



Appeal Decisions

Hearing Held on 12 & 13 July 2017

Site visits made on 11 & 13 July 2017

by Nick Fagan BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10th August 2017

Planning Appeal Ref: APP/Y3425/W/16/3164139

St John's Church, Granville Terrace, Stone, Staffordshire ST15 8DF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by BHG Stone Ltd against Stafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/23671/FUL is dated 4 February 2016.
 - The development proposed is conversion of the church and erection of a rear two storey extension (following demolition of existing single storey extension) to provide 5 no residential units, and the erection of a 2½ storey building fronting The Avenue to provide 4 no apartments on the former church car park.
-

Listed Building Appeal Ref: APP/Y3425/Y/16/3164144

St John's Church, Granville Terrace, Stone, Staffordshire ST15 8DF

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by BHG Stone Ltd against Stafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/23672/LBC is dated 4 February 2016.
 - The works proposed are conversion of the church and erection of a rear two storey extension (following demolition of existing single storey extension) to provide 5 no residential units, and the erection of a 2½ storey building fronting The Avenue to provide 4 no apartments on the former church car park.
-

Decision

1. Both appeals are allowed. Planning permission and listed building consent are granted for conversion of the church and erection of a rear two storey extension (following demolition of existing single storey extension) to provide 5 no residential units, and the erection of a 2½ storey building fronting The Avenue to provide 4 no apartments on the former church car park at St John's Church, Granville Terrace, Stone, Staffordshire ST15 8DF in accordance with the terms of the applications, Refs 16/23671/FUL and 16/23672/LBC, dated 4 February 2016, subject to the two Schedules of Conditions below.

Procedural Issues

2. Technically, listed building consent is not required for the new apartment building fronting The Avenue but because the description of the development is set out on the joint planning and listed building application form and for ease of expression I have kept the same description for both applications.

3. The appellant submitted a planning obligation by way of Unilateral Undertaking (UU) dated 13 February 2017. The wording of this was discussed at the Hearing and the appellant submitted a revised UU dated 14 July 2017 on the day after the Hearing closed, which I had suggested would be useful without of course any prejudice to the outcome of the appeals. I address the UU in more detail below.

Application for costs

4. At the Hearing an application for costs was made by BHG Stone Ltd against Stafford Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issues

5. The main issues in these appeals are:
 - (a) the effect of the proposed development/works on the special interest of this Grade II listed building;
 - (b) the effect of the external works/development on the setting of the listed building and character and appearance of the Stone Conservation Area;
 - (c) whether the residential conversion is likely to be the optimal viable use of the redundant church;
 - (d) whether the extent of the proposed works/development have been financially justified; and
 - (e) whether the proposed works/development would secure the necessary repair and restoration of the listed building including through the UU and conditions.

Reasons

Effect on Listed Building Itself

6. St John's is a large imposing stone faced former Congregationalist (latterly Methodist) church located on the corner of Granville Terrace and the A520 Longton Road on the edge of Stone town centre. It is a prominent feature in the townscape, in part because of its high tower abutting the corner of these two roads.
7. The interior of the church is open so that all the pews including those situated in the first floor galleries have a clear and unimpeded view of the pulpit, which sits on a raised dais, and of the organ behind it, in accordance with the liturgical practice of such nonconformist churches. The 1992 listing description states that the interior is a well preserved good example of its type.

Effect on Interior

8. The proposal is to divide the church's open interior by erecting a full height lateral wall in order to create the separation between the front 4 flats and the larger Unit 5, as well as a full height perpendicular wall between Units 1&3 and 2&4. There is no doubt that such a division would harm the current interior space of the listed building, which is an important element of its significance.
9. The appellant has endeavoured to preserve key open views of the pulpit and organ by restricting the vertical subdivision to only about 50% of the nave. I

agree with the Council that this still nonetheless considerably foreshortens the interior space, and the creation of the mezzanine gallery to house the master bedroom of Unit 5 and its adjoining en-suite bathroom and dressing-room would interrupt the remaining volume.

