



Appeal Decisions

Hearing held on 7 May 2025

Site visit made on 7 May 2025

by Zoe Raygen DipURP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th May 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/M2840/W/24/3358198

United Reformed Church, Fox Street, Rothwell, North Northamptonshire NN14 6AN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Tim Foster against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NK/2024/0209.
 - The development proposed is change of use from church to 1 no. dwelling including additional restoration of 2 no. windows to side elevation, alterations to 14 no. windows and solar panels to rear. Internal works to include new boiler, radiators, 5 no. bedrooms and living accommodation.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/L2820/Y/24/3358199

United Reformed Church, Fox Street, Rothwell, North Northamptonshire NN14 6AN

- 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 Mr Tim Foster against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NK/2024/0214.
 - The works proposed are change of use from church to 1 no. dwelling including additional restoration of 2 no. windows to side elevation, alterations to 14 no. windows and solar panels to rear. Internal works to include new boiler, radiators, 5 no. bedrooms and living accommodation.
-

Appeal C Ref: APP/M2840/Y/25/3359090

Former United Reformed Church, Fox Street, Rothwell, North Northamptonshire NN14 6AN

- 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 Mr Tim Foster against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NK/2024/0652.
 - The works proposed are an internal door between the Chamberlain Office (former Choir vestry) and the Chamberlain Room
-

Appeal D Ref: APP/M2840/Y/25/3359091

Former United Reformed Church, Fox Street, Rothwell, North Northamptonshire NN14 6AN

- 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 Mr Tim Foster against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NK/2024/0649.
 - The works proposed are repairs to existing windows and rainwater furniture with like for like materials.
-

Appeal E Ref: APP/M2840/Y/25/3360360

Former United Reformed Church, Fox Street, Rothwell, North Northamptonshire NN14 6AN

- 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 Mr Tim Foster against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NK/2024/0658.
 - The works proposed are install pv solar panel arrays on the primary roof space of the main liturgical space and the Chamberlain room.
-

Appeal F Ref: APP/M2840/Y/25/3360361

Former United Reformed Church, Fox Street, Rothwell, North Northamptonshire NN14 6AN

- 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 Mr Tim Foster against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NK/2024/0672.
 - The works proposed are a kitchen in the old ground floor school room, more recently used as a baptistry
-

Appeal G Ref: APP/M2840/Y/25/3363080

Former United Reformed Church, Fox Street, Rothwell, North Northamptonshire NN14 6AN

- 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 Mr Tim Foster against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NK/2025/0017.
 - The works proposed are installation of 2 no. automated gates to Fox Street and Evison Road entrances, new fence and gate to John Beverley Mews entrance, 2 no. wall mounted security cameras, 2 no. free-standing pole mounted security cameras and all entrance doors to be fitted with smart locks
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
 2. Appeal B is dismissed.
 3. Appeal C is allowed and listed building consent is granted for an internal door between the Chamberlain Office (former Choir vestry) and the Chamberlain Room at the Former United Reformed Church, Fox Street, Rothwell, North Northamptonshire NN14 6AN in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: NK/2024/0652 and the plans submitted with it in so far as they relate to the internal door only, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.
 4. Appeal D is dismissed.
 5. Appeal E is allowed and listed building consent is granted to install pv solar panel arrays on the primary roof space of the main liturgical space and the Chamberlain room at the Former United Reformed Church, Fox Street, Rothwell, North Northamptonshire NN14 6AN in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: NK/2024/0658 and the plans submitted with it in so far as they relate to the solar panels only, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.
-

6. Appeal F is allowed and listed building consent is granted for a kitchen in the old ground floor school room, more recently used as a baptistry at the Former United Reformed Church, Fox Street, Rothwell, North Northamptonshire NN14 6AN in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: NK/2024/0672 and the plans submitted with it in so far as they relate to the installation of the kitchen only, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule:
7. Appeal G is dismissed.

Applications for costs

8. An application for an award of costs was made by Mr Tim Foster against North Northamptonshire District Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

9. The appeals concern aspects of the same scheme under different, complementary legislation. I have dealt with all the appeals together in my reasoning.
10. As the appeals relate to a listed building, I have had special regard to section 16(2) and section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).
11. I have used the description of development for Appeals A, B and G from the appellant's appeal form as this more accurately describes the development and works than that contained on the application form. I have used a shortened description of development for appeals C and F limiting it to the works only.

