



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 27 June – 30 June and 4 - 7 July 2017

Site visits made on 26 June and 7 July 2017

by David M H Rose BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 31 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R2520/W/16/3163460

Former Rauceby Hospital (Central Core), Grantham Road, Greylees, Sleaford, NG34 8PP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission and for relevant demolition of unlisted buildings in a Conservation Area.
 - The appeal is made by Barratt Homes against the decision of North Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Reference 15/0947/FUL, dated 20 July 2015, was refused by notice dated 18 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of former hospital buildings (Blocks A - F), retention of conservatory as open walkway, conversion of Blocks G, L and M to create 6 dwellings, erection of 100 no. new dwellings (106 in total) with associated access and public open space, and erection of 2,500 ft² commercial unit (A1/A2/A3/A5 uses) and 2,500 ft² community building (D1 use).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Preliminary matter

Close of inquiry

2. Following the receipt of written closing submissions and a unilateral undertaking under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and related exchanges, I closed the inquiry in writing on 25 July 2017.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:-
 - (a) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance and significance of the Rauceby Hospital Conservation Area; whether any harm would be substantial or less than substantial; and whether the guidance set out in paragraph 133 or 134 of the Framework,¹ as applicable, would be met;
 - (b) the effect of the proposal on the significance of Rauceby Hospital Registered Park and Garden and whether the guidance set out in paragraph 133 or 134 of the Framework, as applicable, would be met;

¹ National Planning Policy Framework

- (c) the effect of the proposal on the significance of the non-designated heritage assets having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the assets;
- (d) the overall heritage balance;
- (e) whether or not the proposal would be in accordance with the development plan as a whole; and
- (f) the overall planning balance in light of the above considerations.

Legislation and Planning Policy

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

4. The statutory duty in relation to conservation areas requires '*special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area*'.² The Barnwell Manor judgement confirms that, in exercise of the statutory duty, any harm to a heritage asset must be given considerable importance and weight when undertaking the balancing exercise.³

Central Lincolnshire Local Plan

5. The policies in the recently adopted Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, with particular relevance to the main issues identified, include Policy LP1 with its focus on a presumption in favour of sustainable development; and Policies LP2 and LP4 which set the spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy and levels of growth.
6. In addition, related to the key consideration in this case, Policy LP25 has an overarching theme of protecting, conserving and seeking opportunities to enhance the historic environment; it sets out an applicant's obligations in instances where a proposal would affect the significance of a heritage asset; aligns itself with the tests in the Framework; and lists six considerations for development within, affecting the setting of, or affecting views into or out of, a conservation area.
7. Policy LP26 rehearses design and amenity considerations with criterion 'f' including the incorporation and retention, as far as possible, of existing historic features.

National Planning Policy Framework

8. The Framework provides guidance on conserving and enhancing the historic environment at paragraphs 126 – 141.
9. Paragraph 132 indicates that '*when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be'*
10. Paragraphs 133 and 134 set out the considerations in terms of development resulting in substantial harm and less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets. Unlike conservation areas and listed buildings, a registered park and garden is not protected by a separate consent regime.

² section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

³ Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Limited and East Northamptonshire District Council, English Heritage, National Trust and SSCLG [2014] EWCA Civ 137

11. Paragraph 135 advises that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application and that a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Context

12. The appeal site forms part of what was originally the Kesteven County Asylum which opened in 1902. It comprised a self-contained community of six ward blocks (three for male patients and three for female patients) laid out in echelon form with outlook and aspect over segregated 'airing courts', separated by a central garden, and a broad range of supporting and ancillary buildings set within extensive designed grounds.
13. As redundancy approached in the 1990s, the Council prepared a development brief for the site; and, in November 1992, the central core (including the main complex of buildings, airing courts, chapel and immediate woodland) was designated as a conservation area.
14. Outline planning permission was granted in May 1999 for various works, including the erection of new dwellings, in the grounds of the former hospital, excluding the central core. The latter was the subject of an application for the partial demolition and partial refurbishment of the core hospital buildings.
15. In June 2000, English Heritage (now Historic England) designated the combined sites as a Grade II registered park and garden.
16. David Wilson Homes (subsequently to form part of Barratt Homes) acquired the site in September 2002. A concept plan for the development of the outer parts of the site, in five phases, was approved in March 2003; and Conservation Area Consent was granted in June 2003 for the demolition of buildings within the core comprising various single storey blocks and some two-storey elements of the hospital buildings. The consented demolition amounted to some 70% by footprint. The demolition has been undertaken with the exception of the consented works to the three ward buildings on the western side of the site.
17. A series of permissions resulted in the approval of some 701 dwellings, the bulk of which have been completed, within the grounds of the former hospital. Related planning obligations have secured, amongst other things, the restoration, repair and management of the airing courts, pavilions, gardens and woodland tree groups.
18. Planning permission was granted in March 2004 for the conversion of principal buildings⁴ within the central core to residential use (42 units); the conversion of the chapel to business use; the erection of 17 new dwellings; and the construction of garages to serve the residential accommodation. The permission was not implemented.
19. Amendments to the central core scheme were approved in June 2008 and February 2009; and the time periods for implementation were extended by permissions granted in August 2011.

⁴ Blocks A, B and C represent the ward buildings on the eastern part of the core; Blocks D,E, F are corresponding, symmetrical, wards on the western part of the site; Block G is the former administration building located to the north of, and central to, the ward buildings; and Blocks L and M (former nurses' accommodation) are between Blocks C and D and, in turn, are separated by a dilapidated conservatory which lies directly opposite Block G

20. In March 2017 the Council published a draft Rauceby Hospital Conservation Area Appraisal (and an accompanying Management Plan) which, following public consultation, was approved by the Council's Corporate Management Team as part of the first stage of adoption with a view to consideration by Full Council in September 2017. In light of its advanced stage of preparation, the Conservation Area Appraisal merits significant weight.
21. The Conservation Area Appraisal confirms, notwithstanding the residential development undertaken in the outer areas of the former hospital, that *'the area comprising the central core of the former hospital, its approaches and landscaped surroundings still retains the special architectural and historic interest which it is desirable to preserve or enhance'*. Proposed changes to the boundary of the conservation area, taking in drives and outer buildings, are of no direct materiality to the considerations in the current appeal, other than the conservation area would become enlarged.
22. The Management Plan indicates that the Council will, where possible, seek to retain the existing buildings within the designated area through conversion to new uses; and it will continue to seek appropriate development to secure the restoration of the buildings in the central core, albeit it is anticipated that a relatively large number of new dwellings and high development density would be necessary in order to achieve the retention of the surviving hospital buildings.
23. The Rauceby Hospital Conservation Area is currently on the Historic England 'at risk' register; and the buildings within the appeal site (and others within the wider conservation area) have been identified by the Council, within the Conservation Area Appraisal, as suitable for inclusion on the local list as non-designated heritage assets.
24. The current appeal seeks the demolition of the six ward blocks; the retention and conversion to residential use of the former administration building and the nurses' accommodation; the refurbishment of the conservatory as an open walkway; the erection of 100 new dwellings and two new buildings to accommodate a community facility and a retail outlet. The chapel lies outside the area of the appeal site and is within separate ownership.

Reasons

Issue (a): Rauceby Hospital Conservation Area (as originally designated)

The significance of the heritage asset

25. The significance, of a heritage asset, and the contribution of its setting to its significance, is the sum of its archaeological, architectural, historic and artistic interest. In this case, it is agreed that there is no archaeological interest; and, in my view, the artistic interest is subsumed by the combination of the historic and architectural interest.
26. The historic interest of the conservation area flows from the opening of the Kesteven County Asylum (later re-named Rauceby Hospital) in 1902 following the design of George T Hine, a well-known asylum designer who acted as consulting architect to the Commissioners in Lunacy.

27. The hospital comprised a stand-alone community on a site of some 45 hectares (112 acres) with a prominent entrance/administration building, deep within the site, flanked to the west by a chapel, as foreground to six generously proportioned, two-storey, ward blocks arranged symmetrically in echelon formation. Each group of three wards was separated by paired nurses' accommodation either side of a central conservatory (added in 1914). These buildings framed a central core of ancillary, predominantly single-storey, buildings.
28. The rationale of the layout was to afford each of the ward blocks with aspect and easy access to the airing courts to the south of the main complex with sunlight, views and recreation forming an integral part of patient therapy. The wider grounds provided general amenity and productive work within the woodland and on the home farm and in the kitchen garden forming part of the estate.
29. The grounds themselves were designed and laid out by William Goldring, a landscape architect, who had experience at Kew Gardens and worked on numerous asylums and public parks. The underlying principles were to establish robust belts of boundary trees; woodland and parkland within the site; tree-lined drives; open spaces (notably the airing courts); and an orchard. A variety of mature deciduous and coniferous trees, and some exotic specimens, were typical of late Victorian/early Edwardian landscape design and the designed landscape character of the site mirrored country house estate designs of the late-eighteenth/early nineteenth centuries.
30. By 1922, additional staff houses had been provided on the periphery of the site; an admission hospital (later Orchard House) had been built in the parkland to the north of the central core; and the institution had been re-named the Kesteven Mental Hospital.
31. The Royal Air Force took occupation during the Second World War with the unit functioning as a RAF hospital with a specialist crash and burns facility in Orchard House. The hospital was returned to its original use after the war; it was re-named Rauceby Hospital in 1948; and in ensuing years further additions were made to the buildings, most notably large flat roofed extensions on the southern elevations of Blocks C and D.
32. The surviving architectural interest of the conservation area owes much to the finely detailed, brick-built, stone dressed, administration building and the chapel. Both have slate roofs; the former is topped by a clock tower; and the chapel has a small bell housing.
33. Apart from the former Medical Superintendent's imposing residence on the eastern side of the conservation area, the remaining architectural legacy is to be found in the six ward blocks; the nurses' accommodation; and the conservatory.
34. The ward buildings and nurses' accommodation are similarly brick-built and, despite less ornamentation, are well-mannered with stone dressings, decorative and terracotta detailing and slate roofs. The substantial bulk of the ward buildings, albeit somewhat austere and utilitarian, gains relief from stepped plan form and use of substantial bay windows. The conservatory is a relatively minor component, in form, scale and detailing, albeit its long raised lantern adds some prominence and interest.

