

COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee: Main Planning

Ward: Micklegate

Date: 24 June 2010

Parish: Micklegate Planning Panel

Reference: 10/00614/LBC

Application at: West Offices Station Rise York YO1 6HT

For: Refurbishment and extension of former York railway station and station hotel to form new offices/headquarters for City of York

By: York Investors LLP

Application Type: Listed Building Consent

Target Date: 4 June 2010

Recommendation: Approve after referral to Secretary of State

1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 The application relates to the West Offices site. The offices are accommodated in what was York's original railway station and former station hotel, which are grade 2 star listed buildings within the Central Historic Core conservation area. The station opened in 1841, at that time it comprised of arrival (City Walls side) and departure (Tanner Row side) platforms linked by a cross platform. The hotel was a later addition, which opened in 1853. In 1877 when the new station opened, the old station and the hotel were converted into offices.

1.2 This application is for part demolition, internal and external alterations, required in conjunction with the proposal to convert the building into modern offices. The amount of office floorspace will be increased from 10,057 sq m to 16,731 sq m. To achieve this it is proposed to replace later additions to the arrivals platform building with a 4-storey extension and install 3 extra levels of office space above ground floor level between the platform buildings. The two bridge links between the platform buildings will be removed, the remaining part of the train shed roof would be relocated and a new arched roof, with a 'saw tooth' profile, added between the platform buildings. The proposals also involve the removal of internal partitions and landscaping changes in the garden area and along Station Rise.

1.3 The significant alterations to the host building are as follows -

DEPARTURE PLATFORM (eastern/Tanner Row side)

1.4 The departure platform building was originally 2-storey and accommodated a booking office, waiting rooms and offices at ground floor level, with further offices and a boardroom above. Originally the building was symmetrical, apart from its end blocks (the NE end having 5 1st floor windows, and the SE 3). Between the end blocks, the facade facing Tanner Row consisted of the central booking office with round headed openings and ashlar masonry at ground floor level and arched windows above, which was flanked by 2 blocks with colonnades at ground floor level and 5 rectangular windows above.

1.5 An additional floor was added for further office accommodation in 1854. The building was again extended to the SE in the 1870's, when a single storey toilet block

was added. A further storey was added to the toilet block in 1927, and the SE end extended again in the C20, with 2-storey flat roof additions of white/red brick.

1.6 It is proposed to demolish part of the building on the SE end, removing the toilet block and later extensions, including the 3-storey annexe building that fronts onto Toft Green. On the internal side, the original elevation is partially hidden by an extension which projects over the platform area. This addition is clad in white and red brick, and has a ground floor colonnade, formed by brick arches. It is proposed to remove this extension, which is thought to have been added circa 1879, when the buildings were adapted for office use.

ARRIVAL PLATFORM (west/city walls side)

1.7 The arrival platform was originally single storey and provided refreshment rooms. On the external elevation this area is where the red brick begins and travels SW, including the area where there are 7 round/arched headed openings and then the 3 flat-headed rectangular windows below horizontal rectangular windows. In 1850 the building was extended at ground floor level to the SW, and an upper floor was added, above the 7 round headed windows, creating offices for GNE railways. There are further later extensions to the SW, added in the late C19 after relocation of the railway station, and again in the mid C20 when the bridge links were added.

1.8 Partial demolition of the NW wing is proposed. The hotel building, refreshment block and GNE offices would remain, with later additions to the SW replaced with a 4-storey extension.

HOTEL/CROSS PLATFORM

1.9 The hotel was originally 1 room deep at ground floor level, whilst on the upper floors there were two rows of rooms and a central corridor. The rear range was supported by iron columns and bridged over the cross platform. The ground floor area of the hotel was extended over the cross platform (infilling the area below the supported upper floors) after 1877, when the buildings were converted to offices. It is proposed to remove part of said wall and expose the columns which support the upper floors, thus returning to the original configuration.

PLATFORMS AND TRAIN SHED

1.10 The train shed roof was originally divided into two aisles, covering each platform and the associated tracks, with a gap in the centre. The roof was extended circa 1845 when the platforms were lengthened and truncated to accommodate the hotel, which was added in 1850's. Part of the train shed was removed in the 1950's, when the two bridges, which link the arrival and departure blocks, were added and again in 1966, when Hudson House was built. The remainder of the shed roof is presently covered in timber, with a glazed area near each ridge. The roof covering is modern. It is thought that originally the roof was covered in slate (laid on timber boards) and the upper area glazed. The roof finish has been altered over time and by 1873 it is thought the roof was largely covered with timber boarding.

1.11 It is proposed to re-locate the train shed to the SE end of the building where it would be seen from the city walls. The train shed would act as a cycle store and 'break out' space for office workers.

