



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 24 July 2025

by Dr Rachael A Bust BSc (Hons) MA MSc LLM PhD MloL MCMI FGS MEnvSci MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 September 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/A1530/W/24/3357528

Crouched Friars, 103-107 Crouch Street, Colchester CO3 3HA

- 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 SA & JO Care Ltd against the decision of Colchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 240208.
 - The development proposed is an extension and alterations to provide 13 additional ensuite bedrooms with related day space and landscaping works.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/A1530/Y/24/3357540

Crouched Friars, 103-107 Crouch Street, Colchester CO3 3HA

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by SA & JO Care Ltd against the decision of Colchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 240209.
 - The works proposed are the same as Appeal A.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed extension and alterations to provide 12 additional ensuite bedrooms with related day space and landscaping works at Crouched Friars, 103-107 Crouch Street, Colchester CO3 3HA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 240208 and subject to the conditions in the attached schedule A.
2. Appeal B is allowed and listed building consent is granted for the proposed extension and alterations 12 additional ensuite bedrooms with related day space and landscaping works at Crouched Friars, 103-107 Crouch Street, Colchester CO3 3HA in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 240209 and the plans submitted with it and subject to the conditions in the attached schedule B.

Application for costs

3. An application for a full award of costs for both cases was made by SA & JO Care Ltd against Colchester City Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

4. The appeal proposal relates to a listed building located within a conservation area. As required by sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), I have had special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special

architectural or historic interest which it possesses; and paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

5. Two new plans, namely an amended roof plan (1610/12 Rev C) and a landscaping plan (LSDP 2105.02 Rev B), have been submitted with the linked appeals.
6. It is a well-established principle that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and there are no provisions within the rules for amendments to be submitted. It is important that what is considered by the Inspector at appeal is essentially the same scheme that was considered by the Council and by interested parties at the application stage.
7. Case law¹ has established two separate tests when considering revised or amended plans, namely a substantive test and a procedural test. The substantive test is whether the plans involve a substantial difference or fundamental change to the scheme. The procedural test relates to whether the plans would cause procedural unfairness by depriving any persons of the opportunity to make representations. These two tests are assessed separately, and both must be passed to enable these two plans to be considered as part of the appeal stage.
8. The amended roof plan indicates the type of roof proposed for the linkage element of the proposed extension which is illustrated on the Revision C floor plans and elevations. As it does not introduce a substantial difference or fundamental change it does not fail the substantive test.
9. The landscaping plan is a completely new plan. No specific landscaping plan was included within the original submission. The submitted Arboricultural Report provides information on existing trees, as one element of landscaping within the context of an outline of landscaping. Consequently, the new landscaping plan does not introduce a substantial difference or fundamental change to the scheme whereby it fails the substantive test. Landscaping schemes and details are often secured through planning conditions.
10. In relation to the procedural test, in my view, the omission of these plans from the public register during the lifetime of the applications has deprived interested persons of the opportunity of making any representations about these plans should they have wished. As such in principle, it would be procedurally unfair to accept these two plans as fairness requires re-consultation which has not taken place. Consequently, the two new plans will not be taken into consideration in the assessment and determination of both appeals.
11. It is noted that the Revision C floor plans indicate the proposed extension will accommodate 12 rather than 13 additional ensuite bedrooms. Consequently, the description of development has been amended for accuracy in both decisions.

Main Issue

12. The main issue in both these appeals is the effect of the proposal on the special interest of the Grade II listed building (107 Crouch Street) and the character or appearance of the Colchester Conservation Area 2: Lexden Road, the Avenue (CA).