35. In terms of the totality of the remaining buildings, although the administration building and the chapel are the most visually appealing, the ward blocks are key to the significance of the conservation area as a result of their past function; form and scale; and juxtaposition with the airing courts in particular.

Harm to the conservation area

36. In assessing the degree of harm to the conservation area, it cannot be denied that the area, since it was designated, has suffered a very considerable loss of buildings leading to a much diminished appreciation of the manner in which the institution once functioned. Although the conservation area attracts statutory protection, it is to be observed that the design of the asylum was not a particularly notable or unusual example, albeit it is said that it was at Rauceby where Hine perfected his echelon plan, and none of the buildings are listed (unlike St John's, Bracebridge Heath).
37. However, the remaining buildings are strong remnants which have sufficient stature, presence and layout to epitomize the 'model' form of a Victorian/Edwardian lunatic asylum. In addition, the survival and use of the airing courts and central garden as high quality open space; the sylvan characteristics of the conservation area; and the clear, continuing, interrelationship of the airing courts with the ward buildings are a striking factor.
38. In this regard, I consider that Blocks C and D, either side of the nurses' accommodation, by virtue of immediate proximity and prominence, have the most notable and intimate relationship with the airing courts; Blocks B and E, located further back, have a weaker association; and Blocks A and F have a significantly reduced connection in that they are more distant and offset from the airing courts.
39. It is known that the 2008/11 refurbishment-led planning permissions, providing for the retention of the six ward blocks, would not be viable; and, by inference, the loss of some of the ward accommodation, in terms of opposite pairs, would be inevitable. As a gradation, the Council's view was that the loss of two blocks (A and F) would amount to less than substantial harm to the heritage asset; but the demolition of four units (A, B, E and F) could tip to substantial harm, dependent on the quality of the subsequent redevelopment scheme.
40. Taking account of the elements of the conservation area which would remain unaffected by the proposal and those which would be enhanced by re-use; changes which have occurred since designation, including the significant new building beyond its western and southern bounds; and the acknowledgement of a need for some further loss of surviving buildings, I consider that the demolition of Blocks A – F inclusive would, in combination, result in the loss of the strong sense of place and history and the crucial interrelationship, both functionally and visually, with the airing courts.
41. To my mind, the fundamental essence of the conservation area would be lost and the proposal would amount to substantial harm, at the upper end of the spectrum, engaging paragraph 133 of the Framework and the test of whether the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss. This is a matter which I give considerable importance and weight.

Is the substantial harm or loss necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss – ‘Limb One’ of Framework paragraph 133

Would there be substantial public benefits

Guidance

42. Planning Practice Guidance⁵ explains that *'public benefits may follow from many developments and could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental progress as described in the National Planning Policy Framework they should be of benefit to the public at large public benefits may include heritage benefits such as: sustaining or enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting; reducing or removing risks to a heritage asset; and securing the optimum viable use of a heritage asset in support of its long term conservation'*.

Heritage benefits

43. Looking first at the heritage benefits, in the knowledge that a substantial part of the asset would be lost, the benefits of returning the administration building and the nurses' accommodation to beneficial use, against the continued threat of no use and long term decay, would be very small in the context of the demolition of the ward blocks and the resultant effect on the significance of the conservation area. Whilst the saving of the conservatory is important, the benefit would be very much reduced as the proposal is to keep it in skeletal form without glazing.
44. The neglected, semi-derelict and seemingly abandoned condition of the site is a significant scar on the high quality, modern, residential area surrounding the central core and also on the wider conservation area and its setting. The re-use of a forlorn, brownfield site would, undeniably, result in a substantial improvement to the appearance of the area as a whole. Whilst that is capable of being a significant consideration, the weight that attaches is largely dependent on whether the appeal scheme is necessary to achieve that end or whether an alternative, without such a level of demolition, might deliver a similar result.
45. In terms of better revealing the significance of the conservation area by public access and interpretation, this claimed aspiration is wholly unconvincing as the story of a former hospital without any survival of its ward buildings would be largely meaningless and incomprehensible.
46. However, there is no doubt that the buildings comprising the former complex are at risk as evidenced by the difficulties with security and their propensity to vandalism. Even with robust boundary security and other measures to deter unauthorised access, none of these are likely to be a wholly effective means of repelling potential damage.
47. Whilst part of the central core is readily visible to the public, most notably from the open space to the south and south-west, a good proportion of the site lacks regular passive surveillance. In these circumstances illicit entry could go unnoticed and the pernicious effects of arson, should it occur, could go undetected. The removal of this threat from the administration building, in particular, and also the nurses' accommodation and conservatory, would be a significant public benefit.

⁵ Conserving and enhancing the historic environment - paragraph 020

48. In terms of securing the optimum viable use of the heritage asset, the Rauceby Hospital Site Brief, prepared in 1990, anticipated a number of potential uses for the central core including:- hotel; offices; education or residential conversion; and limited retailing to serve the needs of the complex.
49. The subsequently approved schemes were entirely residential and the appellant's report⁶ identifies residential as the preferred use for the existing buildings. As the site is somewhat isolated with poor access to facilities and services, and having regard to the nature of the buildings, I agree that the potential for 'retirement living' or use as a care home or nursing home would be unlikely. There is also nothing to indicate any realistic requirement for hotel investment in this location.
50. Office accommodation is said to be in demand within Sleaford, and the conversion of any of the ward buildings would be capable of creating a number of units. However, taking account of the constraints of the buildings and their location within the midst of a residential area, there is nothing to suggest that the site would offer the prospect of a realistic office nucleus.
51. Similarly, use for retail is likely to have limited potential in view of the restricted catchment and the absence of passing trade. In addition, there is force in the argument that the likely difficulties in accommodating retailers' standard format requirements would be a further hindrance. Although the report does not rule out community use in one of the smaller blocks, the local community, through GEN, has expressed a preference for new build to meet its specific needs, including the availability of grant funding.
52. Having regard to the contents of the report as a whole, and in the absence of anything of substance to the contrary, the overwhelming balance of probability points to a residential scheme of dwellings as the optimum viable use to support the long term conservation of the heritage asset.

Other benefits

53. As the original approval for the development of the central core was entirely residential, the opportunity to deliver a community building to provide focus and facilities for Greylees would be consistent with the Framework's objective of facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities.⁷ This would be a substantial public benefit.
54. The related aim of securing the provision and use of shared space in the public square and improved north-south pedestrian permeability would also reflect the aims of the Framework⁸ and merit significant weight. The introduction of a convenience store, where none was previously intended, would yield a similar advantage if occupation could be secured.
55. In this regard, whilst the construction of the unit could be assured by a planning condition (requiring its early availability for use prior to the tenth residential occupation), that would not guarantee its occupation. In addition, whilst heads of terms have been agreed with an operator, outstanding uncertainty as to subsequent occupancy diminishes the weight of this benefit to moderate.

⁶ Lambert Smith Hampton Report - 26 May 2017 (the report does not assess financial viability)

⁷ NPPF paragraph 69

⁸ NPPF paragraph 70

56. As to the other claimed public benefits, although the district has a five-year supply of housing land, based on the 'Liverpool' method, Central Lincolnshire has suffered a substantial shortfall in delivery; and part of the anticipated supply includes the dwellings that would have evolved from the original central core permissions. The delivery of these and some 50 additional homes would be a benefit of moderate weight.
57. Like any housing development, economic and social benefits would arise from the New Homes Bonus and in the construction and future maintenance of buildings and spaces justifying moderate weight.
58. The provision of a convenience store and a community building has the potential to reduce journeys by car and some new residents might use the local railway station or bus services. However, that is not to say that Greylees is well connected and the combination of some reduced car journeys and increased public transport patronage is a factor of very limited weight against the more certain inevitable use of the private car.
59. In the absence of anything more than preliminary preparation for a Neighbourhood Plan, the needs of the community rely heavily on the expression of representations to the appeal proposal and the significant level of public support, by majority, for the proposal. These relate primarily to the provision of much needed facilities; the removal of blight; and resolving safety fears which are valid material planning considerations.