1.12 The train tracks and turntables have been removed and the platforms altered. It is proposed to have a level ground floor area by extending the platform level over the area formerly occupied by the railway lines.

TIMBER HUTS

1.12 When the railway station closed, several wooden huts were added between the departure block and Tanner Row, as a temporary means of accommodating further office space. One of the huts remain. The hut has been altered to the extent that none of the facades have their original appearance and internal fittings/furnishings have been removed. It is proposed to re-locate the hut off-site.

2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Development Plan Allocation:

Areas of Archaeological Interest GMS Constraints: City Centre Area 0006

Conservation Area GMS Constraints: Central Historic Core CONF

City Boundary GMS Constraints: York City Boundary 0001

Listed Buildings GMS Constraints:

- Grade 2 Star; York Old Station And Hotel Toft Green 0103
- Grade 2; Gates, Gate Piers And Railings To Old Station Toft 0105
- Grade 2; Main Gates And Wicket Gates To North East Railway 0104
- Grade 2 Star; North East Railway War Memorial Station Rise 0102

Scheduled Ancient Monuments GMS Constraints: City Walls

2.2 Policies:

CYHE4 Listed Buildings

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

INTERNAL

DESIGN, CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

3.1 Support the scheme. Officers consider that the historic importance of the building's use as an early railway station is generally not understood from its current appearance. From the public realm there is no hint of the train shed. Main views of the site are from the city walls, from where the building appears as an additive collection of different structures, built over a century. The 1950's structures, with the large felted mono-pitch roofs of the bridge links dominate the foreground views, with a series of earlier hipped roofs at different levels visible beyond. These, and views of the car parking areas around the building dominate the landscape.

3.2 The proposals represent a significant opportunity to improve the appearance of the building within the conservation area. Importantly the scheme design would assist in elucidating the previous use of the building by removing the later accretions and exposing the relocated train shed canopy. Also the public function to the building and the new role would allow it to reclaim its civic presence within the city. By reinstating the former entrance sequence to the east -through the gateway off Station Rise, into the former centrally located Booking Office - the architectural and historic importance of the building would be better revealed.

3.3 Overall officers support the scheme, it accords with the Government's overall objectives for the historic environment and heritage assets as set out in the new planning policy statement PPS 5. In particular the proposals would enable a public use, of importance to York and its citizens, to be returned to this pioneering historic building and secure its long-term future. The civic nature of the new use would take advantage of the existing spatial qualities of the building, its site and its location, and would better reveal the significance of the structure. Any harm is considered to be outweighed by long term conservation of the asset for public benefit.

3.4 Detailed comments on each aspect of the scheme are as follows -

INTERNAL AREAS

3.5 The ad-hoc historic development of the offices has resulted in awkward relationships between levels. It is proposed to create an accessible flexible working environment by reusing the central zone previously fully enclosed by the train shed canopy. This central area would function as the main connector between the wings and former hotel, in a similar way to the previous platforms, and allow level access through the introduction of lifts. The lifts would be located in positions chosen to overcome the most awkward juxtapositions of floor levels. Unfortunately one of these locations is within the area of the remaining train shed canopy.

3.6 It is important that the interior design of the ground floor central area is developed to further public understanding of its historic use; in particular co-ordination of setting out positions of the columns, the layout of ground floor uses, the definition of the platform zone, and the choice of finishes will be important.

3.7 Internally the distinction between the new and old structures is reinforced by the lightwells which provide a gap between the platform walls of the former railway station and hotel, and the outer edges of the new floor-plates and detailing of the abutments between the bridges and the historic fabric can also help to separate the structures visually. Removal of later paint layers on historic facades will further assist in unifying the appearance of the earlier walls and in distinguishing them from new fabric.

3.8 The fire-engineering strategy has been developed to allow cross ventilation between different zones of the building. The majority of the windows are shown as being retained, overhauled and upgraded to improve their thermal and acoustic performance. It has been agreed that windows will not be reinstated where they have previously been removed and that some of the newly internalized windows could be removed into storage if further openness and inter-visibility is required between the

general office areas. Where this is the case it is important that architraves are retained as their loss would undermine the architectural integrity of the historic interiors.

3.9 Doors have been the subject of a separate schedule as there are few remaining historic internal doors which have not been significantly altered and many of the doors are C20th replacements. The pattern of doors is most consistent in the hotel. There are a variety of external doors as elevations have been altered and added-to over several decades. Notwithstanding the proposals put forward, it is important to rationalize the use of historic doors in meaningful places according to type and fit. The design of new doors should also be the subject of condition.

TRAIN SHED CANOPY

3.10 The presence of the train shed canopy is essential to our understanding of the building as a former railway station. Originally the train shed was a highly visible part of the complex. The early design had a hipped roof canopy supported by a colonnade forming the end screens on the open sides. The canopy was truncated when the hotel was built to the NE and the other arcade was lost when the canopy was extended southwards beyond the station buildings. At an early stage the central open section between the tracks was covered-in and the glazed sections over the centre of the trusses were raised to allow for ventilation. These alterations were minor though compared to the mid C20th destruction of the majority of the structure.

