



Appeal Decisions

Inquiry opened on 12 May and sat on
15 to 18 December 2009

Site visit made on 18 December 2009

by **John Papworth** DipArch(Glos) RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
8 January 2010

Five Appeals at Bedlington Old School, Front Street West, Bedlington, Northumberland NE22 5EL

- The appeals are made by Dysart Developments Limited against the decisions of Northumberland County Council.
- Appeals A, C and D are made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- Appeals B and E are made under sections 20 and 74 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant conservation area consent.
- **Appeal A, APP/P2935/A/09/2096816**, application Ref 03/00442/FUL, dated 21 August 2003, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2008, the development proposed is 19 residential flats with onsite parking. (referred to as the First Scheme)
- **Appeal B, APP/P2935/E/09/2096817**, application Ref 03/00508/CON, dated 6 October 2003, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2008, the demolition proposed is of the existing school buildings and playground and adjustment of ground levels
- **Appeal C, APP/P2935/A/09/2094139**, application Ref 08/00133/FUL, dated 3 April 2008, was refused by notice dated 2 July 2008, the development proposed is conversion of existing building to create 3 dwelling houses; the erection of new building containing 10 residential apartments with associated car parking and landscaping. (referred to as the Second Scheme)
- **Appeal D, APP/P2935/A/09/2111405**, application Ref 09/00003/FUL, dated 23 December 2008, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2009, the development proposed is demolition of existing buildings and construction of 9 No dwelling houses and 3 No apartments with associated car parking and landscaping. (referred to as the Third Scheme)
- **Appeal E, APP/P2935/E/09/2111406**, application Ref 09/00005/CON, dated 23 December 2008, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2009, the demolition proposed is of vacant former school building.

Procedural Matters

1. The applications were made to Wansbeck District Council and that Council determined the applications and issued the decision notices. There has been a review of local government in the area and Northumberland County Council is now the Local Planning Authority.
2. The Inquiry was opened on 12 May 2009 but uncertainty over the drawings considered, and on which proofs of evidence had been produced, led the Inspector then appointed to adjourn without hearing evidence. On this matter being resolved, I resumed the Inquiry and my appointment in substitution has had no detrimental effect on any party's case.

Decision Appeal A

3. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for 19 residential flats with onsite parking at Bedlington Old School, Front Street West, Bedlington, Northumberland NE22 5EL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 03/00442/FUL, dated 21 August 2003, and the plans submitted with it and as amended, subject to conditions 1) to 12) on the attached Annex 2.

Decision Appeal B

4. I allow the appeal, and grant conservation area consent for demolition of the existing school buildings and playground and adjustment of ground levels at Bedlington Old School, Front Street West, Bedlington, Northumberland NE22 5EL in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 03/00508/CON, dated 6 October 2003 and the plans submitted subject to conditions 1) to 8) on the attached Annex 3.

Decision Appeal C

5. I dismiss the appeal.

Decision Appeal D

6. I dismiss the appeal.

Decision Appeal E

7. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issues

8. It was agreed, prior to the Inquiry, that some reasons for refusal had been overcome, or were capable of being overcome by conditions or an undertaking. The main issue in Appeals B and E is;
 - The effect of the demolition of the existing building on the character and appearance of the Bedlington Conservation Area.and in Appeals A, C and D;
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Bedlington Conservation Area including the setting of listed buildings.

Reasons

Demolition

9. The English Heritage publication, "*Guidance on Conservation Area Appraisals*" contains at Appendix 2 advice on considering the contribution made by unlisted buildings to the special architectural or historic interest of a conservation area, and lists ten questions that might be asked. Both the Council and the appellant had considered these questions. I was also directed to the comments of another Inspector in a decision in the London Borough of Havering (APP/B5480/E/06/2009101) on the way that some of the questions could be answered positively for almost any building whether inside or outside a conservation area. The questions need to be considered carefully in the

context of the case, and the advice does states only that the answers could provide the basis for considering that a building makes a positive contribution to the special interest of a conservation area. That wording is not the same as saying that the questions and answers are criteria, or that any positive answers are conclusive to the consideration.