Public benefits - overview

60. In summary, the heritage benefits deriving from the ability to rescue three buildings and the conservatory would be very small in the overall context of the demolition proposed. The weight attaching to improved visual amenity would be substantial if this could not be realised by other, less insidious, means. However, this would be more limited if it could be shown that there was a reasonable alternative. The reduced threat of loss through vandalism is of significant weight. The balance of evidence points firmly to residential being the optimum viable use.
61. In terms of other benefits, the provision of a community facility and public open space merits significant weight; and without firm guarantee of a tenant for the retail outlet, more moderate weight applies. Additional housing, and related social and economic benefits, would also be moderate in weight; and very little weight attaches to the limited potential for reduced car journeys and increased usage of public transport.

Are there reasonable alternatives?

62. The advice in Planning Practice Guidance⁹ on viable uses for heritage assets confirms that *'it is important that any use is viable if there is only one viable use, that use is the optimum viable use. If there is a range of alternative viable uses, the optimum use is the one likely to cause the least harm to the significance of the asset the optimum viable use may not necessarily be the most profitable one'*
63. Heritage Works,¹⁰ in setting out the importance of built heritage regeneration, confirms that *'the key is to find the optimum viable use for the heritage asset, which can be accommodated without impacting its conservation value, and which is viable in the context of the wider scheme'*.

⁹ Conserving and enhancing the historic environment - paragraph 015

¹⁰ A toolkit of best practice in heritage regeneration (April 2017)

64. In this regard, the appellant regards the appeal scheme to be the optimum viable use whereas the Council considers that it would generate 'excess' profit and, in any event, there are three reasonable alternatives to be considered which would cause less harm to the heritage asset, namely:- the retention of four ward blocks; the retention of two ward blocks; or mothballing.

Site value and developer's profit

65. The appellant's assessment of site value derives from an apportionment of the total land acquisition price per hectare/acre, carried forward from 2002, giving a value for the central core of £917,674 (£110,695 per acre). At that date, the entire site had known development potential, and there was no indication that the refurbishment-led development of the central core would require cross-subsidy, or enabling development, from the greenfield land within the site.
66. However, that simplistic accounting convention now looks naïve insofar as the refurbishment-led scheme is agreed to be no longer viable. Whilst the historic figure falls well below the realised receipts for the Orchard House site (£182,609 per acre), which is outside the conservation area and has an expectation of residential development, no direct comparison can be made given the materially different circumstances of the respective sites.
67. Similarly, whilst the Central Lincolnshire Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Study sets a threshold value for un-serviced brownfield land in the sum of £400,000 per hectare (£163,943 per acre), the document warns against the use of the figures for any other purpose. Thus, comparison is again a very inexact exercise having particular regard to the designated status of the appeal site and the presence of buildings which the local planning authority wish to see retained.
68. Marketing of the appeal site at £1 million, in the period leading into the public inquiry, provides no real basis to corroborate value in that the prospects of the site in planning terms remained highly uncertain following the expiration of the earlier conversion permissions and the refusal of the appeal scheme. Moreover, with the addition of a clear indication that the local planning authority would resist proposals involving the demolition of the remaining buildings on the site, it is not surprising that the only, preliminary, expressions of interest, around £500,000 were well below the asking price.
69. It is of note that the appellant and its advisers, in January 2016, acknowledged the Council's questioning of pro-rata land values and Barratt's position seemingly relied more on achieving a minimum pre-determined profit rather than a fixed land value. However, the Council's advisers went on to accept Barratt's value of the site and warned that, whilst it might be argued that a proportion of the land value and/or profit might be written off, the Council was unlikely to be successful at appeal.
70. Nonetheless, that position is said to be related to a lower under offer figure for Orchard House and the basis of the Council's advisers' instructions to solely appraise the viability of the 2008 refurbishment scheme (which was found to be not viable) and the scheme now under consideration at appeal. In essence, the Council's acceptance of the appellant's value owes more to the assumption of demolishing the six ward blocks as opposed to their retention.

71. For my part, whilst it is acknowledged that the appellant would wish to secure its 'book value' for the site, the current land value has been seriously eroded by the passage of time and the Council's on-going presumption for a regeneration-led scheme. That is not to say that the actual purchase price paid by the developer was excessive, having regard to development potential and development plan policy at the time of acquisition; however, it cannot be presumed that the stand-alone market value of the site in current circumstances derives from its original notional value.
72. In terms of developer's profit, Historic England's advice (albeit related to enabling development),¹¹ indicates that *'it is naturally right and proper that a developer be allowed a fair and reasonable return on his investment, to reflect the risk involved in the development project as a very rough guide, in today's market, a pure entrepreneurial residential developer will look for an overall return on costs of between 15% and 20%, while a builder/developer may seek a 10% return on the construction cost element'*
73. The appellant's aspiration of a minimum return of 17% is towards the lower end of the current industry standard of 17% – 22% and may be considered to be perfectly reasonable given the higher level of risk associated with a development which includes refurbishment and its potential for unforeseen costs.
74. In summary, whilst I do not accept the appellant's proffered site value in the determination of a scheme which seeks to deliver the retention of existing buildings (over and above those proposed), I am satisfied that a target profit of 17% is the minimum necessary for Barratt to achieve viability.

Sensitivity testing – the viability of retaining two or four blocks (without alternative uses or without grant funding)

75. Turning next to the sensitivity appraisals prepared by the Council, the retention of two of the ward blocks is claimed to be viable based on a reduced land value and with sales revenue uplifts; and it is said that the retention of four ward blocks could be achieved by similar adjustments.
76. Looking first at the two block scenario, in terms of headline figures, the Council calculates a potential profit of approximately 13.5% based on Barratt's sales values but disregarding potential site value (apportioning a notional £1.00).
77. However, it is claimed that a 17% profit could be achieved with a site value in the order of £730,000, based on a 10% uplift to sales values. In this regard, the Council contends that the achieved values for phase 5 of the Greylees development were substantially higher than Barratt's forecast values and, as a consequence, the appellant's anticipated sales value for the appeal site are too low.
78. The assessment undertaken on behalf of Barratt reviews 48 sales within phase 2, between 2015 and 2017, and 5 sales in phase 5, completed in 2015, to provide an average house price by the number of bedrooms and also as an equivalent floorspace unit (per square foot). Comparison is also made with recent sales of new homes at Castle Park, Sleaford where the average price per floorspace unit corresponds with those at Greylees. As a further check, a review of re-sales at Greylees shows lower values than those of new homes (as might be expected).

¹¹ Enabling Development and the Conservation of Significant Places (published by English Heritage in 2008)

79. In terms of refurbished properties, equivalent appraisal is limited in the absence of comparable schemes. However, in my view, it would not be unreasonable to expect lower returns than those achieved at St John's Village, Bracebridge Heath (a former asylum) as its buildings enjoy listed status and have more imposing and, subjectively, more endearing character. Location close to Lincoln itself may also be a factor.¹²
80. Whilst future sales values cannot be predicted with certainty, I consider that Barratt's assessment is the more robust and reliable and there is inadequate justification to impose a 10% uplift. Without this, the retention of two ward blocks would not be able to demonstrate viability.
81. In the alternative, the Council points to a 19.8% profit based on a 10% uplift of sales values and with an assumed site value of £250,000. However, in light of my assessment above, the loss of the 10% uplift reduces sales revenue by some £1.73 million and takes profit below the level of viability.
82. A further scenario seeks to demonstrate that 25.8% profit could be achieved, based on a site value of £250,000, a 10% uplift in sales values and a further 9% added as a conservation area premium. Having already ruled out the increase in sales values, it remains necessary to consider the claimed heritage dividend.
83. Work commissioned by English Heritage (now Historic England) demonstrates that houses within conservation areas sell for more than those outside designated areas and that a number of characteristics can influence values. Whilst accepting the general principle of a heritage premium, conservation areas vary immensely in character, quality and interest.
84. Although the former hospital buildings at Greylees are not without intrinsic character, recognisable primary architectural merit is somewhat limited to the administration building (and the chapel) and the principal interest is the less tangible layout of the central core and its relationship with its surroundings.
85. In acknowledging that the conservation area and wider environs benefit from retained trees, open space and high quality landscaping, resulting in an attractive living environment, the overall surroundings are very much influenced by location amidst an extensive modern development and, irrespective of whether two or four blocks might be retained, the central core would include further newly built houses.
86. Reference has also been made to the average prices reported at St John's Village where the Council's figures have to be tempered by actual prices achieved. I would also regard this development to be a less than satisfactory basis for comparison insofar as it contains substantial and imposing listed buildings of greater architectural character and merit.
87. Having regard to the above, I am not convinced that a 9% heritage premium has firm foundation and there is nothing to suggest that the retention of two ward blocks would achieve a minimum return of 17% and reach the threshold of viability.

¹² Lambert Smith Hampton Report (page 12) – *'Lincoln does offer significantly better levels of higher skilled employment than the Sleaford area, which allows its residential property values to be higher than when compared to the Sleaford and Greylees area'*

88. In terms of the prospect of retaining four blocks, in each of the worked examples the profit margins would be less than their two block counterparts and it follows that, on the basis of the illustrative appraisals, the renovation of four ward buildings would also fail to achieve viability.
89. Overall, the local planning authority's sensitivity testing serves to demonstrate that the retention of either two or four ward buildings would not be commercially viable even with a nil land value.