3.11 Retaining the remaining train shed in its current location poses difficulties for the new use, as horizontal connectivity of the building's upper levels would be compromised, a lift position could not be achieved where most required and the new central volume would be pushed outside the wings of the building. The canopy would be further hidden from public view by being concealed within the new structure. Although dismantling the structure is considered harmful to the building, its proposed re-erection - on its existing alignment but outside the wings of the enclosed area where sections of canopy would have been - is considered to constitute less than severe harm in terms of policy HE 9 in PPS 5 (see 4.4). The new location would re-establish its presence in a highly visible location close to the former arrival and departure wings. In this place the train shed would enhance public understanding of the origins of the building.

3.12 The specialist report supplied with the application implies that the structure could be dismantled and re-erected without harm. Officers advise further investigations will be necessary to establish the sequence of work and a full recording in-situ will be required. Further thought to the final presentation of the proposed new structure is necessary, covering -

- Any new elements required to provide security (such as railings) should be set well back from the outer perimeter of the canopy, and be light-weight in appearance to reduce their visual effect.
- In order to alleviate pressure on the space under the canopy, consideration should be given to providing some of the cycle storage against the retaining wall opposite the staff entrance.
- The relationship between the canopy and surrounding structures needs to be better defined.

- The treatment of canopy sides and roof require further detailed work to ensure seating connections are other details are faithfully copied. Recreating the solid support wall and using a mixed solid and glazed roof covering both together might unacceptably reduce the light within the office area. However the proposal for redesigning the roof covering as part of the public art strategy also causes some concern with respect to potential loss of historic design intention.

EXTENSIONS

3.13 A new extension would be added to the south west of the former refreshment block, replacing the 1950s extensions. The existing block is of several builds reflecting the continued expansion and alteration of this wing and the elevation facing the city walls employs different types of brick (buff/yellow gault & red) and windows demonstrate varied floor to ceiling heights and different scales. Whilst the south east facing elevation has unified architectural expression befitting of the principal elevation, the northwest elevation demonstrates a pragmatic approach to function.

3.14 The replacement extension would continue the existing building concept of having the outer U-form of solid massing. The height is dictated by the desire to have an efficient building volume with effective relationships between accommodation areas. It would be no higher than the former hotel. The design would continue to use hipped roofs, repetitive vertical windows, cill bands and overhanging eaves; and it would be constructed in matching gault brick with stone dressings. Within this framework of continuity contemporary detailing would be employed. This approach is considered to respect the fundamental architectural design of the building.

ROOF FORM

3.15 The concept of providing the additional accommodation under a new roof in the central area depends on there being a clear distinction between the superstructure and the side wings, and also between the centrally inserted floor-plates and the newly internalised elevations of the historic structure.

3.16 The new roof has been expressed as a shallow arch. It is not a single span structure typical of late railway buildings, but a simple roof covering over the new office area. The supporting columns allow the roof edge to be cantilevered out towards the side walls in order to avoid taking support from the existing structure. This would enable the existing cornice lines to "be read" within the central space and the walls would be free of new structure. Unfortunately due to the height of the new roof and the need for a wide gutter at this point it would not be possible to provide a lighter connection.

3.17 The roof itself adopts a saw-tooth form to provide opening north lights with safe access for maintenance and cleaning. Rooflights would be expressed as continuous panels rather than as individual windows. The outward facing deep section of the roof is set well back from the southwest elevation so the roof presents a sharper thinner edge capping to the glazed end elevation. This device should reduce the visual weight of the roof when seen in relation to the side wings. The horizontal brise-soleil which appears to overlap the SE wing should be redesigned to maintain the separation gap between the two structures.

ENGLISH HERITAGE (EH)

3.18 Welcome proposals as the building is underused and this redevelopment will secure its long-term future. EH consider that a key change is the re-location of the train shed canopy. Comments are also made regarding integration of the new floorspace that would sit between the existing buildings.

3.19 EH consider the harm of relocating the remainder of the original train shed canopy will be 'less than substantial'. EH support the change, on the grounds that the canopy would be relocated to where part of the structure was once located, and public views of the structure are enabled. Further details are asked for, in due course, of the re-erection of the structure and the means of enclosure.

3.20 The additional floorspace in the courtyard is also considered a sensitive matter. EH support the proposal, as submitted, which involves bridge links to unite the extra space and the platform buildings. It is felt that the proposal allows the internal facades of the original buildings to be read as architectural elements in their own right.