10. The first question cannot be answered positively as there is no definitive information on the architect. The answer to the second question I consider to be mainly negative, stone is common but the other attributes less so. The third question can be answered positively as the former school does share features with the church and vicarage, and is, in my view, within the setting of the church and its church yard, the walls and some headstones of which are separately listed. But, the question goes on to ask whether it contributes positively to the setting. That is, I find less certain. The buildings are not directly connected, there being a road between, and the architectural features of the former school set it aside from the ecclesiastical features of the church. I consider the contribution at best neutral. The building no doubt does serve as a reminder of the settlement's development but it would not be in the use which is the real reminder. I do not consider it to have significant historical association with the layout, it is close to the church for historical reasons but I do not attach great significance to this.
11. The road forms a break between it and the church yard , reducing the contribution to the quality of that open space, as set out in question six, and it does not have landmark qualities in the way that the club or the church on either side do. Its reflection of traditional functional character or former uses in the area is now weak, and certainly not as strong as, for example, the size of the club, or the number of non-conformist chapels, that reflect the industrial past. The historic associations are not significant in my opinion, although many local people would have associations and memories. The ninth question is difficult in view of its lack of use, and that lack is a negative feature at present. Its former uses as a school or church hall would not have been greatly positive, and the proposed future use could be positive according to the physical works entailed. Finally, the question on associated structure. If the retaining walls and their landscaping are considered under this heading, they are proposed to be kept and therefore the demolition would not affect the contribution.
12. Further to these considerations, the building is prominent in its location, being seen on higher ground approaching along Front Street East and from Vulcan Place, and does display a style and layout that sets it aside from the domestic architecture presently outside the designated area to the south and the club to the west. It is a building of some interest architecturally, with its symmetrical layout and pitched roof, but in particular viewpoints, that interest is reduced by the later additions. Of more prominence and interest in my view is the layout of retaining walls and planted terraces, both within and outside the site boundary, which form an enclosure to the site and a pleasant partner to the wall around the church at this town centre junction.
13. I now consider the condition of the building. There is no evidence of deliberate neglect to obtain consent for demolition but it is my judgement that the unused state, rather than the actual condition of the fabric, detracts from the character

and appearance of the area. Whilst a suitable future use could, subject to its viability, secure the repair of the fabric, there has been no real progress in that direction over a substantial period of time and it appears to be the case that the last users, as the church hall, were having difficulty maintaining the building.

14. In addition to the English Heritage publication referred to, Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 "*Planning and the Historic Environment*" contains advice at paragraph 4.27 on the demolition of unlisted buildings in conservation areas. Where a building makes a positive contribution, there is advice on the considerations. My conclusion in this main issue is that the building is capable of making a contribution to the character and appearance of the area, and is not a detractor. However, I do not consider this a clear-cut case, and the period of vacancy and the apparent lack of an acceptable re-use over that time all point to the possibility of replacement needing to be considered; doing nothing is not a solution. The same paragraph in the Central Government guidance states that in such cases the decision maker is entitled to consider the merits of any proposed development in determining whether consent should be given. Policy GP18 of the Wansbeck Local Plan 2007 states that demolition of a building which makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a Conservation Area will not be permitted unless there is conclusive evidence that it is beyond reasonable economic repair. Whilst I regard this as a consideration, I shall follow the fuller advice in PPG15 as set out above.
15. I shall now judge the merits of the three schemes for the development of the site, before concluding on the matter of demolition. Two of the schemes are related to the conservation area consent proposals as replacement buildings, and the other, the Second Scheme, retains the building and may further inform my consideration of the worth of the building.

Conservation Area and Listed Buildings

16. **Generally** The site is previously developed land within a town centre close to shops, services and transport. As such its development for residential purposes would be in line with Central Government policy guidance in Planning Policy Statement 3 "*Housing*", as would the density chosen for each scheme, the higher density being the best use of land. The proposals would also accord with various policies of the Development Plan as agreed within the Statement of Common Ground.
17. However, these considerations must be weighed with the statement in PPS3 that there is no presumption that the whole of the curtilage of previously developed land should be developed and that more intensive development is not always appropriate, but when well designed and built in the right location, it can enhance the character and quality of an area. Paragraph 16 makes clear that there is a need for housing to be of a high quality, well designed and to be in suitable locations, and which is well integrated with, and complements the neighbouring buildings and the local area. In addition, this site is within a conservation area and close to listed buildings, and as such the requirements of Sections 72(1) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 apply.

