



Appeal Decisions

Hearing held on 16 May 2023

Site visit made on 15 and 16 May 2023

by Paul Thompson DipTRP MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 June 2023

Appeal A: APP/T3725/W/22/3306716

Glebe Hotel, Church Street, Barford CV35 8BS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Dr Bal Sidhu against the decision of Warwick District Council.
 - The application Ref W/21/2042, dated 3 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is redevelopment of former Glebe hotel, including partial demolition and construction of 4no. dwellings and conversion to 4no. apartments; including new access, car parking, bin stores, cycle parking and associated infrastructure.
-

Appeal B: APP/T3725/Y/22/3306718

Glebe Hotel, Church Street, Barford CV35 8BS

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Dr Bal Sidhu against the decision of Warwick District Council.
 - The application Ref W/21/2043/LB, dated 3 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 March 2022.
 - The works proposed are redevelopment of former Glebe hotel, including partial demolition and construction of 4no. dwellings and conversion to 4no. apartments; including new access, car parking, bin stores, cycle parking and associated infrastructure.
-

Appeal C: APP/T3725/W/22/3313664

Glebe Hotel, Church Street, Barford CV35 8BS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Dr Bal Sidhu against the decision of Warwick District Council.
 - The application Ref W/22/1407, dated 25 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is redevelopment of former Glebe hotel, including partial demolition and construction of 4no. dwellings and conversion to 4no. apartments; including new access, car parking, bin stores, cycle parking and associated infrastructure.
-

Appeal D: APP/T3725/Y/22/3313668

Glebe Hotel, Church Street, Barford CV35 8BS

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Dr Bal Sidhu against the decision of Warwick District Council.
 - The application Ref W/22/1408/LB, dated 25 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2022.
-

- The works proposed are redevelopment of former Glebe hotel, including partial demolition and construction of 4no. dwellings and conversion to 4no. apartments; including new access, car parking, bin stores, cycle parking and associated infrastructure.
-

Decision

Appeals A and B

1. The appeals are dismissed.

Appeal C

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for redevelopment of former Glebe hotel, including partial demolition and construction of 4no. dwellings and conversion to 4no. apartments; car parking, bin stores, cycle parking and associated infrastructure, at Glebe Hotel, Church Street, Barford CV35 8BS, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref W/22/1407, dated 25 August 2022, subject to the attached schedule of conditions.

Appeal D

3. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for redevelopment of former Glebe hotel, including partial demolition and construction of 4no. dwellings and conversion to 4no. apartments; car parking, bin stores, cycle parking and associated infrastructure, at Glebe Hotel, Church Street, Barford CV35 8BS, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref W/22/1408/LB, dated 25 August 2022 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the attached schedule of conditions.

Procedural Matters

4. The two sets of appeals concern similar schemes under different, complementary legislation. I have therefore dealt with the appeals together in my reasoning, except where indicated. Moreover, Appeals A and B constitute Appeal Scheme 1, and Appeal Scheme 2 comprises of Appeals C and D. Despite the descriptions in the banner headings for Appeals C and D, I have taken the description from the Decision Notices, as it reflects the determined scheme.

Main Issues

5. Prior to the Hearing, the Council confirmed it had been in discussion with the appellant and is able to remove its objection to Appeal A on the grounds of flood risk contained in its fifth reason for refusal. Moreover, additional drainage calculations and discharge rates were provided, which have enabled the Lead Local Flood Authority and Council to conclude that there would be no adverse impact on flood risk. It therefore does not seek to defend those grounds.
6. Following receipt of a second speed survey and Road Safety Audit, the Council no longer has concerns regarding the proposed additional access referred to in the fourth reason for refusal for Appeal A. However, despite submission of a parking beat survey, the Council still seeks to defend grounds of refusal in respect of insufficient visitor parking.
7. At the Hearing, the Council confirmed it did not have concerns with the proposed alterations to the floorplan or other elements of the original building.

Its concerns relate to those parts of each scheme to replace 66 Church Street and the extensions north of the listed building. I have therefore considered both schemes on this basis, but addressed those elements in 'Other Matters'.

8. In light of the above, the main issues are:

- whether the proposed new buildings north of 'The Glebe Hotel' would preserve this Grade II listed building and any features of special historic interest that it possesses, including its setting, and the extent to which they would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Barford Conservation Area (All Appeals); and
- whether the proposed development makes suitable provision for visitor parking, and any associated effects on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and highway safety (Appeal A only); and
- whether the proposal would comply with the policies of the Barford Neighbourhood Development Plan and amount to a suitable scheme for housing in the defined settlement boundary (Appeals A and C).

Reasons

Special Interest, Setting and Significance of Heritage Assets

9. The appeal concerns The Glebe Hotel a three-storey Grade II listed building situated to the east of Church Street within the Barford Conservation Area (CA). It likely originated as a rectory in the early-19th Century for the adjacent Church of St Peter. The listing description contains a largely accurate description of the three-bay wide building and the fine Georgian detailing found in its principal façade to Church Street, including its brickwork, tall chimneys, embellishment of openings and joinery details. At the rear is a lower two-storey wing of three bays.
10. Given the extensive frontage of the Hotel, its architectural detailing and scale, and prominent position adjacent to the Church and at a bend in the street, it was evidently designed to make an impression. Furthermore, the remaining low level boundary wall to Church Street includes a stone coping, meaning it is likely to have been topped by iron railings to provide enclosure but show off the building. The northern half of the site's frontage is now marked by a wall and tall planting, which contribute positively to the verdant setting of the building. The historic and physical relationship with the Church also contributes to its special interest and a link through a metal estate fence is still evident.
11. The land around the building is much changed, as demonstrated by historic mapping, including the removal of service and other buildings likely used for stabling and other ancillary uses. The construction of bungalows at its rear in Church Lane, which separated a Dovecote from the building, also considerably reduced the land around the building. The extension of the Hotel in the 1980s, and construction of 66 Church Street to its north, further constrained the space around the building, as the former was constructed close to the rear boundary of what land remained. However, 7 Church Lane was acquired, and an opening created between to enable use of its garden by the Hotel. Despite this, given the considerable alterations to the listed building and its setting, evidence of it as a large single home once set within considerable grounds, has been significantly eroded beyond its forecourt.