¹ *Holborn Studios Ltd v The Council of the London Borough of Hackney* [2017] EWHC 2823 (Admin) which refined the principles previously established in *Bernard Wheatcroft Ltd v Secretary of State for the Environment* (JPL 1982 P37)

Reasons

Significance of the heritage assets

13. The appeal property of Crouched Friars is a residential care home and comprises of several adjoining and interconnected buildings of age, height and scale which are numbered 103-107 Crouch Street. The site is a generous plot considering the proximity to the urban area.
14. The National Heritage List for England (NHLE), listing entry² is for number 107 which is a Grade II listed building which dates from 1776. A larger wing was constructed around 1850 and forms the first extension to the original building. The 19th century iron gate and brick piers which form the main pedestrian access from Crouch Street are also listed³ as Grade II, these elements are an attractive feature.
15. No 107 is a building with two distinctive, but complementary, building styles set back from the pedestrianised section of road with a landscaped front garden enclosed by a low brick wall, railings and boundary vegetation. The two-storey hipped tiled roof with parapet and a traditional symmetrical five bay Georgian frontage with central Tuscan doorcase with pediment head, modillion cornice and 12-light sliding sash windows forms one distinctive part of the building. The Victorian style addition forms the second part and is three storeys with a pitched roof gable front and large bay window with parapet. The façade is finished in a similar brick to the adjoining Georgian frontage, but the side is finished in red brick. The sliding sash windows are present on all three floors, the glazing in this part of the building is 2-light which become more common in the later part of the 19th century.
16. **The significance of the listed building** is derived in part by the prominent front elevation with well-proportioned and balanced architectural features using the local gault brickwork. The siting of the building enables a landscaped garden area to the front enclosed with low brick wall, railings and boundary vegetation contribute to the significance and setting of the listed building. All of which give the building a positive and formal presence in the street scene. The significance is also derived from the historical connection with the town mayor, William Phillips, who had the original building built as a fashionable Georgian residence within a central location.
17. The presence of a 20th century extension has reduced the ability to experience the rear of the listed building from a proportion of the otherwise spacious garden area. However, the design and materials of the 20th century extension are complementary and as such have a neutral effect on the listed building. The 20th century extension is linked to the listed building by a 19th century, single storey, flat roofed, brick-built element which in itself provides a modest contribution to the significance of the listed building. However, the functional railings around the edge of the flat roof together with a set of concrete steps are more modern additions. These modern additions are a distraction to the simplicity and harmony of the visual interest of the roofscape and fenestration of the listed building from the rear. As such they do not make a positive contribution to the significance of the listed building from the rear.

² List Entry Number: 1337689, first listed 2 December 1971

³ List Entry Number: 1123640, first listed 2 December 1971

18. The appeal site lies within the eastern end of the **Colchester Conservation Area 2: Lexden Road, the Avenue**. The CA encompasses a modest geographical area to the west of Colchester City centre. Lexden Road is a tree lined main road which leads to and from the city centre and forms a spine through the CA with several streets extending from it, including The Avenue. Although the area is predominantly residential there are several schools and the former hospital towards to eastern end of the CA near the appeal site is being redeveloped.
19. There is a structure to the built form with dwellings and other buildings being set back from road which allows for landscaped garden and frontage areas, generally enclosed by low brick walls and railings which are sometimes slightly higher around the corner properties. This creates a sense of space and pleasant environment. The majority of dwellings date from the 19th century and many of which are detached three storeys, built in white or grey gault brick, large windows set in a balanced design. Some red brick buildings are present, such as the particularly decorative No 2 Lexden Road, which is a large Victorian gothic building with a distinctive corner turret built in red brick with stone dressings. Whilst some 20th century dwellings are present in the CA, their scale, form, design and use of materials do not significantly detract from the established form and materials of the older properties.
20. **The significance of the CA** is derived in part by the layout of the built form and the siting of the buildings relative to the roads and streets. The siting, scale and relative ages of the dwellings and other buildings gives the appearance of a spacious, verdant and affluent residential area. The siting, materials and spacious nature of the garden area of the listed building and the appeal site make a positive contribution to the CA.