18. **The First Scheme** The school building would be demolished and the stone re-used where appropriate. The site would be redeveloped with a frontage to both Front Street West and Church Lane and the retention of enclosure along the north boundary reconciling the higher ground level of the site with that of the club building and the main road.
19. There is a Bedlington Conservation Area Character Appraisal, carried out by a respected local practitioner. There is some doubt over the status of the document and whether it has been formally adopted by the Council. Nevertheless, I find it useful in augmenting my own observations carried out over the course of the Inquiry and whether or not it is accorded much weight in policy terms, it does appear to record features accurately and provide information on which I can come to my own conclusions. I find the conservation area long and narrow, and varied in architectural style, use of materials, scale of buildings and disposition of spaces. There are recurring themes of stone, pantile roofs, limited window areas and the joining of dissimilar buildings into groups which display within that terrace considerable variety. The spaces formed are similarly varied with rear-of-pavement development along the north side and more space in front of buildings along the south. Within the vicinity of the appeal site there are two significant spaces, the market place to the north and the church/vicarage precinct to the south and east.
20. A further publication is the Bedlington Conservation Area Management Strategy Supplementary Planning Document. This contains a development brief for the appeal site and was adopted. However, for reasons to do with consultation, this document has subsequently been un-adopted and I can accord it no weight as it has not yet reappeared as a consultation draft, although I heard that this is imminent. The development brief is of interest in that it provides the basis for a further scheme illustrating what the appellants considers inconsistencies in the brief and a lack of viability.
21. One of the matters emerging in the brief and which formed evidence to the Inquiry is the view of the church tower from the market place. At present, and as allowed by the state of tree foliage, a view may be had of the upper parts of the tower including the clock, cut off by the roof of the existing school building. The First Scheme frontage buildings would block this view. The likely effect of the development brief would, in my opinion, be a reduction or blocking of the view also. I attach little weight to the idea that the block along the Front Street West boundary could either be single storey or lowered into an excavated base. The former would be uncharacteristic of the area and not assist the viability of the scheme and the latter, apart from adding further cost, would result in awkward levels on the site and would have the single storey appearance as above.
22. On studying the spaces and buildings that make up the conservation area and its history, I attach little weight to the view of the tower. It is plainly seen as part of the church building across the churchyard and Church Lane, a significant open space in my judgement. Any view of the tower from the market place would, at best, be of a small fragment of the building and lacking much of the totality that makes this listed building of interest. There is no

- support in the Appraisal for the retention of the view or of any real visual link between the two important spaces, the church precinct and the market place.
23. I find the establishment of a frontage to both adjoining streets welcome and entirely appropriate, that to Front Street West being softened by the retention of the change of level and terraced planting. There would be additional access providing a through pedestrian route which would improve the appearance of the retaining wall particularly where it abuts the club and currently appears an abrupt change of level and contains poor materials. It is my view that the plan arrangement of the buildings, their landscaping, layout of open space and also their scale and height, would be appropriate to the site and to the conservation area. They would be higher than the club, but I attach weight to the grant of permission on the Elliott's Garage site for two substantial schemes; one permission for a care home being extant. The club is an attractive building that has the bearing and detailing to stand alongside higher neighbours on both sides, in my view.
24. Having found the principal of development and the general arrangement of the proposal acceptable, I turn to the detail of what is proposed. The architectural treatment would be somewhat eclectic, and not reflecting the well-ordered treatment of the club, nor what is proposed for the garage site. It would however reflect much of the attractive juxtaposition of styles, materials and shapes in the wider conservation area. I do not regard it as pastiche in the pejorative sense; it is not contemporary, as the care home scheme appears to be, and it does mix old styles. Nevertheless, this is not, I consider, meant to deceive, and with use of new materials this would not do that in any event. There would be no risk in my judgement of this use of previous styles somehow debasing that which is truly historic and the limited connection with such older vernacular buildings would further reduce this risk.
25. There would be differing pitched roofs and gables interspersed with features such as the corner tower and the flat roofed tower on the north side. I consider these features and the general disposition of pitches and walling planes would add interest and variety within an appropriate palette of detailing and materials. I am inclined to the view that what appears as a cross on the top of the faceted tower risks confusion with the church tower in middle distance views, and this could be altered to some other type of finial by condition. The 'pele' tower may well have historic associations with the area, but even if these are not widely understood, the feature adds variety to the façade and breaks up what might otherwise be a monolithic building. On this last point, the two schemes for the garage site are more homogeneous in their design, but these are large blocks at ground level and more readily associated with the street scene. Variety on the appeal site is, I consider, acceptable.
26. There would be an area of flat roof hidden behind pitches in places. Whilst such a device can result in an over-bulky building, the variety in the detailing and materials would avoid this appearance. Minor matters such as window detailing can be secured by condition, with mullion design aiding the desirable vertical emphasis. Undercroft parking cannot be an objection in principle in view of its previously approved use in the Elliott's Garage scheme and this feature would be little seen in general conservation area views, although it would be visible to the proposed new pedestrian route. Compared with more