12. The extension incorporates simple detailing that is informed by the listed building, including windows to the front with key blocks and a frieze band. It is constructed in a deeper red brick, which contrasts slightly with the original building. While it is much longer across the site's frontage than the historic building that previously joined into the Hotel, and it connects to No 66 at ground floor, the extension is of an appropriate scale and mass alongside the much taller original building, which still dominates its immediate surroundings. Nevertheless, the extension does not make a positive contribution to the special interest of the building, as it occupies a significant extent of the former grounds of the building, thereby crowding it and obscuring much of its external fabric at the rear.
13. The architecture of No 66 is somewhat of a departure from that of the listed building and it stands out as a jarring feature where experienced within its grounds. While there is an overgrown hedge to its frontage which provides some screening of the property from the street, planting is ephemeral and subject to seasonal change and could be lowered or thinned, thereby increasing its visibility. The visual harm it causes to the setting of the Hotel is only not so readily apparent for that reason.
14. As far as it relates to the appeals before me, the special interest of the Hotel is to be found in its architectural and historic interest as a former early-19th Century rectory and now Hotel, which has a close relationship with the adjacent Church. In addition, despite extensions to the building, much of its original architectural elaboration remains evident.
15. The Hotel also draws special interest from its setting, which is defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), as the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. As demonstrated above, its setting has changed considerably, particularly since the mid- to late-20th Century through extensions and erosion of its grounds with other development, which detract from its setting.
16. The Cedar tree in the forecourt of the Hotel is substantially tall and makes a considerable contribution to the setting of the building where experienced from the street. However, the introduction of a hard landscape dominated focus to parking around the tree in place of gardens and a lack of enclosure has also weakened the role played by this forecourt area in highlighting the importance of the building. Nevertheless, it remains a prominent building within its immediate surroundings of Church Street and Church Lane.
17. The CA is primarily focussed on the historic centre of the village, including these streets and High Street, Wellesbourne Road and Bridge Street. As far as it is relevant to the appeals before me, the significance of the CA is derived from the rich legacy of historic structures and overall high-quality of buildings from the various periods of Barford's development. This presents a rich tapestry of its history, significance, and character.
18. The quality of the CA is perhaps best illustrated by the number of listed buildings therein, including the Hotel, and the diversity of the scale of buildings from single to three storeys and groupings either in tight continuous frontages or more loosely spaced. They are also generally prominent from the streets within the CA, including the Hotel, which significantly contributes to the character and appearance of the CA, and thereby its significance.

19. Further to its relationship with the listed building, despite it having lesser prominence than other buildings in the CA, the architecture of No 66 is of limited merit, so it does not contribute positively to the CA.

Effect of the Proposals

Scheme 1

20. The proposed dwellings in Plots 2-4, north of the Hotel, would comprise of a separate new building detached from it. I am mindful that there are tight groupings of buildings of varying scale within the CA, including terraces to the west in Church Street, but this would contradict historic evidence of how buildings have previously featured on the site, specifically their jointing to the north façade of this principal building. Moreover, historic mapping provided with the appeals sufficiently demonstrate that the Hotel has not been a standalone building but an amalgam of parts, including the earlier projection to the north of the building replaced by the current Hotel extension. Furthermore, from an opposing standpoint, the gap would also provide an inconsequential amount of space around the Hotel to better reveal its special interest within a more spacious setting. In this context, the gap would present an uncomfortable relationship that would have a significantly harmful effect on the setting of the Hotel and character and appearance of the CA.
21. The proposal includes a new vehicular access that, for highway safety reasons, would require removal of planting within its visibility splay, with any retained or new planting kept much lower in height. I indicated above that railings are likely to have been present across much of the site's frontage to highlight the presence of the building, but the planting in situ makes an equally important contribution to the character and appearance of this part of Church Street. This would diminish significantly with the proposal to remove planting and would not be mitigated by new lower-level planting in the visibility splay and further planting to the south. The latter, in particular, would take some time to mature and have a similar effect to established planting that would be removed.
22. While opening the frontage of the site in this way would not exacerbate the visual harm associated with the gap between the buildings, the removal of the planting would have a significantly harmful effect on the setting of the listed building and the character and appearance of the CA.
23. All the proposed dwellings would be taller than the existing extension to the listed building and No 66, with steeper roof pitches, and would be situated slightly further forward in the site. However, they would remain recessive to the Hotel, which would maintain its dominance due to its greater headroom at ground and first floors, its additional storey and roof form. These would combine to elevate the building considerably above the proposals. Similarly, the proposed homes would be appropriate in the context of the varied scale of buildings within the CA, particularly in Church Street.
24. The proposal would clearly result in a different appearance to the façade of the building immediately alongside the listed building, with more doors and windows on both floors and a longer façade northward than the existing extension. It would also share some characteristics with terraced houses within the street. However, the size and configuration of these openings would not detract from or undermine appreciation of the ratio of openings in the listed

