between documents requires clarification	
3.1 (g)	An alternative to the roller shutter Door IDT09 on Internal Door Assemblies XX-DR-A-27601, and consideration of more wall retained.	Agent Comments in Tracker	The client has confirmed that the roller shutters can be omitted. (note there appeared to be some confusion in the notes about roller shutters being used to external windows - just to clarify this has not been considered)	For discussion/ further review	It was understood that the roller shutters were within the foyer and related to item 3.1 (c) . Alternative arrangements following the details in 3.1 (c) welcomed	Amended plans required	
3.1 (j)	Clarification that windows	Agent Comments in	Can additional details be conditioned?		Details noted – however in respect of WT10 please		Y - subject to clarification in

	not removed are to be retained in their current condition and not repaired	Tracker Please refer to Window and door report (HMAG-ART-XX-XX-RP-A-61810-P01-S4_WINDOW_DOOR_REPOR T). Can additional details be conditioned?			refer to 3.1 (n)		respect of WT10 – extent of glazing proposed
3.1 (k)	Finoe 12 requested as an alternative to the proposed glazing in current library	Agent Comments in Tracker	As the stone mullions are highly conductive these windows would need a secondary glazing solution. This does mean that the existing glass can be retained. These windows have been debated at some length and as they also represent a significant expanse of the wall, a programme of improving the thermal performance of this space should include significant improvement to these windows and we believe that this is the right approach to celebrate the existing windows too. Request that the final approach to the windows be conditioned.	Request to be conditioned	The original request for a more sympathetic approach expressing the stone mullions internally and externally by improving the glass is again requested. For the reasons previously expressed the proposed treatment of these windows is not supported and an alternative sought. As the request is to retain the details submitted this cannot be conditioned as that approach is not supported. Also noting the previous conversations in respect of these windows and that the consideration is on-going and noting the differences between the previous option and the enhanced option it is not considered that to	Request for more sympathetic approach to the windows repeated.	N

					<p>condition these works would assist in the deliverability of the project as conditions that involve works not considered on the LBC or for methods or materials that would not be supported may not be discharged without further consideration</p>		
		<p>EnerPHit report HMAG-ART- XX-XX-RP-A- 65810 P01 S4</p>	<p>Detail 2</p>		<p>Detail 2 is noted where the windows are expressed within the room. The proposed secondary glazing would be placed in front of the windows, and due to the IWV would have a greater relationship to the IWV than the existing window. Whilst noting that the bull nose cill will be retained, the secondary glazing will obscure the windows to a degree that would severely harm their legibility. The size of the windows is noted as is the horizontal feature in the glazing bar that coincides with the ornate stone transom. The proposed enhanced proposals would involve the secondary glazing coming from the IWV below in front of the window, and obscuring all details of the window including the ornate bull nose cill. Effectively resulting in a new wall and window on</p>		

					the interior and historic wall and window on the exterior. The request for a similar treatment to the Broad Street frontage is again requested for this wall and windows.		
3.1 (l)	Clarification as to the outcome of the skirting boards	Agent Comments in Tracker	(as 3.1g) The large timber skirtings are only present in very small areas, and those that are there are very damaged so they key driver for new skirtings is a high quality and consistent aesthetic. Internal wall insulation doesn't impact to much on this area. Square profile hardwood skirting has been proposed as a high quality replacement but these could be painted softwood matching the historic profile if desired?	For discussion/ further review	The loss of historic fabric should be justified, and in this instance the condition and extent of the area of the skirting boards could be a consideration, however no details of their extent or condition has been provided. Without justification for their loss a thinner IWI is again requested	Further information required	
3.1 (m)	An alternative to Corten Steel requested as the window infill	Agent Comments in Tracker	As identified, the corten has been proposed to tie in with oither new vertical elements, although we note these elements reading as windows, even if they continued to be blocked up so we could review a change to an obscure dark panel to read as window?	For discussion/ further review	Noted that the corten steel was to replicate vertical elements however a differentiation between a vertical wall and a vertical window is suggested as a more appropriate alternative . The consideration of alternative materials are welcomed.	Amended materials welcomed. As confirmation of other materials being considered a notwithstanding condition can be considered or confirmation of materials at this stage if preferred	Notwithstanding and without prejudice if material not previously agreed
		LBC additional information REF 10265	The use of Corten as a material was aiming to highlight the interventions as		The rationale is noted, however as the works are to historic windows a less		