- car parking being visible in the open, and the detrimental effect this might have on density and viability, I consider this proposed covered parking acceptable.
27. The three buildings that the new works adjoin include the houses to the south, outside the conservation area at present, which would not be adversely affected, and there would remain space for the access between. To the west would be the club, the value of whose 'polite' architecture would not be eroded by the proposal. To the east is the church, a listed building with separately listed items within its curtilage. Whilst I do not consider these other items to have a setting any larger than that curtilage, the setting of the church extends over the appeal site in my view. However, the church is such a strong feature of the area, that I do not consider the proposed First Scheme development to be harmful. It would be visible from the church and both would be seen in the same views, but the setting would remain intact, and compared with the risk of continued vacancy, development would enhance the setting.
28. In conclusion on this scheme, the loss of any view of the church tower that exists now is of little weight as part of the character and appearance of the conservation area and is substantially outweighed by the benefits of a viable development of the site and the visual benefits that would occur. The proposed development in this scheme would, at the least, preserve the setting of the church and the character and appearance of the area, as required by the 1990 Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act.
29. **The Second Scheme** This is the scheme that retains the older part of the school building and converts it into three dwellings. Whilst there were views expressed as to the value of internal spaces and structures, this is not controlled in an unlisted building, and I attach little weight to any disruption of internal spaces that might occur. There would be the insertion of a new intermediate floor and to provide adequate ceiling heights this would need to meet the external walls below the head of the ground floor windows. That could be accomplished without adverse effect on the exterior view due to the thickness of the walls and the possibility of sloping the nearest part of the floor thickness and wall above. Conditions could control minor matters such as the circular windows and arrangement of other windows to ensure no loss of character.
30. However, this scheme relies for even its stated limited viability on the addition of new-build attached to the older building and extending across the west side of the site. This is not a matter of enabling development, but the new build is an essential part of the viability of retaining the school. It is clear to me that a scheme with less new buildings would be less likely to secure the retention of the original building. There were objections over detailing, undercroft parking and the like, similar to those in the First Scheme, but there is also, in my judgement, a more fundamental objection regarding the effect on the original building and hence the character and appearance of the conservation area, of the higher block to the rear. This increase in height and modern appearance would tend to loom over the older building, undermining much of what makes it attractive as a building and as an historic asset. Whilst residential uses could be accommodated in the building with only little adverse effect, the