- building, and the vertical alignment and depreciating scale and significance of openings would reflect characteristics of openings on the Hotel.
25. The inclusion of chimneys would add greater prominence to the building, but these are features that are not uncommon with ancillary buildings for large homes, such as the listed building which was once a rectory. They would also be much smaller than those on the Hotel, so they would not exacerbate the harm that would result from position of the building in relation to the Hotel.
 26. The new house to the north of the site would be taller to its eaves and ridge than the dormer bungalow and would remain joined to the building south of it. However, it would be of a form and appearance that would better reflect the detailing of the listed building and the general character and appearance of buildings within the CA. This would therefore be more complementary to the setting of the former and would assimilate more comfortably within the latter.
 27. The proposal would also have potential to utilise higher quality materials in a configuration that would better reflect the characteristics of the listed building and CA, including the brick bond and windows.
 28. The new buildings would occupy a significantly reduced area of land to the north of the listed building with more land given over to gardens. This would reintroduce a significantly greater area of undeveloped land to the rear of the site, which would reduce crowding of the Hotel. The subdivision of the plots 1-4 within the proposal, through boundaries to plots 1-4, would be reasonable in the context of current circumstances and historic evidence of partial subdivision of the site to accommodate ancillary functions, such as stabling. The proposal would therefore amount to another chapter in the divided nature of the site.
 29. I am also satisfied that conditions could be used to ensure that the subdivision shown in Scheme 2 could be replicated in Scheme 1. Moreover, at the Hearing, the appellant explained that use of hedges to demarcate boundaries to result in a softer appearance and retain a better sense of openness to the rear of the buildings, was based on a principle accepted in the district at Haseley Manor.
 30. The layout of the south garden and frontage of the Hotel would also maintain openness in those directions. In terms of the latter, at present the parking for the Hotel is within an open expanse of hard surfacing occupying much of the forecourt area. Removal of planting at the site's frontage would increase visibility of this area, but the proposal would reconfigure and reduce the extent of parking. In combination with new areas of planting and a similar surface treatment, this would be likely to reduce the prominence of disorganized parked vehicles within the whole of the forecourt and, thereby, improve the Hotel's setting and the character and appearance of the CA.

Scheme 2

31. The proposed dwellings in Plots 2-4, north of the Glebe Hotel, would join on to the Hotel, albeit with a passageway through at ground floor. While this would not provide space between the Hotel and new buildings in the site, it would align with the historic presence of buildings jointing to the north façade of the Hotel. Moreover, historic mapping provided with the appeals sufficiently demonstrate that the Hotel has not been a standalone building but an amalgam

of parts, including the earlier projection to the north of the building replaced by the current Hotel extension.

32. All the proposed dwellings would be taller than the existing extension to the listed building and No 66, with steeper roof pitches, and would be situated slightly further forward in the site. However, they would remain recessive to the Hotel, which would maintain its dominance due to its greater headroom at ground and first floors, its additional storey and roof form. These would combine to elevate the building considerably above the proposals. Similarly, the proposed homes would be appropriate in the context of the varied scale of buildings within the CA, particularly in Church Street.
33. The proposal would clearly result in a different appearance to the façade of the building alongside the listed building, with more doors and windows on both floors and a longer façade northward than the existing extension. It would also share some characteristics with terraced houses within the street. Nonetheless, the size and configuration of these openings would not detract from or undermine appreciation of the ratio of openings in the listed building, and the vertical alignment and depreciating scale and significance of openings would reflect characteristics of openings on the Hotel. Furthermore, the door opening to Plots 3 and 4 would be like that found on the existing extension.
34. The new house to the north of the site would be taller to its eaves and ridge than the dormer bungalow and would remain joined to the building south of it. However, it would be of a form and appearance that would better reflect the detailing of the listed building and the general character and appearance of buildings within the CA. This would therefore be more complementary to the setting of the former and would assimilate more comfortably within the latter.
35. The proposal would also have potential to utilise higher quality materials in a configuration that would better reflect the characteristics of the listed building and CA, including the brick bond and windows.
36. The new buildings would occupy a significantly reduced area of land to the north of the listed building with more land given over to gardens. This would reintroduce a significantly greater area of undeveloped land to the rear of the site, which would reduce crowding of the Hotel. The subdivision of the plots 1-4 within the proposal, through boundaries to plots 1-4, would be reasonable in the context of current circumstances and historic evidence of partial subdivision of the site to accommodate ancillary functions, such as stabling. The proposal would therefore amount to another chapter in the divided nature of the site. The use of hedges to demarcate boundaries would also result in a softer appearance and retain a better sense of openness to the rear of the buildings, like the approach accepted in the district at Haseley Manor. Furthermore, the layout of the south garden and frontage of the Hotel would maintain openness in those directions.
37. The proposed bin stores would be modest structures that would be largely reversible. While one would be situated north of the listed building in its frontage, so it would be visible, I am mindful there are already other buildings to the frontage of the site and a balance needs to be struck between reducing the clutter of individual bins stored elsewhere within the site. Furthermore, planting could be added around the building to soften its prominence.

Public Benefits and Conclusions on the First Main Issue (Scheme 1 Only)

38. Despite my findings in relation to the appearance of parking, and the scale and appearance of Plots 1-4, the separation of Plots 2-4 from the listed building and nature of the gap between, together with the loss of landscape features, would be harmful to the special interest and setting of the listed building and the character and appearance of the CA, and thereby its significance.
39. The statutory duties in Sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) are matters of considerable importance and weight, as are the aims of paragraphs 197, 199 and 200 of the Framework
40. The proposal would fundamentally alter and be harmful to the special interest and setting of the Glebe Hotel and the character and appearance of the CA, which would have a harmful effect on their special interest and significance as designated heritage assets. In my view the harm that I have identified would equate to less than substantial harm. In such circumstances, paragraph 202 of the Framework and LP Policy HE1 identify this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of proposals.

Heritage Benefits

41. There would be significant heritage benefits to reinstating period details within the building. Similarly, as I explain later in 'Other Matters' the proposed alterations and extensions to the Hotel, including in the context of its historic floor plan, would not be harmful to its special interest with the north wall of the rear wing reinstated. This latter element would be a heritage benefit, but the other works would amount to an absence of harm.
42. The proposal would remove the sprawling extension to the north of the Hotel and the dormer bungalow and retain space behind the new buildings and introduce new landscaping therein. The new buildings would also be designed with a sympathetic palette of materials, using detailing that would be generally appropriate in this context. However, given the harm resulting from the gap between the Hotel and new buildings, I afford limited weight to these benefits.
43. The Hotel business has clearly fallen on hard times and appears to have quite legitimately been a casualty of the Covid-19 pandemic and limitations in terms of its offer. The appellant has also explored other alternative uses for the buildings. Residential use would appear to amount to a viable use for the listed building and the site in general and it would help to ensure the continued use and conservation of the building. Furthermore, it would reduce running costs associated with a vacant building. Despite this, given my findings in relation to Appeal Scheme 2, the proposal in Appeal Scheme 1 would not amount to the optimum viable use, as it would be more harmful. Although I do not need to explore them in detail, Appeal Scheme 2 would also deliver the same public benefits associated with Appeal Scheme 1, but without its harms.

