



Appendix 10

Turley - Heritage Consultant

Stage 2 Heritage Report

Cambridge Civic Quarter

October 2024

Contents

1.	Introduction	3
2.	The Guildhall	4
3.	The Corn Exchange	8
4.	The Market Square	10
5.	Conclusions and Stage 3	16

Dr J Burgess
Jon.burgess@turley.co.uk

Client
Cambridge City Council

Our reference
CAMC3006

Oct 2024

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This note provides an update on the progress with heritage-related issues impacting the Cambridge Civic Quarter project. Since the end of Stage 1, we have been involved in further design evolution with various team meetings and focused workshops with other consultants working on the project.
- 1.2 During this period, we have continued dialogue with the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Services officers (and including the County Council as Highway Authority). We have also looked at specific aspects of the Guildhall and Corn Exchange / Parsons Court on site with the Historic Environment Team Leader and met with Officers from Historic England.
- 1.3 The overarching aims of some aspects of the proposal, and in particular relating to the future of the Market Square, will inevitably have an impact on the heritage significance of the assets in questions. It is clear from engagement carried out with both the wider public and external stakeholders and the stakeholders within the Council itself that there is a range of opinion about the impact of change and the extent that any change is in the wider public interest. Consequently, we think it is important at this stage to set out our assessment of heritage significance and then comment on the impact which the Stage 2 proposals would have. We had delayed discussions with Historic England pending conclusion of the pre-application discussions but subsequently met with their Officers on 22 October.
- 1.4 In this project, we are advising purely on heritage significance and impacts on built form. It is therefore not for us to seek to weigh any identified harm against the wider public benefits of the proposals. It is important however that we identify heritage benefits and the guiding principles behind the proposals, and so allow others to weigh the issues in the balance.
- 1.5 Our remit does not extend to below-ground archaeological issues. We are however mindful of potential impacts on this and provide some thoughts on next steps at the end of this report.

2. The Guildhall

- 2.1 The Guildhall is a Grade II Listed Building. It was erected in two phases, either side of the Second World War to the designs of the architect Charles Cowles-Voysey (1889-1981). He was an accomplished designer of public buildings (including town halls in Watford, Bognor Regis, Bromley and Worthing). The job architect was John Brandon-Jones (1908-1999) who had joined the practice in 1933.
- 2.2 The west side of the building was completed first and allowed the earlier civic buildings to remain. The original public hall (now large hall) and library form a separately Grade II listed building designed by Peck and Stephens in 1862). These remain to the rear of the Guildhall and include additions of 1884 by G MacDonnell. When Cowles-Voysey's Guildhall was completed to the east, it included a new Small Hall which could act as a foyer to the large hall which was incorporated into the new building (though the former library buildings onto Wheeler Street remained separate). It had originally been proposed to demolish all the C19 buildings and replace them with a larger assembly hall.
- 2.3 The *historic interest* of the Guildhall derives from its standing on a site which has been occupied by municipal buildings probably since the C14. The building and its predecessors have been at the heart of matters affecting the City for many centuries. As the historic interest of the building will not be affected by proposals for the building, it is unnecessary to comment further. Whilst *artistic* and *archaeological interest* are both components of heritage significance, neither are impacted by the proposals for the Guildhall.
- 2.4 The *architectural interest* is more vulnerable to change. The architectural interest of the Guildhall derives from its stripped-Classical 1930s form and symmetry (particularly the north elevation and despite its two-phase construction, visible in the slight change in brick colour). The rather austere external detail is enlivened by the entrance doorways, rusticated plinth and balconies and the attic storey with deep cornice and partly balustraded pediment. The homogeneity of the building materials (Clipsham stone, Williamson Cliffe brick and bronze windows) adds to the architectural quality of the building.
- 2.5 The associations with Cowles-Voysey and Brandon-Jones, very accomplished architects of their era, adds to the architectural interest.
- 2.6 Part of both the architectural and historic interest of the building stems from the planning and the way the large hall was incorporated whilst excluding but retaining the earlier library buildings. The plan also allowed for the formal suite of Council rooms to be accessed directly off the market square, but with the two courts given their own entrance off Peas Hill. The use of the atria allowed light to the Council Chamber and the link corridors behind it whilst the Chamber and the two courts needed to be top-lit due the nature of the site.
- 2.7 The interior adds much to the architectural interest of the building, as reflected in the list description and identified on the plans of heritage significance produced by Cartwright Pickard and agreed with the council officers. Of particular note are the