Deliberate neglect and construction costs – potential discount/savings

90. Whilst the appraisals, referred to above, exclude any figure for the deliberate neglect of the buildings, the Council contends that the financial value of neglect should be struck out in any assessment in accordance with paragraph 130 of the Framework.
91. There is no doubt that the buildings are suffering from general dilapidation and lack of care occasioned by a combination of disrepair; the partial implementation of approved demolition works without effectively sealing the retained structures; bird ingress; and susceptibility to vandalism. Whilst it is acknowledged that the site has been difficult to secure, on the basis of the methods employed by the appellant, there is no evidence to suggest that the impression of having seemingly abandoned works with the onset of the recession amounted to anything more than imprudence, and a measure of irresponsibility, rather than deliberate neglect or damage to the heritage asset.
92. Although the Council intensified its endeavours to secure the implementation of a schedule of works, as a result of the appellant's continuing lack of intervention and remedy, there is evidence that Barratt was not entirely unresponsive to ongoing damage. Its actions may be characterised as one of inertia in that any retained building would need substantial works in any event. Again, I see a lack of intent in regard to the claim of deliberate neglect or damage to the buildings.
93. Moreover, costings show a figure around £135,000 attributable to the deterioration of the buildings which represents a minor element of overall expenditure and insufficient to materially distort the assessment of viability.
94. Moving on to construction costs, from an initial position of general accord on the cost of refurbishment, based on the removal of roofs, first floor ceilings and first floor floor-slabs (the ward blocks), the Council, with the support of Historic England, believes that other options might be available.
95. In simple terms, the first-floor floor slabs and ceilings were cast in-situ and are supported by, and integral to, the inner leaf of the external cavity walls; and the ceilings support the roof structure. I am content that the balance of the evidence firmly points to the sub-standard nature of the first floor, in the ward blocks in particular, having regard to its inadequate thickness and reinforcement and the shortcomings of the original construction process and the floors' consequential excessive span/depth ratio.
96. As to the potential alternatives, the suggestion that existing slabs might be strengthened using a bonded fibre strip reinforcement system, has been shown by detailed evaluation to be an ineffective solution and this is agreed.

97. Secondly, the introduction of intermediate support beams, and new internal supporting walls as part of the process of sub-division, would be technically possible. Although the Council considers that the tension stresses on the top of the slab would be limited, and within the capacity of the slab, I agree with the appellant, irrespective of that point, that the issues of voiding, cracks and steel corrosion within the slab would remain and that it would not be a prudent proposition to retain the floors.
98. Overall, I am satisfied that the original intention to replace the internal floors and ceilings, and the extensive costs that would have been incurred, would have been the appropriate course of action in any scheme of refurbishment. On that basis, there was no obligation on the appellant to pursue costings of unconvincing potential alternatives and the Council's claim of possible cost savings is not well-founded.

Conclusions on the viability of retaining two or four blocks

99. Having regard to the foregoing, my conclusions in paragraph 89 above remain and I am satisfied that the retention of either two blocks or four blocks would not reach the threshold of viability and neither would provide an optimum viable use.

Mothballing

100. The third option, in the Council's view, would be to mothball the site as a further means of causing less damage to the heritage asset. Guidance acknowledges:-¹³ *'Historic buildings are an irreplaceable part of our heritage. When they are left vacant, they are at greatly increased risk of damage and decay, and can easily blight the appearance of their localities It is inevitable that some historic buildings will struggle to find a use English Heritage has produced this guidance to help owners to reduce the risks facing empty buildings, by undertaking a range of precautionary measures and adopting an active management approach'*
101. Although the document is written with particular reference to 'historic buildings', I am content that its general principles provide sound advice and have applicability to heritage assets, including non-listed buildings which contribute to the significance of a conservation area.
102. In an appeal decision relating to the former Fulham Town Hall (a Grade II* listed building), the Inspector viewed mothballing as removing *'the urgency to accept the first scheme to come along, when this would cause significant harm, just to preserve it'*.¹⁴ However, the circumstances of that case are materially different in that, according to the Inspector's decision, *'Fulham Town Hall had been used to a reduced or sometimes minimal extent, described to me as mothballing, for at least 50 years'*.
103. Whilst the central core can be said to have been mothballed for a period of ten years, it is clear that the suspension of works was somewhat piecemeal and that the shutting down of the site was not wholly effective and not in accord with current best practice. Moreover, each building or site presents its own unique issues in terms of the measures necessary to safeguard its future.

¹³ Vacant Historic Buildings: An owner's guide to temporary uses, maintenance and mothballing (English Heritage/Historic England)

¹⁴ CD78 – APP/H5390/W/15/3140593 and 3140594 (paragraph 58)

104. In this regard, the operation of successfully mothballing the central core would necessitate an effective cordon around the site as a whole and the protection of individual buildings within the site itself. Even with the recent works, precipitated by the Council's actions to secure weatherproofing and building specific security, it cannot be denied that the site presents difficulties in terms of resisting the determined intruder; and the blighted appearance of the site, taking account of the improvements secured by recent and on-going repairs, is a further factor.
105. There is no doubt in my mind that in terms of the continuing risk to the buildings, and the general amenity of the area for local residents in particular, short or medium term mothballing would have undesirable implications. This, in turn, needs to be considered in the context of whether or not it can be shown that there is a reasonable prospect of an alternative strategy, through changed ownership or funding, which could deliver a more committed heritage-led scheme in the fullness of time and thereby justify the disadvantages of mothballing.
106. On this basis, at this point in my decision, I cannot rule out the potential value of mothballing as the optimum viable use.

Conclusion on 'Limb One' of Framework paragraph 133

107. In summary, I have found that the proposal would lead to substantial harm to the significance of the Rauceby Hospital Conservation Area and this should be calibrated towards the upper end of the scale.
108. I have also observed that the retention of either two blocks or four blocks would not be viable. However, the substantial harm might be avoided by mothballing the site to arrest further damage and deterioration and to stall demolition. The necessity of demolition is therefore diminished and the resultant harm of accepting the appeal proposal has to be weighed against the public benefits.
109. Whilst there would be a number of important benefits, with varying degrees of weight, their cumulative advantage would not be sufficiently substantial to outweigh the harm to the significance of the Rauceby Hospital Conservation Area as a whole. This conclusion engages the four further tests within the second limb of paragraph 133 of the Framework.

The four tests of 'Limb Two' of Framework paragraph 133

(i) The nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site

110. On the first, given my findings on the lack of viability in retaining either two or four ward buildings, and absent any other alternative use, including the Council's suggestion of incorporating the commercial unit and/or the community facility in a retained building, the nature of the heritage asset prevents any other reasonable use of the site (other than the possibility of mothballing) apart from that proposed.

(ii) No viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation

111. The marketing that has been undertaken has shown a general lack of interest from potential buyers. However, the offer of the site has been on the appellant's terms related to its assessment of the value of the site which I have already found to be ill-conceived as it was based on historic 'book

value'; and there is nothing to show that it reflected the particular circumstances of the site and inevitable diminished value attributable to the higher costs of renovation rather than new build.

112. In this regard, Historic England's Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment confirms that *'no-one is obliged to sell their property. The aim of a marketing exercise is to reach all potential buyers who may be willing to find a use for the site that still provides for its conservation to some degree'*. It goes on to identify considerations including the timing of the marketing; the period and means of marketing; the asking price; and the condition of the site. It warns that *'a price that does not fairly reflect the market value of the heritage asset will deter enquiries'*.
113. There is no doubt that a heritage asset in a dilapidated condition and without an economically viable use, or any grant of planning permission for re-use and/or redevelopment is likely to present a particular challenge in terms of marketing. It can also be inferred that any sale would have been made the more difficult following the refusal of planning permission for the appeal scheme, the pending appeal and the availability of unflattering viability information within publicly accessible documents. Irrespective of whether the method of sale was the most appropriate in terms of specialist promotion, the period of marketing or part disposal, it is clear that the asking price was wholly unrealistic with no prospect of it being achieved.
114. To my mind, the marketing exercise simply showed that the appellant was unable to sell the site for its pre-determined 'no loss' valuation. It does not demonstrate that a viable use of the heritage asset cannot be found in the medium term that would enable its conservation through a willing buyer, at a lower price, to pursue an alternative form of development based on the retention of some or all of the ward buildings.
115. However, given my assessment of the viability of each of the two and four block scenarios, a notional site value of £1 would deliver a profit of around 13.5%. Whilst developers are likely to approach risk in a different manner, the general premise is that a greater risk through uncertainties would be reflected in fixing a higher aspirational profit margin in order to cover unforeseen eventualities.
116. On this basis, there is no reason to suppose that this level of risk would be acceptable, or realistic, on such a large scale project involving the reuse of multiple buildings. Irrespective of the manner in which Barratt approached the marketing of the site, there is nothing to suggest that disposal of the site would achieve a viable developer-led conservation solution.

