

Addendum report for Planning Review Committee - Wednesday 27 April 2016

3. Florey Building, 23-24 St Clement's Street:15/03643/FUL (Pages 3 - 24)

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Review Committee

27th April 2016

Application Number: 15/03643/FUL

Decision Due by: 15th February 2016

Proposal: Refurbishment and extension of existing student accommodation building to provide 25 additional study bedrooms, conference and support facilities.

Site Address: Florey Building, 23-24 St Clement's Street

Ward: St Clement's Ward

Agent: Ms Fiona Lamb

Applicant: Mr David Goddard

The application has been called-in to the Planning Review Committee by Councillors Benjamin, Wade, Hollingsworth, Simmons, Brandt, Pressel, Wolff, Tarver, Thomas, Hollick, Wilkinson, Brown on grounds that the decision by the West Area Planning Committee needs to be revisited because of concerns that the proposed two-storey extension would have an adverse impact upon the listed building

Recommendation:

The Planning Review Committee is recommended to grant planning permission for the following reasons:

- 1 The development proposals represent an appropriate response to the issues of increasing student accommodation on site, providing conference facilities and of restoring the listed building. The City Council has given considerable weight and importance to the desirability of preserving or enhancing designated heritage assets and their settings, including the listed building and conservation area, and that any harm that would result from the proposed development is justified by the public benefits of the proposal. The proposal has been designed to safeguard the amenities of the adjoining properties and would not create any adverse impacts in terms of highways, flood risk, sustainability, archaeology, biodiversity and land contamination that could not be mitigated by appropriately worded conditions. Therefore the proposal is considered to comply with policies contained within the Oxford Local Plan, Oxford Core Strategy, Sites and Housing Plan and National Planning policy and guidance.
- 2 Officers have considered carefully all objections to these proposals. Officers have come to the view, for the detailed reasons set out in the officer's report, that the objections do not amount, individually or cumulatively, to a reason for refusal and that all the issues that have been raised have been adequately addressed and the relevant bodies consulted.

- 3 The Council considers that the proposal accords with the policies of the development plan as summarised below. It has taken into consideration all other material matters, including matters raised in response to consultation and publicity. Any material harm that the development would otherwise give rise to can be offset by the conditions imposed.

Conditions:

- 1 Development begun within time limit
- 2 Develop in accordance with approved plans
- 3 Material Samples in Conservation Area
- 4 Landscape Plan
- 5 Landscape Implementation
- 6 Hard Surface Design – Tree Roots
- 7 Underground Services – Tree Roots
- 8 Tree Protection Plan Implementation
- 9 Arboricultural Method Statement Implementation
- 10 Student Accommodation – Full Time Courses
- 11 Student Accommodation - No cars
- 12 Student Accommodation - Out of Term Use
- 13 Management Plan – including Service Management and Traffic Management Strategy including a restriction on delivery hours at the York Place access
- 14 Archaeology - WSI
- 15 Travel Plan
- 16 Student Travel Information Packs
- 17 Cycle and Refuse Areas Provided
- 18 Construction Traffic Management Plan
- 19 Noise Levels as stated in Noise Assessment Report
- 20 Air conditioning plant
- 21 Scheme of extraction / treating cooking odours from kitchen
- 22 Sustainability Statement Implementation
- 23 Flood Risk Assessment Recommendation Implementation
- 24 Drainage Strategy
- 25 Biodiversity Measures / Enhancements
- 26 Development of a Servicing Plan for all uses
- 27 Contaminated Land Risk Assessment
- 28 Scheme to provide noise insulation to reduce noise breakout

Representation Received

A summary of all the comments received from statutory consultees and third parties are set out within the original committee report included with the agenda. Since the report was submitted a further letter of comment in relation to the application has been received, and the comments are set out below:

East Oxford Resident Association Forum (EORAF)

The EORAF would object to the application on the following grounds.

- 1) Inadequate consultation. The East Oxford Residents Association Forum (EORAF), which represents 22 residents groups in the three East Oxford wards, only became aware of this application last week despite subscribing to Planning Finder. We have spoken to a number of residents in York Place, Anchor Court

sheltered accommodation and the service manager at Anchor Court who informed they had not seen the application. We don't believe this was an inclusive consultation which took into account the requirements of an older, disabled population including the ethnic Chinese who live on the Anchor Court premises. Furthermore there was inadequate consultation with statutory consultee the Environmental Agency who confirmed they were only notified on April 18.