			<p>modern whilst being of a sympathetic colour palette and a material that has texture and has been used in various projects successfully. We still believe this is the best option, but can also proposed a glass window with black material behind to simulate the perception of a window with dark room behind.</p>		<p>modern intervention is considered more appropriate. Dark Glass noted as an option, and could be explored – further</p>		
<p>3.1 (n)</p>	<p>Consideration given to the restoration of the tracery window in N elevation</p>	<p>Agent Comments in Tracker for 3.1.(b)</p>	<p>This wall is located to align above an existing retained beam in the mezzanine below (A). The exhibition side of this wall will have a service ductwork bulkhead (B) which is replicated on both sides of the room to provide symmetry, the 2 beams in this space will contribute to this symmetry. The 3rd beam and pilaster will remain fully exposed in the adjoin rooms instead of trying to build a new wall directly under. See supporting information. Plan submitted</p>	<p>For discussion/ further review For discussion/ further review</p>	<p>I would refer to paragraphs 3.5.4 and 3.5.5 of the previous comments where the request to either open the tracery window OR relocate the wall slightly to expose the corbel in exhibition space 01 was made.</p> <p>Comments on window below in response to LBC additional information REF 10265 section 1.9</p> <p>The location of the ducting next to the new wall is not ideal in that location and would compromise the architectural detail of the corbelling. Whilst noting the location of the existing non original beam, as a non supporting wall could the wall be set back to expose the corbelling in the public room and retain the beam. – see comments for window below.</p>	<p>Additional details required currently not supported.</p>	

		<p>Agent Comments in Tracker for 3.1.(n)</p>	<p>LBC additional information REF 10265 section 1.9</p>		<p>The service ductwork bulkhead was not indicated on any previous plans, and as such was not given consideration at that time. Could the eastern service bulkhead be relocated to be sited within the non public rooms above the mezzanine ? details of the visual appearance of the bulkhead within this space would need to be submitted. However if the location is agreed, and the general design. materials this may be able to be conditioned. The relocation of the wall to expose the corbel – a significant architectural feature would mean relocating the wall by a small amount, and as such it is not considered that this would compromise the kitchenette to a degree to render it unworkable,</p> <p>I note the details for the re-glazing of the window. However given the floor level the reason for just glazing the upper section with the quatrefoils and not the whole section above the transom is not</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

					readily understood. It would seem possible to relocate the wall and glaze the upper part of the tracery window which will enable light to enter the staff kitchen. However as the current proposal is for no light to the kitchenette, the balance would have to be on the exposure of the corbel to the public space.		
3.1 (o)	Paint details for stone mullions	Agent Comments in Tracker	We don't see why the paint could not be removed and stone finish restored.	For discussion/ further review	Restoration of original stone mullions welcomed. Details of the paint removal required or could be conditioned		Y
3.1 (p)	An alternative paint colour requested	Agent Comments in Tracker	Happy to review an alternative colour and for this to be conditioned. See supporting information.	For discussion/ further review	Alternative colour welcomed. As confirmation of other colour being considered a condition can be considered if preferred	However if amended elevation plans being prepared the reference to colour to be conditioned would be suggested as being annotated on the elevation drawings to avoid a condition	Y if not previously confirmed
		supporting information.	The render colour is discussed further on page 4		The use of a colour within the Hereford Design SPD is welcomed. The Supporting information suggests a stone colour, which would be supported as the area to be rendered lies beneath stone mullioned windows and the render would accentuate this architectural feature.		
3.1 (q)	Clarification to the reference to 6 vision panels in the coal shutes	Agent Comments in Tracker	These have been removed from the proposals. The Heritage Statement can be corrected to remove these.	For discussion/ further review	Clarification welcomed	Suggest that further plans details to omit this reference	