Other Benefits

44. The main parties agree the Council can demonstrate 5.08 years of deliverable housing land. The appeal scheme would deliver eight homes toward the supply of homes in the district and would add to the choice of properties available. However, given its magnitude, this would only be a moderate social benefit.

45. There would be short-term benefits to the local and wider economy from employment associated with construction works and the procurement of materials. Occupants of the proposed homes would also be likely to contribute to supporting services and facilities in the village and wider parish. These would all constitute benefits in social and economic terms but, given the scale of the proposed scheme, they would be afforded moderate weight.
46. The proposal would remove hardstanding around the root protection area of the Cedar tree, which can lead to compaction of soil and aeration, and potentially increase its lifespan. The tree makes a significantly positive contribution to the setting of the Hotel and the CA's character and appearance. This would amount to heritage and environmental benefits, but such impacts could be made in absence of the proposal, so they attract moderate weight.
47. The sustainable construction of new buildings and potentially sourcing energy from renewable sources would amount to environmental benefits, but of limited weight given the magnitude of the proposal. Similarly, there would be environmental benefit from removal of some parking and new planting in the forecourt area of the building, but this would be tempered by the loss of existing mature planting, so the weight I could afford it would also be limited.
48. The proposal would be situated in an accessible location within walking distance of the facilities and services in Barford, including its shop, school and playing fields. It would also preserve biodiversity within the site. However, I ascribe negligible additional benefit in respect of these matters, as I consider them to be absences of harm.
49. The proposal relates to previously developed land and could therefore be said to make more effective use of the site, which is occupied by vacant buildings. Nevertheless, it would not safeguard and improve this particular environment, a key component of the Framework's objective of making effective use of land. Seeking to make a more optimal use of land should also not be at the expense of design quality or the creation of development that is of high quality and responsive to its context.
50. Taking the above together, the public benefits I have outlined would not justify allowing a proposal that would fail to preserve the special interest of the Grade II listed building, its setting, and the character and appearance of the CA. In accordance with paragraphs 199 and 202 of the Framework, considered together, I am therefore not persuaded that there would be wider public benefits of sufficient magnitude to outweigh the great weight to be given to the less than substantial harm that I have identified to the special interest and significance of the heritage assets.
51. The proposed new buildings north of Hotel would not constitute high quality design and so would fail to preserve this Grade II listed building, including its setting, and the character and appearance of the CA. Hence, the proposal would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraphs 197 and 199 of the Framework and conflict with the design and heritage aims of Policies BE1, HE1, HE2 and NE4 of the Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029 (LP); and Policies B6, B7, and B8 of the Barford Neighbourhood Development Plan 2014-2029 (June 2016) (BNDP).

Conclusion on the First Main Issue (Scheme 2 Only)

52. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would constitute high quality design and so would preserve The Glebe Hotel, including its setting, and the character and appearance of the CA. Hence, it would satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraphs 197 and 199 of the Framework, and accord with the design and heritage aims of Policies BE1, HE1, HE2 and NE4 of the LP; and BNDP Policies B6 and B7.

Visitor Parking (Appeal A only)

Policy Background

53. The LP and BNDP are both parts of the development plan, and BNDP Policy B13 and LP Policy TR3 accord with the requirements of Framework paragraph 107. However, the BNDP is older than the LP and the Warwick District Council Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (June 2018) (SPD) referred to in Policy TR3 and neither of these refer to the BNDP or any other neighbourhood plan. Policy TR3 requires compliance with the SPD, but the latter is not policy in itself and only provides further information on the expectations of the policy.
54. The SPD sets out the requirement for allocated spaces for new dwellings of one to four or more bedrooms and these requirements are replicated in Policy B13. The former does not include a requirement for visitor parking, but the latter requires at least one off-street visitor parking space for each dwelling.
55. At the Hearing I was referred to the Planning Practice Guidance in relation to neighbourhood plans¹. This states *individual policies in a neighbourhood plan may become out of date, for example if they conflict with policies in a plan that is adopted after the neighbourhood plan becomes part of the development plan. In these cases, the more recent policy takes precedence.*
56. There is clear discord between the requirements of the policies and SPD, but I am mindful Policy B13 deals with local circumstances and requirements for parking. While it goes further and is based on a narrower evidence base, it therefore remains pertinent to proposals for new development in Barford.

Effect of the Proposal

57. The proposal would include 22 off-street spaces, which would meet the quantum of spaces required by the SPD and Policy TR3, but there would be a deficiency of six visitor spaces required by Policy B13. Additional parking would therefore need to be met on-street.
58. The application and appeal are both supported by evidence of parking problems in the vicinity of the site. The appellant's parking survey focussed on parking near to the site and its new vehicular. At the Hearing, the Council accepted it was not necessary for the survey to include Church Lane, but expected it to cover a longer distance from the Hotel, overnight surveys and assessment of on-street parking demand associated with the use of the Church and organised sports at weekends on the nearby playing fields, as required by the SPD.

¹ Paragraph: 072, Reference ID: 61-072-20190315 and Revision date: 15 03 2019.