- 2) Poor quality information regarding the design of the building.
- 3) Poor permeability by blocking access to the front doors of York Place 1-7 ,the riverside and Angel and Greyhound Meadow
- 4) We support the concerns expressed by York Place Residents Association about access, transport, loss of amenity and inappropriate design of the extension. We question the noise impact assessment as only impacts on York Place 1 and 8 have been assessed. York Place 1 is the furthest away from the Annex whilst impacts on adjacent number 7 don't seem to have been considered.
- 5) We share the concerns of the 20th Century Society and architect Alan Berman on the unacceptable impacts on the listed Florey building and its setting.
- 6) No evidence of an Equality Impact Assessment of this scheme. Anchor Court houses a number of older people from the Chinese community whose needs should be separately addressed in the equality impact assessment.
- 7) No reference to the temporary arrangements to accommodate Queens College students during the refurbishment period. We understand that the students would be accommodated in head-leased HMOs during the refurbishment period as renting accommodation in adjacent Alice House at £220 per week is deemed too expensive. We have seen in the Castle Mill mitigation options debate that options 2 and 3 were rejected as it involved moving students out into the private renting sector leading to unacceptable pressures on Oxford's overheated housing market. We urge the council to press the applicant for details on these arrangements and reject the application if students would be accommodated in the private sector.

If the committee is minded to approve the application we would like to see the following conditions which would:

- 1) Ensure access to the front doors of York Place 1-7
- 2) Ensure access to the towpath leading to the Angel and Greyhound Meadow as this route has been used for decades by walkers (until Queens college blocked access off 10 months ago).
- 3) Refuse a secondary access via York Place except for emergency vehicles
- 4) Refuse access for construction traffic via York Place
- 5) A condition on noise which considers the impacts on York Place 1 through to 8.

Background

1. At the West Area Planning Committee on the 12th April 2016, Members resolved to approve planning permission for the refurbishment and extension of the existing Grade II Listed Florey Building to provide 25 additional study bedrooms, conference, and support facilities under reference 15/03643/FUL. A copy of the officer's report has been attached to the committee agenda.

2. The decision of the West Area Planning Committee has subsequently been called-in to the Planning Review Committee by Councillors Benjamin, Wade, Hollingsworth, Simmons, Brandt, Pressel, Wolff, Tarver, Thomas, Hollick, Wilkinson, Brown on grounds that this decision needs to be revisited because there are concerns that the proposed two-storey extension would have an adverse impact upon the listed building
3. The purpose of this supplemental report is to provide specific comments on the matters listed above and to address other points that have been made following the West Area Planning Committee meeting.

Impact upon the Grade II Listed Building

4. The Florey Building is a Grade II Listed building which is recognised as having internationally recognised importance. The design development of the refurbishment of the existing student accommodation and insertion of a two-storey annexe building has given consideration to this significance. In doing so, the architects have involved the Oxford City Council Heritage Officers, Historic England, 20th Century Society, and other interested groups in the development of the proposed scheme.
5. The officer's committee report sets out clearly the assessment of the proposed two-storey annexe's extension's impact upon the significance of the Grade II listed building in paragraphs 17-29. The assessment includes reference to the specific comments of the relevant statutory bodies such as Historic England, and other groups such as the 20th Century Society. It also includes a summary of the Oxford Design Review Panel's conclusions with respect to the proposal.
6. The listed building consent (15/03643/LBC) also considered the impacts of the proposed works including the two-storey extension upon the listed building. This application was approved by the West Area Planning Committee but has not been called-in to the Planning Review Committee. A copy of the report is attached in **appendix 1**.
7. As stated within both committee reports, officers consider that the size, scale and massing of the development would be appropriate for the site and would not harm the significance of the St. Clement's And Iffley Road Conservation Area Conservation Area or the setting of the Grade II listed building. This would accord with the aims of the NPPF and also the above-mentioned policies of the Oxford Core Strategy 2026, Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016, and Sites and Housing Plan 2026.

Noise Impact

8. The East Oxford Resident Association Forum has raised concerns that the Noise Impact Assessment has not considered the impacts upon all of the properties within York Place. The officers report deals with this matter in paragraphs 37-39.

9. The assessment has identified a number of receptors throughout York Place in order to establish the existing background noise level within this area and then recommends that all plant is designed to achieve a rating level of 5dB below the existing background noise level. This is to be secured by condition in order to safeguard the amenities of all the adjoining properties.
10. The West Area Planning Committee resolved to grant planning permission subject to a number of conditions which sought to mitigate any such noise impact on residents. These included a scheme to mitigate noise breakout, and a restriction on delivery times to prevent disturbance to York place from deliveries within anti-social hours.
11. The officers report states in paragraph 7 that the proposed two-storey annexe would be used for a number of purposes including dances. The applicant has subsequently clarified that the multi-purpose space would only be used for lectures, seminars, and conferences. The nature of this use would be unlikely to give rise to significant noise disturbance to the surrounding residential properties but the condition requested by the West Area Planning Committee would seek to mitigate this, and a Management Plan for the facility is also to be secured by condition.

Flood Risk

12. The East Oxford Residents Association Forum have stated in their letter of comment that the Environment Agency have confirmed that they were only notified about the application on the 18th April 2016.
13. Officers would advise members that this statement is incorrect. The Environment Agency was formally consulted on the application on the 6th January 2016. The agency has since confirmed that they did not receive this consultation but have acknowledged that this may have been due to an administration error at the agency.
14. The application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment which was developed following pre-application discussions with the Environment Agency which identified the potential flood risk for the site and possible impacts upon the adjacent watercourse. As set out within paragraphs 58-61 of the officers report included within the agenda.
15. The Environment Agency has confirmed that they have no objection to the principle of the development but are in the process of reviewing the Flood Risk Assessment to determine if the development will increase flood risk. They have indicated that a response will be provided prior to the committee meeting, and these comments will be provided verbally at the meeting.