4. Woolhope Room							
4.1.1 (a)	Clarification of new beams joists	Agent Comments in Tracker	See supporting information, Section 1.11 onwards (Structural Info)	For discussion/ further review			
4.1.1(b)	Window seals location and type to be agreed by condition	Agent Comments in Tracker	Noted - to be conditioned	to be conditioned			Y
4.1.1 (c)	Repairs to balcony to be conditioned	Agent Comments in Tracker	Noted - to be conditioned	to be conditioned			Y
4.1.1 (d)	Details of venting to be conditioned	Agent Comments in Tracker	Noted - to be conditioned	to be conditioned			Y
5. Third Floor							
5.1. (a)	Clarification and details in respect of the vertical steel supports should be provided before this element can be considered	Agent Comments in Tracker	See supporting information, Section 1.11 onwards (Structural Info)		Steel details noted, and referenced throughout table on relevant sections		
5.1 (b)	Clarification in respect of the discrepancy between documents as to whether the ceiling will be retained or dismantled and re-erected and if	Agent Comments in Tracker	The plan is to retain this structure and if possible retain in-situ. The strategy for doing so will need to be confirmed as part of a temporary works assessment with the appointed contractor. Can this be conditioned?	For discussion/ further review	The plan to retain the ceiling structure is welcomed. However the methodology as to how that will be achieved will need to form part of this application, and the discrepancy between documents addressed. It is acknowledged that the finer details may change,	Further information required at this stage	N

	the later the methodology should accompany the application in order that this element can be considered.				however at this stage it would not be possible to leave all details until the appointment of a contractor as the details have to be considered prior to the works commencing, and further information as to how the ceiling can be retained with other works proposed would need to be submitted. However for the reasons identified in 3.1 (d) these details cannot be conditioned as they are fundamental to the consideration of the listed building consent application		
	HFM-BML-XX-ZZ-DR-S-0360 rev T02		Section 4 suggests current trusses to remain in part where visible.		This document is useful and when compared with DWG No 102-65-ART-XX-XX-DR-A-44200 - existing sections, seems to suggest that the visible trusses within the space may not support the roof, and as such would not be cut to accommodate the additional floor. Confirmation that this is the case would be required to establish the degree of historic fabric that is being lost.	Further clarification required.	
5.1 (c)	Clarification in respect of the internal wall insulation in Middle	Agent Comments in Tracker	Please see the EnerPHit Overview Document included in the supporting information. The document sets out the procedures to be followed at	Request to be conditioned	For the reasons identified in 3.1 (d) these details cannot be conditioned as they are fundamental to the consideration of the	Further information required at this stage	N

<p>Exhibition Hall/Museum are required. The IW1 in Exhibition 4 (003) clarification is required in respect of the trusses which appear to have the same dimensions on both Section F-F XX-XX-Dr-A-45525 rev P01 and Section D-D XX-XX-DR-A-45515, whereas section F-F indicates the vertical steel supports adjacent to the existing wall. Clarification as to the proposed works to the trusses are required, as Section D-D XX-XX-DR-A-45515 indicates that</p>		<p>RIBA Stage 4 detailed design where the opportunity to carry out additional sampling and obtain the information required to finalise the details will be possible. We therefore request that all internal wall insulation and window details solutions are conditioned.</p>		<p>listed building consent application</p>		
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

	<p>the timber trusses are to be supported and protected throughout the works which is welcomed, however the Structural Engineer is to confirm new fixings and support system to Delta beam construction. These details are required in order that this element can be considered.</p>						
	<p>Clarification in respect of proposed works to trusses as discrepancy between plans. details are required in order that this element can be considered</p>	<p>Agent Comments in Tracker</p>	<p>Please see the EnerPHit Overview Document included in the supporting information. The document sets out the procedures to be followed at RIBA Stage 4 detailed design where the opportunity to carry out additional sampling and obtain the information required to finalise the details will be possible. We therefore request that all internal wall insulation and window details solutions are conditioned.</p>	<p>Request to be conditioned</p>	<p>For the reasons identified in 3.1 (d) these details cannot be conditioned as they are fundamental to the consideration of the listed building consent application</p>	<p>Further information required at this stage</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>5.1 (d)</p>	<p>Clarification in respect of the corncing and if the 100mm IWI is indicative as it will be behind</p>	<p>Agent Comments in Tracker</p>	<p>Please see the EnerPHit Overview Document included in the supporting information. The document sets out the procedures to be followed at RIBA Stage 4 detailed design where the opportunity to carry</p>	<p>Request to be conditioned</p>	<p>For the reasons identified in 3.1 (d) these details cannot be conditioned as they are fundamental to the consideration of the listed building consent application</p>	<p>Further information required at this stage</p>	<p>N</p>