59. The Council does not dispute the survey sufficiently demonstrates on-street parking capacity would be likely to be available to serve the proposal between 0700 to 1900, during the week. This is when most residents are likely to be at home. At the Hearing, interested parties explained parking associated with the extant use of the Hotel has previously led to on-street parking problems. However, this is also likely to have been at weekends and I am mindful that the proposal is likely to result in lower trip generation than the Hotel use.
60. Accordingly, were the Hotel use to be reinstated it would likely generate some on-street parking demand for guests, visitors, and staff, so parking pressures within the locality would be unlikely to recede. With these points in mind, notwithstanding the nature and type of traffic travelling through the village and under provision of off-street visitor parking in the proposal, the extent of demand for visitor parking associated with it is unlikely to have any greater effect to on-street parking than the Hotel use. Furthermore, even if all the visitor spaces required for the proposal were to be needed at the same time, visitors would be no more likely than users of the Hotel or other properties to park indiscriminately within neighbouring streets. The impacts of deliveries would also not be significant and likely comparable with other developments.
61. It would therefore be unnecessary to carry out further survey work, as this would be unlikely to add anything more to the existing evidence base, and I conclude the proposed development would make suitable provision for parking and would not have a harmful effect on highway safety or the living conditions of nearby occupiers. Hence, the proposal would not conflict with the aims for parking in respect of such matters as expressed in LP Policies TR1 and TR3 and BNDP Policies B11 and B13.

Location (Appeals A and C)

62. Despite my favourable finding in relation to the second main issue, conflict with other BNDP policies in the first main issue would render Appeal A in conflict with BNDP Policy B1. The scheme in Appeal A would therefore not amount to a suitable scheme for housing in the defined settlement boundary for Barford.
63. Conversely, due to my finding in the first main issue, despite the appeal site not being a preferred site for housing shown on BNDP Map 5.7, the scheme in Appeal C would amount to a suitable scheme for housing in the defined settlement boundary for Barford, in accordance with Policy B1.

Other Matters (All Appeals)

64. The proposed extensions to the east of the Hotel would be consistent with the form of earlier additions, which step down in scale. The detailing and roof configuration would also respect the existing characteristics of the building. Furthermore, the proposed layout of the apartments within the building would be sympathetic to its historic floor plan, with the north wall of the rear wing reinstated. These works would not be harmful to the special interest of the listed building and those aspects of the scheme visible externally would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the CA, in accordance with the Act and policies of the development plan.

65. The conservatory to the south façade of the Hotel is a later addition but shares some characteristics of the remaining building. Even so, it is not possible to instruct it be demolished and replaced as part of this proposal as requested by some interested parties, as it is not part of the scheme before me.
66. As I have referred to above, the appeal property is next to the Church of St Peter, a Grade II* listed building. Next door-but-one to the north is 'The Old Mill House'; at the building's rear is the 'Dovecote At Rear Of Number 7', the latter being a bungalow served from Church Lane; and opposite the forecourt of the site are 'Jasmine Cottage' and '29 Church Street', all of which are designated as Grade II listed buildings. I have therefore had regard to the statutory duties referred to in the Act. However, given the nature and scale of the proposed buildings and their physical relationship with these designated assets, their settings would be preserved, and the proposal would not detract from them. I note that the main parties arrived at a similar position in the Statements of Common Ground for the appeals.

Other Matters (Appeals C and D only)

Location, Need for Housing, and Loss of Visitor Accommodation

67. Several interested parties have raised concern regarding the availability of public transport links for Barford and the absence of other infrastructure, but it is designated in the LP as a growth village suitable for additional housing. Inclusion of smaller starter homes is also not a requirement of the LP or BNDP policies to which I have been referred, and the proposed mix of housing would be reasonable in the heritage context of the site.
68. Although there are concerns regarding the loss of the Hotel, including the facilities it provides, there are no policies within the development plan which seek to protect against this, including the BNDP which protects community facilities. There would be no policy basis to resist the appeal scheme on this basis and, in any event, there is insufficient substantive evidence before me to dispute the appellant's evidence regarding the viability or consideration of alternative uses for the building, despite the apparent need for hotels in the district.

Provision of Infrastructure

69. The proposal falls below the threshold for any contributions to infrastructure or affordable housing required by the LP. Moreover, while the BNDP seeks such housing on small sites such as the proposal, this conflicts with the Framework, as the site is not within a designated rural area.

Highway Safety, Traffic, Parking, and Air Quality

70. The proposed homes would utilise the existing access serving the Hotel and, considering this extant use, vehicle movements associated with the proposal would be unlikely to lead to its intensification, including in terms of particulates emitted from vehicles. I am also mindful that charging for electric vehicles would need to be secured through the Building Regulations.
71. There would be sufficient parking for residents and visitors, in size, number and access, in accordance with the SPD and BNDP and the local highway authority did not object to the appeal scheme, subject to planning conditions. There is therefore no basis for me to resist the proposal on such grounds. Details of

timings of works and areas for parking for construction vehicles can also be addressed by condition.

72. The existing pedestrian access into Church Lane would remain in place for the proposal, so its use would not be an inconvenience for neighbouring occupiers and, given the amount of parking that would be provided, there is no reason for me to believe that occupiers of the development would need to park there. Similarly, while I accept that Church Lane may be used for parking in association with the Church and playing fields, it is unlikely future occupiers of the development would be at any greater risk than residents of other existing properties in the lane when using it to access these and other facilities.

Refuse Collection

73. It is likely that collections would add to traffic in Church Street, but this has to be appreciated in the context of traffic associated with refuse collections for the extant Hotel use. Bin stores are to be located closer to Church Street and the Council has stated collection would be taken from the kerbside of that street. This would only be for a temporary period, so any inconvenience caused to pedestrians and other road users would be limited and unlikely to differ significantly to other locations in Church Street.

Trees and Biodiversity

74. While some of the trees within the site would be removed as part of the proposal, the evidence before me indicates that they would be of little amenity value. There would also still be some parking within the root protection area of the Cedar tree, but its impact would be a great improvement over what is currently experienced. Retained trees would be protected during construction, with measures secured by condition. The implications of the proposal on trees would therefore not be a constraint sufficient to dismiss the appeal.
75. Some concerns have been identified to the effect on relocated bat roosts, but there are sufficient provisions within the proposed conditions to ensure mitigation is provided in an appropriate manner, including any discrepancies as to their location.