Other Matters

16. Rights of Access: The East Oxford Residents Association Forum has reiterated the concerns of the York Place Residents Association that the proposed development would prevent access across the strip of land that lies adjacent to 8

York Place and leads to the towpath which currently provides access to 1-7 York Place and also the Angel & Greyhound Meadow.

17. As stated in paragraph 75 of the officer's report, matters relating to access rights across land are a matter for the applicant to deal with in terms of whether they are able to implement a planning permission and would not constitute a material consideration for the determination of this application.
18. In terms of Angel & Greyhound Meadow, it is incorrect to state that the development will prevent access to the meadow. The meadow is currently accessed via a bridge leading from the St Clement's Car Park, and this would be unchanged by the proposed development.
19. Equality Impact Assessment: The East Oxford Residents Association Forum has indicated that there is no evidence of an Equality Impact Assessment for the proposal. They have suggested that Anchor Court houses a number of older people from the Chinese community whose needs should be separately addressed in the equality impact assessment.
20. The National and Local Validation List for a full planning application does list an Equality Impact Assessment as a validation requirement for an application for this type of development. The lack of any such assessment would not be a material reason to withhold planning permission.
21. Temporary Arrangements: The East Oxford Residents Association Forum has also suggested that details of the temporary arrangements to accommodate the Queens College students during the refurbishment period should be provided.
22. Officers would advise members that such arrangements would not constitute a material planning consideration for the determination of this application.

Conclusion:

23. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, and relevant policies of the Oxford Core Strategy 2026, Sites and Housing Plan 2011-2026, and Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016 and therefore officer's recommendation to Members would be to approve the application.

Human Rights Act 1998

Officers have considered the Human Rights Act 1998 in reaching a recommendation to grant planning permission, subject to conditions. Officers have considered the potential interference with the rights of the owners/occupiers of surrounding properties under Article 8 and/or Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Act and consider that it is proportionate.

Officers have also considered the interference with the human rights of the applicant under Article 8 and/or Article 1 of the First Protocol caused by imposing conditions. Officers consider that the conditions are necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others and to control the use of property in accordance

with the general interest. The interference is therefore justifiable and proportionate.

Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998

Officers have considered, with due regard, the likely effect of the proposal on the need to reduce crime and disorder as part of the determination of this application, in accordance with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. In reaching a recommendation to grant planning permission, officers consider that the proposal will not undermine crime prevention or the promotion of community safety.

Contact Officer: Andrew Murdoch

Extension: 2228

Date: 21st April 2016

This page is intentionally left blank

West Area Planning Committee

12th April 2015

Application Number: 15/03644/LBC

Decision Due by: 15th February 2016

Proposal: Refurbishment and extension of existing student accommodation building to provide 25 additional study bedrooms, conference and support facilities.

Site Address: Florey Building, 23-24 St Clement's Street (**site plan: appendix 1**)

Ward: St Clement's Ward

Agent: Ms Fiona Lamb

Applicant: Mr David Goddard

Recommendation:

The West Area Planning Committee is recommended to grant listed building consent for the following reasons:

- 1 The City Council considers that the proposal, subject to the conditions imposed, would accord with the special character, setting and features of special architectural or historic interest of the listed building.
- 2 The Council considers that the proposal, subject to the conditions imposed, would accord with the special character and appearance of the conservation area and preserve or enhance it. The Council has taken into consideration all other material matters, including matters raised in response to consultation and publicity.
- 3 The proposals represent an appropriate response to the issues of student accommodation on site, improving facilities, providing conference facilities and of restoring the listed building. The City Council has given considerable weight and importance to the desirability of preserving or enhancing designated heritage assets and their settings, including the listed building and conservation area. The City Council considers that any less than substantial harm that would result from the proposed development is justified by the public benefits that would result and that the proposal is considered to comply with policies contained within the adopted Oxford Local Plan, the adopted Oxford Core Strategy, the adopted Sites and Housing Plan and National Planning policy and guidance.
- 4 Officers have considered carefully all objections to these proposals. Officers

have come to the view, for the detailed reasons set out in the officer's report, that the objections do not amount, individually or cumulatively, to a reason for refusal and that all the issues that have been raised have been adequately addressed and the relevant bodies consulted.