COUNCIL FOR BRITISH ARCHAEOLOGY (CBA)

3.21 Support the re-use of the building, which removes unsightly later additions. Comments made regard the re-location of the train shed. CBA note that the shed as existing has been altered substantially - the original roof has been replaced; it is in part encased in a later building (at the back of the hotel) and has been affected by the installation of service ducts. The proposal to relocate will enable the shed to be seen from the public realm and would sit where part of the shed once did. Further details have been requested regarding the re-building of the structure and proposed roof materials, which could be secured as a condition of consent.

ANCIENT MONUMENTS SOCIETY (AMS)

3.22 Welcome the Council's decision to move its offices to this important site. AMS see this as a commitment to historic buildings within the City of York and a means of ensuring a sustainable future of one of York's major 19th-century buildings. AMS do not formally object, but do have concerns over the design of the roof, the extension to the NW range, and the footprint and height of the hotel building (which is the subject of a separate application).

- Roof - the idea of a glazed light-weight roof over the area of the former platforms is a proposal AMS would support as one with great potential. However AMS consider the proposed roof appears 'rather heavy', and it would have a poor relationship to the original cornice of the existing side wings. AMS believe that a good conservation principle would be to keep the new roof and floors visually separate from the solid existing structure.

- The proposed north-west range, which would replace buildings of little interest, is considered to be a storey too high and is heavy in appearance in brickwork with a vertical emphasis. Either a reproduction of the south-west range or a modern glazed structure would be more appropriate. The height of the proposed new north-west

range will unbalance the symmetrical plan, especially when the whole site is seen from the City Walls.

- The proposed hotel scheme is too close to the south-west range of the station building. It is also far too high and dominant within the setting of the listed building upon which it makes a significantly adverse impact. The hotel (separate application) would block the fine view of the well detailed low south-west range by passing close in front of it.

20TH CENTURY SOCIETY

3.23 No response.

GEORGIAN GROUP

3.24 No comments as buildings constructed after 1840.

VICTORIAN SOCIETY

3.25 Formally object to the proposals in their current form due to the proposed roof and glazed end elevation. Otherwise there is support for the scheme in principle as the building has been subject to alterations that have been detrimental to its historic interest and it is presently underused. The proposal allows many of the inappropriate alterations to be reversed and a single owner will occupy the building, securing its long-term future. Detailed comments are as follows -

- Relocated train shed canopy - Ask that there be some enclosure to each side of the canopy, to re-create the sense of the original context. In particular on the south side and it is considered the hotel wall does not achieve this.

- Roof - The design of the atrium roof is deemed inappropriate. The society understand the reason for referencing railway architecture and the north light roof has logic both architecturally and environmentally but the current design is inelegant and misconceived. The design references stations such as York, St Pancras and Kings Cross which have barrel vaulted train sheds. These are a very different type of station design to York Old Station which is a rectiplanar structure. It is recommended that the atrium roof is constructed of horizontal triangular trusses rather than curved trusses. Even if a curved roof were considered appropriate, the proposal fails to deliver the impressive sweep of an unsupported arch that one would find at a real station. From the city walls the roof looks more like it belongs to an out of town business unit or retail park. This impression is not helped by the design of the glazed end wall with its over-scaled projecting rectangular arches.

- The zinc cladding (to the roof) is likely to be highly reflective and will be too prominent when seen from the city walls or across the city. Such a large roof in an incongruous material will detract from the mellow aspect of the existing buildings and will have a considerable and detrimental visual impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. A darker and less reflective material should be used, for example, terne coated steel which has the same tonal qualities as the existing roof on the former station and other historic buildings in the conservation area.

PROTECTION OF ANCIENT BUILDINGS SOCIETY

3.26 No response.

MICKLEGATE PLANNING PANEL

3.27 Object on the following grounds -

- The overall roof/ atrium in the centre of the building is too high and obtrusive. The style seems to be a vague imitation of that of the main railway station which dates from around 30-40 years later than the West Offices, and seems to jar somewhat with the architecture of the earlier building. The Panel also felt that the overall quality of the design was poor.
- Disappointed about the extent to which the original features of the old railway station within the "quadrangle" of the main building - including the original canopies and platforms - are to be removed, relocated or concealed as part of the development. Ask for a more imaginative design to preserve these features in a meaningful and visible form.
- The trees on the SE boundary of the site are vital to the setting of this part of the West Offices and should be replaced with appropriate species.

YORK CIVIC TRUST

3.28 The Trust support the proposals, the following comments have been made over particular aspects of the scheme -

- Train Shed - ask that the roof glazed, replicating the original appearance of the glass and that the sides be spaced away from surrounding buildings, i.e. it should not be attached to the proposed hotel.
- NW extension - the extension appears contrived, in particular due to the bay windows on the end of the elevation which appear out of place. The preference would be to have a glazing pattern which is respectful of the remainder of this elevation.
- Car Parking - understand the approach for limited car parking but feel there is space for further vehicle spaces to the NW of the building. Further spaces could be provided for pool cars, or those using green technology.
- Station Rise - the area between West Offices and Cedar Court Hotel demands high quality design and presentation. It is felt further thought needs to be put into the landscaping scheme for this area.