Living Conditions

76. The existing Hotel building and attached dwelling, are extensive and close to the dwellings north and east of the site. Despite the removal of some trees and windowsills being lower, given the separation of the proposed dwellings from those adjacent and the position of windows, there would not be unacceptable harm caused to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers regarding their privacy or outlook. I note the Council arrived at a similar conclusion having regard to its Residential Design Guide in doing so.

Community Engagement

77. While the Framework advocates that applicants should be encouraged to engage with local communities before submitting applications, there is no statutory requirement to do so. This is regrettable but it is not a reason for me to dismiss the appeals.

Inconsistencies in Information

78. I have had regard to the scheme before me and find any inconsistencies associated with some evidence having not been updated along with revisions to the scheme to not have inhibited my ability to take a reasoned and considered approach to the identified effects.

Planning Balance (Scheme 1 Only)

79. The development plan for the area includes the LP and BNDP. While these both predate the current Framework, it is clear that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to its publication. Due weight should be given to their policies according to their consistency with the Framework.
80. BNDP Policy B1 seeks to ensure housing is built in the right places having regard to compliance with other policies therein. In this sense, it would accord with the overall principles of achieving well-designed places advocated by the Framework. BNDP Policies B7 and B8 and LP Policies BE1 and NE4 are also generally aligned to these principles. Despite the absence of a balancing exercise in relation to heritage harms in BNDP Policy B6 and LP Policy HE2, these policies are generally consistent with the heritage aims of the Framework. LP Policy HE1 is also consistent with the Framework. I therefore afford considerable weight to the conflict of the proposal with these policies.
81. I have already identified the benefits of the appeal scheme as part of the assessment of public benefits in undertaking the necessary balancing exercise in relation to the heritage assets.
82. Subject to planning conditions there would not appear to be conflict with the development plan regarding a number of matters, not least harm to trees and living conditions and the main parties have been able to agree there would not be harm to highway safety from the proposed access or flood risk from drainage associated with the proposed buildings. I have also found that there would be sufficient on-street parking available to serve the proposed homes if all the off-street spaces provided are utilised by visitors. These matters would therefore neither weigh in favour nor against the appeal scheme.
83. In terms of harm, the proposed new buildings north of The Glebe Hotel would fail to preserve the special interest of this Grade II listed building, including its setting, and would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the CA. Furthermore, conflict in this regard also renders the proposal in conflict with the BNDP and it would not amount to a suitable scheme for housing in the defined settlement boundary for Barford.
84. Given this clear conflict, I am referred to Framework paragraph 208 in respect of enabling development. However, the evidence before me does not sufficiently demonstrate Scheme 1 would amount to enabling development and, in any event, my findings in Scheme 2 indicate there are other realistic means by which conservation of the listed building could be achieved.
85. This leads me to an overall conclusion that the appeal scheme would not accord with the development plan, when considered as a whole, and I find that the adverse impacts of the proposal are matters of great weight against its approval that outweigh the stated benefits.

Conditions (Scheme 2 Only)

86. In addition to the standard time limits for both appeals, in the interests of clarity I have specified the approved plans in Appeal C. This is unnecessary for Appeal D, as the decision incorporates the plans.
87. In the interests of preserving the contribution made to the special interest and setting of the listed building, conditions are necessary on both appeals for the specifications and samples of materials, including details of external doors and windows.

Appeal D

88. Additional details of a scheme of precaution measures to secure and protect windows during construction, are also necessary to protect historic fabric. For similar reasons, conditions are also necessary to ensure that demolition of building materials bonded to the original listed building are carried out by hand; that new window and door frames are constructed in timber and painted; and to ensure all new external and internal works or finishes and those for making good of retained fabric match those existing. In the context of Framework Paragraph 204, a condition would be necessary to ensure that all reasonable steps are taken to ensure the new development would proceed before any demolition takes place of the extensions to the listed building.

Appeal C

89. Conditions are necessary to ensure that protected and notable species, and retained trees are protected prior to any work on site being undertaken. A further condition is also necessary to ensure protected trees and other planting are not removed and any replacements subsequently made. Prior to development commencing a detailed schedule of bat mitigation measures, and a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) are necessary to ensure these protected species are not harmed by the development and a net biodiversity gain in accordance with the Framework. A sustainable urban drainage scheme, and later a maintenance plan, are also necessary at this stage to prevent increased risk of flooding.
90. Further conditions are also necessary prior to commencement of the development, for a Construction Management Plan, a Sustainability Statement, and a scheme to deal with archaeology. These are required in the interests of highway safety and living conditions; to provide an energy hierarchy scheme and a programme of delivery of all proposed measures; and to ensure remains of archaeological importance are recorded, preserved, and protected, where applicable. However, I have added that agreement should be sought for the timing of construction and demolition to provide certainty to all parties.
91. Development above slab level would also need to be restricted, in the interests of the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, until finished floor and site levels have been approved.
92. Prior to first occupation of any of the dwellings, in the interests of preserving the contribution made by the special interest and setting of the listed building, and significance of the CA, separate conditions are necessary to deal with a hard and soft landscaping. Similarly, details of the water efficiency of the dwellings are necessary at this stage in order to preserve this resource;

and the dwellings shouldn't be occupied until refuse and recycling storage, and parking and secure storage for cycles, to provide a satisfactory appearance to the development and encourage use of alternative modes of transport.

93. Parking and manoeuvring areas should also be maintained for that purpose to avoid on-street parking in the interests of highway safety and living conditions. Further controlling conditions are also necessary, in the interests of health and the environment, to deal with any unexpected contamination; and to ensure access is only taken from the existing access, the surface of which shall also be improved, and no gates, barriers or doors erected across it.

Conclusion

94. The proposal constituting Scheme 1 would be contrary to the development plan and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. Accordingly, for the reasons given, I conclude that Appeals A and B should be dismissed. However, for the reasons outlined, I conclude that Appeals C and D should be allowed.

