



COPELAND BOROUGH COUNCIL DELEGATED PLANNING DECISION

| | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|---|------------|
| 1. | Reference No: | 4/21/2242/OL1 | |
| 2. | Proposed Development: | LISTED BUILDING CONSENT FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS AS PART OF RENOVATION AND REFURBISHMENT OF EXISTING BUILDING, INCLUDING REPAIRS TO EXTERNAL RENDER, ALTERATION TO DORMER WINDOWS, DEMOLITION OF PART OF EXISTING STORES & FORMER SHOWER BLOCKS, REDUCTION OF REAR WALLS, RECONSTRUCTION OF PORCH AT NO.11, AND REPLACEMENT/REPAIR OF WINDOWS. | |
| 3. | Location: | 1- 11 LONSDALE TERRACE, ST BEES | |
| 4. | Parish: | St. Bees | |
| 5. | Constraints: | ASC;Adverts - ASC;Adverts, Conservation Area - Conservation Area, Listed Building - Listed Building, Coal - Standing Advice - Data Subject To Change | |
| 6. | Publicity Representations &Policy | Neighbour Notification Letter | Yes |
| | | Site Notice | Yes |
| | | Press Notice | Yes |
| | | Consultation Responses | See Report |
| | | Relevant Policies | See Report |
| 7. | Report: | | |
| | Site and Location | | |
| | | This application relates to 1 – 11 Lonsdale Terrace, located within the centre of St Bees. The properties are Grade II Listed and are located within the St Bees Conservation Area. This group of terrace properties was previously in the ownership of St Bees School, and was utilised as boarding accommodation. | |
| | Relevant Planning History | | |

4/09/2245/0 – Listed Building Consent for replacement windows, replacement rainwater goods (nos. 1 – 11); rendering of chimney stack (no. 8); rear canopy over rear – Approved Listed Building Consent.

4/16/2017/OL1 – Listed Building Consent for works associated with the subdivision of terrace; reinstatement of individual properties together with associated external – Approved Listed Building Consent.

4/16/2016/OF1 – Subdivision of existing terrace; reinstatement of individual properties together with associated external works – Approve.

Proposal

This application seeks Listed Building Consent for the internal and external alterations of part of the renovation and refurbishment of the existing buildings. The proposed works include the repairs to the external render, alterations to the dormer windows, the demolition of part of the existing stores and former shower blocks, reduction of the rear walls, the reconstruction of porch at no.11, and the replacement/repair of windows.

This application is being considered alongside a Full Planning Application (ref: 4/21/2241/OF1) for the same works.

Consultation Responses

St Bees Parish Council

No objections.

Copeland Borough Council – Conservation Officer

24th August 2021:

Request further information.

Much of this is good practice and will see these properties given an optimum viable use with minimal harm to their character and appearance, along with much improvement.

There are several areas where clarification or detail is required, these are as follows:

- The Heritage Statement needs one or two minor corrections referring to time period. See also Proposed GF plan, which refers to 18th century Victorian style street lamp – the Victorian period started in the 19th century and ended in the 20th.
- Proposing to replace all the windows in the terrace needs to be subject both to more specificity about the condition/quality of existing windows (from the photos and from site visits these appear to be variable, with both poor windows and a number that have quite a beautiful appearance) and more specificity about the proposed replacements. From what I've seen in the Heritage Statement and on site, some of the six-over-six windows in particular are

beautiful and may be retainable with cleaning and repair work. Currently a sample sash window is provided by the architect, but there are other openings in the buildings that wouldn't suit this type. The heritage statement ought to be used to assess their significance and comment on the impact of wholesale removal.