- development of the large and taller rear block would appear out of place and too close.
31. On some sites this juxtaposition could be less harmful as a low view-point would have the effect of lessening the relative heights. In this case, there are important elevated views from the church yard and adjoining its listed structures that would place the higher building in an unacceptable relationship with the building which this scheme purports to save. Had this been true enabling development as defined by English Heritage in relation to listed buildings at risk, I would have to conclude that the new building would materially detract from the architectural and historic interest of the asset and would materially harm its setting. In view of the limited weight that I have been able to attach to the value of the building in its setting and therefore its retention, in my first main issue, I find the harm to the wider area caused by the attempt to retain the building and build new development unwarranted. The proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and would harm the setting of the listed buildings. Views into the conservation area would also be adversely affected.
32. **The Third Scheme** I have discussed the merits of a view of the church tower earlier as part of my consideration of the First Scheme. This third scheme is designed around the retention of broadly as much of that view as presently exists, achieved by a number of devices. Chief of these is the splitting of the layout into two parts with a gap between. As the view sought is diagonal to the rectilinear site, the gap is similarly diagonal, introducing an uncharacteristic shape to the built form. There is an element of diagonal development around the north of the market place, but this is not to frame or preserve views, and in fact the 'gap site' in the corner is an unresolved edge to the space which 'leaks' the view rather than retaining it. The buildings along the other two, northern and western, sides act to constrain the market space, a role not performed by the diagonal placing on the appeal site. The result of the diagonal gap in the appeal site is not just a lack of the frontage block to Front Street West that I find so appropriate in the First Scheme, but another unresolved edge to an important space in the conservation area.
33. That diagonal layout has other unfortunate detailed results in my estimation. The western block is shown to have a poorly proportioned and awkwardly detailed roof layout at its northern termination. In drawn elevation it appears unbalanced and unattractive, and in reality, seen from the lower vantage point of the market place, and in mobile views passing along Front Street West, I consider it would look contrived and would severely detract from the well-mannered and formal club facade. Another result is the long corner angle, not a feature much seen in the conservation area and where it is, limited to a short stretch to take a building round a tight corner or to accommodate a door. The introduction of this feature in a prominent location would appear out of place and harmful in my opinion.
34. As with the Second Scheme, although there were detailed objections, which could be dealt with by condition, I find a fundamental flaw in the layout which causes the proposal to harm the character and appearance of the conservation area. The merit of a view of the church tower, which I have found to be

limited, would be outweighed by the harm caused by features that would appear within that view of the listed building.

Conditions and Undertakings

35. As set out in my statement of the Main Issues, certain other reasons for refusal were agreed to be capable of being overcome by conditions or an undertaking. Draft conditions were discussed at the Inquiry and amended in light of my views and further discussion. In particular, the date of the applications for Appeals A and B mean that a five year permission and consent is applicable. Conditions should be attached to require approval of further details of materials, enclosure and boundary treatment, doors and windows, as well as rainwater goods, and soil and vent pipes. To that I suggested should be added flues and other vents, and this was agreed. The materials condition should ensure the re-use of stone and other materials to be agreed prior to demolition. Further conditions are required to control access and the changes to the eastern boundary. Traffic and access was a concern expressed by local people, but which was agreed by the Highway Authority to be satisfactory. In view of these concerns, it is essential that the revised arrangements are carried out. There is also a need to secure the provision and retention of a cycle store. A landscaping scheme is to be required, and I consider it good practice to add the provision for an alternative tree or shrub to be permitted in the event of one dying, as to repeat the use of a failed species may not be wise. The site is constricted and close to dwellings, and control of operations, wheel cleaning and construction times during re-development is necessary and reasonable. Provision of energy from renewable sources, preferably at the 10% sought by Policy GP34 needs to be secured. The supporting text to the policy states that the council will only expect these provisions to be included within a scheme of development where it is viable. My view is that a lesser amount may be acceptable as being preferable to no such provision at all, subject to that lesser amount being justifiable. This was agreed by both parties.
36. In addition, separate conditions are required to be attached to the conservation area consent covering recording of the building, salvage of materials and items of interest, and the carrying out of a survey for bat roosts. A condition is required to link demolition to a scheme and contract for re-development to avoid a gap site over a long period. I shall incorporate conditions on hours of work, wheel washing, as well as site compounds and parking, to match those in the construction phase.
37. A signed and dated unilateral undertaking pursuant to Section 106 of the 1990 Planning Act was presented for the First Scheme, and was stated by the Council to be agreed. This undertaking provides for a contribution to children's play facilities. I consider the undertaking satisfies the tests in Circular 5/05 "*Planning Obligations*"; it is relevant to planning, necessary to make the proposal acceptable in planning terms as it relates to a reason for refusal, directly related to the development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development proposed, and reasonable in all other respects. Whilst similar undertakings were presented with the Second and Third Schemes, neither these nor the use of conditions are capable of overcoming the fundamental objections that I have identified in those cases.