10. However, this bedroom would have a fully glazed wall which would look onto the open lightwell above the raised pulpit and organ, the focal point of the church's interior. This open well would extend upwards to the underside of the church roof. It would also be overlooked by an open sitting area and library on the first floor, which would be lit by two rooflights in each side of the church's dual pitched roof. The ground floor of this area would be kept largely open and used as a gym and games room. The appellant also intends to restore the organ itself as well as the clock in the tower, which would be positive benefits, as would the repair and retention of the church's stained glass windows and their protection by the use of new internal secondary glazing.
11. The proposed conversion necessarily involves the stripping out of all the church pews but this would be likely to happen with any change of use which included the whole of the church's floor space. However the raked floor of the upper galleries would be retained, albeit largely under the new first floor. The revisions to the original 2015 scheme in the western lobby area involve resiting some of the pews along the wall under the church's main western window as well as ensuring that this lobby area remains open at first floor level. I consider that the restoration of the original floor plan at ground floor and the use of the original openings and staircases to access Units 1-4 as well as the retention of the open lobby/foyer area at first floor is a positive aspect of the scheme's overall design.
12. There was discussion at the Hearing about what constituted a good conversion of a church with reference to specific examples. The appellant cited the residential conversion of a similar sized Grade II listed open plan Methodist church in Nantwich permitted by Cheshire East Council in 2009¹.
13. The floor plans show a more intensive conversion of that church than what is being sought here, albeit that the retained open area affording views of the pulpit and organ is deeper by one bay than that proposed in this case. In particular the perpendicular walls are closer to the retained pulpit and are largely solid, that scheme delivers 8 flats rather than 5 and the lobby/foyer area on the first floor is subdivided and used as habitable floor space. The comparison between that scheme and this one is not determinative, especially in view of the fact that neither main party's conservation experts had direct knowledge of the Nantwich Methodist Church, because this proposal must stand or fall on its own merits. Nonetheless, there are a number of positive design elements in the proposed conversion as set out above that are noticeably absent from the Nantwich scheme.
14. The Council's conservation expert argued that other uses would have less impact on the open plan form of the church and cited the use of St Mary's Church in Derby as architect's offices and St John's Church in Hanley, Stoke as an antiques showroom as examples which had less impact on those

¹ Decision Notice and approved drawings set out in Appendix 1 of appellant's summary statement of 15 May 2017

churches' interiors. However, Anglican churches, as Mr Taylor confirmed in the case of St Mary's, have side aisles and it was possible in that case to install new first floors into those side aisles to create new office space without subdividing the central space of the nave. That would not be possible in this church because there are no side aisles and so there is no direct comparison between the two churches. I address the issue of optimal viable use below.

15. Mr Taylor also pointed out that a number of what he called 'west end conversions' of churches have been successfully carried out that leave the bulk of the internal space of their naves open. Whilst this may be so it is likely that any beneficial use of this church would involve some subdivision of its interior space even for restaurant/bar, showroom or office uses, albeit not to the extent proposed here.
16. In summary the proposed conversion would undoubtedly harm the open plan form and volume of the church's interior, an important element of the listed building's significance. But there are several positive design features of the conversion plans and other non-residential uses are likely to involve some element of subdivision even if not to the same extent as that proposed here as well as the removal of the pews.

Effect on Exterior - The Proposed Extension and Rooflights

17. The Council accepts that the size and design of the rooflights is acceptable but considers there would be too many of them. However, there would only be six on each roof plane and they would be sited low down on the roof. Consequently those proposed to face Longton Road would not be prominent from the main road, particularly in views from street level next to or opposite the church. Those on the other roof plane would only be seen from the alley next to Granville House and from the rear of houses in Granville Terrace and Avenue Road. Both sets of rooflights would only comprise a small portion of their respective roof planes and would not harm the building's exterior appearance.
18. The existing post-war flat-roofed rear extensions to the church are badly designed and in a poor state of repair; there is no objection to their removal. The proposal is to replace them with a two storey extension that would form the principal living space of Unit 5. This would be inset from Longton Road a considerable distance, and at the point where it meets the church on this elevation would be further inset and joined to the original structure by a slim glazed link with a lower roof. These would mean that it would read as appropriately subsidiary to the church in the Longton Road street scene. The extension's design includes two projecting rendered gables on the Longton Road elevation and that facing the car park, both of which would have first floor windows with arches to reflect the ecclesiastical style of those in the church. Such features would pay heed to the church and its townscape context without competing with it.
19. The Council considers this extension to be unnecessary and that any dwellings created, assuming these to be the optimal use, should be wholly within the original church. But I consider the design of the extension including its height, siting, massing, roof design and elevational detailing to be complementary to the much greater bulk and the external appearance of

the church. The rendered section of the rear of the church is that resulting from the demolition of the original schoolroom in the 1950s. But I can see no objection to the rendered gables proposed because render would not seek to compete with or ape the stonework of the church. The same applies to the main brick elevations of the extension, which needn't be strident since the precise type of brick can be agreed via a condition. Using different materials like these would, in conjunction with the lesser scale of the extension compared to the church itself, provide a complementary contrast.