- What existing windows are both of good quality and reparable condition?
- What windows contain historic glass?
- Where replacement can be justified, what other window types will be needed?
- Locations of any lath and plaster to be removed should be known and agreed prior to consent. It appears that some of the works on the top floors in creating bathrooms will involve removal of lath and plaster. What alternatives or mitigation have been considered in such cases?
- I request a demolition plan, allowing the elements to the rears of the properties to be removed to be clearly understood.
- Diagram should be provided showing openings to be inserted through ground floor internal walls in houses 6-10.
- In the case of some of the internal doors, it is left ambiguous as to whether they can be made satisfactory using intumescent paint or whether they will need replacing. If doors can be repaired and made good, this would be a preferable solution.
- A specification for the lime plaster is required.
- Details should be provided of new light fittings, and internal and external door furniture.
- Detail should be provided of the new gates, gate piers and gate lighting.
- Possibility of adding a plaque to commemorate the conservation and re-opening of Lonsdale Terrace as private houses was discussed on site. If this is proposed, details can be added to this application, or another will be needed in future.
- Clarification is needed on irregularities in the existing and proposed drawings (see above).
- Further detail is needed on the need for, alternatives to, and likely implications of the basement level tanking scheme. There may be unintended consequences and it would need to be seen that these eventualities had been covered (please refer to above notes).

The above will need to be addressed in some form before I am able to come to an informed decision about the likely impact and benefit.

3rd September 2021:

Request further information.

Previously raised concerns have not been addressed:

- I would support conditioning the treatment of the windows in the main facades (not including the dormers or rooflights), but the references to replacing them in the supporting documentation would need to be removed first to avoid confusion.
- I reiterate my view that the application needs to better identify the extent of lath and plaster removal, and justify why this is necessary.
- An example internal elevation drawing should be added showing the proposed opening.
- As previously discussed with the architect, I'd be supportive of the use of a condition to allow the treatment of the internal doors (whether modification/repair of existing, or whether replacement) to be determined following investigation.
- The section on the internal doors in the D&A Statement will need updating to reflect this, as it's currently ambiguous.
- A specification for the internal lime render still needs to be submitted.
- It would be preferable to find an alternative to the ball finials on the tops of the gate piers. A flat or chamfered coping slab would provide a better appearance, as well as responding to the detailing found elsewhere on High House Road.
- Clarification is needed on irregularities in the existing and proposed drawings.
 - o The existing and proposed external store plan needs removing as it shows the previous proposal (i.e. to retain sections and convert them).
 - o If the windows are to be handled via a condition then the proposed elevation drawings ought to show the windows as existing but with an annotation.
 - o The alterations to the ground floor hood moulds on the Finkle Street elevation of House 1 are not mentioned in the heritage statement, which only says that the entrance here will be "entirely retained". It would be useful to have clarification on this.
 - o There are still inconsistencies between the existing and proposed side elevation drawings (e.g. proportion changes that suggest outriggers are being shortened, which is not suggested in the rest of the drawings). As previously mentioned the main chimney in Elevation 4 appears very different between existing and proposed, but no change is observed from the front elevations or roof plans.
 - o The existing roof plan shows each house with a black square approximately in the middle of its front wall. It's not clear what these are, so an annotation should be added if they're a feature and they should be removed (as in the proposed roof plan) if not.

- The heritage statement should feature justification of the tanking strategy in light of the above concerns.

4th October 2021:

Request further information.

Previously raised concerns have not been addressed:

- I would support conditioning the treatment of the windows in the main facades (not including the dormers or rooflights), but the references to replacing them in the supporting documentation would need to be removed first to avoid confusion.
 - The revised “as proposed” elevation still shows all the windows in the front, side and rear elevations being replaced and is still annotated to refer to their refurbishment/replacement. If any consent/permission are to relate to this drawing, it can’t be ambiguous, as determining which windows to repair and which to replace must be handled via a condition following a proper survey. I’d suggest the “as proposed” drawing should show the windows the same as the “as existing” drawing, but with an annotation explaining that any replacements will be subject to discharge of a condition. I accept the principle of replacing some of the windows, but the application does not distinguish between those to be replaced and those to be refurbished, and if this drawing remains as-is it won’t be clear what’s been consented.
 - These drawings, where reproduced elsewhere e.g. in the Design and Access statement, should be consistent. The D&A statement says on page 28, for example, that all the windows will be replaced with the design shown in Sketch A on p 29.
- The existing and proposed external store plan needs removing as it shows the previous proposal (i.e. to retain sections and convert them).
 - It appears that this has not been updated. I would be grateful for clarification on whether the current version of it in the application is accurate.
- The existing roof plan shows each house with a black square approximately in the middle of its front wall. It’s not clear what these are, so an annotation should be added if they’re a feature and they should be removed (as in the proposed roof plan) if not.
 - I am not able to find a revised copy of this drawing, so would appreciate clarification on whether it is drawn correctly or needs updating.