Paul Thompson

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Joe Bennett	Principal Planning Consultant (RCA Regeneration)
Sian Griffiths	Planning Director (RCA Regeneration)
Mike Lapworth	Architect (MGL Design Associates)
Nigel Vening	Director of Transport Engineering (Banners Gate Transportation Ltd)

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Robert Dawson	Principal Conservation Officer
Andrew Walker	Principal Planning Officer

OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES:

Amanda Griffin	
Mark Griffin	
Cathy Kennedy	
John Murphy	Chairman of Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton Joint Parish Council
Doug White	

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOLLOWING THE CLOSE OF THE HEARING

- Statement from Interested Parties that was read out at the Hearing and responses from the main parties.
- Revised set of planning conditions, agreed by the main parties.

SCHEDULES OF CONDITIONS

Appeal C: APP/T3725/W/22/3313664

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 198-P100A, 198-R201 Rev G, 198-R202 Rev A, 198-R203 Rev C, 198-R204 Rev B, 198-R205 Rev C, 198-R206 Rev C, 198-R213 Rev C, 198-R218 Rev C, 198-R219 Rev B and any specification contained therein.
3. No development, including all preparatory work, shall take place until the Godwins Tree Surveys Impact Assessment with Tree Protection Measures report from Godwins, reference AIA.13546.01 dated 19 October 2022, including their Tree Protection Measures and Tree Protection Plan, together referred to as the scheme of protection, has been adopted. The development thereafter shall be implemented in strict accordance with the approved scheme of protection, which shall be kept in place until all parts of the development have been completed and all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed.
4. No development shall take place until a detailed schedule of bat mitigation measures (to include timing of works, replacement roost details, monitoring and further survey if deemed necessary) has been completed in consultation with a suitably qualified bat worker and submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such approved mitigation measures shall thereafter be implemented in full.
5. No development shall take place until a detailed schedule of protected and notable species mitigation measures during construction (to include timing of works, protection measures, enhancement details, monitoring and further survey if deemed necessary) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such approved mitigation measures shall thereafter be implemented in full.
6. No development shall take place until a detailed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The plan shall include details of planting and maintenance of all new planting; details of species used and sourcing of plants; and habitat enhancement/creation measures and management such as native species planting, wildflower grassland creation, tree/hedgerow planting and provision of habitat for protected/notable species. Such

approved measures shall be implemented in full prior to the occupation of the development and thereafter managed/maintained in accordance with the approved details.

7. No development shall take place until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before any part of the development is first occupied and shall thereafter be retained as such. The scheme to be submitted shall:

- i) Where the drainage scheme proposes to connect into a 3rd party asset, for example a public sewer, further information should be provided regarding the ownership, purpose, location and condition of this asset along with confirmation of the right to connect into it. This could take the form of land ownership plans showing riparian ownership, land drainage consent, flood risk activity permit or agreement under Section 106 of the Water Industry Act (1991).

- a) The flood risk assessment contains a developers enquiry response from STW dated 12 November 2021. This is typically only valid for 6 months from the date of issue. An updated correspondence from STW should be provided confirming their acceptance of the discharge rate and location.

- ii) Demonstrate detailed designs of all SuDS features proposed in accordance with 'The SuDS Manual' C753, in particular the LLFA require cross sections of all features, including the proposed permeable paving, attenuation tanks and rain gardens.

- a) Further consideration should be given to incorporating small-scale SuDS features into the open-spaces to provide additional attenuation.

- iii) Suitable network calculations should be provided in full demonstrating the performance of the designed system. This should include:

- a) A range of return periods and storm durations inclusive of the 1 in 1 year, 1 in 2 year, 1 in 30 year, 1 in 100 year and 1 in 100 year plus climate change return periods.
 - b) Results should demonstrate the performance of the drainage scheme including attenuation storage, flows in line with agreed discharge rates, potential flood volumes and network status. Results should be provided as a summary for each return period.
 - c) Evidence should be supported by a suitably labelled plan/schematic (including contributing areas) to allow suitable cross checking of calculations and the proposals.

8. No development shall take place until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The plan shall include details of:

- The hours of working for all construction and demolition works.
- The routing and timing (avoiding peak periods) of delivery and other construction traffic to/from the proposed development and the measures by which this is to be managed and monitored, including signage and information that will be provided to contractors and delivery companies.
- Suitable areas for the parking of contractors and visitors, including details of the capacity of the on-site staff/visitor/contractor parking areas and confirmation of the assessment that this is sufficient to accommodate forecast demand and thereby avoid vehicles having to park off site on the highway network.
- Measures to prevent mud and debris on the public highway, including wheel washing facilities and the methods to be used to keep the public highway clear of any mud, debris and obstacles (in the event of spillage).
- The swept path analysis of the expected largest type of delivery vehicle when entering, leaving and turning within the site. This is needed to confirm that vehicles can enter and leave the site (from and to the public highway) safely and in a forward gear.
- Suitable areas for the unloading and storage of materials off the public highway.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Construction Management Plan at all times.

9. Notwithstanding details contained within the approved documents, no development shall take place until a Sustainability Statement, including an energy hierarchy scheme and a programme of delivery of all proposed measures, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. All approved measures shall be carried out in accordance with the approved programme of delivery and thereafter retained as such.
10. No development other than above ground level demolition and preparatory works shall take place until:
 - a) a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for a programme of archaeological evaluative work has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
 - b) the programme of archaeological evaluative fieldwork and associated post-excavation analysis and report production detailed within the approved WSI has been undertaken. A report detailing the results of this fieldwork, and confirmation of the arrangements for the deposition of the archaeological archive, has been submitted to the local planning authority.
 - c) An Archaeological Mitigation Strategy document (including a WSI for any archaeological fieldwork proposed) has been submitted to and approved

in writing by the local planning authority. This should detail a strategy to mitigate the archaeological impact of the proposed development and should be informed by the results of the archaeological evaluation.

The development, and any archaeological fieldwork post-excavation analysis, publication of results and archive deposition detailed in the Mitigation Strategy document, shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved Mitigation Strategy document.