entrance / stairhall with its accomplished use of marble and bronze and the Council Chamber which leads from it. The Committee Rooms, Members' Rooms and also the Chief Executive's office all have walnut used for wall panels and in the furniture (not part of the listing). The small hall with its barrel-vaulted roof and Neoclassical detailing is also of note as are the two former Courts at ground floor level on the Peas Hill side of the building.

- 2.8 The decoration of the Council Chamber includes the coffered ceiling with glazing, leather-panelled walls and oak benches together with original curtains and hangings and the city's coat of arms behind the raised dais. Some of this detailing was reflected in the ground floor court rooms, though the Police Court has been stripped of features since the building was listed.
- 2.9 The building was designed with a clear hierarchy and with an eye on the level of use. The principal entrance and rooms are therefore of the highest quality materials. The secondary entrance and other spaces, rather than having marble, therefore have terrazzo, whilst the Guildhall Street entrance and stairs, which gave access to the public halls, were covered with rubberised finishes by Dunlop.
- 2.10 Beyond the main civic spaces, the standard offices were rather plainer. Walls were plastered with plaster cornices and windows had tiled surrounds. The grained timber doors were perhaps the main features and they accessed long corridors with WCs, small kitchens off in the interior of the site. In places, the 1930s wcs survive with their terrazzo finishes and occasional original sanitaryware.
- 2.11 Whilst the building retains many of its original features, there are areas which have been altered and are of little architectural interest. These include the ground floor reception area, which has been altered several times, some of the altered WCs, the lifts (added later) the atria and basement areas. Although the latter has not been particularly heavily altered, it was never built with any architectural pretension. Exceptions in the basement, which are of higher significance include the steps down from the dock in the Sessions Court and surviving cells.
- 2.12 The exterior of the Guildhall, its principal rooms and stairs and lobbies to the civic spaces are considered to be of high heritage significance. The service areas and much altered spaces are of low significance whilst the general offices and other secondary areas are considered of moderate significance.

Impact of proposed works on Heritage Significance

- 2.13 The Phase 2 Works have been carefully considered to meet the Council's brief whilst minimising the impact on the Heritage Significance of the building. Key guiding principles have been to avoid changes to the external appearance of the building and to protect the key spaces and rooms within the building.
- 2.14 The main impact on the external appearance of the building will be the proposed extension at level 4 on the west side of the building together with the roof plant enclosure. Effectively the extension would just continue the mass of the existing top floor further to the south. The only place this extension would be readily visible from ground floor level would be from the Wheeler Street / Peas Hill / Bene't Street junction and when looking east along the southern leg of St Edwards Passage (from where some

of the roof-top telecommunications plant is currently visible). The impact of the increased mass can be gauged from the northern leg of St Edwards Passage (eg by David's Bookshop) where the existing taller fourth floor can be seen. From within the majority of Peas Hill, the narrowness of the street, height of the Guildhall and the prominent cornice means that the recessed upper floor could not be seen.