(iii) Conservation by grant-funding or some other form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible

117. The appellant's approach to investigating grant-funding for the re-use of buildings within the central core was largely precipitated by the refusal of planning permission for the appeal scheme. Analysis of retaining all six ward buildings showed a conservation deficit of £4.6 million with this reducing to approximately £2.5 million for a scheme keeping two wards.

118. Published guidance¹⁵ confirms that *'where there are no expressions of interest in the general market for maintaining the asset, reasonable endeavours will need to be made to see if there is a public or charitable organisation willing to take on the asset and to find grant-funding that may pay for its continued conservation*'.
119. A sweep of 145 potential funding sources was undertaken reducing to seven on further examination of funding criteria. Of these, only Heritage Lottery Fund – Heritage Enterprise, which awards grants up to £5 million, indicated a potential to provide funding. The Architectural Heritage Fund, which provides project viability grant, also responded positively.
120. The approach to Heritage Lottery Fund established that funding did not permit the financing of private residential developments and that in order to be eligible for funding the scheme would need to include a mix of commercial or cultural uses with some residential use and the restoration works undertaken by a not-for-profit organisation.
121. The appellant's notes of the meeting confirm its understanding that the funding of all six buildings was unlikely; but the retention of one or possibly two buildings might secure funding if a suitable partner and occupier could be found. Barratt's overall conclusion, following further exchanges with Heritage Lottery Fund, was that grant assistance was unlikely to be achieved without community and public involvement; a private residential scheme would not qualify; and the bar to profit above 15% would disqualify an award.
122. Nonetheless, in response, Heritage Lottery Fund expressed the view that the buildings could be saved and that the Heritage Enterprise programme was designed to provide solutions for sites such as Rauceby Hospital. Barratt appears to have assumed that it would have to sell the site to an organisation with relevant experience of non-residential schemes; and it invited the Heritage Lottery Fund to either purchase the site for £917,000; or, alternatively, to provide details of any organisation which would receive grant funding to acquire the site.
123. A reply from Heritage Lottery Fund corrected Barratt's misunderstanding by confirming that funding was available for mixed use schemes incorporating residential accommodation; it was not necessary for a private owner to dispose of a site; it was not the Fund's role to identify potential partners; and that funding could be made available to organisations to purchase land and buildings where the price accurately reflected the condition and value of the holding.
124. The approach to Heritage Lottery Fund was for a pre-conceived residential project. It appears to have been undertaken with superficial simplicity in that it lacked direct engagement with the aims of the Fund and, in effect, with no offer of an immediate remedy, Barratt took the outcome to demonstrate absence of grant funding. Crucially, it did not seek to explore a broader based strategy or to develop a bespoke project.
125. The Architectural Heritage Fund limits grants up to £25,000 and loans to charity or social enterprise organisations for the acquisition of buildings or to provide working capital for a restoration project. It is evident that the appellant would not qualify and any funds available would be insufficient.

¹⁵ Historic England – Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment

126. Heritage Lincolnshire, an organisation offering advice and assistance on heritage led regeneration, but not funding, was also involved and provided general guidance on potential opportunities for charitable and public funding; possible funding partners; and successful projects but thereafter involvement with Heritage Lincolnshire appears to have waned. Approaches to Lincolnshire County Council and North Kesteven District Council for funding and public ownership respectively met without success.
127. It is evident that Heritage Lincolnshire has been successful in securing the conservation and re-use of historic buildings. It is a member of the Heritage Trust network and can draw on national experience of successful partnership approaches to heritage-led regeneration bringing significant economic benefits to local communities. By way of example, the partnership for Bletchley Park obtained funding, from multiple joint sources, to rescue a variety of buildings with a project cost of £15-20 million.¹⁶
128. Heritage Lincolnshire accepted that the scale of the appeal site would dictate a predominantly residential-led scheme and advised that schemes which result purely in residential use are unlikely to gain support as they will not achieve the public access requirements of many funders who are distributing public money. Nonetheless, it considered that the inclusion of mixed uses, designed to meet a local need or to generate economic and social outcomes, could open up a wider range of funding opportunities.
129. Heritage Lincolnshire's written statement has to be considered with caution, in the absence of any appearance at the inquiry and the lack of opportunity to test its position. However, it is clear, that Barratt did not approach the possibility of securing financial support with a sufficiently robust project appraisal or strategy to determine the possibility of collaboration through grant-funding or development partnership.
130. An approach to Historic England, shortly before the inquiry, confirmed that demand for its grants outstrips available funds and applications and awards have to be prioritised with some schemes failing to achieve monies. Historic England's Guidance for Applicants explains:- *'We give grants towards the repair and conservation of listed buildings, scheduled monuments and registered parks and gardens our grants are primarily for urgent repairs or other work required to address risk by preventing loss or damage to important architectural, archaeological or landscape features We can only offer a grant if your project involves a certain type of historic property'*
131. The categories of properties which might qualify for grant assistance include a *'building listed at grade I or II*'* and *'an unlisted building of significant historic or architectural interest and within a conservation area'* In this regard, the relative attributes of the unlisted buildings of the former Rauceby Hospital could fall to be considered alongside buildings of the highest national importance. Historic England's response can reasonably be taken to be a highly unlikely main source of grant-funding.
132. Drawing together these threads, the appellant's enquiries to secure grant-funding were based on a given scheme to be undertaken by a private developer. Its approach ran counter to the normal process of developing a project in partnership and with a view to fulfilling the specific aims of a

¹⁶ It is acknowledged that Rauceby Hospital does not have the same degree of national standing and historic exclusivity and the potential for creating a large scale public attraction

particular funding body; and its attempt to attain public ownership was pre-determined with failure given the terms on which it sought to sell.

133. Overall, Barratt could have done significantly more in its approach to seeking sources of grant funding or securing alternative custody of the buildings and it is evident that its vision was a single perspective of securing a residential, developer-built, scheme. Historic England's guidance¹⁷ forewarns that *'finding a suitable new use for an empty building is likely to need imagination and entrepreneurial flair. A feasibility study or options appraisal may be required to examine potential uses and sources of funding including grants'*
134. The Council's committee report acknowledges that *'it is not the role of the Authority to hypothesize whether conservation by grant-funding would be possible or what the outcome of any such funding application might be it would be arguably unreasonable of an Authority to require an applicant to engage with a lengthy grant funding application process, in particular where the final outcome is in some doubt, and where an asset may continue to deteriorate in the intervening period. However, the inference from part (iii)¹⁸ is that at least some proportionate effort should be applied to demonstrate that funding is not possible it is considered that at least some additional feasibility work should be undertaken to demonstrate compliance'*.
135. That additional feasibility work was undertaken as described above. However, it remained constricted in outlook and it appears to have been performed as a task which had to be done to prove a point. Critically, it was lacking in the process of identifying options based on development opportunities and constraints and without reference to a properly informed, wide-ranging, appraisal of potential interest in developing an alternative restoration project.
136. Moreover, the whole process lacked the imagination and flexibility often required to deliver a conservation based proposal which could secure grant funding. It is telling that the overall conclusion of the appellant's Heritage Funding Report is: - *'there are no organisations that fund heritage conservation schemes that involve 100% private sector residential development'*. That conclusion should have been apparent at a very early stage in the process.
137. On this basis, the inherent limitations and imperfections in the approach to seeking to bridge the conservation deficit leaves considerable uncertainty as to whether a supported project could provide a future for some of the ward buildings. Overall, Barratt's approach was not a proportionate or reasonable attempt to engage with the complexities of the funding and project development process. It has therefore failed to meet the prerequisite of showing that conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible.

(iv) The harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use

138. The starting point is that the appeal proposal, through the loss of all six ward buildings, would result in substantial harm to the heritage asset of the Rauceby Hospital Conservation Area and it would neither preserve nor enhance its character. Paragraph 132 of the Framework requires: - *'As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification'*.

¹⁷ Vacant Historic buildings: An owner's guide to temporary uses, maintenance and mothballing

¹⁸ NPPF paragraph 133

139. The local planning authority accepts the need for the demolition of some of the ward buildings, but even its aspiration to save at least two of the blocks shows a significant shortfall in terms of market viability. The onus on the appellant to show that there is no realistic prospect of salvation through other sources of funding or ownership has not been fulfilled and the demolition of the six ward buildings does not have clear and convincing justification.
140. Mothballing would place the threat of redevelopment on hold and provide an opportunity for the appellant to fully assess whether an alternative scheme, avoiding such extensive demolition and loss to the heritage asset, could be devised based on a supported funding mechanism. However, there could be no guarantee that a stay of execution would be the impetus to an achievable alternative regeneration-led project. Mothballing would also place buildings which would be saved by the approval and implementation of the current proposal from continuing risk of deterioration and damage and, in the longer term, rendering their rescue as potentially unviable. Closing the site would also be at odds with the clear aspirations of the Greylees community.
141. Bringing the site back into use would be a benefit as it could be said that its appearance would be enhanced by the removal of dereliction and blight in the terms explained earlier. However, that does not discharge the duty to consider the details of the appeal scheme itself and to determine over and above the loss of buildings whether it would have further negative implications or positive attributes by way of mitigation for the inherent harm.
142. In terms of layout, the footprint of ward blocks C and D would be replicated to maintain reference to the former airing courts and nurses' accommodation; and the macro-scale of the buildings in terms of bulk, height and mass would be repeated. However, the micro-scale would be different insofar as the replacement buildings would be in three-storey form and the number and configuration of windows and doors would differ significantly from the existing blocks. The delineation of enclosed rear gardens would also diminish the sense of openness inherent in the relationship of ward blocks C and D with the airing courts.
143. The overall concept of the proposal is supported by the Council and I agree that the collaborative approach to the project has, in general terms, resulted in good design which would, on completion, provide a high quality living environment with a strong sense of place. Although the construction of new dwellings would result in the loss of some of the woodland area to the north-east of the administration building, principal trees would be retained within the layout and the degree of harm would be minor.
144. On this basis, the scheme as presented, through its overall design and respect for its context, would offer a moderate degree of mitigation for the loss of the six ward buildings. Nonetheless, taking the benefits (previously identified in paragraphs 43 – 61 above) as a whole, I conclude that the harm or loss to the Rauceby Hospital Conservation Area would far outweigh bringing the site back into use in the manner proposed.