Conditions:

- 1 Commencement of works LB consent
- 2 LB consent - works as approved only
- 3 7 days' notice to LPA
- 4 LB notice of completion
- 5 Repair of damage after works
- 6 Further works - fabric of LB - fire regs
- 7 Details stacks, plant and colours
- 8 Removal of historic features
- 9 Internal features retained and protected
- 10 Features to match
- 11 Preservation of unknown features
- 12 Fire doors - character
- 13 Lighting
- 14 Recording Written Scheme Investigation
- 15 Audit of original internal features and fittings
- 16 Method statement protection
- 17 Further details
- 18 Further works - buildings bounding site
- 19 Materials samples
- 20 Materials to match existing
- 21 Conservation management plan

Main Local Plan Policies:

Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016

- CP1** - Development Proposals
- CP8** - Design Development to Relate to its Context
- CP9** - Creating Successful New Places
- CP11** - Landscape Design
- CP13** - Accessibility
- HE2** - Archaeology
- HE3** - Listed Buildings and their Setting
- HE4** - Archaeological Remains Within Listed Building
- HE5** - Fire Safety in Listed Buildings
- HE7** - Conservation Areas

Core Strategy

- CS18_** - Urban design, town character, historic environment

Other Material Considerations:

- National Planning Policy Framework
- This application is in or affecting the St. Clement's and Iffley Road Conservation Area. The development is affecting a Grade II Listed Building.

- Planning Practice Guidance

Relevant Site History:

68/19646/A_H - Residential graduate accommodation with caretakers flat: Approved

71/24116/A_H - Formation of new carriageway to Florey Building: Approved

72/12926/A_H - Renewal of temporary consent for garage for two vehicles:
Temporary Permission

82/00512/GFH - Revised access to Florey Building and St. Clement's Car Park
associated works: Deemed Consent

Public Consultation

Statutory Consultees:

Historic England:

- The Florey building is 'truly remarkable' and has historic, architectural and aesthetic significance;
- The interiors contribute to the completeness as they are as Stirling designed;
- The building has always been challenging to live in and use and restoration and modernisation are necessary for its long-term future;
- The proposals represent a much-needed upgrading of the accommodation of this highly-important building. The proposals involve a high degree of change and a degree of harm, however they are probably the least harmful means of meeting the College's brief. The harm is less than substantial but not insignificant. Historic England accepts that this is justified to ensure that the building has a sustainable long-term future;
- The harm mostly would arise from the infilling of the area under the podium and from the internal reconfiguration as the building would lose its completeness and not be as Stirling intended; and the extension would make it more difficult to appreciate the building's remarkable form and views would be compromised; and
- Historic England defers to the Council to weigh the balance between harm and benefit.

The Twentieth Century Society:

- The Society has been involved in pre-application discussions on the above site with the architects.
- Has concerns relating to the insertion of the new porter's lodge and additional ground floor accommodation. It is hard to ascertain from the provided visualisations the overall impact on the building. The movement forward of the screen wall affects the permeability of the space in terms of the passage of light between the quad and the rear approach of the building. This is a key feature of the building: the perceived separation of elements that the view of sky between the building and pods beneath confers is vitally important to the design ethos of the space. We would request that the Council seek assurances that it is the intention of the applicants to maintain these views.
- Objects in principle to the loss of the mezzanine level in the majority of the double

height rooms on the 4th/5th floor. The earlier proposals envisaged the retention of six of these 'heritage rooms': now reduced to three. The Society would like to see a minimum of six of these rooms being retained and in their original configuration. The loss of such a large part of significant heritage is not considered acceptable, especially as an earlier iteration of the proposals was considerably less damaging.

- Disappointed that the original internal décor and fittings in the student rooms are to be lost. Wants consideration being given to the retention of some of the timber detailing and original fabrics in the refurbished rooms, as well as some elements of the original colour scheme.
- It is noted that inserting the new rooms into the mezzanine will have an impact on the external appearance of new glazing system being proposed for the building. The “cascade effect” in the glazing is of fundamental importance and the detailing of the floor junctions with the glass at this point is critical in maintaining the glazing pattern. Whilst the Society understands the need for the new glazing system and acknowledges that considerable expertise has gone in to ensuring the similarity of the new to the original fabric, the join area at the new floor junction contains extra opening lights which break the continuity in glazing at this point. The Society would like to see this detail revised to minimise the visual impact of the changes at this critical junction.
- The proposed new annexe will be out of the main axis of view on the initial approach to the Florey Building, which the Society considers to be the correct approach to ensure that it is read as subservient to the listed building. The Society considers the proposed scale and massing of the new build extension to be uncontentious. The use of a complementary cladding material is appropriate. The Florey Building is rugged and robust, as well as being quirky in nature, and can withstand an extension that develops this ethos. The desire to re-invigorate the road approach and especially the riverside walk is welcomed, as is the very necessary proposal to provide a proper common room space.

Third Parties:

York Place Residents' Association: (summary of heritage comments)

Admire Stirling's work and vision; the building is much admired and photographed; it is a landmark, a new structure would obscure the Florey and is entirely out of place and strongly oppose on aesthetic and cultural grounds; the new building would not be an acceptable compromise between heritage and practical needs- the College could adjust its undergraduate intake to match the number of rooms at the Florey Building instead.

103 Southfield Road

A complete rethink of strategy is necessary; the sky gap between ground floor and upper form would be adversely affected; the enlargement of the ground floor quadrangle space would destroy the conception of this as a private, quiet space; the change to the glazing is unclear; the proposed annexe has no redeeming features.

