Design and Conservation Consultation

Proposal Residential conversion		Location 50 High Street Brampton
Dc case officer: KS	**Conservation Officer:** LB	**Application Ref.No: 25/00885/lbc 25/00884/ful** ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SEPT 2025

Additional information was submitted Sept 2025 this includes a structural calculations package, helix repair details, and a drawing roof, ground floor first floor (this drawing is stated as being not to scale)– comments in BLUE update my original advice below. Some of this information had been previously submitted

Listed building consent and planning permission is sought for alterations to form a separate dwelling. The building is a grade II listed structure located within the Brampton Conservation Area

Previous advice was provided in association with application 24/01577/lbc which was not supported due to insufficient information being supplied which did not enable the council to undertake its statutory role.

Listed building consent is required for all works that affect the special architectural and historic interest of the structure. The council can only consider works that have been detailed in the application.

Works therefore that are not detailed in the application but are likely to be required as part of the proposal and which affect the special significance of the listed building would not be assessed and would not be authorised under this application.

The former coach house and stables to the Old House, an adjacent listed building is described as Early C18. Red brick with rebuilt north gable end. C19 slate roof. Band between storeys. Hay loft opening at first floor. Included for group value. The structure was listed in Oct 1983, Prior to this date it appears the gable wall was taken down and reconstructed with a brick external face and a blockwork internal face. Part of the ground floor to the rear of the building also appears to have been rebuilt. The roof and the internal floor may also have been partially reconstructed at this time.

Significance.

The building makes a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area, it is reflective of the history of the settlement and the association with the adjacent Old House. Architecturally the solidity of the structure and the quality and appearance of the historic handmade brickwork is significant. The building appears to have originally been of single storey construction (tumbled brickwork to southern gable) , it was raised in height probably in the 19th Century to form a 2nd storey hay loft, the high level access door to the rear reflects this change in use. To the ground floor (rear elevation) there is a boarded access door and 2 small windows under timber lintels , to the front there is evidence of blocked slit ventilation shafts, a blocked small window and a high level access door. The Northern gable is modern and includes a pair of timber garage doors

Patress plates can be seen on the front and rear elevations and the tie is seen within the building, this has been inserted to restrain the walls, however I am not convinced that this is effective as there is evidence of further structural movement, this should be investigated by a structural engineer.

The application

Previous heritage advice was provided in association with application 24/01577/lbc. This was not supported and withdrawn due to insufficient information being supplied which did not enable the council to undertake its statutory role. The shortcomings of the application were set out in these comments.

The application drawings are identical to those submitted as part of the 24 application, additionally now however a structural report has been undertaken and the applicant is seeking a single bedroom as

opposed to 2 bedrooms.

The heritage statement is inadequate.

The structural report recommended

We strongly advise that the following remedial and investigative actions be undertaken before conversion works commence:

1. Brickwork Repairs • Undertake crack stitching repairs using the Helifix system, which offers full surveys and insurance-backed guarantees.

   There is no indication on the drawings where the helifix bars will be inserted.

2. Roof Inspection and Repairs • Conduct a detailed roof survey to identify defects such as joint separation, timber decay, or insect infestation. • Replace or repair compromised roof members as required. •

   There is no evidence that this has been done, there is no indication what works will need to be undertaken to the roof

   The drawing suggests that every single rafter will be doubled up with new rafters laid between the old. This was picked up in the previously submitted structural document. The concerns I raised at that time that the roof will have to be stripped remain. No details of insulation are provided

3. Rainwater Goods • Inspect and overhaul gutters, downpipes, and underground drainage. • Ensure effective discharge away from the building to prevent foundation washout and further brick deterioration.

   As no new gutters have been proposed on the drawings it is understood that this relates to existing rainwater goods. The drawings do not show any downpipes are to be provided so there is no indication how water will be discharged

   Still not shown

4. External Walls and Ties • Address loss of brick bond on the southern gable via the Helifix system. • Install restraint ties connecting the timber first floor to external walls to improve lateral stability

   Again there is no indication what is proposed and where it is proposed.

   Helifix repair details doc this is a partial resubmission of information originally part of the structural document submitted 15/5/25 which was inadequate– this is product information on 4 Helifix products each intended for different scenarios. There is no indication which system will be used on this building, and none appear to be applicable to the issues experienced by this building. The drawing makes reference to 5 sites for Helifix ties referencing RB04 or similar, RB12 or similar and RW04 or similar none of which feature in the Helific repair details doc. The stitching of cracks needs to be indicated on photographs of the elevations not on a plan as this is not specific enough.

Constructional Calcs

Appended to the structural report are sheets of structural calculations for a building regulation submission. The supplied information is unclear

This seems to suggest the insertion of additional new rafters into the roof – this would necessitate the stripping and relaying of the roof these works are not indicated on the drawings. As noted above

The doc suggests a ply membrane will be glued and screwed on top of the existing floor joists – this is again not shown on the drawings.