	existing hardboard.		out additional sampling and obtain the information required to finalise the details will be possible. We therefore request that all internal wall insulation and window details solutions are conditioned.				
5.1 (e)	Clarification discrepancy between plans in respect of IWI on south walls of Third Floor exhibition Room	Agent Comments in Tracker	Please seeHMAG-ART-XX-XX-RP-A-65810_EnerPHit Overview-S4-P01 included in the supporting information. The document sets out the procedures to be followed at RIBA Stage 4 detailed design where the opportunity to carry out additional sampling and obtain the information required to finalise the details will be possible. We therefore request that all internal wall insulation and window details solutions are conditioned.	Request to be conditioned	For the reasons identified in 3.1 (d) these details cannot be conditioned as they are fundamental to the consideration of the listed building consent application	Further information required at this stage	N
5.1 (f)	Clarification discrepancy between plans in respect of IWI Third Floor Exhibition	Agent Comments in Tracker	Please seeHMAG-ART-XX-XX-RP-A-65810_EnerPHit Overview-S4-P01 included in the supporting information. The document sets out the procedures to be followed at RIBA Stage 4 detailed design where the opportunity to carry out additional sampling and obtain the information required to finalise the details will be possible. We therefore request that all internal wall insulation and window details solutions are conditioned.	Request to be conditioned	For the reasons identified in 3.1 (d) these details cannot be conditioned as they are fundamental to the consideration of the listed building consent application	Further information required at this stage	N
6. Fourth Floor							

6.1 (a)	Clarification and details in respect of the vertical steel supports and new floor in the 1874 section of the building, should be provided before this element can be considered.	Agent Comments in Tracker	See supporting information, Section 1.11 onwards (Structural Info)	For discussion/ further review			
6.1 (b)	Slimmer IWI on the three Broad Street rooms and the retention of the cornice, architrave and picture rail, and the reuse of the skirting boards	Agent Comments in Tracker	Clarification required. Conditioning detail SD10 in the EnerPHit report (Sketch Detail) would be welcomed. See supporting information. HMAG-ART-XX-XX-RP-A-65810_EnerPHit Overview-S4-P01.	For discussion/ further review			

6.1 (c)	Consideration of the retention of the staircase to the librarians quarters. As this is a substantial loss to the significance of the building	Agent Comments in Tracker	The remodelling of this part of the building is critical to provide sufficient vertical circulation to provide adequate wheelchair access and also fire escape from the building and to bring back in to use the upper floors. At an early stage an alternative option to extend the historic stair to serve all floors was discounted following discussions with the conservation officer (Nick Joyce) and Historic England (Dr. Sarah Lewis) who both noted in pre-app feedback that the secondary stair has less significance and is potentially dispensable if needed to facilitate suitable access.	For discussion/ further review	Pre-application discussions noted, however all Listed Building Consent applications are a balancing exercise between the works to a listed building and the public benefits of the works. It is noted that the previous advice was provided at an early stage. However since then the project has moved on and the extent of the works changed significantly.		
		LBC additional information REF 10265	Page 3 provides further information in respect of the levels		The loss of the staircase is regrettable, and the need for a safe access and a lift is acknowledged. The additional information clarifies why the lift is so positioned and its loss is regrettable, however based on the additional information, the loss of the historic staircase is now not opposed.	Previous objection withdrawn	
6.1 (d)	Re-consideration of the size and design of	Agent Comments in Tracker	It is not clear to us how this is not in line with national policy or local plan policies LD1 and LD4. The draft Hereford	For discussion/ further review	The concerns previous raised remain. The size of the window is of concern being not consistent with	Request for amendments repeated as stairwell window	