Oxford Design Review Panel-

The Oxford Design Review Panel was in broad support and encouraged the design response and the restoration of the Listed Building.

Sustainability:

The proposals would help with the continued use of the listed building and improves its energy efficiency.

Officers Assessment:

Site Description and Significance:

1. The Florey Building is an internationally significant heritage asset and was listed at Grade II in 2009. It was designed by James Stirling and Partners and completed in 1971 and forms one of a trio of “Red Buildings”, now a famous part of the architect’s work. The building has a comprehensive list description which emphasises its innovative design, architectural value and associational value with James Stirling.
2. The building is a masterpiece that merits close study and tells us about its time when originality was particularly valued in modern architecture and the new confidence of the 1960s which is still evidenced today. The building can be described as being remarkable, which is recognised by the fact that it is one of a very small number of Post-War buildings that are listed. Stirling had a high status amongst the architectural avant-garde and this final red brick trilogy university building represents a radical reinterpretation of the idea of the quad or the amphitheatre. The Florey represents the culmination of Oxford’s involvement with experimental modernism. The form is highly sculptural and the overall effect is dramatic.
3. The Florey was built by the Queen’s College as a quite separate block of study bedrooms arranged over four storeys arranged in a canted semicircle raised up on concrete piloti. The two prominent towers hold the main staircase and the lift and they refer to historic towers of traditional buildings.
4. Stirling succeeded in making a large, bulky building appear relatively light; this is partly achieved by the stepped and cupped sculptural form. This is also achieved by the open space designed to be seen between the top of the ground floor wall (and porter’s lodge) and the underside of the main building. It is possible to see greenery between these spaces thus the building’s context set against the trees is seen.
5. A cloister runs around the court on the east, south and west sides and provides access to the stairs descending at each end of the building. To the east, the cloister terminates in a ramp leading down to the public footpath along the river bank.
6. Stirling cleverly created a cascade effect between different floors and articulated the lower floors with red banding. There are ribbon windows to the outside of the plan form, which emphasise the canted form and modelling. The top 4th and 5th floor rooms are duplexes, having an internal staircase each and allowing full-height windows. Corridors provide entry to all study bedrooms which face the courtyard with service rooms, shower rooms and WCs at the outer face of the building. The corridors have small angled meeting spaces which are clever in

conception but apparently are not much appreciated; and the showers and WCs are too few and modern requirements are for improved offer. The study rooms have large windows and give attractive views to the trees and meadows.

7. The courtyard has a raised lawn with a separate breakfast room which has a clerestory without vents thus giving limited views to the outside. These spaces have some original features. The roof of the room is paved above the level of the court and accessed by a wide set of steps.

Surroundings

8. To the North is tributary of the River Cherwell; this building overlooks the open space of Angel Meadow, with mature trees opposite the Florey. To the East is a car park, open since the construction of the Florey Building with consent for student housing with some public parking.
9. To the South East are the backs of the buildings fronting onto St Clement's; these are mostly brick 19th century two and three storey properties. 27 St Clement's is Grade II listed. To the South is the 1980's Anchor Court, a red brick four storey building occupying the site between the Florey's southern boundary and St Clement's.

Proposal:

10. The Queen's College's aim is to house all 100 first year undergraduates in the main building and to construct a linked annexe to improve facilities with a new 100-place dining room, more flexible multi-use spaces, to introduce conference facilities and a new common room.
11. The main works as affecting heritage and design can be summarised thus, to include:
 - The external red tiles are to be refixed or replaced;
 - Concrete is to be cleaned and repaired;
 - Replacement of roof and upgrade for thermal purposes;
 - Introduce new lift to access lower common room and replace lift to main tower;
 - Photovoltaics to be added to the roof;
 - Addition of en-suites to all bedrooms;
 - Remove study room doors, shelves, wardrobes to match originals;
 - Addition of a new floor between 4th and 5th floors but retaining three heritage rooms in their existing duplex form, thus providing 17 additional bedrooms;
 - Double glazing courtyard façade and podium glazing to closely match original sight lines and fenestration patterns;
 - Repair and upgrade of original strip windows to south elevation including louvres and other glazing;
 - Renewal of all mechanical and electrical services;
 - Entrance steps replaced to match;
 - Widened entrance to the left of the towers;
 - Reconfiguration of ground floor access including removal of steps to caretaker's flat, the dias to be reinstated to accommodate new steps and

abutment;

- Removal of ante room (TV room) on ground floor in the undercroft and rebuilt, reconfigured with glazing and louvre assembly to closely resemble existing;
- Rebuilding of caretaker's flat in undercroft and reconfigured with replacement glazing and louvre assembly to closely resemble existing;
- Remove server shutters and upgrade room;
- Replacement of lighting, signage, etc.;
- Replace glazing to breakfast room in courtyard to provide ventilation and new lift link to breakfast room;
- Replacement of ceilings with dry linings;
- Replacement of surface mounted services to improve appearance;
- Recovering asphalt flat roofs to match;
- Works to retaining walls in courtyard including new balustrades and steps with landing;
- Replacement of non-original fences, and security barriers;
- Creation of a new riverside terrace by the proposed annexe; and
- Replacing doors to tower entrance, caretaker's flat and others to match.