20. I acknowledge that the stone string course between the ground and first floors of the extension would not line up with either that on the main church building or on its lower north east section. But this is not necessary because there is a clear visual break between the extension and church on Longton Road due to the set back from the road and the design of the glazed link. The siting of the extension means that any such difference would not be readily perceptible or prominent on the extension's other elevations.

Effect on Setting of listed building and character and appearance of Conservation Area

The Longton Road Wall and Proposed Access and Car Parking Area

21. The 1.5m high brick wall with blue brick coping that runs along Longton Road enclosing the existing car park is arguably curtilage listed and therefore part of the listed building itself. But the Council's objections to its loss relate to the setting of the listed building and its effect on the Conservation Area (CA) and I agree that it should therefore be considered in this context.
22. The wall undoubtedly performs an enclosing role for the site and is a positive feature of this prominent streetscape in the CA. The proposal would see it demolished and replaced by 500mm high railings with planting behind. This is in part to achieve the requisite visibility splays for the proposed vehicular access into a parking court that would provide all the necessary off-street parking for the development. But it would also be necessary to achieve the widening of the footway on this side of the road required by the Highway Authority as part of the development.
23. Whilst the wall is attractive I consider that the proposed railings, which would form a complete boundary treatment by extending along The Avenue frontage as well, would provide an acceptable enclosure, especially with greenery behind them, and that the demolition of the wall would not materially harm the listed building's setting or the setting of this northern edge of the CA. I make this judgement in the light of the public benefit that would be achieved by creating a uniform 2m wide footway along this busy road at the entry to the town centre. The brick from the walls including the blue coping bricks would be reused to build the proposed walls between the parking spaces and the extension and on the boundary with Granville House. This would satisfactorily recycle historic materials in the new scheme.
24. However, I am unconvinced by the design of the new access and the parking court. It is unclear why an access to no more than 16 parking spaces is required to be 6.1m wide. I am also unclear why the turning area between the two main ranks of parking spaces needs to be so wide. It appears that

there would be a needless amount of hard surfacing unless additional parking spaces are required. A lesser area could alternatively result in more soft landscaping, which would better enhance the setting of the church and improve the look and feel of this part of the site directly abutting the edge of the CA. The same would apply to a narrower vehicular access. The appellant, in answer to my question at the Hearing, raised no objection to the imposition of a condition reserving details of these issues, and that is what I intend to do.

The Proposed Apartment Building on The Avenue

25. The apartment building would be inset from the footway and slightly inset from the front of the neighbouring houses on The Avenue. It would extend as far back approximately as the two storey rear projection of 1 The Avenue. The proportions, height and massing of the building would be similar to the Victorian/Edwardian houses on this side of the road within the CA.
26. In my opinion the Council's criticisms that the appellant has cherry-picked a random selection of design features from the neighbouring houses and transposed them onto the proposed building in an inorganic way is rather harsh. The angled two storey bays and the dormers sitting on the wall plate would successfully mirror similar features on the existing houses. The set back of the rendered lower wings would in my view work equally well and the front elevation of the block would be attractive and complementary to the neighbouring houses in the CA.
27. The block's rear elevation would be fairly bland but inoffensive and its pattern of fenestration and materials would be acceptable. It would be sited at least 30m away from the listed church and its modest height and massing would not harm the setting of the listed building. It is possible that a redesign of the parking and turning area could give this block some soft landscaped garden area but this is not a criticism of the building itself and I note the Council has raised no objection to the apartment block on this basis.
28. For these reasons I consider that the new block would not harm the setting of the listed building and would preserve the character and appearance of the CA.