	the window to the stairwell		<p>Design Guide does include the one line that Georgian principles set out a clear hierarchy of windows with larger on the ground floor and smaller above, however this is typically more in relation to smaller scale residential type buildings, in contrast civic buildings such as typically demonstrate larger windows at upper levels. In relation to the roof design, Historic England commented in pre-application advise that 'In developing the proposals it will be important to ensure that the new roofscape complements the character and quality of historic roofs without apologising for its intervention'. We feel that this represents an appropriate design approach for the building and celebrates the museums connection with the cathedral and providing this view from a stairwell provides this connection for all users of the building emerging at each upper level.</p>	<p>any other window of traditional buildings in this sensitive location. The impact of this feature when viewed from the cathedral grounds would be out of keeping with the fenestration size and rhythm of the Broad Street elevation of the Museum, which will be viewed alongside this window with feature hood from the Cathedral. Whilst appreciating that a view of Cathedral is important to the visitors to the Museum, conversely elements of the current Museum are visible from the Cathedral grounds, and the stairwell window so proposed would be a discordant and overdominant feature of the new works to the museum whilst viewed from the Cathedral grounds. Whilst the desire for views of the cathedral are duly acknowledged, it is also noted that the utilisation of the upper floors of the exiting museum will enable views of the Cathedral, in addition to the new floors being proposed to the museum and the viewing terrace. Therefore the request to limit the size of the stairwell window is repeated.</p>	not considered appropriate	
--	-----------------------------	--	--	---	----------------------------	--

6.1 (e)	Reconsideration of the heads of the venetian gothic windows	Agent Comments in Tracker	As part of the pre-app process various options were progressed for the upper level and roof details and this approach well received, including from Historic England who contributed that 'In terms of the draft design we are persuaded that, subject to materials and detailed design, the reinterpretation of Venetian Gothic fenestration could be successful in delivering an active and modelled roofscape that would contribute positively to the conservation area' - as a result this has been progressed as the preferred option for some time now. It is not clear to us how this is not in line with national policy or local plan policies LD1 and LD4.	For discussion/ further review	This suggestion was made on the mis-assumption that it was the size of windows that was required as opposed to the design. Whilst it is acknowledged that the Broad Street elevation has venetian gothic fenestration indicative of the period of construction, the subsequent extensions to the museum did not. However it is also recognised that venetian gothic windows were not generally of size of the window being proposed. As such clarification would be useful as to the size of venetian gothic windows originally considered at early stages, as the size of the windows on the roof extension is in marked contrast to the existing venetian gothic windows of the Museum. As such the local character and distinctiveness is not being protected, conserved or enhanced by the window size and design and as such would not be considered to comply with LD1 and LD4. However the size of	Amended window designs are again requested to limit the impact when viewed from King Street as per Figure 8 previously issued.	
---------	---	---------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	---	--	--

					<p>the four centred arch on the windows below are noted, as is their lower height above ground level. The elevations will be viewed from both the Cathedral grounds and King Street. From the Cathedral grounds the lower windows of this section of the museum are not visible. However they are from Aubrey Street where the venetian windows would appear over sized and top heavy in comparison to the large four centred arch below, in addition leading to a conflict in arch designs. However the greatest significance will be the view from King Street, I would refer to figure 8 of my previous comments that illustrate the impact of the oversized venetian arches would have when viewed above the roofscape of listed buildings. The roof would be a dominant feature above the listed buildings and would have an impact on their setting by their size and design as such would not comply with policy LD1 and LD4. Amended window designs are again requested to limit the impact when viewed from King Street as per Figure 8 previously</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					issued. Therefore the request was made to try to mitigate the impact of the proposal on King Street and to marry up the arches on this elevation. However if venetian gothic is the preferred design for a roofscape, this could be explored further, however the size of the windows indicated would not be supported as venetian gothic and a higher number of much smaller windows with the same proportions at the Broad Street elevation, could be explored further. If venetian gothic is sought.		
7. Fifth Floor							
7.1 (a)	Details of the steel support to this floor	Agent Comments in Tracker	See supporting information, Section 1.11 onwards (Structural Info).	For discussion/ further review			
7.1 (b)	Details of soil pipes if internal or external	Agent Comments in Tracker	To be conditioned, see supporting information however further detailed design is required to ensure that the routes proposed at present can be achieved.	Request to be conditioned		Some clarification required, but the principle of external siting on the northern elevation not opposed.	Y if external only
		LBC additional information REF 10265	The drawing on drainage Clarification 1.3 indicates that there will be one soil pipe on the northern elevation and 4 RWP.		The siting on the northern elevation is welcomed as it is the less public elevation. The location of the RWP directly adjacent to the tracery window is		