12. Officers consider that the principle issues to consider are as follows:

- The works of demolition, restoration and alteration of part of the grade II Listed Florey Building;
- The impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area;
- The impact of the new building and link on the setting and context of the existing listed building; and
- Further information that would be secured by condition.

Policy Background

13. The application site is a grade II listed building in the St. Clement's And Iffley Road Conservation Area.

14. Conservation principles, policy and practice seek to preserve and enhance the value of heritage assets.

15. The Government sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development and explains that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of this. The National Planning Policy Framework NPPF sets out twelve core planning principles that should underpin decision making (paragraph 17). Amongst those are to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations.

16. The NPPF in Annex 2 defines heritage significance as:

'The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations is because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.' It defines the setting of a heritage asset as: 'the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may

make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.’

17. The NPPF stresses the desirability of avoiding or minimising any conflict between the conservation of a heritage asset and a proposal (para 129), requires great weight to be placed on the asset’s conservation and clear and convincing justification for any harm (para 132) [Recent case law (Barnwell) has demonstrated that this responsibility should be given special consideration] and that harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use (para 134).
18. The NPPF states that regarding the great weight that should be given to the asset’s conservation ‘the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be’.
19. The 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act requires the Local Planning Authority to have special regard to preserving the building or its setting when considering whether to grant planning permission or listed building consent (section 66).

Assessment of impacts:

20. Considering the Florey Building’s internationally recognised importance, any interventions proposed for this building need to be handled in an extremely sympathetic manner so as to maintain its significance. Consideration of the building’s significance has been undertaken in the design development of these proposals.

External

21. Restoration and modernisation is essential for the preservation of the building. Building failure is a major consideration. Unfortunately, although the dramatic form is exceptionally successful and the ideas and concept are realised, the practical application of the radical ideas had several failures. The building has needed substantial repair and upgrading for some time and the study rooms have always been cold in winter and too hot in summer; the building is difficult to heat. The external walls are clad in red tiles which in places are coming away from the fixing material and there are white streaks; the concrete is streaked in places. The tiles have all been checked and many may more come off from the building surface, thus posing a risk.
22. To the courtyard, inner elevation, the later secondary glazing would be removed, being an improvement, and would be replaced with double glazing to closely match the original glazing bars. Although double glazing is very rarely appropriate for listed buildings, with some C20th buildings it can be argued that the original design intent is paramount rather than the fabric itself. Stirling himself used off the shelf windows here not bespoke windows. The replacement glazing would closely match the profile width, the glazing pane modules and the fenestration pattern which maintains the cascade effect. The stepped ledges between each storey at 1st, 2nd and 3rd floors were originally tiled and

accentuated the cascade effect by framing them in red. This visual effect has been lost as the college has removed those tiles and introduced new flashing; the flashing would be replaced with new profiled aluminium to the original profile and matching red colour which would reinstate this delineation of the floors.

23. The riverside terrace would be restored and part of the riverside walk reactivated, much improving this very neglected area
24. The impact of the repairs and landscaping on the Conservation Area would be a local improvement as the condition of these does detract from the appreciation of the Heritage Asset. The impacts of the annexe are discussed below.

Internal

25. The project aims to provide a highly sustainable design with low maintenance. The solution must resolve the engineering and fabric deficiencies including the roof, insulation, heating and fenestration and remove problems associated with condensation, damp penetration and the acoustic separation between rooms.
26. Although the interior is simpler, it does have significance as much of this is original and illustrates the original design intent, thus has historical illustrative value. The proposals are for original internal décor and fittings in the student rooms are to be lost. Further consideration should be given to the retention of some of the timber detailing and original fabrics in the refurbished rooms, as well as some elements of the original colour scheme.
27. The structural support for the new mezzanine floor between 4th and 5th floors is kept well back from the façade and limits the impact on that façade. New opening lights would have flush glazing lines and the vent glass would not be framed with silver coloured metal, thus reducing the impacts. The requirement to provide fire and acoustic separation does require some intervention but this has been kept to the minimum.
28. The reduction in the number of proposed heritage rooms (from six to three heritage duplex rooms) came from Historic England's suggestion in order to reduce the impact of the infill accommodation on the ground floor. This also has the benefit of keeping to the original design intent of the bedrooms being on upper floors. This has reduced the depth of the ground floor infill by one metre, moving the outer edge back from the edge of the soffit of the main building above. It was agreed that three heritage rooms was on balance a reasonable number to record.
29. The conversion of bedrooms to en-suites would improve the welfare for students and is viewed by colleges as an important requirement. However this does result in loss of original fabric. It is hoped that more of the original fabric could be retained as appropriate.
30. Dining space for students in the breakfast room is insufficient and there is a limit to the settings. Placing a new kitchen and dining room capable of seating 100 students also allows for the breakfast room to be converted to a common room, which was missing from the original design.