CONSERVATION AREAS ADVISORY PANEL (CAAP)

3.29 Overall CAAP support the scheme. However comments have been made with regards the train shed roof. Whilst of the opinion that overall there was a net gain in relocation of the train shed, using the whole area as a cycle shed and excluding the

public from benefiting from viewing the roof was not the best use of the space. CAAP suggest that the new wall supporting the roof replicates the original wall.

YORK GEORGIAN SOCIETY

3.30 Object to the proposals due to the proposed re-location and use of the train shed canopy. In the opinion of the society, it is considered the chosen approach is contrary to national planning policy established in PPS5: Planning for the Historic Environment, as the development would lead to substantial harm to the heritage asset, and an alternative design/approach could be less harmful.

3.31 To dismantle the surviving original roof structure and re-erect it as cycle storage at the end of the new office block will remove all vestiges of the original platforms and track-bed, and the characteristic elements which define the original station will be obliterated. Its architectural significance and historic integrity will be compromised unacceptably and all evidence of its original function will be lost. In particular, to demolish and relocate the existing trainshed and relegate it to use as a bicycle shed is inappropriate and demeaning to an important part of the historic fabric of the building.

3.32 Alternatively the society suggest the floor layout be amended so the structure could remain in-situ. This could occur alongside information regarding the original function of the structure and the platforms. Such treatment would be exemplary, meeting an objective of PPS5, "to contribute to our knowledge and understanding of our past by ensuring that opportunities are taken to capture evidence from the historic environment and to make this publicly available".

3.33 Otherwise, whilst not as desirable, the relocated trainshed structure should be used as a public space where the story and function of the old station explained. Such treatment would be preferable to designating it for bicycle storage and while not compliant in quite such an exemplary way with the Government Objective cited, would go part-way towards meeting it.

PUBLICITY

3.34 Deadline for comments was 26.5.2010. Two letters have been received. Objections have been made on the following grounds:-

- It is considered the train shed roof structure is of significant historic interest, it should be retained in situ, and not used as a cycle store. In addition the proposed roof, due to its style also affects the historic understanding of the building.
- The proposals do not retain enough features of the present architecture in the departure area (courtyard) to give sufficient historical preservation of the original railway station.

3.35 In addition to the statutory publicity, prior to submission the applicants held public exhibition in March 2010. Comments from the exhibition are summarised as -

- Support for re-use of the site.

- Design too modern, and concern over the impact/prominence of the new roof, due to its height and the SW elevation due to its height and proximity to the city walls.
- Object to loss of internal fabric (the track levels and platform should remain distinguished) and re-location of train shed canopy (which loses its integrity due to re-location, proximity to the proposed hotel and the proposed use as a cycle store).

3.36 Letters were also received from The Georgian Society, Railway & Canal Historical Society, and Yorkshire Architectural and Archaeological Society.

3.37 The York Georgian Society and the Yorkshire Architectural and Archaeological Society both raised concerns over the impact on the original remaining fabric of the building. Of note the train-shed, and the platforms and the sunken track-bed, the latter would be overlaid to create a level floor. The preference is that these elements are retained in-situ and incorporated into the proposed building, to preserve the historic and architectural importance of the listed building.

4.0 APPRAISAL

KEY ISSUES

4.1 Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require that in considering whether to grant listed building consent for development that affects a listed building or its setting, the LPA (local planning authority) shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

4.2 PPS5: Planning for the Historic Environment establishes national planning policy with regards to 'heritage assets', which includes listed buildings. The policy makes a presumption in favour of conservation, alterations must be justified. However PPS5 advises that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term. Where a proposal has a harmful impact on the significance of a designated heritage asset which is less than substantial harm, LPA's should weigh the public benefit of the proposal against the harm; and recognize that the greater the harm to the significance of the heritage asset the greater the justification will be needed for any loss.

4.3 When change is proposed it is the responsibility of the LPA to consider whether any adverse impact on the listed building is out-weighed by heritage benefits. The English Heritage guidance note to PPS5 advises such benefits, which can weigh in favour of a scheme, can be when a proposal -

- Sustains or enhances the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting.
- Reduces or removes risks to a heritage asset.
- Secures the optimum viable use of a heritage asset in support of its long term conservation.
- Makes a positive contribution to economic vitality and sustainable communities.

- Is an appropriate design for its context and makes a positive contribution to the appearance, character, quality and local distinctiveness of the historic environment.
- It better reveals the significance of a heritage asset and therefore enhances our enjoyment of it and the sense of place.