Conclusion on Effect on Listed Building and on Conservation Area

29. The exterior works/development would not harm the setting of the listed building and would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. However, the subdivision of the church's interior would harm the current interior space of the listed building, which would adversely affect its special interest and significance.
30. Policy N9 of the Plan for Stafford Borough (PSB) requires the significance of heritage assets to be protected and appropriate mitigation measures to be put in place where harm is unavoidable. To the extent that the proposal would harm the significance of the listed building it would fail to comply with Policy N9, though I turn now to the issue of the building's optimal viable use.

Optimal Viable Use

31. The appellant relies on the Delamere Marketing and Viability Assessment dated 29 November 2015 to demonstrate that residential conversion is the optimal viable use and that the totality of the development scheme is required in order to meet the costs of repairing the listed building.
32. The Council challenges the marketing details set out in Section 4 of the Delamere report. It argues that there are no details of the Louis Taylor marketing campaign and queries why there was such a limited number of viewings; there is no first-hand information about how flexible the owners were on the offer price; it considers the lack of a national marketing campaign to have limited possible purchasers; and notes that no options appraisal has been carried out for each potential use of the church.
33. I accept that these are shortcomings of the Delamere report. But the Council does not dispute that the property was placed on the market in October 2012; a sale board was continually displayed on the site until the property was sold at auction on 12 November 2013; adverts were placed in the local Sentinel newspaper and that the auction catalogue was more likely than not sent out to about 250 local, regional and national prospective buyers. Furthermore it does not challenge that only two offers were received prior to the auction and that these prospective buyers, one of whom was also seeking residential conversion, pulled out because of the likely repair costs. It does not challenge the auction guide price of between £50,000-£100,000 although does suggest that the appellant may have overbid for the site at £157,000.
34. The Delamere report also considers the feasibility of restaurant or office use of the building but concludes that the former would be unviable because of the proximity of 20 nearby eating establishments in the town and backs this up with evidence of the marketing of several of these. I was able to verify the existence of many of these establishments during my visits and that a number of them are still for sale after nearly two years. I agree that any restaurant in the church would have many competitors close by in the town centre, many of which are better located and are premises that do not require lots of money spending on them. I also consider that it would be difficult to regularly fill (or even half fill) a restaurant or restaurants occupying such a large floor area that the church would provide.
35. In terms of office uses the report likewise outlines office availability on a number of nearby business and industrial parks and provides evidence that the repair and conversion costs to such a use would be uncompetitive with the market rent that could be secured for such offices when compared with the rental values of available premises at the time, and hence office use would be unviable. I very much doubt whether the situation has changed since the report was written and note that the Council does not fundamentally challenge its conclusions in this respect.
36. In summary, I accept that the report is lacking in detail and it is possible that the appellant overbid in order to secure the site. But the Council does not fundamentally challenge that the church was properly marketed for over a year or that restaurant or office uses would be unviable. It has suggested that an antique showroom or similar use may be feasible but the failure of

one of the two bidders (who wished to pursue such a use) to pursue his initial offer of £165,000 because of the costs of necessary repairs to the building suggests also that such a use would be equally unviable. If the appellant overbid it did not do so by a huge amount compared to the estimated costs of repairs (see below) and this does not therefore negate its case. I conclude for these reasons that residential conversion is the most likely optimal viable use of the building.

Financial Justification for the Works/Development

37. It is agreed between the main parties that the proposal would not constitute 'enabling development' in the sense referred to by NPPF paragraph 140 because there is no in-principle planning policy objection to it. Rather it should be assessed in terms of whether it preserves the significance of the listed building and the character and appearance of the CA, which I have done above.
38. In light of my above conclusion that the interior conversion works would harm the current interior space of the listed building and adversely affect its special interest and significance it is necessary to assess whether the extent of such works are financially necessary, given the repair costs necessary to preserve the church.
39. The appellant provided a detailed list of repair/restoration estimates broken down into individual constituent parts such as repairs to the roof including lead work, structural works to repair cracks on the front elevation and clock tower, etc. Many of these individual estimates are evidenced by appropriate quotes from builders or specialists. There is no challenge to these estimates by the Council nor any argument that such repair works are unnecessary to the building's long term preservation and given the evidence and what I saw on site they appear to be reasonable and realistic. Whilst the repair of the organ and clock may not be strictly necessary they signify the appellant's intention to properly restore the church, and I consider this is a benefit of the scheme; those repair costs are in any case only a small proportion of the overall estimated cost of repairing/restoring the church itself of £508,725.
40. The appellant's submitted Summary of Costs and Gains shows an overall gross profit of £242,000 on an overall acquisition and build cost of £1,250,000 (which includes the above costs of £508,725), a level of profit which is within industry norms. The Council did not challenge the likely sales value of the proposed flats² and I have no reason to disagree with these. Consequently I conclude that the extent of the proposed works/development has been financially justified.