- 2.15 The impact on the external appearance is therefore very limited and would give consistency to the elevation and prevent views of rooftop accretions. The extension could be designed to replicate the brick and masonry of the existing top floor or be designed to be more visually lightweight and of more contemporary materials (eg a grey metal cladding). This would be evaluated for agreement at Stage 3, with both approaches being potentially acceptable if appropriately designed.
- 2.16 The enhanced environmental performance of the building which is proposed will necessitate roof-level plant. As the symmetry of the main elevation of the Guildhall is an important aspect of its architectural form, it is considered better to design it a consistent roof-level plant screen which will be recessed on the roof but follow the building line. This will be visible in long views, particularly across the market, but can be designed of materials and colour which either picks up on those of the building or appears visually lightweight and blends with the sky.
- 2.17 Another aspect of how the building helps respond to climate change will be from roof-level PVs. The plant enclosure will necessitate the removal of some of the existing PVs. It is proposed to replace these on the roof of the Large Hall which, as noted, is separately Grade II listed from the Guildhall itself. The PVs would be placed on the main roof slopes, not the apsidal end to Wheeler Street which is more visible. The main roof is only visible from street level at the end of Bene't Street where it meets Wheeler Street / Peas Hill. An assessment would be made at Stage 3 to determine whether it is better to fix PVs over the existing slates or to remove areas and store the slates.
- 2.18 The other change to the external appearance is within the internal lightwells. Currently these are not attractive spaces, functional rather than of any aesthetic merit. The proposed works would utilise these spaces and allow them to bring light more effectively into the new foyer and basement spaces. To achieve this, some internal walls will need to be removed as will the lift shafts, the latter being replaced with more attractive glazed lifts. New lightweight glazed roofs will enclose the atria. These areas are of low heritage significance whilst the reception space (ie the area behind the stairhall and lobby) has been much altered. With appropriate detailing at Stage 3, this work has the potential to enhance the internal quality of the building with minimal impact on heritage significance.
- 2.19 To enhance accessibility through the main entrance, it is proposed to install a new 'invisible' platform lift within the steps in the entrance way. We have been involved with the insertion of a similar lift at the Grade I listed Clare College and when not in use as a ramp, it folds up to look like the existing steps. This can be detailed at Stage 3 but would allow all users to access the building via its main entrance without being visually intrusive.

- 2.20 Otherwise, the main civic rooms, together with the stairs and corridors which access them would be retained unaltered, preserving a key aspect of the building's heritage significance.
- 2.21 The exception to this is the ground floor Sessions Court accessed directly from Peas Hill. This currently retains the vast majority of its original fittings, together with the dock and stairs down to the cells in the basement. The adjacent former Police Court has been stripped of almost all its fitting since the building was listed.
- 2.22 Unless the Sessions Court is to be retained as some form of museum-piece or exhibit, there will need to be some modifications made to allow the space to be made more usable and improve accessibility. It is important that this is done more sensitively than in the Police Court however and certainly the judges raised dais, dock and stairs, wall finishes and coat of arms together with sufficient of the benching to allow the original form to be understood, should be retained. This would be detailed in Stage 3.
- 2.23 However, if the basement area of the Guildhall was to be offered to a museum (eg the Museum of Cambridge), it may be that the Sessions Court could be retained virtually intact and used as some form of education space. Again this could be explored in Stage 3.
- 2.24 The other proposed changes to the interior of the building relate mostly to the removal of walls in the basement and upper floors. These areas are of less heritage significance. A desire to create a more adaptable, open plan form will mean the loss of the original character of cellular offices accessed from a corridor. Whilst this will cause some 'harm' in heritage terms, the retention of more of this character particular at first floor level reduces the level of harm.
- 2.25 Other proposals include better insulation and providing better secondary glazing to the windows. The present secondary glazing was installed in the early 2000s and has established a precedent to be improved upon.

3. The Corn Exchange

- 3.1 The Corn Exchange is a Grade II Listed Building designed by Richard Reynolds Rowe in 1875. Rowe had beaten a local architect, John Edlin, in an architectural competition judged by Alfred Waterhouse, though some, including Waterhouse himself, penned some concern at the decision!
- 3.2 The original use of the building, the association with Reynolds Rowe who was the Ely Diocesan architect and the records of the original architectural competition all add to the building's *historic significance* though that is unaffected by the proposed works.
- 3.3 The building was converted to a public hall in the early 1980s and has undergone several relatively minor alterations since.
- 3.4 Its *architectural interest* derives from its attractive Venetian Gothic design with good use of polychromatic brickwork to add character. The 3-bay façade to Wheeler Street is particularly attractive with a fine gabled centrepiece which gives a dignified entrance to the building. The side bays incorporate stone panels carved with agricultural scenes. The main door and first floor windows are all within Venetian arched heads of red and blue brick. The first floor windows are plate glass sashes with carved spandrel panels. At roof level are gablets, the west dormer now with louvres replacing the sash windows.
- 3.5 The side elevations which run the length of the hall are more repetitive but nicely handled with large arched windows with plate tracery set below an upper arcade with smaller windows arranged in groups of three. The Corn Exchange elevation has a large single storey porch in similar design at its south end and the granite foundation stone at the north end.
- 3.6 The upper part of the main hall has a recessed attic storey and then a zinc clad roof (presumably replacing slates in the 1980s works). The safety gantries are modern.
- 3.7 The Parsons Court elevation is similar, though some emergency / loading doors have been inserted below the sills. A half level external fire escape has been added and the south end window replaced by a modern timber door. At the south end is a return single storey range, of similar materials and features and again used for loading. This has a modern door. There is a first floor extension added at the end of the C20.
- 3.8 The interior of the Corn Exchange has been significantly altered in its conversion to a concert hall. As a result, many of the fittings are from the 1980s. The main aspects contributing to the architectural significance are the impression of the original space and the exposed ironwork work and glass roof and the fair-faced polychromatic brickwork of the walls.
- 3.9 The original elements of the building are considered to be of high architectural significance. The 1980s and later additions are of low / no significance.
- 3.10 Opposite, on the west side of Parsons Court, No.3 has been included as part of the Corn Exchange proposals. This Grade II listed building, built in the late Georgian period