Conclusion on 'Limb Two' of Framework paragraph 133

145. The second limb sets out four tests each of which has to be fulfilled. Firstly, it has been demonstrated that the nature of the heritage asset prevents any

other reasonable use of the site, other than mothballing. Secondly, whilst the appellant's approach to marketing was effectively self-serving and unrealistic, the evidence on viability confirms that a market-led scheme involving two or more of the ward blocks would not be commercially viable.

146. Thirdly, the investigation of an alternative delivery mechanism was undertaken on an inadequate basis and it has not been shown that conservation, based on some form of collaborative support, is demonstrably not possible. Finally, the benefits of securing the early reuse of the site, taking full account of the almost universal community support and its disillusionment about the lack of positive regeneration, would not be sufficient to counteract the overwhelming degree of harm to the conservation area.

Issue (b): Rauceby Hospital Registered Park and Garden

The significance of the heritage asset

147. The historic interest of the registered park and garden rests on association with William Goldring and the philosophy inherent in the laying out of lunatic asylums within generous landscaped surroundings with a variety of purposes. The architectural and artistic interest is a function of the overall conception of landscape design; the quality of the landscaping, with varied tree species contributing to amenity; and pleasant, functional, open spaces. Whilst the designed landscape is the primary element of significance, it cannot be disconnected from the institution in general and the central core buildings in particular which provided the foundation for, and function of, the design.

Harm to the registered park and garden

148. The registered park and garden is somewhat remarkable in that it contains approximately 700 new dwellings. Nonetheless, although inter-visibility and openness across the site has been lost, much of the early planting and woodland remains; the airing courts and central open space have been restored to a commendable standard; new planting has taken place; and the general principles of the designed landscape remain legible. The relationship between the airing courts and the ward blocks endures as an important element in the appreciation of the function and values of the institution.
149. The loss of the ward blocks, even with rebuilding on the footprint of the two nearest blocks, would weaken the clear tie between the patients' accommodation and the airing courts. In addition, the focus of the former asylum would be radically diluted and the remaining buildings would provide little semblance of the scale and purpose of the institution and the underlying rationale for the laying out of the landscaped grounds. The value and understanding of the heritage asset would be severely diminished and diluted.
150. However, having regard to the extent of the registered landscape and the degree to which surviving elements remain, the harm to the designated asset would be less than substantial. Nonetheless, as the buildings of the central core provided the justification for the design and layout of the grounds, I would calibrate the harm towards the upper limit of less than substantial. Paragraph 134 of the Framework indicates that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

151. Taking into account the substance of the public benefits identified earlier in my decision, I have reached the conclusion that these would be insufficient to outweigh the resultant level of harm to the registered park and garden.

Issue (c): Non-designated heritage assets

152. The non-designated heritage assets include the six ward blocks. Paragraph 135 of the Framework states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application; and a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss of significance of the heritage asset.
153. Although there is inevitability that some of the ward buildings will need to be demolished, the scale of any harm and loss of significance, even with the retention of other buildings, would be considerable. Again, the public benefits of demolition and redevelopment as proposed would not outweigh the identified harm.

Issue (d): the overall heritage balance

154. Taking full account of the statutory duty and relevant guidance, my overall conclusion on the three components of the heritage balance, individually and in combination, is that the harm resulting from the loss of the six ward buildings does not have clear and convincing justification and the resultant public benefits would not outweigh the harm to the designated and non-designated heritage assets.

Issue (e): the development plan

155. Policy LP1 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan provides a presumption in favour of sustainable development and an indication that planning applications that accord with the policies in the Local Plan will be approved, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
156. Historic environment policy LP25, in relation to development which affects the significance of a heritage asset (whether designated or non-designated), including any contribution made by its setting, reflects the thrust of paragraphs 133 and 134 of the Framework including the provision of clear justification especially for works which would harm the significance of an asset, so that the harm can be weighed against public benefits.
157. The sub-section on conservation areas requires development within a conservation area to preserve and enhance or reinforce it, as a reflection of the statutory duty, and it sets out a series of development management criteria. However, it cannot be read in isolation and regard must be had to the policy as a whole and the expression of the policy and statutory approach to heritage assets as set out in criteria a – c. Given my findings on issues (a) – (d) above, the proposal would conflict with policy LP25.
158. The proposal would be consistent with all of the design principles and amenity considerations set out in policy LP26 save for conflict with criterion 'f' which seeks to incorporate and retain as far as possible existing historic features. However, this can be considered to be secondary and superfluous consideration where policy LP25 and the tests of the Framework apply.

159. Policy LP2 identifies Greylees as a medium village where, applying policy LP4, the settlement's growth level should not exceed 15% subject to a site specific limit, for appropriate locations, of nine dwellings or up to 25 dwellings where proposals can be justified by local circumstances. Given that the appeal site is brownfield land; its development would not harm the form, character or rural setting of the settlement; and it has a clear swell of local support, there is no material conflict with these policies.
160. Overall, the proposal would conflict with the principal policies of relevance to the main issues, notably policies LP25 and, in turn, LP1 due to conflict with the environmental role of sustainable development; and it would not be in accordance with the development plan when taken as a whole.

Issue (f): the planning balance

Unilateral undertaking/planning agreement

161. The planning obligations within the unilateral undertaking are conditional on them being required either in whole or in part by any grant of planning permission; and the covenants are conditional on their individual terms being determined as meeting the statutory tests set out in Regulation 122 and 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) and the advice in paragraph 204 of the National Planning Policy Framework either in whole or in part.
162. The undertaking makes provision for 50% of any profit made on the gross development value of the project of either 17% or 17.49% (as determined in this decision) to be paid to the Greylees Fund with the monies available to North Kesteven District Council; Sleaford Town Council; The Greylees Engagement Network; Heritage Lincolnshire; or any other heritage or community group (as may be agreed) to make application for funding from the fund for one or more of the following purposes (in summary):-
- (a) the provision of affordable housing on land within the administrative area of the district council;
 - (b) the provision of additional education facilities to serve the development at the Sleaford South Sustainable Urban Extension;
 - (c) the provision of health facilities to serve the development at the Caythorpe and Ancaster Medical Practice;
 - (d) the preservation and enhancement of the former Rauceby Hospital and its environs; and
 - (e) the provision of further community facilities or activities at Greylees.
163. Categories (a), (b) and (c) are listed as Band One; and (d) and (e) as Band Two. The former would have priority over the latter.
164. The appeal scheme has been calculated to return a profit for the developer of approximately 17% which would achieve Barratt's minimum target which would be at the lower end of the industry standard, particularly for a project including the renovation of some existing buildings.
165. Achieving minimum viability is calculated to be without any allowance for affordable housing and infrastructure provision. The purpose of the undertaking, in the event of the project attaining a higher than anticipated return, would see the surplus divided equally between the developer and the community with the latter used for any or all of the purposes above.