Whether the proposed works/development would secure the necessary repair and restoration of the listed building

41. In addition to the drawings showing the conversion of the church into 5 residential units the appellant has also submitted documentation setting out works to repair/restore the listed building³.

² As set out in the Tinsley Garner letter of 21 July 2016 contained in Appendix 7 of the appellant's Statement of Case

³ The HBL Associates letter of 17 November 2014 & drawings 5705-001 Rev A, -002 & -003 dated 18 October 2016 and CJR Heritage Services Conservation Specification and Work Schedules dated November 2016

42. The Council argues that insufficient detail has been provided within this documentation such that it cannot be assured that all the works necessary to ensure the building's preservation and future longevity will take place. In particular Mr Taylor argued that a schedule of dilapidations and repair works is necessary now, before permission is given, to include necessary works to the roof, floor, arch over the organ and to prevent damp penetration. He disagreed that the appellant could not open up relevant sections of the building so that such a schedule could be provided now.
43. I do find the appellant's arguments for not doing this, namely that such works may themselves require listed building consent, to be rather far-fetched. But it has provided 1:20 details on drawing 14/1/3242/5a Revision H regarding the methodology for inserting the new steelwork into the church's main walls, the installation of the new mezzanine floors to Units 3 and 4, the details of the main lateral wall and the details of secondary glazing and the Council has no objection to such. The HBL drawings and letter explain how the structural cracking will be addressed and it is clear from the estimate that the roof will be renewed or recovered.
44. Furthermore it will be essential that, given the proposal is to convert the church into five individual market dwellings, the appellant is able to show prospective purchasers that any structural defects in the building have been overcome and that all relevant local planning authority requirements have been adequately addressed. There is no reason why such requirements cannot be achieved through conditions attached to planning permission and listed building consent, and through the Building Regulations since evidence of compliance will demonstrate to any future purchaser that these matters have been adequately addressed. The Council's Conservation Officer would have to sign off any schedule of dilapidations and repair works and so would have a direct say in how they were conducted. It would of course be in the financial interests of future owner/occupiers to ensure that the listed building is properly maintained.
45. The revised UU also prevents the appellant from disposing of any of the new residential units unless and until all relevant repair work to the church is completed. The term 'disposal' now includes renting any of the units on an Assured Shorthold Tenancy as well as freehold or leasehold sale. The Schedule of Repair Works is satisfactorily defined in the UU because it includes not only the HBL letter and drawings and the CJR Specification as referred to above but also reference to a full schedule of dilapidations as required by the Council as set out in one of its suggested conditions, which I include in the Schedules of Conditions below. The UU therefore fulfils the three legal tests of necessity, relevance and reasonableness related in scale and kind to the proposed development.
46. For these reasons I conclude that the proposed works/development would secure the necessary repair and restoration of the listed building including through the UU and conditions.

Planning Balance

47. Statute requires that I give special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic

interest which it possesses⁴. I have concluded that the proposed conversion would harm the open plan form and volume of the church's interior, an important element of the listed building's significance.

48. The church's significance arises both from its internal space and use and its external impact being located on a prominent corner site on a main road on the edge of Stone town centre. Whilst the proposed internal conversion works would have a material impact on the church they would not in my opinion amount to substantial harm to the listed building because they would preserve many of its key internal features as set out above and enable the building to be restored and remain as a dominant feature in this part of the town, whilst the extension and new apartment building would respect its external design and be respectful of its setting.
49. It is important that the building is preserved and in order for this to occur it must have a long term viable use. I have concluded that residential conversion is the most likely optimal viable use of the building and also that the extent of the proposed works/development has been financially justified.
50. The public benefits of the scheme, namely the restoration of the listed building and its preservation into the future secured by the residential conversion scheme, outweigh the harm to its interior space. Even if, as per the Council's contention, the works would lead to substantial harm, I consider that the harm is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use. The proposal therefore complies with either paragraphs 133 or 134 of the NPPF.