was originally a house. It is plain but attractive, two bays wide and three storeys high. Other than because of its age, there is no known *historic interest*. Its *architectural interest* stems mostly from its simple, balanced proportions and sash windows, which reduce in height at second floor level. The most notable feature is the attractive Tuscan doorcase and panelled door which occupies the right-hand ground floor bay.

- 3.11 Internally, the building has been repurposed as office accommodation and few features of any architectural interest remain. Consequently whilst the exterior is considered to be of high heritage significance, the interior is low, though opening up works could reveal more interesting features hidden behind later fittings.

Impact of proposed works on Heritage Significance

- 3.12 The main external changes proposed to the Corn Exchange is the first floor extension at the south end. This sits well back behind the south porch which borders the Corn Exchange Street carriageway and is unlikely to be visible from there. Views would therefore be from the raised walkway to the Grand Arcade car park. The porch is an attractive and prominent feature in the architectural style of the rest of the Corn Exchange and it is proposed that the extension would sit as a very neutral back-drop to avoid competing with this architecturally. As such it would read in the same way as the existing taller structures which currently frame the porch.
- 3.13 As noted earlier, whilst the roof structure is a very important component of the building's heritage significance, the roof covering itself seems to have been replaced in the 1980s conversion. The replacement of this with a more efficient and better insulated material and addition of PVs will have a very limited impact on the building's significance.
- 3.14 Similarly, internal changes to the bar area are largely to later fabric and may give the opportunity to once again reveal more of the internal fair-faced brickwork, such a characteristic of the interior.
- 3.15 It is also proposed to create a new bar area in No.3 Parsons Court. This former house has been repurposed in the C20 as offices and little of internal character survives. Provided the external form is retained, it should be possible to convert the building with little impact on heritage significance and removal of later fittings may reveal hidden aspects of the building's original form.
- 3.16 These works would sit in tandem with the 'stopping up' of Parsons Court which would help transform the service area-character of the lane. Making it more attractive would benefit the setting of both the Corn Exchange and No.3 Parsons Court.