29th October 2021

Request revised information.

This response follows three earlier ones, and discussion with the Victorian Society.

As before, I am supportive of the conversion of these dwellings and believe a lot of the proposals show sensitivity and good practice.

As requested, the windows are being dealt with via a condition. Owing to the size and complexity of the job, this requires some specificity with the supporting documents, therefore these require updating

As a condition is being used to establish and justify the approach for each window, all that can accurately be said at present about the windows is that they will be variously repaired and/or replaced subject to survey, justification, and a strategy containing details.

There are one or two other points, but the majority now relate to the wording of sections relating to the windows.

17th November 2021

Request updated information

This response follows four earlier ones, and discussion with the Victorian Society.

A number of discrepancies and inaccuracies are still within the submitted information which need to be amended as per previous comments.

17th November 2021

No objections.

This response follows five earlier ones, and discussion with the Victorian Society.

Following submission of revised details, the issues I've identified have been addressed and I am able to support the application with the condition previously agreed.

Victorian Society

16th September 2021:

We have no objection to the reconversion of this terrace into individual houses. The only aspect of the proposals that we're really concerned about is the treatment of the windows. From the information that's been provided it seems likely that many of the windows are historic (especially to the front), although this isn't made clear. It is proposed to replace all of these windows with new double-glazed units. Given that these windows make an important contribution to the character of the terrace, and are likely historic, this proposal will cause a great deal of harm to significance. This harm isn't clearly justified: we must note that there is no legal requirement to conform to the requirements of the Building Regulations when dealing with existing work, and the applicants have provided no evidence that any of the windows are beyond repair. The application thus fails to meet

the requirements of the NPPF, paragraph 189. We strongly recommend that this aspect of the proposals is removed, and the windows treated according to the clear guidance in Historic England's advice document 'Traditional Windows: Their Care, Repair and Upgrading'.

17th September 2021:

Of course we have absolutely no objection to the replacement of the uPVC and other modern windows to the rear — we agree that this would be a considerable improvement — we were only concerned really with the windows at the front. The intention to try to retain the historic windows at the front where possible is laudable, but we have some doubts about the possibility in principle of replacing the glass with slimline double glazing because of the extra thickness and weight. If it is possible — well and good. If it isn't possible, but the windows can nonetheless be repaired, we suggest other ways of improving thermal performance are investigated (secondary glazing, e.g., draught strips), and that the replacement of the windows is an absolute last resort. We recognize the climate emergency, and support works to improve the thermal performance of historic buildings, but in this case think that removing all the surviving historic windows would be disproportionately harmful to significance, especially given that there's not much of interest left in the interiors. We appreciate the surviving shutters (where they exist) might make secondary glazing difficult as well.

21st September 2021

Firstly, for clarity: we presume the claim is that the installation of double-glazed windows will reduce the heat loss *through the windows* by 75%, not that it will reduce the heat loss of the entire building by 75%. There are two things to say about this.

