

CUMBERLAND COUNCIL
CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Proposal: Addition of two names

Address: Lowca War Memorial, Lowca

Reference: 4/25/2425/OL1

Date: 27/01/26

Description: Lowca war memorial dates from 1920, and was relocated in 2008.

Conclusion: Request further information

Assessment:

- I do not believe that adding two names to the war memorial will in itself cause any harm to the memorial's significance, provided there is space to do so and the lettering matches the existing lettering.
- I note the consultation response of the War Memorials Trust. While I do not believe the proposal will entail harm to the memorial, the man concerned appear to already be commemorated elsewhere, making this a somewhat unusual proposal.

Summary

- Although I don't see any reason related to the conservation of the memorial as to why the proposed addition should not go ahead, I recommend that the applicants consult further with the War Memorials Trust in order to decide whether to actually proceed with the work on the basis that the names are already commemorated elsewhere.
- Before undertaking the work, I would request a drawing of the lettering, as proposed, in situ (i.e. a proposed elevation drawing of the war memorial) showing where the lettering will go and what it will look like. The details of the inscription currently included only state the wording, not these other details.
- I would be happy for this aspect to be handled using a condition to be discharged prior to carrying out the work.

Relevant Policies and Guidance:

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 establishes a need "in considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works [for the Local Planning Authority to] have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest" [Section 16(2)]. This requirement also applies to the granting of planning permission affecting a listing building or its setting [Section 66(1)].

NPPF para. 210 states that "In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation..."

NPPF para. 212 states, in the case of designated heritage assets, “great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation”, irrespective of whether potential harm is substantial, less-than-substantial, or total loss. Where harm to a designated heritage asset is less-than-substantial, it should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal (para. 215).

The Copeland area’s Local Plan contains a number of relevant policies:

- BE1 provides for the preservation and enhancement of built heritage assets by:
 - Requiring a heritage impact assessment or heritage statement where the proposal would affect a heritage asset;
 - Giving great weight to the conservation of Copeland’s designated heritage assets when decision making;
 - Ensuring that new development is sympathetic to local character and history;
 - Supporting proposals for the appropriate reuse of vacant historic buildings, recognising that putting buildings into viable uses consistent with their conservation can help sustain and enhance their significance;
 - Supporting proposals that increase the enhancement, promotion and interpretation of Copeland’s architectural and archaeological resources;
 - Strengthening the distinctive character of Copeland’s settlements, through the application of high-quality design and architecture that respects this character and enhances the setting of heritage assets.
- BE2 states that development should preserve or enhance designated heritage assets (or important archaeological sites) and their settings. The more important the asset, the greater weight that will be given to its conservation. Proposals that better reveal the significance of heritage assets will be supported in principle. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset will require clear and convincing justification.

Sammy Woodford

Conservation and Design Officer