31. Some services are built into the fabric such as underfloor central heating and replacing these would require major interventions.
32. There are other matters of detail that are not addressed and these would be secured by conditions.

Proposed linked annexe building and its impacts:

33. A design competition was commissioned by the College and the winning architects were chosen because of their previous experience of restoring and adapting 20th century heritage buildings such as the Isokon building in Camden. At competition stage, taller buildings were proposed by other architects and these were rejected as causing too much harm to the setting of the Florey Building. The College has consulted the 20th Century Society and others and had pre-application discussions with Historic England and the Conservation Officer. These have resulted in improved proposals although the Society has concerns, as set out above.
34. The proposed annexe would be located to the west of the Florey, would have two storeys and a glazed link to the main building.
35. The new block is the minimum size to fulfil its brief. Housing all the under graduates in one building means that there are no student rooms in the annexe, thus reducing its size, thus reducing the impact on the listed building. The design and approach to the new annexe addresses the main form and design of the Florey Building, however the annexe allows us to differentiate between the new and the old, as different volumes, without competing or being too bold or radical, which would distract. The scale and massing responds to that of the Florey without competing with it.
36. The form of the annexe would be a two-storey elongated rectangle with splayed front entrance which refers to the canted bay characteristic of the Florey, The glazed link between the buildings is designed to be as simple and lightweight as possible so to help this sense of separation.
37. The annexe has been designed to match the spacing and pattern of the main building. The annexe's footprint is elongated due to site constraints and the major Thames sewer running down York Place. The building has been kept as far away from the main building as possible to reduce the impacts on it. The end splayed wall has a large window with a cantilevered main entry below, and this splayed angle addresses the Florey's projecting end stairs and addresses the Florey. The width of the link block is dictated by the slope of the land and the space required to

accommodate ramped access. Although there will be some loss of heritage material, this has been kept to the minimum. The link would pass underneath the Florey volume, set away from it so as to appear separate.

38. The use of a complementary cladding material but different colour scheme is in

line with the pre-application advice to the applicant which stressed the need to differentiate the building from the listed building in material terms, in a similar way that Stirling's History Faculty Library in Cambridge contrasts with the concrete buildings surrounding it on the Sidgwick site.

39. The rain screen cladding would be ribbed terracotta tiles in reddish-black. This cladding would be in large panels, expressed by construction joint subdivisions, being suppressed construction joint subdivisions with vertical ribs, thus would appear as vertical cladding in three horizontal bands. This would contrast in a subtle way with the Florey Building's vitrified terracotta tile panels subdivided into grids. The tiles of the Florey have a more horizontal emphasis whereas those of the annexe have a more vertical emphasis. The glazing system would have planar windows, flush with the terracotta cladding designed to be read as part of the outer cladding, thus giving the appearance of sharp lines and sheer surfaces. The doors and windows would have black silicone bonded frames with flush glazing methods. The roof would be a green roof with biodiversity benefits and a reference to the green of the meadows nearby.
40. Another way that the annexe would contrast with the Florey would be the asymmetrical placing of some of the large windows, whereas the Florey is symmetrically designed with a strict grid pattern.
41. The size, scale, and design of the annexe and its impacts on conservation area have been carefully considered. The proposed annexe would be positioned away from the main axis, which is from St Clement's Street. (Stirling designed the main axis to be from the Cherwell side; however the riverside walk was never completed.) The location would minimise the annexe's impacts and any harm on key sightlines. Views towards the Florey would in parts would be partly obscured by the new building and our appreciation of it (and its silhouette) would be harmed in places; however the loss of views have been kept to a minimum.
42. Longer views from St Clement's would not be altered as the annexe would not be visible from there. The unsightly traffic barriers would be replaced with a boom barrier and the walls restored with improved ground treatment. Regarding the impacts on the conservation area, although the Florey is substantial, it has the appearance of being tucked away from the main frontages of St Clement's Street. Its rear elevation can be partially seen and its staircase towers are a prominent feature in views from St Clement's, however due to the location of the annexe this would have no impact on views from the main road. Although part of the main building is visible across the river, the glazing reflects the trees and reduces its impact on the river setting; it would be visible looking across the Cherwell but only to a lesser degree. From the north east and the bridge the annexe would be slightly visible however there is substantial foliage. As the Florey is already completely different in scale and character from the rest of that part of the conservation area, the two-storey annexe was carefully designed to complement and not compete with the Florey and cannot be said to have a detrimental effect on the character or appearance of the conservation area.
43. The glazed front stairway at the front entrance references Stirling's stairs and windows, which appear to break out from their volumes. The annexe's height,

treatment and colour would be subservient to and also refer to the Florey.