166. In this regard, it is necessary to revisit some of the viability considerations set out earlier in this decision. Firstly, in relation to the acquisition costs of the land, Barratt seeks to recover its initial apportioned outlay in the sum of £917,674 whereas the Council pursues a lower figure of £250,000 or such other sum as may be determined on behalf of the Secretary of State.
167. For my part, as the appellant's amount is a fixed sum in the undertaking, the matter is one of reasonableness and subsequent weight to be given to the obligation as a whole.
168. My earlier criticism of Barratt's approach to determining land value was based on an assessment related to the retention of two or four ward blocks and the higher costs of refurbishment, compared to new build, and the consequential depressing effect on market value. Whilst there is nothing before me to establish a precise figure deriving from the approval of the appeal scheme, I am satisfied that Barratt's position is reasonable. In this regard, when set alongside the Orchard House site and generic brownfield land, the central core is likely to involve higher build costs associated with the regeneration of the retained buildings. The comparative values appear to be broadly coherent.
169. The undertaking does however require determination of the gross development value at either 17% or 17.49% as part of the baseline. The two figures relate to Barratt's declared minimum profit margin and Savills' development appraisal (on behalf of Barratt) respectively. Much can be attributed to different accounting conventions and modelling and given that the former was Barratt's declared bottom line, I see no reason to deviate from its 17% return as the benchmark of viability.
170. The dispute between the parties goes beyond the undertaking in that the Council considers that a formal agreement, delivering necessary mitigation, is essential. It is said that this should include commuted sums for:- off-site affordable housing (£1,548,517); improvements at Caythorpe and Ancaster Medical Practice (£45,050); additional secondary and sixth form capacity (£430,532); and additional primary school classrooms (£270,624).
171. This arises from the Council's calculations, based on Barratt's/Savills' values, that the appeal scheme would be capable of delivering 19.7% profit or 27% profit by increasing sales values by 10%. It is also said that 35.5% could be achieved by setting the land value at £250,000 and by adding a conservation premium of 9% to the 10% undervaluation.
172. I have already determined that the land value of £917,674 is reasonable; and that there is no convincing reason to apply uplifts of 10% and 9%. It is understood that Barratt would finance the development from reserves and, according to the Council, the finance costs are an artificial distortion in favour of the appellant. Even if this were to be the case, the overall difference between the parties is in the order of 3%. To my mind, that is a relatively small disparity, given the nature of the figures and potential variables, which serves to demonstrate that the Council's pitch for a comprehensive planning agreement, in the manner suggested, could not be justified.
173. On this basis, the mechanism of an undertaking is entirely proportionate and reasonable in the circumstances of this case. There is convincing evidence that the profit likely to be generated by the project would be in the range of 17% - 20%.

174. In my opinion, having regard to the absence of any prerequisite contributions arising from the development, any surplus returns (over 17%) should be made available on an equal share basis to reflect the developer's higher than 'normal' risk and development plan justification, in policies LP11 and LP12, for affordable housing and infrastructure to support growth.
175. From the evidence available I am satisfied that the terms of the undertaking comply with the relevant statutory and policy tests set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations and the Framework and the obligation can be taken into account.

Other matters

176. Although the majority of representations from the community offer support for the proposal, several residents raise objections and concerns.
177. In terms of traffic volumes, parking provision and patterns, highway capacity and road safety, some local residents point to existing problems and suggest the need for an additional access point, traffic calming and a small car park. However, the highway authority has not identified any technical or capacity constraints related to the use of the existing Greylees road network, and I find no basis to oppose the proposal, as presented, on traffic grounds.
178. Whilst additional open space might be an aspiration for some existing residents, Greylees enjoys good provision and the scheme as submitted would deliver a focal public square. The two in combination would provide a mix of places where people could meet and enjoy contrasting spaces.

Overall conclusion

179. The six ward buildings of the former Rauceby Hospital form a key element of the Rauceby Hospital Conservation Area and contribute to the significance of the Rauceby Hospital Registered Park and Garden. They are also non-designated heritage assets in their own right. The demolition of these buildings and the resultant harm to the assets falls to be considered in accordance with the guidance in paragraphs 133 - 135 of the Framework.
180. It is common ground that the earlier approved schemes for the refurbishment of the principal buildings, with limited new build, are not viable. In addition, I have found that the Council's sensitivity analysis, and preferred intermediate scenario(s), for the retention of at least two of the ward blocks would neither reach the threshold of economic viability nor represent a reasonable alternative to the appeal scheme.
181. The final option of mothballing could throw the buildings a lifeline in the hope of an alternative solution being conceived. However, lack of viability in the terms already explained, would demand significant grant funding as a precondition. It is acknowledged that finding appropriate uses and devising a heritage-led scheme, which could secure grant-funding, might prove to be an arduous and time-consuming task and one that would not necessarily have a guaranteed successful outcome. Mothballing would also run counter to the community's unequivocal message and aspiration to see the completion of the central core and to gain the benefit of facilities which are currently lacking.

182. However, heritage assets are an irreplaceable part of both the nation's and local community's legacy. The loss of the six ward buildings would be irreversible and the harm to the identified heritage assets would be permanent. The planning process provides special custody for the historic environment through statutory measures and government guidance. One of the core principles of the Framework is to '*conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations*'.
183. Nonetheless, there may be instances where the loss or damage to heritage assets is justified by other considerations. The necessary justification rests heavily on the appellant and one of the steps required by the Framework is for verification that '*conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible*'.
184. In this instance, Barratt has not pursued the necessary process with sufficient alacrity and flair and, in light of this failing, mothballing can be considered to be a reasonable option and optimum viable use of the site and buildings in the short to medium term.
185. Mothballing would inevitably bring the risk of further damage to, and/or deterioration of, the buildings. However, that could be minimised by appropriate security and maintenance measures and by Barratt acting responsibly and promptly in its further investigation of alternative solutions with a view to bringing forward a revised scheme or providing the necessary balance of evidence to justify the current proposal. Maintaining the status quo would be consistent with the statutory duty to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.
186. On this basis, it has not reasonably been shown that the appeal scheme would be the only means of achieving the identified public benefits, including those which might be delivered as mitigation through the planning obligation, or that such benefits would outweigh the identified harm. The proposal would therefore be in conflict with the tests set out in paragraphs 133 - 135 of the Framework and also with the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.
187. For the above reasons, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David MH Rose

Inspector

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

David Hardy	Partner - Squire Patton Boggs UK LLP Instructed by The Legal Officer North Kesteven District Council
-------------	--

He called

Andrew Brown BA, Barch, MSc, MRTPI, IHBC	Director Woodhall Planning and Conservation
Alan Gray BSc, MRTPI	Economic Development Manager North Kesteven District Council
Sanjay Dhanani Beng	Associate Director Waldeck
Ben Aspinall BSc (Hons), MRICS, MRTPI, RICS Reg Val, RICS ACRETM Accredited Mediator	Managing Director AspinallVerdi
Nick Feltham BA (Hons), M.Plan	Principal Planning Officer North Kesteven District Council

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Jeremy Cahill QC Christian Hawley (of Counsel)	Instructed by:- Chris Waumsley, Freeths LLP
---	--

They called

Matthew Horridge BA (Hons), MCIAT, ICIOB	Architectural Design Manager Barratt & David Wilson Homes
Bill Swan BSc Quantity Surveying, MRICS, Dip Project Management, LLM Master of Research	Director Gleeds Advisory Ltd
Robert Galij BA (Hons), BTP, MRTPI	Planning Director (North Midlands Division) Barratt & David Wilson Homes
Jason Clemons BA (Hons), MA, MSc, MRTPI, IHBC	Director and Head of Built Heritage WYG
Chris Madge BSc, CEng, MICE	Managing Director Ecotech Consulting Engineers Ltd
Ben Glover BSc (Hons), MRICS	Director Development Services Savills (UK) Ltd
Chris Waumsley DIPTIP, MRTPI	Head of the Planning and Environment Group Freeths LLP

FOR GREYLEES ENGAGEMENT NETWORK:

Michael Downes
BA, BPI, MRTPI

Director
Aspbury Planning Limited

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Nigel Johnson	Local resident
Tim Eccles	Local resident
Peter Liivet	Local resident
Matt Tones	Local resident
Louise Maratty	Local resident
Simon Evans	Local resident
Paul Bolton	Local resident
Emma Evans (obo Melanie Kendrick)	Local resident
Sara Johnson (obo Louise Short)	Local resident
Sara Johnson	Local resident
Jan Brearleycook	Ward Councillor Quarrington and Greylees – Sleaford Town Council
Carole Hagan	Local resident

CORE DOCUMENTS

Submitted with the Planning Application -	
1.	Planning Application Forms
2.	Planning Statement including community engagement
3.	Design and Access Statement including community engagement
4.	Commercial Opportunities Report (Hodgson Elkington) Oct 15
5.	'Report and Valuation' Development Appraisal (Hodgson Elkington) Jul 1
6.	Arboricultural Report
7.	Heritage Statement
8.	Archaeological statement
9.	Structural Inspections & Addendum Structural Reports
10.	Ecological Report
11.	Building for Life 12 evaluation sheet
12.	Flood Risk Assessment and drainage strategy
13.	Planning application drawings (refused)
Other relevant documents	
14.	Reports to Planning Committee (including Addendum Reports)
15.	Minutes of the Planning Committee (including Minutes of the Councillor site visit)
15a.	Not used
15b.	Not used
15c.	Draft list of conditions
15d.	The Evolution of Greylees –planning history 1990-2017
Planning policy	
16.	National Planning Policy Framework (2012)
17.	Extracts from Planning Practice Guidance
18.	Extracts from North Kesteven Local Plan 2007
19.	Central Lincolnshire Inspectors Report
20.	Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (April 2017) and Statement of Adoption
20a.	Extracts from Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Version April 2016 including the Policies Map and Inset Map 15 (Greylees)
Housing Land Supply	
21.	Five Year Land Supply Local Plan Examination Note – ED0022
22.	Central Lincolnshire Five Year Land Supply Report (1/4/17 to 31/3/22) Sept 2016
23.	Strategic Housing Market Assessment, July 2015
Conservation and Heritage	
24.	Rauceby Hospital Site Brief – 1990