WHETHER ANY ADVERSE IMPACT ON THE LISTED BUILDING

DEMOLITION

4.4 Listed building consent is sought to demolish the SE end of the departure wing, the C20 office accommodation extension which fronts onto Tanner Row, an extension to the internal side of the departure building, which covers over the original elevation, the lower 2-storey additions on the SW/arrivals wing, and the two bridge links between the platform buildings, added after the 1950's. These later ad-hoc additions to the original buildings were introduced when the building was in operation as offices do not contribute to the understanding of the original use. They are functional areas with little, if any historic/architectural importance. The demolition works are supported as they integral to allowing the proposed re-use and assist in revealing the original station layout.

NEW SW WING, SOUTH (GLAZED) ELEVATION AND THE NEW ROOF

4.5 In assessing the visual impact and relationship to the listed building of the new elements, the justification/design approach for these elements has been considered (whether the resultant building is fit for purpose), along with the scale and shape, detailing, and materials of the proposed extensions. Part HE7 of PPS5 advises that LPA's should take into account the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to the character and distinctiveness of the local environment. The English Heritage guidance note to PPS5 advises that a building's contribution to its setting can be sustained or enhanced if new buildings are carefully designed to respect their setting by virtue of their scale, proportion, height, massing, alignment and use of materials.

4.6 The buildings to be demolished on the SW wing are subordinate in scale to the part of the building to be retained and are generally inconsistent in terms of the roof shape and finish and the arrangement and proportion of windows. The proposed extension's scale is comparable to the hotel building and the taller part of the departure wing opposite. The eaves level, around 15m from ground level, is around the same height as the flat roof of Hudson House where it is 4-storey. The extension does step up in eaves and ridge height from the part of the wing which is to be retained, but this is necessary to gain the required extra floorspace to be provided and can accommodate additional services w/c accommodation, avoiding the need to retro-fit the latter into the listed building. It is considered the new building, in terms of its massing, proportion and overall scale, will not appear over-dominant and will not detract from the setting of the listed building.

4.7 The extension will be of buff coloured brick, leaving only the original arrival platform building and later boardroom building above with red brick. This allows a clear definition between the station's original buildings (on this side) and later additions. The window arrangement respects the existing pattern through a linear vertical emphasis in the openings, with the size of the openings (typically) diminishing

on the upper levels. The window glazing arrangements vary in their pattern, as do windows throughout the external elevations on the existing building, in particular in the original departure platform building. There are two bay windows at the end of the extension, to allow light into the open office space within. The bay on the NW elevation introduces a contemporary element, which will draw some attention to the extension, but it would not appear unduly out of place, and alludes to the SW elevation, where a further bay sits comfortably adjacent the glazed elevation that covers the office space proposed under the new roof. The glazed end elevation is articulated with functional columns, which are positioned to refer to the location of the railway lines. The extension and closure to the end elevation will appear contemporary, the detailing and openness references the original layout of the railway station. Overall officers consider these extensions will sit comfortably with the building, improve the overall appearance in relation to the existing situation, and not detract from the historic or architectural interest of the listed building.

4.8 The roof profile allows climate control in the building, enabling natural light gain, whilst preventing glare/overheating. The roof is designed so it is fit for purpose and allows the least prominent structure; a flat roof would not allow the climate control requirements, and a pitched roof would create a far more heavy/prominent structure that would compete for attention with the main building.

4.9 The supporting structure of the roof has been designed to minimise fixings to the existing buildings. From the outside the roof will appear behind, and detached from each wing. The roof would be fixed to the buildings above the cornice, so from inside the walls of the platform buildings would otherwise be free of the roof structure. A lighter connection (suggested by the AMS) is not possible as the area requires a gutter and needs to be able to allow access onto the roof for maintenance.

4.10 The roof has been designed as an addition which is functional, fit for purpose, and of contemporary design. In accordance with PPS5, the structure is deemed to be visually acceptable, and it would not detract from the appearance or historic interest of the building.

INTERNAL AREAS

4.11 The new floor-plates have been designed so they appear as floating floors, separate from the original building's facades. The floor-plates follow the lines of the tracks and are predominantly separated in the centre, referencing the original train shed roof, which was centrally open. Physical connections to the existing elevations are limited in area and amount, but are necessary to enable permeability through the building, and inclusive access, given the variation in floor levels in the existing buildings.

4.12 The lower area where the tracks were once located is to be covered with a suspended floor. This allows a level floor and the void below will be utilised, as part of the ventilation strategy for the building. There is strong justification for the works, which are necessary to enable viable use of the building and its environmental performance. Although these internal works cover some evidence of the original station layout, officers consider the impact can be mitigated, by introducing elements in the new scheme which explain the former station use. These are explained in conservation officers comments, in 3.6, and can be secured through condition.