- i) When considering the energy performance of buildings it is vitally important to take a whole-building approach, especially in the context of historic buildings where compromises might have to be made in places to preserve elements that contribute to significance. There is not a lot of quantitative analysis available about the impacts on energy consumption and carbon emissions, but Historic England have been producing a body of research over the past decade or so which aims to clarify the thermal performance of historic buildings, taken both as wholes and with respect to important parts such as windows and doors, solid walls, and roofs. This research is ongoing; the published reports can be found here: <https://historicengland.org.uk/research/current/conservation-research/energy-efficiency/>. There are two points to extract which are specifically relevant to this case. The first is that the common assumptions about the thermal performance of historic buildings which are built into common models, e.g., are not necessarily good ones, and do not necessarily apply equally well to all historic buildings. If anyone is really serious about improving the thermal performance of an existing building, then it is vital to have some idea of how it actually performs thermally, and therefore where savings might best be made. The second point is that thermal performance should be considered in terms of the whole building, not its components in isolation. Improving the thermal performance of the

windows will not help much if most of the heat is lost through the roof, for example, or the walls. In this case it is unclear what contribution the existing windows make to the heat loss from the building, and therefore what the exact benefits of replacing them would be. If a properly quantitative argument is to be made about the advantages of replacing the historic windows then it must be made on good evidence of the thermal behaviour of the existing buildings. We recommend that the applicants and your authority refer to the research report A Retrofit of a Victorian Terrace House in New Bolsover: A Whole House Thermal Performance Assessment for further information (available here: <https://historicengland.org.uk/research/results/reports/103-2015?searchType=research+report&search=Bolsover>)

- ii) When considering the thermal performance of windows and doors specifically, it isn't simply the case that heat is lost through conduction through the glass. Heat is lost through windows in a variety of ways, through the glass, the frames, and by the replacement of warm air by cold through draughts. There are therefore various different ways of reducing heat flux through the windows, of which changing the kind of glass is only one. Historic England have published an interesting research report on improving the performance of traditional wooden-framed sash windows which gives further details: 'Research into the Thermal Performance of Traditional Windows: Timber sash windows', available here: <https://research.historicengland.org.uk/Report.aspx?i=16035>. This report shows clearly that a range of measures can be taken which, in combination, result in a significant reduction in heat loss through the windows. Clearly, not all of these measures will be possible in this case, but many will, which could result in an acceptable reduction in heat loss without the harm to significance that the loss of the historic windows would entail.

The proposals to restore the surviving shutters are thoroughly positive, and we understand if the precise details of the joinery make it impossible to install secondary glazing. We must point out in this context that the shutters are not simply a decorative feature, but have a practical purpose in reducing heat loss, and if properly and carefully restored will anyway make an important contribution to the energy efficiency of the houses. As the research report cited above shows, the use of well-fitting shutters reduces heat loss through the windows substantially, which should be taken into account when judging the relative costs and benefits of the proposals.

We must here also point out the environmental costs in terms of carbon emissions of replacing existing historic windows with new double glazed units. The lifespan of historic windows can be hundreds of years. The likely lifespan of new units, according to Historic England, is around 25 years. Specifically, HE state: 'The service life of slim profile double glazed units is around 25 years, and the carbon costs of the inert gases used to fill the void between the glass layers is high. Therefore, their whole-life carbon costs of upgrading have to be weighed against benefits and their impact on the heritage values of the building.' We should also add that there are also carbon costs associated with the destruction of the historic joinery.

The assertion that it 'would be likely that all rooms with single glazing would become unusable in winter, making them damp, mouldy and unpleasant spaces' is illogical and must be discounted. These houses have had single-glazed windows since they were built, and the applicants' own heritage statement makes it clear that, leaving aside patches of damage through water ingress, the interiors are in good condition. If single glazing entailed that the interiors became 'damp, mouldy and unpleasant spaces' then there would be ample evidence that that had already happened. The use of these buildings is not proposed to change, and it is unlikely that the restoration works will mean that the air inside the buildings becomes much more humid. If moisture is or is likely to be a problem then we recommend that the applicants consider the ventilation strategy of the buildings very carefully.