Main Issues

12. The main issue for appeal A is the effect of the development on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and for the remaining appeals the effect of the works on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

Reasons

Significance

13. The United Reform Church is a Grade II* listed building and therefore in accordance with paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is of the highest significance.
14. Built in 1735 from coarsed and squared ironstone with stone dressings and a hipped slate roof, it has later additions both externally and internally. It also has fine stained glass windows. It was allegedly constructed on the site of a barn within which Rothwell's Independent Church was established in 1655.
15. Internally the Church is relatively simple, but its layout and features reflects the importance placed by the faith on fellowship with pews and a gallery focussed on the pulpit providing the perfect auditory conditions for services. The organ and pulpit provide a strong focal point reflected in the pews both at ground level and on the panelled gallery to three sides of the main body of the Church set on slender fluted columns.

16. The significance of the building for the purposes of this appeal relates to the architectural and historic and social interest to which the external design, including the windows and the internal spacious layout with the gallery, pews, organ and pulpit all positively contribute.

Impact

17. The proposals before me consist of one application for planning permission with an associated application for listed building consent for the change of use of the church to a dwelling together with various alterations to facilitate that change of use. In addition separate applications for listed building consent have been made for individual parts of the work contained in the overarching planning application and listed building consent. I have therefore addressed the development and works individually.

Removal of features

18. The proposal involves the removal of the pews and the organ, but the pulpit would be retained. The wholesale loss of these features, and in particular, the pews would erode the visual significance of the building as well as the importance placed on the fellowship by the faith. However, I have a letter from Meadowwood Preservation, specialists in wood boring beetle treatments, which states that evidence of infestation was found in many of the pews, and they do not feel confident to recommend treatment works. Furthermore, it is the intention of the appellant to retain as many pews as possible to use within the building and to store in the void created by the works to the gallery, making the works reversible as far as those pews that are in good condition are concerned.
19. While the loss of the organ is regrettable, it acts as part of the focal point of the fellowship behind the pulpit, which in my view is more important to the significance of the church. The proposal to replace the organ with a feature panel would also serve as a focal point, emphasising the importance of this area of the church. Furthermore, it is the appellant's intention to donate the organ to whomever can accommodate it so that it can be continued to be used and played as intended. Nevertheless, the loss of both features would cause harm to the significance of the church.

Works to the gallery

20. The proposal involves building up the floor level to the top of the highest pew with the proposed bedroom walls extending to the ceiling. While this would erode the open nature of the gallery through its enclosure for bedrooms, the alterations would be carried out in a manner that would be reversible. Furthermore, the side walls would be set back from the edge of the gallery to allow a walkway to remain around the whole of the gallery retaining an appreciation of the openness and the importance of the gallery to the fellowship. However, the works to the gallery would be harmful to the significance of the building.

Internal door between the Chamberlain office and the Chamberlain Room

21. At the Hearing, the Council confirmed it had no objection to the principal of the insertion of a door as proposed. However, it considered that there was a lack of detail such as the joinery detail, method statement, how the walls would be restored and painting detail.

22. The walls to both rooms are simple and lacking significant detail. The principle of inserting a door, while resulting in the loss of historic fabric, would not cause material harm to the significance of the building. The details required for its implementation could reasonably be secured by the imposition of a condition.

Works to windows and rainwater furniture together with installation of new windows