4. The Market Square

- 4.1 Although the market has been in existence in some form possibly for more than 1000 years, it could not be described as a 'market square' until the 1850s. Prior to that, and as shown on plans from the C16 up to Baker's Plan of the City in 1830, the space was far more amorphous, with specialist markets in the surrounding streets though one constant seems to have been the relatively open nature of the east side of the present space (shown as Market Hill even on the 1575 Braun Hogenberg Plan). Perhaps not surprisingly this side retains quite grand merchants' houses today. However, from Loggan's Plan of 1690 through to Baker's Plan of 1830, there was a mass of buildings hard against the back (east side) of Great St Mary's Church and a whole block of buildings on what is now the west side of the market square.
- 4.2 The market was said to have been first paved as early as 1613, the year before the erection of Hobson's Conduit¹. However, after a major fire in 1849 which destroyed the buildings on the west side of the market, the Cambridge Corporation Act gave the Council the means to expand and resurface the market using granite setts. At the same time the old Conduit Head was moved to Brookside and a new Gothic fountain added as the centrepiece (much of it demolished in 1953).
- 4.3 The surface of the Market Square was listed as 'Market Place paving and two sets of iron railings' on 30 October 2019. The reasons for designation states that 'the granite setts laid out in 1855-56 and iron railings installed later in the C19' are listed as an 'integral part of the mid-C19 scheme for the expansion and re-laying of the Market Place which can be accurately dated' and are therefore a relatively early example of large-scale historic paving. This forms part of the *architectural interest* as do the 'handsomely designed' railings which are considered to be of good quality ironwork (with the exception of one later gate).
- 4.4 The *historic interest* is also considered to stem from their being 'good quality examples of C19 street furniture which (together with the previously listed fountain base) form a significant ensemble at the heart of the city. More generally, the historic interest of the market place stems from it forming the commercial hub of the City for many centuries.
- 4.5 The list description acknowledges that two areas along the west side (totalling 220sqm of the 2000sqm total listed area) have been either replaced or covered over by asphalt. These include the area in which the underground lavatories were provided in the early C20, though the present surfacing is not that shown on early C20 photographs. Similarly, there is the concreted area beneath the present rubbish skips, which is edged with some larger setts laid in a different pattern. SW of the fountain is a further L-shaped area of concrete. The reason for the change of surfacing is unknown though it appears to date from after the late 1960s. The description does not comment on the loss of setts at the corners to accommodate wider junction radii in the C20.

¹ Taylor, A. 'Cambridge: The Hidden History' Stroud (1999) p137

- 4.6 The list description similarly makes no mention of the sett patterns which are apparent from the photogrammetry survey and on the ground, nor are the drainage channels mentioned. Perhaps most surprising is the lack of commentary on the different types and shape of setts visible on the market square which include rectangular and squarer setts.
- 4.7 The suggestion that the iron railings were added in the later C19 is incorrect. As the Ordnance Survey plans show, they appear some time between the 1903 and 1927 plans. It is known that archaeological investigations were taking place c1902 for the public toilets and so it is likely that they were inserted in the early years of the C20.

The Market Fountain

- 4.8 The Gothic fountain was created as the focal point of the newly enlarged market square in 1855. It was apparently designed by Gordon M Hills.² Despite Hills later become Diocesan Surveyor to London and Rochester he appears to have been a relatively little-known architect. Nevertheless, old photos reveal it as being an accomplished Gothic design, if not a very enduring one.
- 4.9 Just short of its centenary in 1953, the fountain ‘was seen to be swaying in the breeze’. It was dismantled, leaving only the base, and each carefully numbered piece was stored safely and never seen again!³ The exception is the four corner figures which are in the courtyard of the Museum of Cambridge.
- 4.10 The list description (which dates from 1972) simply states ‘stone fountain, much weathered, set in a granite basin’.
- 4.11 In its heyday, the fountain provided fresh water for those using the market and was the central feature of the newly enlarged and planned marketplace. What remains today is a rather sad shadow of its former self. It is in poor condition with some continuing movement of the structure evident and lacking any explanation of its original form. It has lost its role as the centrepiece of the market.
- 4.12 The fountain’s *historic interest*, as a symbol of Victorian civic pride at the heart of the commercial and administrative centre of the city, has therefore been significantly diminished.
- 4.13 Its *architectural interest* is now equally limited. Only the base and a small part of the rest of the structure survives and it is difficult for anyone who does not know the history of the fountain to understand what it was originally like.

Historic Core Conservation Area

- 4.14 In terms of the contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area, the presence of a bustling market in a major civic space is a key characteristic of central

² Atkinson, T D ‘*Cambridge Described and Illustrated...*’: Cambridge (1897) p70

³ Durrant, J ‘*Cambridge Past and Present...*’: Stroud (2007) p15

Cambridge and the physical and any commercial improvement of this has the potential to benefit both the character and appearance of the area.