Effect of the proposal

21. The appeal proposal seeks a two-storey extension which would be linked to the two-storey 20th century extension, known as Friar's Wing. The planning history demonstrates that No 107 has previously been extended; initially with the original Victorian addition together with a single storey link extension which leads into the more recent Friar's Wing extension.
22. The appeal site main garden area is to the rear and is enclosed to the north by a substantial red brick wall. The orientation of the proposed extension would result in some visible change which would extend the built form towards Manor Road. Notwithstanding the generous plot size for this location, the **additional built form** would result in further loss of the historic garden area which forms part of the significance of the listed building. This would further erode the ability to appreciate the listed building from the rear.
23. The topography sees the land rising from Crouch Street through the appeal site to Manor Road and would enable the proposed extension to be built partly into the rising slope of the garden. The effect would to a degree mitigate the actual and perceived **overall height and volume**, particularly when viewed from Manor Road. However, from various positions within the appeal site, the proposal and its **articulation**, when viewed in combination with the Friar's Wing would result in a dominant modern block of development within the garden area of the listed building.

24. The proposed extension ridge height would be lower than Friar's Wing which it would link into and lower than the rest of the care home collection of buildings. However, even with some **cascade in height**, it is insufficient to mitigate the effect of the presence and orientation of the proposed extension which would harm the ability to fully appreciate the rear of the listed building and therefore harm its significance as consequence of the change to its setting to the rear.
25. From my site visit, when walking along Manor Road, I found that the height of the wall limited the views of the appeal site to predominantly roofscape of the collection of buildings. Only the upper part of the proposed extension would be visible in the public views from Manor Road. Manor Road and adjoining terraced streets are outside of the CA and present a denser pattern of built development in comparison to the appeal site. Consequently, the current sense of space within appeal site, when viewed from Manor Road provides some relief to the built form and the spaciousness is part of the significance of the CA. The additional element of roofscape would indicate the presence of the additional built development on the appeal site. In my view, the cumulative effect of additional built development would be somewhat localised, but it would still represent harm to the CA as a whole.
26. I note the Council's consistent suggestion and preference for a single storey building as an alternative **form** of extension. However, this is not the appeal scheme which is before me. Whilst I also note the appellant's contention that a single storey extension would not be practical or viable, no viability assessment or evidence has been submitted. In my view, a single storey extension would represent an inefficient use of land, further compromise the garden space and could present operational challenges for the care home from the potential internal distances between parts of the overall establishment. In any event, I am required to determine the two-storey scheme before me and that is what I have done.
27. The proposed external works would include the removal of the external staircase and railings from the 19th century link. This would be a positive change and thereby improve the experience and the setting of this part of the listed building.
28. The proposed internal works would involve some alterations to internal walls to repurpose the space. Whilst there would be a limited loss of fabric, it would not alter the historic legibility of this part of the building. As such, in my view this would not lead to a loss of features of architectural or historic interest. Accordingly, this aspect of the proposal would have a neutral effect on the significance of the building.
29. In drawing together my assessment on the effect on the designated heritage assets, I have found that the proposed external works on the 19th century link would be positive, and the internal alterations would be neutral. However, the harm from the proposed new extension itself, by virtue of its presence, height, form and articulation would be greater than these other effects. Consequently, the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the Grade II listed building and the character or appearance of the Colchester Conservation Area (CA) as a whole. It would not therefore accord with the statutory duties of the Act.
30. The proposal would conflict with Policy DM15 of the Local Plan⁴ which seeks, amongst other things, high quality design responding to the context. There would

⁴ Colchester Borough Council Local Plan 2017-2033 Section 2, adopted July 2022

be some conflict with Policy DM16, insofar as it seeks to conserve and enhance the significance of designated heritage assets. Nevertheless, in line with paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), Policy DM16 requires that the harm is weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. I shall return to the public benefits in the planning balance later in the decision.