					<p>noted but is not desirable, would there be scope for relocating one or ideally both RWP further away from the window to the more blank elevation to the western side.</p> <p>However noting the location of the toilets it assumes a degree of SWP running internally. If this is the case this should be shown on the floor plans. However should an additional SWP be required on the north elevation this elevation for those services is supported.</p>		
7.1 (c)	Clarification of the height of the lift shafts	Agent Comments in Tracker	The lift shafts are shown accurately allowing for lift manufacturers clearance at the head of the lift, roof structure, build ups and parapet. Levels have been added to drawings. Please see supporting information, Section 1.10	For discussion/ further review			
		LBC additional information REF 10265	It is noted that 1.10 indicates the height of the rear lift will be 18428, and the public lift will be 17828		The public lift at a height of 17828 is lower than the existing chimney height at 18641 and is noted. The clarification in respect of the height of the rear lift shaft is noted		
7.1 (d)	The treatment of the Aubrey Street elevation to be reconsidered to be more	Agent Comments in Tracker	The language that has been developed is for new vertical elements to be expressed in corten cladding, this also allows a neat junction between the vertical and mansard pitch that would not be easily achieved with slate	For discussion/ further review	The opportunity to review for a more cohesive approach in terms of materials given the simplicity of the current elevation is welcomed.	For further discussion/ review	

	cohesive in terms of materials and pitch. Given the prominence of the Aubrey Street elevation, and the uncomfortable juncture between the corten steel lift shaft covering and the slate walls, an alternative treatment for this elevation is sought.		to slate relationship. We can review potential but have been through this design in quite a bit of detail during the design development process and our opinion is that this is what works most effectively without increasing the height of this element further.				
7.1 (e)	Consideration of the windows on the south elevation to represent arches below	Agent Comments in Tracker	See comments above (6.1.1e)	For discussion/ further review	Comments made in 6.1.1 (e)	Amended window designs are again requested to limit the impact when viewed from King Street as per Figure 8 previously issued.	
7.1 (f)	Requested changes to design of stairwell window	Agent Comments in Tracker	See comments above (6.1.1d)	For discussion/ further review	Comments made in 6.1.1 (d)	Request for amendments repeated as stairwell window not considered appropriate	
7.1 (g)	Details of the pv panels –	Agent Comments in	Noted - to be conditioned				Y

	could be conditioned	Tracker					
7.1 (h)	Materials with particular attention to the brickwork – could be conditioned	Agent Comments in Tracker	Noted - to be conditioned				Y
Comments on new information							
A1.		HFM-BML-XX-01-DR-S-0102 – T03	Tender Drawing Ground Floor Plan First Floor Structure above Balustrade strengthening / extension required, exact details and design TBC by Specialist Sub-contractor		Works to the primary staircase has been included in this drawing not previously referenced	Information on the works to the staircase required as part of the LBC application	
A.2		HFM-BML-XX-01-DR-S-0102-T03 HFM-BML-XX-01-DR-S-0101-T03 LBC additional information REF 10265	Hellibar crack stitch inner and outer leaf at 450 c/c full height Structural Proposals section 1.14 There are numerous locations around the existing Library and Museum where there noticeable cracks formed in the existing masonry. • The below is a typical crack stitch repair detail by Helifix. It involves inserting bars within the mortar joints of the masonry along the crack, and then applying a new mortar joint to encapsulate		Stitching of cracking is often an accepted means of repair – subject to details. Full details of the extend of and method of stitching should accompany the application with areas illustrated on elevation plans	Full details required.	