Conclusions

38. The existing building makes only a neutral or limited contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area, and the risk of long term vacancy and the limited viability of a scheme that retains it is a further consideration. The scheme that does retain the building has serious flaws in the relationship of the new development required to attain viability such that much of the architectural or historic value of the retained building would be lost. As a result I conclude that the Second Scheme is unacceptable. The Third Scheme also has fundamental shortcomings in the design and layout that are not capable of being overcome by conditions. Associated with that scheme is the second application for conservation area consent, and strictly, since there is a requirement to consider the merits of the replacement scheme, Appeal E should fail also.
39. The First Scheme I find to be acceptable and to preserve both the setting of the listed buildings and the character and appearance of the conservation area. It would bring the site back into beneficial use and provide housing in a sustainable location making use of previously developed land. As such I conclude that the merits of the replacement building in the First Scheme clearly outweigh the loss of the existing building and that in addition to the grant of planning permission for the new development, conservation area consent may be granted for demolition, the subject of Appeal B. There is no detriment in dismissing the second consent appeal while allowing the first, as the first would have a five year period for the works to be carried out against the three years of the second consent. For the reasons given above I conclude that Appeals A and B should be allowed, but that Appeals C, D and E should be dismissed.

S J Papworth

INSPECTOR

ANNEX 1

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Nicola Allan of Counsel, instructed by Northumberland
County Council

She called;

Peter Rogers BA(Hons) IHBC Historic Buildings Advisor
Northumberland County Council

Jennifer Adamson BA(Hons) MRTPI South East Area Development Manager
Northumberland County Council

FOR THE APPELLANT:

James Strachan of Counsel, instructed by Dickinson Dees LLP
He called;

Dr Jonathan Edis MA PhD MIFA Director
IHBC CgMs Consulting

Christopher Barr BSc(Hons) MArch Nicholson Nairn Architects
RIBA

Jan Bessell BA(Hons) MRTPI MIQ Dickinson Dees LLP

INTERESTED PERSONS

Mrs Rewcastle Churchwarden, St Cuthbert's Church

DOCUMENTS

- | | | |
|----------|----|---|
| Document | 1 | Photographs of school building and cover sheet dated 25 April 2008 submitted by Council |
| Document | 2 | Layout drawing 'Resource Centre Scheme' submitted by Council |
| Document | 3 | Rebuttal Proof of Evidence Jan Bessell and Appendices submitted by Appellant |
| Document | 4 | Design and Access Statement March 2009 submitted by Appellant |
| Document | 5 | Letter G V A Grimley to Dysart Developments 12 May 2009 submitted by Appellant |
| Document | 6 | Letter Bradford & Bingley Storey Sons and Parker to Millhouse Developments 21 January 2004 submitted by Appellant |
| Document | 7 | Letter Sinton & Co to Bradford & Bingley 19 December 2003 submitted by Appellant |
| Document | 8 | Letter Wansbeck District Council to Bradford & Bingley 5 March 2003 submitted by Appellant |
| Document | 9 | Committee Reports, plans and Notice of Permission re. Elliott's garage site submitted by Appellant |
| Document | 10 | Bedlington Resource Centre <i>Site Context</i> submitted by Appellant |
| Document | 11 | Pre-development photographs, site at Hexham, submitted by Appellant |
| Document | 12 | S106 Undertakings for each of three schemes, 17 December 2009 submitted by Appellant |
| Document | 13 | Agreed conditions submitted jointly |
| Document | 14 | Letter from Mr & Mrs Dawson, neighbour |

ANNEX 2

Conditions attached to the grant of planning permission for 19 residential flats with onsite parking at Bedlington Old School, Front Street West, Bedlington, Northumberland NE22 5EL;

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than five years from the date of this permission.
- 2) Notwithstanding the details submitted with the planning application, no works of construction shall commence on the application site (or at a time as otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority) until a schedule of the types and colours of materials to be used on the external elevations of the proposed development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the re-use of stone and other materials identified and agreed as being suitable prior to demolition. The materials and details as approved shall thereafter be used on the development.
- 3) No works of construction shall commence on the application site (or at a time as otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority) until details of all means of enclosure/boundary treatment to be erected within, and adjacent to, the application site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The means of enclosure/boundary treatment shall not be erected otherwise than in accordance with the approved details.
- 4) Notwithstanding the details submitted with the planning application, details of all external doors and windows, and all rainwater goods, soil and vent pipes, flues, ducts and any other pipework, satellite or radio antennae, as well as the finial to the corner tower, on the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to their installation. The development shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved details.
- 5) Notwithstanding the details submitted with the planning application, no development shall commence (or at a time as otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority) until detailed designs for;
 - a) Vehicular and pedestrian access point(s) to the application site,
 - b) Car parking areas,
 - c) Vehicular turning spaces,have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works as approved shall be completed prior to the occupation of any of the dwellings hereby permitted (or at a time as otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority) and shall be thereafter retained.
- 6) Notwithstanding the details submitted with the planning application no development shall commence (or at a time as otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority) until a scheme (including a method statement and programme for implementation) in respect of the proposed realignment, alteration and repair of the boundary/retaining wall along the eastern boundary of the application site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall thereafter be undertaken in accordance with the approved scheme prior to first occupation of the dwellings.
- 7) Notwithstanding the details submitted with the planning application, no works of construction shall commence on the application site (or at a time as otherwise