23. The Council confirmed that it had no objection to the repair of rainwater furniture, subject to a condition requiring details of the materials and design to be used. Furthermore, although the two windows proposed to the west elevation would not be reinstated entirely in line with the outline that can be seen in the brickwork of previous windows in this elevation, it also confirmed that its only objection is based on the organ having to be removed to enable the works. The loss of the organ would be harmful, and therefore, by association the two new windows would also be harmful.
24. Turning to the repair/replacement of the windows, the principal concern of the Council relates to the lack of detail as to the extent of repair/replacement and the replacement of most of the stippled glass in the windows with clear glass.
25. The windows in the building vary in age, condition and the extent that they contribute to the significance of the building. I accept that repairs to the windows could reasonably be secured by the imposition of a condition. Moreover, the replacement of some of the modern windows would be acceptable subject to details of joinery and appearance.
26. Nevertheless, the extent of repair versus replacement of the historic windows is not clear from the submission and a condition survey would have been helpful to assess the extent of alteration necessary to assess the level of harm. Moreover, the wholesale loss of historic glass to some of the principal windows, which contribute substantially to the significance of the building as a church would be particularly harmful.
27. The windows are one of the main features of the building which particularly denote it as a church from its external appearance. I noted at my site visit that some of the stippled glass had been replaced in the past with clear glass resulting in a significantly harmful impact on the character and appearance of the windows and hence the significance of the building through the altered visual appearance and the way the light is refracted into the Church. I acknowledge that many of the windows had Perspex on the outside so that the clarity of the light and effect of the windows may not be as originally purposed. However, the loss of such a large amount of historic glass is not acceptably justified even if the replacement is heritage glass. I noted on my site visit that adequate light was available in the Church, even with the windows in their current condition. While there would be a lack of outlook for a residential property, this could be accommodated without such a wholesale loss of all the stippled glass.
28. The appellant suggests that details of the windows can be reserved by way of a condition. However, the window treatment has the potential to markedly alter how the building is appreciated both internally and externally and to inform the level of harm. Given the degree of architectural and historical significance of these features it is not appropriate for such details to be reserved by way of a condition

Solar panels

29. Within Appeal A solar panels are proposed to three southern roof slopes. Within Appeal E listed building consent is sought for the installation of solar panels on four of the southern roof slopes.
30. Although I have a brochure and specification for the solar panels there is little other detail before me regarding the method of attachment, how much roof tile, if any, would need to be removed, details of cable runs and battery storage. However, I am satisfied that this could be the subject of a condition if otherwise acceptable.
31. Historic plans within the appellants Heritage Impact Assessment (the HIA) show that the Church was originally visible within the wider area with little development surrounding it. By the early 1900's the existing Victorian and Edwardian terraces had started to enclose the Church. Development continued such that the Church is now surrounded by built form. This, together with vegetation within the burial ground, means that there are only limited views of the building itself from the surrounding streets. Nevertheless, the solar panels would be visible, albeit only on a localised, limited basis. The proposed works, whilst permanent in nature, are also modest in scale and would be readily reversible. The works would result in a relatively minor change to one element of the building that contributes to its appearance, and this would reduce its aesthetic value. However, this change would not so fundamentally alter the building that, taken overall, the ability to understand and appreciate its significance would be compromised. As a result, I find that the extent of the harm would be minor.

Kitchen

32. The Council confirmed at the Hearing it had no objection to the kitchen being installed in the baptistry subject to details of installation of services. The appellant confirmed that there would be no new services installed. The Council's principal concern related to the treatment of the baptismal bath.
33. Although a later addition following the change from the use of the room as a school room to a baptistry, it nevertheless contributes positively to the significance of the building demonstrating the use of the room, its location next to the main church reflecting entry into the church through baptism, and its design.
34. The appellant intends replacing the cover with glass so it can be seen, retiling it and using it for a wine cellar. I agree with the Council, this needs sensitive treatment, and the colour and tile design needs careful thought to ensure its original use is still legible. However, again this could be agreed though the imposition of a condition, as could the details of any new services.
35. The baptistry is a relatively plain room with little detail or ornamentation other than the two fine stained glass windows which would be retained. The installation of a kitchen here would not therefore be controversial.
36. The plans before me contain details of alterations to provide two new doors from the baptistry into the main church. While the appellant confirmed it is not their intention to carry out this work, that is not reflected in the plans before me.

37. There was originally a wall between the baptistry and the church, then a screen, was installed separating the two before a modern wall was erected. On this basis while I note the significance of the baptistry being separate from the Church, two new openings could be installed into the simple wall without harm. All works could be reversed if necessary.
38. Consequently, with the appropriate conditions in place the works would not be harmful.