			<p>the bars.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contractors will be required to carry out repair works sympathetically with appropriate materials that will 'match' the existing in both appearance and property 				
A3		<p>HFM-BML-XX-ZZ-DR-S-0090 —Rev T02</p> <p>HFM-BML-XX-ZZ-DR-S-0090 —Rev T02</p>	<p>Demolitions Plan Sheet 1</p> <p>Demolitions Plan Sheet 2</p>		<p>These plans are useful in depicting the walls, stairs, and roof to be demolished, However It is suggested that this is coloured with 2 colourways to differentiate between historic fabric and modern features as the loss of historic weight is given greater significance than modern fabric, and some modern elements to be removed are welcomed. However not all historic fabric to be lost in recorded on these plans and it is acknowledged that other historic fabric is proposed for removal, excavation of the basement, potentially all plaster to external walls, ceilings, and such it would be useful if all the historic fabric to be removed was acknowledged in addition to the more modern mezzanine structures, stairs etc.</p>		

A4		HFM-BML- ZZ DR S 0095	Temporary Propping layout Important note: Sequencing of groundworks will be necessary to ensure adequate bearing to crash deck at basement / ground floor levels due to presence of 'Kings Ditch' known voids below rear basement slab and requirement to replace existing 'lightweight' suspended timber floor to central section		I note the temporary scaffolding around the Museum, and the note in respect of ground works. No objection from a listed building viewpoint, however the views of the planning archaeological advisor should be sought		

In respect of the application for listed building consent only , I duly acknowledge the complexity of the application, and that some of my previous requests for further information have been addressed, and many are identified as being for further discussion/review; items 2.1 (a), 2.1(c), 2.1(d) 2.1 (e), 3.1 (a), 3.1 (b), 3.1 (c), 3.1 (g), 3.1 (h), 3.1 (g), 3.1 9l), 3.1 (m), 3.1 (n), 3.1 (o), 5.1 (b), 6.1 (a), 6.1 (b), 6.1 (c) , 6.1 (d), 6.1 (e), 7.1 (a), 7.1 (c) , 7.1 (d), 7.1 (e) and 7.1 (f) and I would welcome the opportunity to review additional information and/or amended plans in respect of these details.

Nonetheless, whilst there is general support for the refurbishment and retention of the use of the building as a Museum to celebrate the County's rich heritage, given the significance of this listed building, I have concerns that a high proportion of the details requested have not been provided with the recent further information received, and that the suggestion is that many details can be conditioned. A listed building consent application should contain sufficient information to make a decision in respect of the proposal based on the information provided, and any conditions utilised where further investigation which in itself would require listed building consent such as exposure of details, such as 2.1 (f) or where the principle details are approved and it is the finer details that are required for individual aspects that would not be at the heart of the consent, i.e 3.1 (j), 3.1 (p), 4.1 (b), 4.1 (c), and 4.1 (d). However in this instance I note that 2.1(b), 3.1 (d), 3.1 (e) 3.1 (f), 3.1 (k), 4.1 (a), 5.1 (c), 5.1 (d), 5.1(e), 5.1 (f) and 7.1 (b) are requested to be conditioned, however the principle of the works has not been fully detailed to a degree that support for the works can be given at this stage. As such it is not possible to condition these details as either there is insufficient information to make a favourable consideration or that the details provided are not supported.

As such these details are required at this stage in order to gain built heritage support for the works. I would remind you of paragraph 194 of National Planning Policy framework which advises that;

*In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. **The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance**".*

Policy SS6 of the Herefordshire Core Strategy requires that, “*Development proposals should be shaped through an integrated approach to planning the following environmental components from the outset, and **based upon sufficient information to determine the effect upon each where they are relevant;***

- *landscape, townscape and local distinctiveness*
- *historic environment and heritage assets*

It is not considered that the necessary required level of information has been provided and where further information is required that has been detailed above.