11. No development shall be carried out above slab level unless and until samples of the external facing materials to be used and large-scale details of all external doors and windows (including a section showing the window reveal, heads and cill details), eaves, verges and rainwater goods at a scale of 1:5 (including details of materials) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
12. No development shall be carried out above slab level until details of the finished floor levels of all buildings, together with details of existing and proposed site levels on the application site and the relationship with adjacent land and buildings have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with these approved details.
13. Prior to the first occupation of any of the dwellings hereby permitted, a hard landscaping scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Details of hard landscaping works shall include boundary treatments, including full details of the proposed boundary walls, railings and gates to be erected and specifying the colour of the railings and gates; footpaths; and hard surfacing, which shall be made of porous materials or provision shall be made for direct run-off of water from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area. The hard landscaping works shall be completed in full accordance with the approved details within three months of the first occupation of the development hereby permitted and retained as such.
14. Prior to the first occupation of any of the dwellings hereby permitted, a soft landscaping scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. All planting shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details in the first planting and seeding seasons following the first occupation. Any tree(s) or shrub(s) which within a period of five years from the completion of the development dies, is removed or becomes in the opinion of the local planning authority seriously damaged, defective or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with another of the same size and species as that originally planted. All hedging, tree(s) and shrub(s) shall be planted in accordance with British Standard BS4043 - Transplanting Rootballed Trees and BS4428 - Code of Practice for General Landscape Operations.
15. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied unless and until a scheme showing how a water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per

day based on an assumed occupancy rate of 2.4 people per household (or higher where appropriate) will be achieved has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No dwelling shall be occupied until the works within the approved scheme have been completed for that particular dwelling in strict accordance with the approved details and thereafter the works shall be retained at all times and shall be maintained strictly in accordance with manufacturer's specifications.

16.No occupation and subsequent use of the development shall take place until a detailed site specific surface water maintenance plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such maintenance plan shall:

- a) Provide the name of the party responsible, including contact name, address, email address and phone number; and
- b) Provide details on how surface water each relevant feature shall be maintained and managed for the lifetime of the development.

The development shall subsequently thereafter be managed in accordance with the approved maintenance plan.

17.Notwithstanding the submitted details, no external lighting shall be installed or utilised anywhere on the site until a detailed external lighting scheme, that is based on approved drawing number 198-R218 Rev C, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The lighting scheme shall include measures to minimise light spill around the site boundary trees/hedgerows, bat roosts and the Dovecot. The external lighting serving the approved development shall be installed and utilised only in accordance with the approved details.

18.The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied unless and until the car parking and manoeuvring areas indicated on the approved drawings have been provided and thereafter those areas shall be kept marked out and available for such use at all times.

19.The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied unless and until the refuse and recycling storage areas for the development have been constructed or laid out in strict accordance with the approved plans and made available for use by the occupants of the development. Thereafter those areas shall be kept free of obstruction and be available at all times for the storage of refuse and recycling associated with the development. Refuse and recycling storage containers shall be stored within the refuse and recycling storage area shown on the approved plans, unless when being presented on street for collection facilities.

20.The development shall not be occupied until the existing access with the public highway has been surfaced with a bound material for a minimum distance of 6m as measured from the near edge of the public highway carriageway, in general accordance with Drawing Number P1484/31, dated 13th October 2022, with details to be approved in writing by the local planning authority.

21. The development shall not be occupied until on-site cycle parking and secure cycle storage meeting WDC Parking Standards SPD standards in respect of quantum, dimensions and design has been provided, in accordance with details that have first been approved in writing by the local planning authority.
22. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken, and where remediation is necessary, a remediation scheme must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the local planning authority.
23. The existing tree(s) and shrub(s) indicated on the approved plans to be retained shall not be cut down, grubbed out, topped, lopped or uprooted. Any tree(s) or shrub(s) removed, dying, or being severely damaged or diseased or becoming, in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective, within five years from the substantial completion of development shall be replaced, [as soon as practicable/ within the next planting season] with tree(s) and shrub(s) of the same size and species as that originally planted. All tree(s) and shrub(s) shall be planted in accordance with British Standard BS4043 - Transplanting Root-balled Trees and BS4428 - Code of Practice for General Landscape Operations (excluding hard surfaces).
24. No gates, barriers or doors shall be erected at the entrance to the site for vehicles.
25. Access to the site for vehicles shall not be made or maintained from the public highway other than via the existing vehicular access as shown on Drawing Number P1484/31, dated 13th October 2022.

Appeal D: APP/T3725/Y/22/3313668

1. The works hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this consent.
2. No works shall be carried out above slab level unless and until samples of the external facing materials to be used, including those for the approved boundary treatments, and large scale details of doors and windows (including a section showing the window reveal, heads and cill details), eaves, verges and rainwater goods at a scale of 1:5 (including details of materials) have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The works shall not be carried out otherwise than in strict accordance with such approved details.
3. Before any works commence, details of a scheme of precaution measures to secure and protect windows during the building work, particularly the

historic window glass, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details. No such glazing shall be disturbed or damaged or removed temporarily or permanently to facilitate protection works unless approved as part of the approved scheme of precaution measures or without separate prior written approval from the local planning authority. Any intact historic window glass damaged during the building work shall be reported to the local planning authority and shall be replaced like-for-like from a suitable approved source.

4. No demolition [or alteration by way of substantial partial demolition] shall take place until arrangements have been put in place to secure the redevelopment of the site permitted under this permission and details of these arrangements have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The arrangements shall include details of the timescale for carrying out the redevelopment approved under this consent.
5. Any demolition works of building materials bonded to the original listed building shall be carried out by hand.
6. All new external and internal works and finishes and works of making good to the retained fabric, shall match the existing original work adjacent in respect of methods, detailed execution and finished appearance.
7. All new window and door frames shall be constructed in timber and shall be painted and not stained.

END OF SCHEDULES