Other Matters

31. Several other matters in addition to those which are part of the main issue, have been raised by interested parties, these other matters broadly include overlooking and privacy, light, car parking, and various concerns regarding the construction activity.
32. The glazed openings for the habitable rooms within the proposed extension would look west and east. The submitted Arboricultural Report indicates that the trees on the western and eastern boundaries are early to mature and except for one dead tree, most are reported to be in a good condition and therefore I have no substantiated evidence before me to demonstrate that these trees would be unlikely to survive for many more years and therefore are to be retained. It is noted that the only trees identified for removal/cut back would be a cherry tree within the proposed additional car parking area; a plum tree which would be within the footprint of the proposed extension building itself and the fig tree adjacent the rear boundary wall. The retained intervening trees would diminish any direct overlooking and therefore there would be no harm to the privacy of occupiers of the properties to the west and east.
33. The gable end of the proposed extension contains a glazed opening; however, this is a non-habitable window which would serve a second stairwell. As such, it would not be likely to give rise to a degree of direct overlooking that would harm the privacy of the occupiers of Manor Road. Comments regarding private views from windows are noted, but this is not of itself regarded as a planning matter.
34. In response to previous concerns regarding the 25-degree angle test which is used to establish the effect on daylight of a building on opposite buildings, it is illustrated on the proposed elevations. The proposed extension building falls underneath the line drawn at 25 degrees and consequently it would not be expected to have a detrimental effect to light on the existing dwellings to the west, east and north. Reference is also made to the 45-degree angle test. However, this is generally used to assess the effect of extensions on attached buildings, where the extension is perpendicular to windows within an adjoining property; as such it would have no bearing on occupiers of properties outside of the appeal site. Reference has also been made to the right to light; however, the courts have determined that as planning is concerned with land use in the public interest, any loss of private rights would not be a material consideration in the determination of a planning proposal.
35. The on-site car park provides 14 car parking spaces of which 3 undesignated spaces can be used for the occupiers of The Coach House. I note the concerns raised about parking capacity, use of the undesignated spaces and the photograph submitted which illustrates a particular point in time. On my site visit, which is also a particular point in time, the car park was in use, but spaces were available.
36. The proposal incorporates 3 additional car parking spaces to take account of the increase in staff and visitors arising from the 12 additional bed spaces. An

assessment of travel modes of staff has been submitted by the appellant. Whilst this is also a snapshot and does not clearly indicate how and when this data was captured, in the absence of any other data to the contrary, it does demonstrate that some staff already travel by non-car modes and there are limited numbers of visitors. Policy DM20 of the Local Plan has been submitted and encourages a modal shift away from cars to other modes of travel. Given the urban location, the site is accessible by good public transport, walking and cycling and there is also a multi storey car park within a few minutes' walk.

37. Whilst I have been provided with 2009 Essex County parking standards⁵ I note that these standards are expressed as maximums and pre-dates current national policy on transport related matters. The Framework in paragraph 113 is clear that maximum parking standards should only be set where there is a clear and compelling justification that they are necessary. Without such justification, it limits the weight that can be attributed to these standards in decision making. No objection about car parking has been raised by the Highway Authority. As such the additional 3 spaces would seem a reasonable and proportional uplift.
38. Various concerns regarding the details of construction have been raised. Whilst such works will be temporary, the details can be established and managed through a Construction Method Plan (CMP). A CMP can be secured through a planning condition and provides a means of managing concerns relating to the construction phase. This could therefore address matters including hours of working, access arrangements for deliveries and construction vehicles and details regarding excavation and other groundworks.

Planning Balance

39. Given my findings in relation to the main issue in these appeals, the Framework is clear that great weight should be given to the heritage asset's conservation. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification.
40. The harm would not result in a total loss of the significance of the listed building and would be limited to the rear and as such is of lesser importance. As such, the harm would be less than substantial in terms of the Framework, and in the order of low to moderate harm.
41. The degree of harm to the character and appearance of the CA, and, consequently, its significance would be localised to the views from outside of the CA on Manor Road. As a result, the harm would also be less than substantial in terms of the Framework, and in the order of low harm.
42. Where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the Framework in paragraph 215 requires that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
43. The care home is currently operational with 53 rooms and provides specialist residential accommodation for people with care needs, including dementia and is

⁵ Parking Standards Design and Good Practice, September 2009

within a sustainable and accessible location. The appellant indicates that there is a need for additional new specialist accommodation and facilities within this site which will also improve the viability of the home and enable upgrades to existing accommodation for current residents.