I would also refer to Policy SD1 of the Herefordshire Core Strategy which requires that;

“...development proposals should incorporate the following requirements;

- 2. new buildings should be designed to maintain local distinctiveness through incorporating local architectural detailing and materials and respecting scale, height, proportions and massing of surrounding development, while making a positive contribution to the architectural diversity and character of the area including, where appropriate, through innovative design;*
- 6. ensure that distinctive features of existing buildings and their setting are safeguarded and where appropriate, restored;”*

It is not considered that the application current does provide sufficient information to confirm that the that **distinctive features of existing buildings** and their setting are safeguarded, and I would reference the table above for examples in that regard.

As such to comply with National Policies and the Core Strategy Policies the above information is again requested in order that the details of the proposal can be considered prior to determination.

I would also raise concerns that as a result of the less than substantial harm that has been identified to both the setting of listed buildings in the vicinity, the conservation area and the host listed building, suggestions previously made to mitigate or minimise that harm have not been explored. In addition to further information and clarification amendments to the design and detailing was previously requested, and whilst I note that they have been addressed in the additional details, they have not been resolved.

I would refer to paragraph 200 of NPPF which advises 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. Substantial harm to or loss of assets of the highest significance, grade I and II* listed buildings, should be wholly exceptional.

In accordance with paragraph 195 of NPPF , I would refer to the guidance prepared by Historic England The Setting of Heritage Assets – Historic Environment Good Practise Advice in Planning Note 3, [HEGPAN 3] in respect of how to assess setting, which should have been utilised in the assessment of the setting of heritage assets.

<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/heag180-gpa3-setting-heritage-assets/>

Historic England The Setting of Heritage Assets – Historic Environment Good Practise Advice in Planning Note 3, [HEGPAN 3] advises 5 steps to be considered when assessing setting.

1. Identify which heritage assets and their setting are affected.
2. Assess whether, how and to what degree these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage assets.
3. Assess the effects of the proposed development whether beneficial or harmful on that significance,
4. Explore the way to maximise enhancement or minimise harm
5. Make and document the decision and monitor outcomes.

This exercise was undertaken in the preparation of the previous comments and suggestions for mitigation measures to minimise harm to the host listed building and the wider city skyline and the setting of other listed buildings. I would again repeat these requests for mitigation to minimise the harm of the proposal for the reasons referenced in my previous comments.

The key issues would be;

1. The roofscape of the city that is – the beacon tower and the windows on the southern elevation and the stairwell window, for the reasons identified in paragraphs 8.1.15 – 8.1.50, and 9.1 – 9.24 of my previous comments
2. The treatment of some internal walls and windows, with particular reference to the current pilasters and windows in the library, and potentially the IWI of the ground floor Broad Street elevation.

I note the additional information within the LBC additional information REF 10265 1.6. 1.7 and 1.8 in respect of the proposed location of the viewing Beacon and I am grateful that the relocation has been explored. It is regrettable that the longer viewpoints assessed in the setting assessment were also not explored further as the longer distance views from Victoria Bridge and indicated in my previous response in Figures 14 15 and 16 , and Photographs, 23 24 and 25. Whilst no firm conclusion appears to have been reached within the LBC additional information REF 10265, the consideration of the relocation and/or changes to the size/design of the viewing beacon is welcomed and it would appear from the short term views that the Beacon viewed to the north would have the lesser impact on the city skyline. It is noted that the impact on key view 3 would be greater in this location that the other options, however the impact on the other key viewpoint would be less. Whilst all views of the Cathedral are important, inevitably some views are more important than others, and it is considered that Key View 1, Key View 2, and Key View 6 are perhaps more significant than key view 3. However I acknowledge that the longer distance views have not been considered. As such I would welcome the opportunity to discuss the relocation of the Viewing Beacon moved to the North and the West further including the longer distant views.

The large gothic windows and stairwell window to the south elevation would create a building that would be over dominant when viewed from King Street and/or Cathedral Close as illustrated in figure 8 and photograph 18 of the previous comments. Amendments to limit their external visual appearance are again sought.

Amended plans in line with Step 4 of the Historic England Guidance mitigation - as detailed in section of the previous comments are again requested in order that the details of the application could be supported in built heritage terms taking into account relevant national policy, legislation and Herefordshire Core Strategy Policies.

Consultation response from: Debra Lewis
DATE RETURNED: 31/07/2023