This is now shown on the drawing. A scaled section drawing is required,the supplied not to scale drawing is insufficient. A scaled drawing should be at 1:10 and indicate the build up of the floor and the accurate position of the ties it should also indicating if the existing floorboards are to be retained and then ply sheathing applied. I note the drawing now suggests that all the existing

joists may be doubled up as a joist bolting detail is provided.

Based on the indicative section the bottom of the apex truss to be retained is allegedly measured at 2.72m, but it is unclear if this is the top of the finished floor (with or without the sheething). Based on this rough measurement I believe the Eaves ties may not be sufficiently high above the FFL to allow unrestricted access. Further justification is required

It is unclear if works to the foundations are required – again indicative drawings are provided, these are not to scale and there is no way to understand the impact on the levels in the building. The dialogue box indicates that the floor will be reinforced concrete with a polythene DPM. This will then force any damp up the walls of the building as no DPC has been proposed. Neither of these systems are appropriate for a listed building

The application doesn't include a schedule of works and is scant in detail. This was highlighted in my comments on the 24 application. None of the points raised have been satisfactorily addressed

The application drawing 3098 101D only shows the installation of a partition on the ground floor to form an enclosure for the insertion of a staircase, Wc and hall. The existing garage doors are replaced by two new outward opening doors (one is glazed the second is solid vertical boarded). On the first floor a second set of partitions are formed, the bathroom partition is not in alignment with the ground floor. The partition dog legs to form the entrance to Bed 1, the entrance doorway sits under the line of an existing horizontal tie beam, if the illustrated section is accurate the beam is shown at only 1.7m above the first finished floor making this doorway will be difficult to achieve, it is likely that the appearance of the beam will be harmed. The application indicates that no new openings will be formed in the building the only change is to the first floor opening on the front elevation which is now shown as a window and the change to the former garage door.

Assessment

This is a simple listed building with some scope for alteration however this application is wholly inadequate. It is evident from the site inspection that in order to comply with building regulations the following works will be required:

- Insulation to walls, floor and roof – what is proposed, 1:50 constructional section required through building – it is evident the entire structure will be now drylined- there is still no indication of insulation. This will fundamentally undermine the character of the building
- Insertion of new ceiling – where and what, is proposed, impact on existing beams - no details provided
- Insertion of new windows and doors – details required – none provided
- Location of soil vent pipe to wc and bathroom – external soil vent pipe will not be acceptable – not provided
- First floor structure – is this to be retained or replaced, does the existing provide sufficient residential loading capacity what is proposed?, are the historic downstand beams retained.
- Will the roof require stripping and reroofing – still awaiting confirmation
- Brickwork repairs – schedule and methodology of the works required, engineers report required to consider repairs to the fabric incl. any requirement for Helifix ties. The roots of numerous trees (now removed) surrounding the building may have impacted upon the building - insufficient
- Some concern that the proposed staircase does not meet building regulation requirements not proven
- Door to first floor bedroom loft hatch – is this a new window or is the existing door retained , the elevation shows the shutter in a closed position not provided
- The kitchen/ living room has very limited natural light, it may be better if the partition to the hall was glazed to allow natural borrowed light from the front door.

- A 1.8 m close boarded timber fence is proposed to define the boundary of the plot, to the rear of the site this will not result in harm however the erection of this boundary treatment to create an access corridor in front of no 50 is not acceptable, this will be visually unacceptable and harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of the listed building. a low brick wall to mirror that at the front of the site would be more appropriate. This point appears to have been addressed and a low wall is now shown

In the exercise of planning functions, the statutory test set is that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Area and special regard shall be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. On the basis of the information submitted this application the Council can not exercise its duty to have special regard to the preservation of the listed building as the information is inadequate to understand the implications of the proposals. Whilst it can occasionally be appropriate to seek further details by condition after the grant of permission and consent, that course of action would have to be in the knowledge that the building's significance can be safeguarded. In this case there are so many unanswered questions over the proposed works it is not possible to conclude with certainty that the building can be altered in the way intended without causing unjustified harm.

The applicant has been given numerous opportunities to justify the proposed conversion ofteh building and provide the requisite information. Where information has now been forthcoming I conclude that the proposed works will harm the significance of this structure and that all will remain will be 4 walls

-Do not support the proposed works to the building or the proposed change of use,. This was not a redundant structure the applicant has chosen to split it off from the adjacent building where it was a storage building.

The applicant may exercise his right to appeal if he feels unable to meet the requirement to supply sufficient accurate information.

Recommendation:.

Do not support

The proposals are not fully justified they do not show that they preserve the listed building and its setting, they also do not have regard to the preservation and enhancement of the Brampton Conservation Area, and are therefore not in accordance with ss. 16, 66 & 72 of the Planning (LBCA) Act 1990, and policy LP 34 of the adopted Huntingdonshire Local Plan.

Signed……L.B Date: 17 October 2025