44. Policy DM10 of Local Plan has been submitted and it recognises the need for a range of housing types and tenures and as such it will seek to provide for the needs of particular groups, which includes older people and specialist housing. The appellant explains that the policy supporting text indicates that Colchester is expected to record a 60.6% increase in its population of those aged 65 and over. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicates that there will be a requirement of some 2,147 additional specialist units of accommodation, the majority of which should be specialist and older person's accommodation. In Colchester, this means that an additional 94 specialist and extra care housing units should be provided each year.
45. Furthermore, the appellant indicates that according to NHS statistics published in July 2023 indicate that 1 in 11 people over the age of 65 have dementia in the UK. The number of people with dementia is increasing because people are living longer. It is estimated that by 2030 the number of people with dementia in the UK will be more than 1 million, rising to 1.4 million by 2024. Consequently, I find the nature of the proposal would be a significant benefit.
46. I have also found that the external works to the 19th century link would represent a significant heritage benefit. The proposed extension would incorporate energy efficiency measures to comply with relevant standards set out in policy and regulation which would be a significant benefit to the building itself, current and future occupiers. The proposal would also offer some additional employment opportunities. Economic benefits would be derived from the construction and landscaping phases but also through continuing to support suppliers and service providers all of which would be a moderate benefit. Taking all of these elements into account would result in benefits to the public at large.
47. Consequently, I find that the above amount to a clear public benefit which would outweigh the less than substantial harm to the special interest of the Grade II listed building and the harm to the character or appearance of the CA as a whole.
48. In this case, public benefits of the proposal in Appeal A would outweigh the conflict with Policies ENV1, DM16 and DM15 of the Local Plan, which seek, amongst other things, to protect the historic environment and ensure high standards of design; Policy SP7 of the North Essex Authorities' Shared Strategic Section 1 Plan, adopted February 2021, which sets out place shaping principles and chapter 16 of the Framework regarding the historic environment. I have had regard to the Framework and these same Local Plan policies for Appeal B in so far as they are material in determining a proposal for Listed Building Consent and taking all considerations into account, I find both appeals to be acceptable.

Conditions

49. The Framework in paragraph 57 indicates that conditions should only be imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development (or works) to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.

50. The Council has suggested conditions and the appellant has provided comments, for both the planning and listed building consents. I have considered the suggestions and comments in relation to the Framework and the PPG, amending where necessary in the interests of precision.
51. It is necessary for some matters and details to be agreed either prior to the commencement of development or at various stages of activity because they influence the way the site is developed. Other conditions require compliance. All conditions imposed in both appeals are reasonable and necessary to make the approved development and works acceptable.
52. The standard condition setting out the **time limit** for implementation is imposed on both Appeal A and Appeal B to provide certainty. The **approved plans** are set out in a condition on Appeal A to define the permission. However, it is not necessary to replicate the approved plans condition on Appeal B since progressing the works will be in accordance with the approved plans which is part of the formal decision on Appeal A.
53. Other conditions for Appeal A relate to archaeology, trees and hedgerows, construction management plan, landscaping, contamination and cycle parking.
54. Having regard to the urban location and the concerns raised by interested parties, a condition for a **Construction Management Plan (CMP)** is necessary. This would ensure that the construction phase is carefully planned, approved and therefore managed to minimise the effects on occupiers and users of both the site and surrounding properties during the construction phase. These details should be approved prior to the commencement of development to ensure certainty regarding the construction phase. The Council's suggested condition for working hours would be incorporated into the requirements of the CMP.
55. The submitted Arboricultural Report provides information on trees illustrated within a general landscaping outline. Trees are only one element of landscaping, as such it is necessary to have a scheme of **hard and soft landscaping** approved and implemented to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the site, the CA, and the setting of the listed building. It would also enhance the living conditions of the current and future occupiers of the care home.
56. As the footprint of the proposed extension overlies the line of the Roman Road between Colchester and London this is a sensitive **archaeological** location. Although the Archaeological Advisor notes that part of this footprint has previously been excavated, there is still potential for further underlying features and deposits. A Written Scheme of Investigation is therefore necessary to ensure that archaeological remains are investigated, recorded, reported and presented for future understanding. It is a necessary pre-commencement condition, since any groundworks would affect the potential sub-surface archaeological features and deposits.
57. The suggested condition for existing **trees and hedgerows** is necessary to safeguard the existing trees and hedgerows which contribute to the character and appearance of the site. However, it has been amended for precision and enforceability to refer to, and ensure compliance with, the submitted Arboricultural Report. A further suggested compliance condition has also been included to ensure that **no burning or storage** of materials which would cause damage is necessary to protect the health of the existing trees and vegetation on site.