RELOCATION OF THE TRAIN SHED CANOPY

4.13 The remaining 3 bays of the train shed canopy frame is an integral element of the grade 2 star listed building. There would be some harm to the heritage asset because of its relocation and therefore the benefits of the proposal must be judged against the harm, as required by PPS5 (refer back to 4.2 and 4.3).

4.14 Re-location is necessary to allow level access to each floor level and if the train shed canopy were retained in-situ, the approach to climate control/energy efficiency within the building would not work. The relocation plays an integral part in securing optimum viable use of the building. Officers consider that the approach, to relocate the canopy, refurbish it, bring in into active use, display it from the public realm and assist in the understanding of the original function of the building constitutes adequate justification for this work, and the subsequent gain outweighs the harm.

4.15 The final presentation of the structure is yet to be agreed. Preference is for the structure to stay true to its original appearance, and means of enclosure. This can be secured by condition, and be subject to further consultation if deemed necessary.

4.16 Conditions can be attached, as advised by conservation officers, to cover the re-use and alterations to doors and window architraves.

ACCESS RAMP

4.16 The Station Rise entrance would gain an access ramp. This structure would be a simple addition that would not detract from the buildings appearance and historic importance.

RAILINGS

4.17 The railings that run along the Tanner Row boundary of the site terminate where they run into the 1950s extension which it is proposed to demolish. The railings are grade 2 listed. They appear to run through the brick wall of the building. How they are finished should this building be demolished, as is proposed, can be covered by condition.

HERITAGE BENEFITS

4.18 The buildings have been used as offices since closure of the railway station over 100 years ago. Almost all of the C20 alterations have had a detrimental impact on the appearance of the listed building and the quality of the office space is compromised by poor accessibility, due to various changes in levels. Refurbishment of the building will address these issues. The building is not suitable as modern office space and has suffered from reduced levels of occupancy due to this and its size. The scheme proposed would involve full occupancy of the building and secure its long term stability, the new wing and central infill being required to gain the required amount of floorspace to allow the entire scheme to occur.

4.19 The proposed facilities will assist in regenerating this part of the city and the building itself will achieve a BREEAM excellent rating, so it will operate in a sustainable manner. Given that the site will not be restored to its original use, as a railway station, the proposed retention of offices is considered the optimum viable use

of the site and overall the scheme will have significant benefits, fitting the government's objectives established in PPS5, identified in 4.2 and 4.3.

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 The proposed development delivers considerable heritage benefits, as set out in PPS5: Planning and the Historic Environment and the companion English Heritage guidance note, principally by securing the long term optimum use of the building and improving its environmental performance and accessibility. There are some proposed alterations of original fabric, in particular that the train shed canopy structure has to be moved, and the area where the tracks once stood becomes a level floorspace, but these are necessary changes. As required by PPS5, these elements would be recorded prior to alteration. However the overall benefits significantly outweigh the harm that would occur and therefore officers recommend consent be granted.

5.2 The application will need to be referred to the Government Office as the Victorian Society, one of the national amenity societies, have formally objected to the proposal.

COMMITTEE TO VISIT

6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Approve following referral to Secretary of State

- 1 TIMEL2 Development start within 3 yrs (LBC/CAC)
- 2 Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
- 3 Samples of the materials to be used (including proposed internal floor) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. The development shall be carried out using the approved materials.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the listed building.

4 A Method Statement for the dis-mantling and re-erection of the remaining parts of the train shed shall be provided prior to such works commencing. The statement shall include a sequence of works which shows how this element of the contract would fit with overall contract programme. It shall specify measures for protecting the train shed during the course of works. The statement shall be supplemented with drawings showing the setting out of the structure in relation to the existing building and new extensions. 1:20 and 1:5 elevational, sectional and detailed drawings shall be provided to illustrate the how the pre-fabricated elements will be integrated with the new wall and columns and the new roof covering. The proposed roof covering and location of internal fittings shall be subject to approval by the Local Planning Authority. No work shall commence before the structure has been fully recorded in accordance with an archaeological recording specification approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the heritage asset is recorded and protected in accordance with PPS5: Planning and the Historic Environment.

5 A set of final elevation drawings for the inner walls of the courtyard shall be provided prior to occupation of the building. Drawings shall be supplemented by large scale details showing any proposed alterations to windows and window openings, including measures to provide additional guarding.

Drawings shall show any changes to wall finishes, including proposals for the newly constructed walls. Areas identified for paint removal, cleaning and re-pointing shall be illustrated on the drawings. Specification of materials and methods shall be supplied for agreement and such work shall not progress before trial samples have been agreed.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the listed building.

6 Large scale details of the items listed below shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development and the works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

a) The extent of alterations to walls, floors, ceilings and windows in each area.