- 4.15 In terms of the components of the market, the stalls themselves, whilst they add colour and informality, are relatively recent structures and so there is nothing of intrinsic significance in heritage terms. Similarly their exact orientation and even degree of permanence has changed throughout the years and certainly in the 1960s the space was as much as car park as it was a market.
- 4.16 The Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal highlights a number of 'key positive views' across the market square. These include views of King's College Chapel and the tower of Great St Mary's from the east side of the square, of Nos. 4 & 5 Market Hill from the end of St Mary's Passage and the west end of Market Hill and of the Guildhall from similar positions. Within all these views, the bustle of the market and the lack of height of the market stalls adds vibrancy in the foreground of the often grand buildings without architecturally competing. Consequently there is no adverse impact on the setting of the various listed buildings which surround the market. The one building which perhaps should dominate the space is the fountain, but it now fails to do so and cannot be seen above the market stalls.
- 4.17 One important view not picked up in the Conservation Area Appraisal is that from the end of Rose Crescent. The 'drama' of emerging from the narrow lane into the space of the market is an important piece of townscape. The experience is more marked than from other streets which run into the market due to the curving nature of the street and as it doesn't enter right on the corner of the market square.
- 4.18 The rather austere Guildhall rises over the market in this view. Although not completed until many years after the refashioning of the market in 1855, the relationship between the Guildhall and the market is an important one as the latest (and last) civic building to be built in the city's commercial heart. The main civic rooms are on the first floor and the balcony allowed civic leaders to address people gathering outside. As a consequence, both the location of the market and the relative openness of the space immediately in front of the Guildhall are aspects of the building's setting which contribute to its heritage significance. The loss of either would harm our understanding of the building and its function within the city.
- 4.19 The market space contributes less to the setting of other listed buildings surrounding the space. The Grade I listed Church of St Mary the Great, whilst an attractive and imposing presence on the west side of the space turns its back on a market whose appearance has changed many times since the church was first built in the C14. Nos. 4 and 5 Market Hill, Grade II and I listed buildings respectively dating from the C16-C18 on the east side of the market were likely built as merchants houses. Their location next to the market is an important part of the setting, though their form and outlook has changed many times. Many of the other listed buildings around the market are generally of C19 and 1930s and are of a type which characterises the commercial streets in the centre of the city.
- 4.20 Whilst the Grade II listed Market Hill Buildings on the north side of the market are of similar age to the Guildhall, they comprise shops and student rooms above. Whilst they of course orientate towards the square, other than allowing the building to be

appreciated across the space, the market does not contribute to the setting in a way which impacts on the building's heritage significance.

- 4.21 The three K6 telephone boxes, which are Grade II Listed, and stand to the NW of the church were originally adjacent to the lavatories on the west side of the market square. They were moved there in the 1990s. Whilst their position in traditionally the busiest part of the city centre was noteworthy, their relocation has reduced this.

Impact of proposed works on Heritage Significance

- 4.22 Part of the brief for the project, as we understand it, is to make the Market Square more accessible for all potential users. It is clear from the feedback from those with disabilities and the Council-commissioned access report that the current setted surface does not achieve this. Mindful of the heritage significance of the setts, there is clearly a potential impasse.
- 4.23 A spectrum of different approaches is possible – ranging from leaving the setts intact and accepting that they are not suitable for all users (and could be considered dangerous), through to entirely replacing them with an alternative level surface – which would be fully accessible but entirely destroy the heritage significance. In between these two polar opposites sits the proposal for lifting, dressing and relaying the setts to provide a level surface or leaving some setts intact but replacing them with a flat surface on main desire lines. The main concerns with the latter approach would be the surface would still not be ideal / unsafe for some users, the layout would be inflexible and the appearance of the space would be impacted.
- 4.24 In theory, it might be possible to cover over the setts with another material to produce a flat surface, so leaving them intact. The problems with this approach are that the appearance would fundamentally change, there would be a change in levels adding a further safety hazard, the surface could become uneven if the underlying setts continue to sink and it may prove difficult to later remove the added top surface without damaging the setts.
- 4.25 In our opinion, the best compromise is to seek to lift, dress and relay the setts. This has been achieved in other areas with heavy footfall. Lifting some setts will be necessary anyway in some areas where the setts have sunk / become loose.
- 4.26 To help offset the heritage impact of this, it is proposed to relay the market place to its original dimensions (using the evidence from the 1886 Ordnance Survey map and other sources) and so making the ends of the setted area less rounded. Areas lost to tarmac in the C20 would also be re-laid as setts. Interpretation material could be provided to further enhance the heritage significance of this approach. In Stage 3, further research should be carried out to understand better the different setts patterns, sizes and types of setts and the drainage patterns so where appropriate these can be re-created (albeit flush).
- 4.27 Whilst the lifting and redressing of the setts will cause some harm to their heritage significance, there will also be heritage benefits through the relaying of lost areas, repair and also from the re-creation of the original market square dimensions. It is also proposed to replace the outer-perimeter of the market square with York Stone pavings, as was originally the form.