25.	Rauceby Hospital Conservation Area Designation Report - 1992
26.	Rauceby Hospital Development Brief – 1995
27.	Extract of policy RH2 of 1996 NKDC Local Plan
28.	Historic Landscape Assessment (in support of application 00/0058/FUL)
29.	Development appraisal (submitted with 00/0058/FUL and 00/0263/CAC) – 2000
30.	Not used
31.	Extracts from 'Rauceby Reflections' by Gwyneth M Stratten (1992/1997)
32.	NPPF Heritage Statement prepared by Roger Wools & Associates for David Wilson Homes (submitted with 12/0607/PREAPP) – 11 th September 2012
33.	Letter from North Kesteven District Council to David Wilson Homes – 13 th December 2012
34.	Letter from English Heritage to the Council – 17 th March 2013
35.	Rauceby Hospital Registered Park and Garden – Entry description 27 June 2000
36.	Draft Rauceby Hospital Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan 2017
37.	Draft Rauceby Hospital Conservation Area – CMT Report & Minutes
38.	Historic Environment Good Practice Advice Planning: Note 2 – Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (Historic England) – July 2015
39.	English Heritage - Enabling Development and the Conservation of Significant Places REVISION NOTE June 2012
40.	Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 4 – Enabling Development and Heritage Assets (Historic England) – consultation draft 2017
41.	CMT report, minutes and appendices – Non Designated Heritage Asset consultation 2016
42.	Historic England Structural Engineering Report - 2015
43.	Historic England – Guide to temporary uses, maintenance and mothballing
44.	Historic England 'value of conservation areas'
44a.	The Asylums List – The Time Chamber
44b.	Heritage Lottery Fund Heritage Enterprise Application Guidance December 2013
44c.	Rauceby Hospital Conservation Area Designation Report 1992 – Committee Report
Viability	
45.	Barratt's viability appraisal Central Core - Current Layout (Revision H) – March 2016
46.	Aspinall Verdi/Turner and Townsend – economic viability appraisal (EVA) report (2008/2011 refurbishment scheme) – 11 March 2016

47.	Aspinall Verdi/Turner and Townsend – economic viability appraisal (EVA) report (15/0947/FUL Revision H) – 31 March 2016
48.	Barratt’s 17-option alternative viability scenario report – November 2016
49.	Not used
50.	RICS ‘financial viability in planning’ 1st edition (GN 94/2012)
51.	Not used
51a.	File of viability information submitted to NKDC by Barratt including Maber Cost Plan March 2014 and Maber cost plan summary comparison January 2013 and March 2014
51b.	Turner & Townsend comments on Maber Cost Plan 2014
51c.	Turner & Townsend report to Ben Aspinall 21.10.15
51d.	Turner & Townsend Refurbishment Appraisal 09.11.15
51e.	Turner & Townsend New Build Appraisal 09.11.15
51f.	Maber revised Report December 2015
51g.	Maber cost plan summary 2015
51h.	Turner & Townsend Comments on Maber Report 2015
51i.	Maber response to Turner & Townsend comments
51j.	Turner & Townsend follow up report to Ben Aspinall 11.12.15
51k.	Agreed minutes – meeting with NKDC 05.08.16
Marketing	
52.	LSH Webpage advert
53.	Rightmove webpage advert
54.	Lincolnshire Echo press article (posted March 30 2017)
55.	Sleaford Target cover story 5 th April 2017
56.	St John’s Hospital Bracebridge Heath details
56a.	LSH Marketing Report May 2017
Relevant Case Law	
57.	Bedford Borough Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and NUON UK Ltd [2012] EWHC 4344 (Admin)/ [2013] EWHC 2847 (Admin)
58.	Forest of Dean District Council v SOSCLG & Anr 2016 EWHC 421 (Admin)
59.	East Northamptonshire v. Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2015] 1 W.L.R. 137 (known as the Barnwell Manor Case)
60.	R (on the application of) Forge Field Society & Others v Sevenoaks DC & Interested Parties [2014] EWHC 1895 (Admin)
61.	R (on the application of Gillian Hughes) v South Lakeland DC & Interested Parties [2014] EWHC 3979 (Admin)
62.	Jane Mordue v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and others [2015] EWHC 539 (Admin) (High Court and the Court of Appeal)

63.	Palmer v Herefordshire Council and ANR [2016] EWCA Civ 1061
64.	Gibson v Waverley judgement
65.	Lucas v Oldham Metropolitan borough 2017J EWHC 349 (Admin)
Relevant PINS Appeal Decisions	
66.	APP/F4410/W/16/3146851 – Frenchgate Centre, St. Sepulchre Gate, Doncaster
67.	APP/R0660/A/13/2200462 and 2211111 – North of Weston Lane, Shavington
68.	APP/K0235/A/09/2108506 – Airfield Farm, Podington
69.	DPI/B4215 & TWA/13/APP/03 – Network Rail Ordsall Chord Order (report to the Secretary of State for Transport and the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government)
70.	APP/U1430/A/12/2176517 – 36 and 38 Western Road, Bexhill-on-Sea
71.	46 Brick Lane, London
72.	APP/K5030/V/13/2205294 – 48 Farringdon Street, 25 Snow Hill and 29 Smithfield Street, London (s.77 T&CPA)
73.	APP/V0728/A/13/2196213 – Miltoun House, Albion Terrace, Guisborough, Redcar & Cleveland
74.	APP/Y3940/E/13/2196123 – Baydon Manor, Marridge Hill, Ramsbury, Marlborough, Wiltshire SN8 2HG
75.	APP/F0114/W/15/3006257 and 3006260 – Former St Nicholas School, Church Street, Radstock
76.	APP/T3725/A/14/2215618 – Land east of Wellesbourne Road and north of Wasperton Lane, Barford CV35 8EL
77.	Not Used
78.	Fulham Town Hall appeal decision
79.	Bassingham appeal decision
79a.	APP/L2360/A/13/2196884 Land at Chapel Lane, Wymondham, Norfolk
79b.	APP/T3725/A/14/2221613 – Land at the Asps, bound by Europa Way (A452) to the east and Banbury Road (A425) to the west

Additional Inquiry Documents	
INQ 1	GEN Summary of Neighbour comments to Application
INQ 2	Non-Agreed Extract of Transcript of Committee
INQ 3	R (on the application of Hayes) v City of York Council
INQ 4	Appeal Decision 2202293 Hamlet Court, Queens Road, Cowes
INQ 5	Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management
INQ 6	Heritage Works 2017 (3 rd Edition)
INQ 7	Inspector's Note – Preliminary Main Issues
INQ 8	ANB Photomontage
INQ 9	Waumsley email 14 March 2017

INQ 10	Freeths' letter 10 February 2017
INQ 11	NKDC letter 23 January 2017
INQ 12	Artist's impression of Appeal Scheme
INQ 13	JC QC Opening – Appellant
INQ 14	DH Opening – Council
INQ 15	Email M Horridge 21 June 2017
INQ 16	Note on calculation of building footprint of demolitions
INQ 17	Screenshot of GEN Facebook post 23 March 2017
INQ 18	Whitby High Court
INQ 19	Whitby Court of Appeal
INQ 20	South Lakeland decision
INQ 21	CIL Report
INQ 22	Non agreed list of asylums in Conservation Areas
INQ 23	BA / BG Viability Position Statement
INQ 24	Barratt's letter dated 3 July 2017
INQ 25	Update on status of Neighbourhood Plan
INQ 26	Orchard House Register Entry
INQ 27	Jason Clemons Rebuttal
INQ 28	Madge Response
INQ 29	Note on levels of recording of historic buildings
INQ 30	Unredacted PBA CIL Study
INQ 31	Barwood Strategic Land II LLP v East Staffs 2017 EWCA Civ 893
INQ 32	Extract of Appellant's Notes re Robert Galij cross examination
INQ 33	Hopkins Homes Supreme Court decision
INQ 34	Heritage Works 2 nd Edition
INQ 35	Jan 2015 GEN Consultation Exercise
INQ 36	Council's Transcript of RG / JC
INQ 37	Nigel Johnson – written statement
INQ 38	Tim Eccles – written statement
INQ 39	Helen Maratty – written statement
INQ 40	Simon Evans – written statement
INQ 41	Paul Bolton – written statement
INQ 42	Melanie Kendrick – written statement
INQ 43	Louise Short – written statement
INQ 44	Sara Johnson – written statement
INQ 45	Jan Brealeycook – written statement
INQ 46	Statement of Common Ground

INQ 47	Official Copy of register of title
INQ 48	Title Plan
INQ 49	List of draft conditions (with differences highlighted)
INQ 50	Appellant's list of draft conditions
INQ 51	Closing Submissions on behalf of North Kesteven District Council
INQ 52	Unilateral Undertaking (14 July 2017) with accompanying schedule and comments relating to the undertaking
INQ 53	Closing Submissions on behalf of GEN
INQ 54	Closing Submissions, and response to LPA submissions, on behalf of Barratt Homes
INQ 55	Email from North Kesteven District Council, dated 17 July 2017, with final comments on the Unilateral Undertaking and CIL Compliance Statement
INQ 56	Correspondence relating to Secretary of State's Direction under s76(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
INQ 57	Close of inquiry correspondence dated 25 July 2017