Security Equipment

39. The appellant has replaced all the existing security cameras on the building with modern equipment. Although these have been fixed to the brickwork, rather than the less significant mortar joints, the Council confirmed at the Hearing that according to its records, that is where the previous cameras were fixed.
40. The colour of the cameras could be improved, to integrate more acceptably with the building and the appellant was not averse to this. Subject to a condition to secure this and the details of fixings of the new cameras, these works would not be harmful.
41. The proposal also includes the provision of 2 free standing pole mounted security cameras. While there is a description of these works and location, nothing is exact. For example, the height, diameter, finish of the pole, how it would be fixed and any implications for archaeology. This is also the case for the details of the automation for the gates. While in principle there is no issue with these works, more detail is required to ensure that there is no harm to significance and archaeology. In addition there is very little detail before me regarding the installation of smart locks, either in terms of the significance of the doors, or how the locks would affect that significance. Finally details of the new fence and gate to the John Beverly Mews entrance are lacking and the location is not clear.
42. This is a common theme running through these applications and while I sympathise with the appellant in terms of difficulty in getting exact details without committing people to the work in the absence of the necessary consents, in some instances that detail is required, and this is one of them. I have found above that in many cases a condition could be imposed to ensure the relevant detail is submitted prior to the works being carried out, in this instance I do not consider it reasonable. I would need to see the exact location of the works and their detail to assess the full impact. In the absence of any details to demonstrate that harm would not be caused, I can only conclude harm would be caused.

Other Matters

43. The appellant has raised issues regarding the accuracy of the list description for the building, particularly with reference to the age of the windows in the baptistry and the age of the pulpit. This he considers casts doubt on the overall validity of the list description and the reliability of evidence from Historic England.
44. I have made my decisions based on the evidence before me, including that of the appellant, and my observations on my site visit which were particularly useful. The alleged inaccuracies have not impacted on my decision.

Heritage Balance Appeals A, B, D and G

45. I have found that much of the proposed development and works would cause harm to the significance of the building and there is no dispute between the parties on this.
46. I note that the Council consider that the level of harm for most of the works would be less than substantial and I concur given my findings above. The exception is the removal of the pews, which the Council, the appellant's HIA and Historic England all find cause substantial harm to the significance of the building. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that substantial harm is a high test. It goes on to say that in determining whether works to a listed building constitute substantial harm, an important consideration would be whether the adverse impact seriously affects a key element of its special architectural or historic interest¹.
47. I agree the removal of the pews would have an adverse impact, but would it seriously affect a key element of the buildings architectural or historic interest? Having viewed the building, which I am aware that Historic England have not, I believe there are a number of elements as I have indicated that contribute to the significance of the building, the pews are one of these. I can see that the pews are important, but they are, in the main, a relatively modern addition. While they evidence the evolution of the Church and the contribution of its worshippers they have not always been in situ. Furthermore, the way the Church is laid out it is evident that the fellowship is important whether the pews are in situ or not, particularly given the existence of the gallery, the sense of which would be retained. While therefore, the loss of the pews, the enclosure of the gallery and the loss of the organ would together be harmful to the internal layout eroding the key importance of the role of the fellowship in this Church, it would, nevertheless still be legible and would not result in the total loss of significance of the building. Furthermore, the harm is tempered by the proposal to retain and store the pews that are in good condition on site as well as use them within the building, the donation of the organ so that it would still be used in another venue and its replacement by a focal feature and the retention of a walkway around the gallery. Together therefore, their loss is harmful, but I am satisfied it would be at the higher end of less than substantial harm.
48. As such paragraph 215 of the Framework states that the harm should be weighed against the benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
49. The building has not been used as a Church since September 2022 following a closing service. It was placed on the market in April 2023 using advertising on national websites, the agent's website and marketing boards at the property. There were 32 viewings, including by five religious bodies as well as for a prospective commercial recording studio, an office and a dance studio/club. There were several viewings regarding prospective residential use, only two of these were for a single residence. In my view, even though interest in the subdivision of the Church was not pursued, it is difficult to see how this could have been achieved without causing substantial harm to the significance of the building.