Conditions

51. Regarding both appeals, a condition is necessary listing the approved drawings in the interests of precision. A condition is necessary in the listed building consent (LB) listing additional details required as discussed above in order that the conversion of the church preserves the significance of the listed building, although there is no need to duplicate such a condition in the planning permission (PP). The phasing/timing of various parts of the works was discussed at the Hearing but I do not consider the Council's suggested condition is necessary because the repairs to the church and the conversion works themselves are both necessary as part of the scheme and such a condition would be needlessly restrictive. As indicated in paragraph 24 above, PP Condition 4 reserves details of the final access, parking and turning area. Conditions 3 and 5 of the PP are necessary to ensure highway and pedestrian safety, and Condition 6 to safeguard the living conditions of nearby residents during construction and demolition.

Conclusion

52. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeals should be allowed, subject to the conditions below.

Nick Fagan

INSPECTOR

⁴ S16 & 66 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Schedule A – Planning Permission Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 14/1/3242/1; 14/1/3242/2; 14/1/3242/3; 14/1/3242/4; 14/1/3242/5a Rev H; 14/1/3242/5b Rev H; 14/1/3242/6 Rev G; 14/1/3242/7 Rev B; 14/1/3242/8 Rev K; 14/1/3242/9 Rev F; 14/1/3242/10 Rev C; 14/1/3242/11; 14/1/3242/12; and HBL drawings 5705-001 Rev A, -002 & -003.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until details of the visibility splays at the new vehicular access have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The splays shall thereafter be kept free of all obstructions to visibility over a height of 600mm above the adjacent carriageway level and be provided in accordance with the approved plan prior to the development being brought into use.
- 4) Notwithstanding the detailed design of the new access, parking and turning area shown on drawing 14/1/3242/8 Rev K, the final design of these aspects of the scheme shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of development. The development shall not be brought into use until these aspects of the scheme have been provided and they shall thereafter be retained. Edging kerbs are to be installed between the block paved access and the edge of the carriageway.
- 5) The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the footpath between The Avenue and the north end of the proposed vehicular access on Longton Road has been widened to 2m in accordance with any drawing approved under Condition 4 above.
- 6) All construction, including demolition, site works and deliveries to the site shall only take place between the hours of 0800 and 1800 Monday to Friday and 0800 to 1400 on Saturday, and not at all on Sundays or public/bank holidays. There shall be no burning on site during development.

Schedule B – Listed Building Consent Conditions

- 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
- 2) The works/development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 14/1/3242/1; 14/1/3242/2; 14/1/3242/3; 14/1/3242/4; 14/1/3242/5a Rev H; 14/1/3242/5b Rev H; 14/1/3242/6 Rev G; 14/1/3242/7 Rev B; 14/1/3242/8 Rev K; 14/1/3242/9 Rev F; 14/1/3242/10 Rev C; 14/1/3242/11; 14/1/3242/12; and HBL drawings 5705-001 Rev A, -002 & -003.
- 3) Notwithstanding any description/details in the application documents and before the commencement of development the following details for the church building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:- a) full schedule of dilapidations and repair

works; b) detailed drawings of structural steel work; c) details of internal partitions; d) details of stone cleaning; e) details of fenestration; f) details of conservation works to retained internal features (e.g. pews, organ, clock); g) details of external joinery including colour finishes; h) details of all rainwater goods; and i) details of brickwork and render including sample panels. The development shall thereafter be implemented in strict accordance with the approved details.

End of Conditions

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Alistair Howells	(For) Appellant
Rob Mills	Les Stephan Planning
Jason Knight	JPK Design Ltd
Colin Richards	CJR Heritage Services

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Alan Taylor	(Interim) Conservation Officer
Richard Wood	For case officer
Sarah Poxon	Previous application case officer

INTERESTED PARTIES

Cllr Lynne Bakker-Collier	Ward Councillor & Stone Town Councillor
Ian Fordham	Stone Town Councillor
Tom Kelt	GRANTA Residents Association (supporter)
Peter Walker	Local resident (supporter)

End of Appearances

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING OR THE NEXT DAY

1. Letter advertising the appeals, 24 January 2017
2. A1 copies of all the agreed drawings (handed to me at the site visit)
3. S106 planning obligation (the UU) dated 14 July 2017 (and received that day)

End of Documents