44. Regarding the impacts on the setting of the listed Florey Building, there would be a partial loss of views towards it and the full appreciation of its silhouette would be harmed to a lesser extent in some areas. Our appreciation of its original conception would be altered by the intervention in some views. It is considered that there would be no impact on the Grade II listed 27 St Clement's.
45. The Florey Building roof is visible from South Park, being situated in a dip in the land by the river. There may be some impacts on this view from the proposed plant and by photovoltaic roof panels and details of these would be required by condition so as to minimise any adverse impacts. Photovoltaic panels have improved greatly and it is possible to obtain these that are not shiny or reflect bright sunlight. It is not considered that these would be visible from elsewhere such as from the meadows or St Clement's as these elements would be in the middle of the roof.
46. Regarding the improved conference facilities, College has stated that the cost of servicing the rooms and buildings is in excess of the income received from students for their accommodation. Bringing in conferences to College is needed to reduce the financial burden and allows College to subsidise students. The refurbished and extended Florey would enable greater income from conferences.
47. The Oxford Design Review Panel (ODRP)'s comments have been taken on board including that the annexe should not compete or replicate the original building; making the annexe's shade of red tile cladding to be different from the Florey and showing how the public realm is connected to the context, retention of heritage rooms and not planting trees in the courtyard. ODRP questioned whether the opening into the quadrangle could be reduced. Stirling's intended that students would arrive from the river side thus this opening was a minor access point into the service yard and car park area. This concept was not realised as the access is from York Place thus there is justification for widening the route into the quadrangle. Historic England's comments were taken on board, in particular moving accommodation from the undercroft into more of the duplex rooms, being less harmful. This contrasts with the 20th Century Society's objection to the loss of further heritage rooms than originally discussed. The retention of more internal heritage features and further details on several matters would be secured by condition. The ground floor accommodation was made more organic in form. However Historic England's suggestion that the annexe be clad in a similar shade of red, which the ODRP did not support, was not carried out. The ODRP commented that the design of the annexe was more compelling and shows architectural merit in its own right and could be braver by emphasising the materials' colour texture and scale more and making the annexe appear more confident in its own right.
48. Regarding the Society's comment that the perceived separation of elements that the view of sky between the building and pods beneath confers is vitally important to the design ethos of the space, and the Society's request that the Council seek assurances that it is the intentions of the applicants to maintain these views the response is that the architects have confirmed that the view of the sky between

the building and the pods has been mostly retained.

Landscape and public realm:

49. The landscaping is addressed within the planning permission however it is an important part of Stirling's design and is part of the setting of the listed building. Various later additions such as chain-link fencing, the car parking arrangements, general neglect and unsympathetic treatment have harmed the setting. The truncated riverside walk appears neglected. The fact that the building was designed to address the river, but does not, means that the entrance is to the rear of the building. The landscape proposals such as new gates would improve the setting however there is a lack of detail in this regard, which would be secured by planning conditions.
50. A new ramp would be constructed out of part of the steps to the riverside thus improving access; although this is a change to Stirling's design it would not harm this part or the setting and is in the spirit of his design intent to improve access to the river and how the building addresses the river.

Conclusion:

51. The Council has weighed the balance between harm and benefit. A degree of harm, less than substantial but not insignificant, would be caused to the significance of the heritage asset. However, the public benefit of housing the entire first year of undergraduates in the building and improving their welfare outweighs this harm. Any harm caused has clear and convincing justification.
52. In addition, the Florey Building and its landscape require specialist conservation and upgrading. Any harm to the building's significance would be kept to the minimum and any historic material removed would be recorded. The special architectural and historic interest of the listed building would be conserved. The landscape would be improved. Any harm caused to the conservation area has been minimised and the character and appearance of the conservation area would be preserved. The proposals are considered to comply with national and local policies.

Human Rights Act 1998

Officers have considered the Human Rights Act 1998 in reaching a recommendation to grant listed building consent subject to conditions. Officers have considered the potential interference with the rights of the owners/occupiers of surrounding properties under Article 8 and/or Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Act and consider that it is proportionate.

Officers have also considered the interference with the human rights of the applicant under Article 8 and/or Article 1 of the First Protocol caused by imposing conditions. Officers consider that the conditions are necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others and to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest. The interference is therefore justifiable and proportionate.

Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998

Officers have considered, with due regard, the likely effect of the proposal on the need to reduce crime and disorder as part of the determination of this application, in accordance with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. In reaching a recommendation to grant Listed Building Consent officers consider that the proposal will not undermine crime prevention or the promotion of community safety.

Background Papers:

- The Statutory List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest
- 'Good Practice Advice' (GPA) Advice guides, Historic England
- 'Conservation Principles', Historic England, 2008
- 'Oxford, an Architectural Guide', G Tyack, OUP, 1998
- 'The Buildings of England: Oxfordshire', J Sherwood and N Pevsner, Penguin, 1975
- 'Jim Stirling and the Red Trilogy: Three Radical Buildings', ed. Berman, Frances Lincoln Ltd, 2010
- The St Clement's and Iffley Road Conservation Appraisal, Oxford City Council
- Character Appraisal: St Clement's, section 2, Oxford City Council
- The Florey Building Conservation Statement, by Alan Berman, Architect, October 2013

Contact Officer: Katharine Owen

Extension: 2148

Date: 4 April 2016