58. The site is not declared as being **contaminated**. I note the consultation response from the Council's Environmental Protection Team seeking a phase 1 desk study, I find this is unnecessary for a residential garden. The 4-part contaminated land suggestion from the Council is therefore unnecessary. However, a condition to focus on the actions and requirements should something unexpected be discovered is considered to be a reasonable and proportional precautionary measure.
59. The application form indicates that the existing **6 cycle parking** spaces would remain and are shown on the submitted block plan. I note the consultation response from the Highway Authority raises no objection and does not contain a specific requirement for an increase in the quantum. The Council's suggestion for at least 1 space per 5 members of staff is already achieved with the current provision. Since the care home operates a shift pattern the total workforce would not be all be onsite at the same time. The current provision would remain satisfactory even with the 2 additional members of staff, having regard to current use of cycles by staff. I note the consultation response from the cycling group for cycle parking to be secure and covered. Whilst this suggestion could encourage more cycling, the development does not change the existing provision and any improvements to existing provision are not dependent upon this development. As such the condition is amended for compliance to ensure that the existing space is kept available for cycle parking at all times.
60. The suggested requirement for an **ecological survey** condition has not been included because the proposed extension will have a separate glazed link and roof as shown in the Rev C scheme. As such this would not result in the same degree of disturbance to the existing modern extension as was proposed within the Rev B scheme, so this condition is not necessary.
61. **The conditions for Appeal B**, in addition to the time limit for commencement, relate to the requirement for the submission and approval for details for materials, brickwork, architectural features, other openings and other service infrastructure. These are all relevant to the works permitted and are necessary in order to preserve the special interest of the building and the character or appearance of the CA. A condition requiring the 'making good' is necessary to preserve the historic character. It is necessary to amend this for precision and enforceability to ensure that it applies to any of the existing fabric of the building that has been disturbed by the works.
62. Two suggested conditions have not been imposed. Firstly, a suggestion for a condition to limit the scope of works to the approved drawings. As explained earlier, the approved plans are already listed on the accompanying planning permission, so duplication is not necessary. Secondly, a condition regarding unexpected features of historic character. There is no clear justification for this condition and there are no above ground historic features within proposed siting for the extension. Any below ground features would be managed through the archaeological condition on the accompanying planning permission in Appeal A.

Conclusion

63. For the reasons given above both appeals should succeed.

Dr Rachael A Bust INSPECTOR

Schedule A – Conditions for Planning Appeal APP/A1530/W/24/3357528

Time Limit

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Approved Plans

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the submitted Site Location Plan Rev A and Drawing Numbers 1610/09 B3, 1610/04 C, 1610/05 C, 1610/07 C, 1610/07 C1, 1610/08 C, and the Arboricultural Report (drawing no. LSDP 2105.01 Rev A).

Construction Management Plan

3. Prior to the commencement of development, a Construction Management Plan (CMP), should be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CMP shall provide the details for:

- i) The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- ii) Access arrangements for loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- iii) Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- iv) The groundworks and details of excavation, including measures to ensure land within the site and immediately adjacent, together with the rear boundary wall will be safe and stable; and
- v) Site operations to ensure that no demolition or construction work shall take place outside of the following times:
 - Weekdays: 0800-1800
 - Saturdays: 0800-1300
 - Sundays and Bank Holidays: No working.