¹ Paragraph: 018 Reference ID: 18a-018-20190723

50. The other prospective purchasers listed a number of reasons for not pursuing interest, chiefly conversion costs, running costs and the lack of car parking. This latter reason cannot be ignored. I heard from the local Councillor who described the many problems of parking in the surrounding area, and I saw this to be the case at my site visits. The surrounding area is tightly developed with predominantly terraced housing with little or no off street parking. Consequently, having spent time at the appeal site and witnessed the constraints, on street parking is limited in the vicinity of the appeal site. Furthermore, there is little on-site parking. As a result, the property would be unsuitable for a commercial or community use, without it causing harm within the surrounding area. Moreover, The Manse is now in residential accommodation. It is sited very close to the front elevation of the Church and its limited parking space. Any commercial or community use of the building would be difficult to achieve without having a harmful effect on the living conditions of these residents. As a result, although Historic England has concerns regarding the price the property was marketed at, it seems to me that it was not the price of the property that was putting prospective purchasers off but the specific on site conditions particularly the lack of car parking. In addition, the maintenance costs of a historic building were also cited, and I have sympathy with this view. While grant aid may be forthcoming for works or repair and in some cases alteration to historic buildings, ongoing maintenance and running costs are unlikely to be funded through grant aid.
51. Hence, I am of the view the marketing evidence submitted by the appellant is enough to demonstrate that a single residential would secure the optimum viable use. Considering that it is difficult to see how such a use could viably be undertaken with the pews and organ in place as existing which gives further justification for their removal, the internal works to the gallery, as well as the new windows on the west elevation, the only objection to which is the removal of the organ.
52. The benefits associated with the proposal would be the provision of one house in an accessible location. At a time when the Council can demonstrate a five year housing land supply this would attract moderate weight. There would be economic benefits in the form of the purchase of the materials to be used in the repair and conversion works and these would also attract moderate weight.
53. The appellant confirmed at the Hearing that the solar panels would provide sufficient energy to power the house without reliance on the grid. The production of renewable energy and reduced use of electricity from the National Grid would be environmental public benefits to which I give moderate weight given the size of the installation. Furthermore, a reduction in the energy bills for the property could lead to additional funding being available for the investment in other aspects of the maintenance necessary for the long-term conservation of the building. It would thus help secure the optimum viable use of the building.
54. While the security cameras would improve the security of the building, this is primarily a private benefit. Any benefit from the protection of the listed building from vandalism would be minor in the long term when the building is occupied.
55. Perhaps the most significant benefit would be the reuse of the property in its current optimum viable use. This would ensure that it is not left empty and is

retained, repaired and maintained to ensure its significance as a listed building is not further eroded and I give this significant weight.

56. Together, the public benefits are significant, however the harm attracts very considerable importance and weight, given the asset is of the highest significance, they are not sufficient to outweigh the harm caused by the scheme as a whole and the individual elements of the alterations to the windows and the security equipment and works to the gates. I acknowledge that a single residential use is the optimum viable use however, I am not convinced that my concerns, particularly around the window alterations, could not be addressed with a scheme that would be less harmful to the significance of the building.
57. Given the above, I conclude that, on balance, the proposal would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the Grade II* listed building. This would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 212 of the Framework and conflict with policy 2 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 adopted 2016 (the JCS) that seeks, among other things, to ensure that proposals conserve and where possible enhance the heritage significance and setting of an asset in a manner commensurate to its significance. As a result, the proposal would not be in accordance with the development plan as a whole.

Heritage Balance Appeal E

58. I have found that the harm caused would be minor and therefore in my view at the lower end of less than substantial. I have found significant public benefits which are outlined above. Consequently, even though the harm would attract very considerable importance and weight, the public benefits, would, in my view, outweigh the less than substantial harm.
59. Given the above, I conclude that, on balance, the proposal would preserve the special historic interest of the Grade II* listed building. This would satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 212 of the Framework and would not conflict with policy 2 of the JCS that seeks, among other things, to ensure proposals conserve and where possible enhance the heritage significance and setting of an asset in a manner commensurate to its significance. As a result, the proposal would be in accordance with the development plan

Conditions

60. The conditions suggested by the Council in its statement were discussed at the Hearing. Further conditions were received after the hearing regarding issues that had been discussed on the day. I have made some amendments to ensure that the conditions comply with the requirements of the Framework and the PPG.
61. There is no power under the Act to impose a condition requiring compliance with plans on decisions for listed building consent. This condition is not necessary because listed building consent is given for the works as set out in the application and the formal decision. Unlike planning permission, there is no provision for an application for a minor material amendment to a listed building consent and so such a condition would serve no purpose. On this matter, the Council is concerned that the plans submitted for the individual applications for Listed Building Consent include additional works to the rest of the building. Therefore, in its view, any consent would relate to all the matters on the submitted plan rather than the

individual element applied for. However, I am satisfied that this can be overcome by reference to the specific works applied for as per the description of the works, and excluding all other works on the plan in the formal decision.