- 4.28 Although as noted earlier, the railings are not as old as the list description suggests, they do form part of the listing together with the setts. One of the gates has been replaced but otherwise they survive intact. It is proposed to carefully dismantle the railings and reuse them. Whilst they will not be in their original position, they will be performing the same function as when first installed. The works will allow minor repairs to be carried out and the features properly preserved.
- 4.29 As described earlier, the market fountain is a shadow of its former self and is in deteriorating condition. Whilst it is acknowledged that the structure was listed in its current truncated state, it is no longer the centrepiece of the market. In addition to its very underwhelming form and on-going maintenance liability, it potentially prevents opportunities for bringing the space into more active and flexible use.
- 4.30 As noted, when the opportunity was presented to remodel the market in the 1850s, Hobson's Conduit was moved and the fountain erected in the centre of the new larger market square. The current brief to take a more visionary look at what a C21 market place should be like could give the opportunity to re-consider the form of and location of the water-feature once again. This could be seen as the next phase in the square's history and one which follows historic precedent.
- 4.31 In line with this vision to make the market square an attractive and flexible civic space suitable for a range of uses, it is proposed to carefully dismantle the fountain. The granite base could however be retained and effectively a section cut through the fountain used as an inlay within the historic sets to mark the position of the fountain. This could be augmented by interpretation within the market square to aid understanding of the mid-late C19 form and enhance its heritage significance. The remaining elements of the fountain could be offered to the Museum of Cambridge and so reunited with the original surviving elements.
- 4.32 Retaining its footprint at the centre of the Victorian marketplace, supplemented by interpretation, will allow aspects of its heritage significance to be retained. In our view, and given the present form of the fountain, the removal of the surviving fabric will not constitute substantial harm in heritage terms. It is accepted it would be a high level of less than substantial harm however
- 4.33 The removal would also cause a level of harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. In terms of the 'character' this would be because it could diminish the historical significance of the Victorian market. However, with the retention of the base and enhanced interpretation, this could be retained / arguably enhanced. In terms of the appearance, the present structure is in poor condition and no longer the visual centrepiece, its reduced height meaning it cannot be seen above the market stalls. It is more appropriate to consider the overall impact of the works as a whole on the appearance of the market square and its contribution to the historic core conservation area.
- 4.34 Another aspect of the vision has been to enable the market to perform better in all weathers by the provision of a covered structure. Whilst consideration was given to a permanent two storey structure, this proved challenging (partly due to the visual impact). It is therefore proposed to create a more visually lightweight canopy structure

formed of a series of pitched roofs running north-south in the same way as the current market stalls are orientated.

- 4.35 The height of this structure will be just slightly higher than the present stalls and therefore the impact on important views across the market will be maintained. In particular, the structure will be set away from the view-cone / pedestrian desire-line which runs from the end of Rose Crescent to the top of Pety Cury improving legibility across the square and maintaining the feeling of openness.
- 4.36 It is proposed that the columns supporting the roof structure will be slotted carefully into the setts, the re-laid stones continuing beneath the new structure to maintain the legibility of the original market area.
- 4.37 As the height of the new canopy is deliberately kept low, there will be no adverse impact on the setting of the various listed buildings surrounding the space as these buildings will continue to be appreciated from the square in the same way as they are at present.
- 4.38 Clearly the lifting of the setts and other excavation works will have an archaeological impact. This would be developed as Stage 3, though this could give the opportunity for revealing more about the original surfaces of the market and the buildings which originally occupied part of the space. What is revealed could inform future interpretation of the market square and enhance its historic interest. The same would be true of, for example Peas Hill where an undercroft is known to survive under the pavement between St Edward's Church and the Guildhall.