(Generally each area will include several rooms, with separate drawings showing "before" and "after" conditions for comparison purposes. Unusual features such as bell pulls, special vents, wooden bracket fixtures (board room), register plates and speaking tube apparatus etc shall be identified on proposal drawings, along with reflected ceiling plans, showing any adaptations to existing cornices, any ductwork or other items of fixed plant and equipment, the suspended floors and any significant impacts. The booking office shall be the subject of its own full set of existing and proposal drawings at 1:50 and 1:5 scale. Details of the new entrance doors and their opening mechanisms shall be provided, illustrating how the doors would be integrated with existing walls. Finishes and lighting shall be specified).

b) Partitioning systems. Partitions shall be transparent, unless otherwise required, to retain the openness of the spaces. Partitions and other insertions shall be scribed around existing details.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the listed building.

7 Large scale details of the new doors and a drawing schedule of the new and retained doors (internal and external) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development and the works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the listed building, and to rationalize the use of historic internal doors in meaningful places according to type and fit.

8 Disturbed areas of the existing fabric shall be made good in materials and details matching adjacent surfaces.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the listed building.

9 Large scale details showing how the new floor would be introduced into the central area shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development and the works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Details shall include sections and floor plans, the location of any structure, plant and service outlets. Floor finishes shall be illustrated and samples provided for approval. The interior scheme shall assist with interpreting the former use of the building with materials chosen and finishes designed to respond to the robust large scale nature of this industrial building.

No work shall commence before the area has been fully recorded in accordance with an archaeological recording specification approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the listed building, and to contribute to the understanding of the railway use/heritage asset, in accordance with the objectives of PPS5.

10 Large scale details of the items listed below related to the area between the platform buildings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development and the works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

a) Each of the different connection points for the new structure. Existing cornices shall be visible from within the space. Clerestory windows and rooflights shall be specified.

b) The structure forming the new floor-plates in the central zone. To include the bridge links and staircases and their balustrades, and lifts. Staircases shall be placed free of the historic walls. Abutment positions between new and old fabric shall aim to have a negative detail to visually separate the structures.

c) The new SW facing glazed end wall showing how the inverted U-shaped elements would be integrated with the wall and how abutment details with the side wings would be handled.

d) All brise-soleil.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the listed building.

11 Large scale details of the extension to the SW wing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development and the works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Details shall illustrate: typical sections through external walls, with window and door reveals, cills, heads, eaves and cornices provided at large scale.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the listed building.

12 Details of the acoustic and fire-strategies shall be provided illustrating any fixed equipment, finishes or other requirements which might affect the character of the

building (e.g. sprinkler system). Details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development and the works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the listed building.

13 Details for integrating the requirements of the environmental performance strategy into the building to be provided for approval, illustrating how the interventions would affect the existing building fabric. Details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development and the works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

(Information shall include illustrations or samples of requirements for plant, delivery and storage areas, the new chimney, typical ductwork runs and types and equipment such as radiators, vents, etc. It is desirable to restore the chimneys to their as-built form).

Reason: To assess the impact of such, and minimise the effect on the character of the listed building.

14 Details of CCTV and signage (when the latter would be physically fixed to the building), shall be supplied to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to installation, and installed in accordance with the approved plans. CCTV shall include manufacturers details, location and any associated fixing.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the listed building.

15 A schedule of repairs shall be provided for any items deviating from a "like for like" repair approach.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the listed building.

16 A survey and audit of existing landscape materials and fixed structures (bollards, pavement lights, lamps etc) shall be carried out prior to works commencing. The landscape scheme shall be revised to incorporate these elements where they are a valuable part of the inheritance of the site and important to the setting of the building, and be submitted to an approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the works carried out accordingly.

Reason: In the interest of the setting of the listed building.

17 The destination of the late C19th timber pre-fabricated structure proposed for relocation shall be provided along with details of how it will be dismantled, taken to its new site and re-erected. Any works shall be preceded by a level 1 photographic recording (English Heritage standard) showing the building in context. The information shall to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority in an agreed format prior to works commencing, and the works shall occur in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the historic importance of the listed building, and to

contribute to the understanding of the railway use/heritage asset, in accordance with the objectives of PPS5.

18 Prior to occupation of the building as approved, should the 1950's office building that fronts onto Tanner Row be demolished, a method statement for making good the railings shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority, approved and the works carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and treatment of the railings, which are grade 2 listed.

7.0 INFORMATIVES:

Notes to Applicant

1. REASON FOR APPROVAL

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal, as it would secure the long-term optimum viable use of a grade 2 star listed building currently at risk, and as the works proposed would not have an undue impact on the heritage asset, subject to the conditions listed above, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to the character, appearance and setting of the listed building. As such the proposal complies with PPS5: Planning For the Historic Environment and Policy HE4 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan.

Contact details:

Author: Jonathan Kenyon Development Control Officer

Tel No: 01904 551323