Landscaping

4. Prior to the commencement of development above ground floor slab level, details of both hard and soft landscaping works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include:

- i) Earthworks showing existing and proposed finished levels or contours;
- ii) Any means of enclosure or retaining structures.
- iii) Hard surfacing materials.
- iv) Minor artefacts and structures such as benches.
- v) Proposing planting scheme for trees, shrubs or other landscaping plants, including quantity, size, species positions and densities; and
- vi) Implementation programme, including any relevant phasing.

The hard landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and completed before the first occupation of the new extension. All new planting shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details in the first planting season following the first occupation of the new extension. Following the completion of the planting, all new planting shall then be monitored and recorded for at least five years. In the event that any planting dies, is removed, destroyed, fail to thrive or are otherwise defective during such a period, they shall be replaced during the first planting season thereafter.

Archaeological Monitoring

5. No works shall take place until a Written Scheme of Investigation has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions:

- i) The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording.
- ii) The programme for post investigation assessment.
- iii) Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording.
- iv) Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation.
- v) Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation; and
- vi) Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works.

The site investigation shall thereafter be completed prior to development. The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the approved Written Scheme of Investigation and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

Tree and Hedgerow Protection

6. The development hereby approved shall be implemented in accordance with the Arboricultural Report (LSDP 2105.01 Rev A). All existing trees and hedgerows shall then be monitored and recorded for at least five years following the first occupation of the new extension. In the event that any existing trees and/or hedgerows die, are removed, destroyed, fail to thrive or are otherwise defective during such a period, they shall be replaced during the first planting season thereafter. Any tree works agreed to shall be carried out in accordance with BS 3998 (or an equivalent British Standard if replaced).

Tree and Natural Feature Protection

7. No burning or storage of materials shall take place where damage could be caused to any tree, shrub or other natural feature to be retained on the site or on adjoining land (see BS 5837 or an equivalent British Standard if replaced).

Contaminated Land (Reporting of Unexpected Contamination)

8. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. Development on the part of the site affected shall be suspended until a risk assessment has been carried out and submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Where unacceptable risks are found, the development shall not resume or continue until remediation and verification schemes have been carried out in accordance with details that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Cycle Parking

9. The cycle parking illustrated on the approved plan 1610/09 B3, shall be retained and made available for this use at all times.

End of Schedule A

Schedule B – Conditions for Listed Building Consent Appeal APP/A1530/W/24/3357540

Time Limit

1. The works hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this consent.

Making good

2. Within 2 months of the works being carried out, all adjoining surfaces which have been disturbed by the works (including brickwork, plaster and floor tiles) shall be made good with materials and finishes to match those of existing undisturbed areas.

Materials

3. No works shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the works hereby permitted 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.

Brickwork

4. Prior to the laying of any bricks above ground floor slab level, full details of all new brickwork, including the type of brick, bond, mortar mix and joint profile shall be submitted to and agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be constructed in accordance with the agreed details.

Architectural details, openings and infrastructure services

5. No works shall commence above ground floor slab level until additional drawings that show details of the architectural detailing of the development hereby approved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, window detailing (including details of the depth of reveal and any dormer features), eaves, verges, gullies, ridge, brickwork/stonework detailing recessed/projecting/decorative brickwork, rainwater goods, leadwork and cladding by section and elevation, at scales between 1:20 and 1:1, as appropriate. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved additional drawings.

6. Prior to the commencement of any works, additional drawings that show details of any proposed new windows, rooflights, doors, eaves, verges, cills, arches and glazing to be used, by section and elevation, at scales between 1:20 and 1:1, as appropriate, shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved additional drawings.

7. Prior to the commencement of any works, details of all new or replacement external chimneys, flues, extract ducts, vents, grilles and meter housings and rainwater goods shall 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.

End of Schedule B