62. On each appeal the Council suggested conditions which would not be strictly relevant to the element applied for in the individual applications for Listed Building Consent. I have therefore only imposed those relevant to each appeal.

Appeal C

63. A condition is required regarding the duration of the permission in the interests of certainty. Further conditions are necessary to secure the exact details of the opening, door and associated fittings as well as details of how the opening will be made good in the interests of the significance of the building.

Appeal E

64. A condition is required regarding the duration of the permission in the interests of certainty. A further condition is necessary to secure the exact details of the works and fixtures in the interests of the significance of the building.

Appeal F

65. A condition is required regarding the duration of the permission in the interests of certainty. A further condition is necessary to secure the exact details of the works and services required in the interests of the significance of the building. A condition is also necessary to ensure that no additional external fixtures are installed. Finally details of the treatment of the baptismal bath are also required to ensure the significance of this feature is retained.

Conclusion

Appeal A

66. The matters raised above would not be sufficient to outweigh the conflict with the development plan as a whole. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Appeal B

67. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Appeal C

68. For the reasons given the appeal is allowed.

Appeal D

69. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed

Appeal E

70. For the reasons given the appeal is allowed.

Appeal F

71. For the reasons given the appeal is allowed

Appeal G

72. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

Mr John Cosgrove	Principal Development Officer, North Northamptonshire Council
Ms Sam Pace	Place Services, on behalf of North Northamptonshire Council
Ms Liz Mordue	Lead Planning Archaeologist, North Northamptonshire Council

FOR THE APPELLANT

Mr Tim Foster	Appellant
Mr Adrian Ringrose	Chartered Architect Stimpson Walton Bond

INTERESTED PARTIES

Councillor Jim Hakewill	Rothwell-Mawsley Ward
-------------------------	-----------------------

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE APPEAL

A Comments of Councillor Jim Hakewill speaking in support of the proposal

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER THE APPEAL

1. Additional conditions

CONDITIONS SCHEDULE

Appeal C:

- 1) The works hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) No works shall take place on site until full details of the new door has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include door elevations at a scale of at least 1:10, horizontal and vertical cross sections at a scale of at least 1:5 and details of specific mouldings at a scale of at least 1:2. The works shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained in that form thereafter.
- 3) All new 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.
- 4) Prior to the commencement of any investigative works a detailed schedule of opening up works including marked-up elevations, plans, and photographs of locations, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 5) Prior to the commencement of works, structural drawings which detail the new lintel and methods of support for the new opening, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works must be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Appeal E:

- 1) The works hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision
- 2) No Solar P.V. Panels or associated plant or equipment shall be installed on or in any part of the roof or building until full technical details of the panels, mountings and associated equipment as well as full details of how the panels would be installed on the roof to include details of any openings, fixings, extent of protrusion and cable runs etc. have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Appeal F:

- 1) The works hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) No works shall commence on site until a method statement detailing the introduction of services, plumbing, electrical works and all other internal interventions has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The statement shall include, but not be limited to, the methods for lifting any floorboards and skirting boards and details of any repair methods. The services shall be installed in accordance with the approved details.

- 3) No new plumbing, pipes, soil-stacks, flues, vents or ductwork shall be fixed on the external faces of the building other than those shown on the drawings hereby approved.
- 4) All disturbed fabric shall be made good using materials and treatments matching that of the existing building.
- 5) Prior to installation, details of how elements of the new kitchen will be fixed to the walls, floors, and ceilings shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 6) Before work begins, the position, type and method of installation of all new and relocated services and related fixtures (for the avoidance of doubt this includes communications and information technology servicing), shall be specified and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority wherever these installations are to be visible, or where ducts or other methods of concealment are proposed. The works shall be implemented only in accordance with such approval.
- 7) Prior to works to the baptismal bath details of the alterations to it shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details