5. Conclusions and Stage 3

- 5.1 The pre-application discussions have shown a broad consensus with Officers regarding the proposed works to both the Guildhall and Corn Exchange. As reflected earlier in this note there are areas where additional detail will be needed which is inevitable in a Stage 2 design. In the case of the Guildhall, this includes design development of issues such as the rooftop extension and plant enclosure, the PV type and fixing and the glazed roofs to the atria.
- 5.2 Perhaps the main area for additional detailing relates to the Sessions Court. The Conservation Officer is keen to see most if not all of the original fittings retained. This may be possible if the space could be used as an education space and this needs to be explored in Stage 3. Otherwise retention of all features will be a challenge if any active use of the space (other than as a museum-piece) is to be found. With further analysis, the design team consider that a compromise where the main features are retained, but the space made more usable is possible and this should be the subject of more detailed study at the next stage.
- 5.3 There is even greater consensus regarding the Corn Exchange. Further details of some of the cladding of the extension, main building insulation, upgrading of windows will inevitably be needed given the building's Grade II listed status but should be comfortably achievable.
- 5.4 Similarly the idea to convert No.3 Parsons Court can be fully worked up to ensure any surviving features which may be hidden are understood and where possible revealed as part of the proposed conversion of the present offices to a bar.
- 5.5 There is less agreement regarding the proposals for the Market Square. In our opinion, a 'do nothing' approach where the setts are just repaired where they have sunk, been damaged or badly altered in the past will not create a surface appropriate for modern equitable use.
- 5.6 The proposed lifting, redressing and relaying of the setts has been achieved elsewhere, research by LDA suggests, and we consider this to be the best compromise which gives a suitable surface and retains heritage significance. Further research and detailing will be necessary at Stage 3.
- 5.7 The railings, which are newer than the listing suggests, are Grade II Listed and their relocation will cause a relatively high level of harm. The reuse will ensure their survival and mean that they can once again perform a suitable function. The repositioning means that space can function more adequately.
- 5.8 Similarly, we accept that the removal of the remains of the fountain, even if a new home can be found, will still represent substantial harm, despite the fact that the structure is a shadow of its former glory. We have explained why we consider this necessary to enable the Market Square to function more successfully. We have also explained that embedding the base of the fountain, together with providing interpretation to allow people to understand the original form will help reduce the

level of harm and help enhance the historic interest of the market generally. These aspects should be explored more thoroughly through Stage 3.

- 5.9 The largest visual change to the Market will be from the new canopy structure. Further details of this will be developed, with the intention of creating something which has as lightweight a form as possible, the minimum height and with fully reversible sockets in the setted surface. Accurate visual representations will be provided to advise the design detailing and fully understand the visual impact.

Statutory Tests

- 5.10 In undertaking this work, we are always mindful of the statutory tests, the development plan policies and central government guidance. These will need to be applied and tested as the scheme develops through Stage 3.
- 5.11 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 imposes a statutory duty to seek to have ‘special regard’ to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, or their settings when considering applications for Listed Building Consent (S16) or planning permission (S66). S72 places a similar duty with regard to the character and appearance of Conservation Areas.
- 5.12 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2023) in paragraph 199 reiterates this, requiring the conservation of heritage assets to be given ‘great weight’ in the planning process. However, there is acceptance that there are cases where heritage importance can be outweighed by other factors. Paragraph 206 states that whilst substantial harm to or loss of grade II listed buildings should be ‘exceptional’, Paragraph 207 sets out the various tests, all of which must be met, unless it can be demonstrated that the level of harm *‘is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm of the loss.’*
- 5.13 In cases of less than substantial harm, paragraph 208 applies and requires the harm to be ‘weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use’.
- 5.14 Policy 61 of the Cambridge Local plan, largely reiterates the requirements of the NPPF. It will therefore be necessary as designs develop in Stage 3, to test the levels of harm which all the various proposals will cause against the public benefits which will accrue.

Archaeology

- 5.15 Whilst it is not within Turley’s remit, we are mindful of the potential archaeological impact of proposed works within the Market Square, Guildhall Street and Peas Hill.

In Stage 3, specialist archaeological advice should be obtained and so help guide the development of the scheme. This will likely involve the need for a desk-based assessment of the area and early advice on recording, trial trenching and ultimately a written scheme of investigation to be agreed with the County Council.