agreed with the Local Planning Authority) until a landscaping scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme shall include details of;

- a) the treatment proposed for all ground surfaces,
- b) the proposed plant and tree species,
- c) materials proposed and their disposition,
- d) the ground preparation works prior to planting and,
- e) the future maintenance of landscaped areas.

The approved landscaping scheme shall be carried out during the first planting season following the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, and shall be maintained for a period of 5 years from the date of planting. During this period any trees or shrubs which die or are damaged, removed or seriously diseased shall be replaced by trees or shrubs of a similar size and species to those originally required to be planted, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written approval to any variation.

- 8) No development shall commence until provision has been made (either within or outside the application site) for a site compound area, including a materials storage area and parking area for operatives' vehicles in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the compound area as approved shall be kept available for use for the duration of the construction works unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 9) No demolition/construction works shall commence on the application site until details of a wheel cleaning facility and its siting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The facility shall be retained in the approved position for use by construction traffic for the duration of the demolition/construction works or as otherwise approved by the Local Planning Authority.
- 10) No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until details of cycle storage facilities within the application site, and a programme for their provision, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning authority. The facilities shall thereafter be provided, and retained, as approved.
- 11) Works of demolition or development shall not be carried out other than between the hours of 08:00 and 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:30 and 13:00 Saturdays, and shall not be carried out at all on Sundays and on Bank and public holidays.
- 12) No works of construction shall commence on the application site (or at a time as otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority) until a scheme containing details of the energy conservation measures to be included (and subsequently retained) in the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall demonstrate that 10% of predicted energy requirements shall be provided on site from renewable sources or such other lesser percentage as is shown to be viable. The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the approved scheme and shall be retained thereafter.

ANNEX 3

Conditions attached to the grant of conservation area consent for demolition of the existing school buildings and playground and adjustment of ground levels at Bedlington Old School, Front Street West, Bedlington, Northumberland NE22 5EL;

- 1) The works hereby authorised shall begin not later than five years from the date of this consent.
- 2) No part of the former church school building shall be demolished until a full photographic record has been made both of the external elevations of the building and any features of historic or architectural interest within it, in accordance with details previously submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. A copy of the photographic record shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.
- 3) No part of the former church school building shall be demolished until an assessment of the stone and other materials that can be retained from the building and re-used has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. All such materials shall not be removed from the building otherwise than in accordance with the approved assessment and, once removed, these materials shall be securely stored until they are required for re-use.
- 4) No demolition of the former school building shall commence until a contract for the undertaking of the new development that is the subject of the planning permission of the same date as this consent has been let.
- 5) No works shall be undertaken on the demolition of any part of the former church school building until a bat report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall contain information on the presence of any bats within the building and recommendations for their protection including any necessary mitigation measures (and a programme for the implementation of such measures). Any mitigation measures identified in the approved report shall thereafter be undertaken prior to demolition.
- 6) The works of demolition shall not be carried out other than between the hours of 08:00 and 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:30 and 13:00 Saturdays, and shall not be carried out at all on Sundays and on Bank and public holidays.
- 7) No works of demolition shall commence until provision has been made (either within or outside the application site) for a site compound area, including a materials storage area and parking area for operatives' vehicles in accordance with a scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the compound area as approved shall be kept available for use for the duration of the demolition works unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 8) No works of demolition shall commence on the application site until details of a wheel cleaning facility and its siting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The facility shall be retained in the approved position for use by demolition traffic for the duration of the demolition works or as otherwise approved by the Local Planning Authority.