Although we appreciate that single-glazed wooden windows are often seen as having an inherently poor thermal performance, and that their summary replacement is increasingly justified by appeals to arguments about energy efficiency and carbon emissions, the true situation is far less clear cut. More research needs to be done on this aspect of building performance, but it is amply clear that simply replacing historic single-glazed windows is not an adequate response to the complex demands of reducing energy consumption, limiting carbon emission, and preserving heritage significance. As the available research goes to show, these goals are not inherently opposed.

In the case of Lonsdale Terrace we maintain that the loss of the historic windows would be very harmful to significance, and that no real evidence has been presented that the replacement of the historic windows with double-glazed units is necessary. It is not yet even clear that the energy efficiency of the buildings is a problem, or that, if it is a problem, it is a problem best solved by replacing the windows. We recommend that your authority clarifies the specific goals of the applicants in this case, and is satisfied that the replacement of the historic windows is the best way of meeting those goals, before granting consent.

We appreciate that there is an extant consent for the straightforward replacement of all the windows. I'm not sure if we were consulted about it, but can only apologise for not having responded at an earlier stage. I'd be grateful if you could let me know your decision in due course.

26th October 2021

Formally, I have to say that it is very disappointing that the applicants have refused to address the substantive points we made in our last response. The Victorian Society's clear position is that the retrofit of historic buildings has an important role to play in the wider response to the climate emergency, but that the climate emergency should not be used as a catch-all excuse to make hasty, ill-considered, and harmful changes to historic buildings. As I made explicit in my last response, it is not the principle of making these buildings more energy efficient that is objectionable, but the vague and poorly justified proposals to replace the surviving historic windows. It remains unclear that these proposals represent the best way to increase the energy-efficiency of the buildings, consistent with their conservation.

I have been in touch with Dr Woodford to discuss the situation. Given that the Victorian Society

supports the principle of returning Lonsdale Terrace to residential use, and has no objections to any of the other proposed alterations, we have agreed that the question of the treatment of the windows, and the justification for it, can be controlled by conditions on any consent given to the current proposals. The Society suggests that such conditions include the provision of an independent survey and assessment of the existing windows which can be used to inform detailed proposals to replace those that are truly beyond repair, to retain those which can be retained, and possibly to alter those for which alterations can be convincingly justified. Whilst we stand by our advice, we would like to withdraw our formal objection, so that the application can be dealt with without more delay.

Public Representation

This application has been advertised by way of a site notice and press notice. No comments have been received in relation to the statutory notification procedure.

Planning Policy

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Development Plan

Copeland Local Plan 2013 – 2028 (Adopted December 2013)

Core Strategy

Policy ST1 – Strategic Development Principles

Policy ST2 – Strategic Development Principles

Policy ENV4 – Heritage Assets

Development Management Policies (DMP)

Policy DM27 – Built Heritage and Archaeology

Other Material Planning Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Conservation Area Design Guide SPD (Adopted December 2017)

Emerging Copeland Local Plan (ELP):

The emerging Copeland Local Plan 2017-2035 was recently the subject of a Preferred Options Consultation which ended on 30 November 2020. The Preferred Options Consultation builds upon the completed Issues and Options Consultation, which finished in January 2020. Given the stage of

preparation, the emerging Copeland Local Plan 2017-2035 has only limited weight in decision making, but provides an indication of the direction of travel of the emerging planning policies, which themselves have been developed in accordance with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Assessment

This Listed Building Consent application seeks permission for numerous external and internal work to a Grade II Listed Building. The main issue considered within this application relates to the impact of the development upon a heritage asset.

Impact on Heritage Asset

Policy ST1, ENV4, DM27 of the Copeland Local Plan seek to protect, conserve and where possible enhance the historic, cultural and architectural character of the Borough's historic sites.

The Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act sets out a clear presumption that gives considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving a heritage asset and its setting.

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 establishes a need "in considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works [for the Local Planning Authority to] have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest" [Section 16(2)]. This requirement also applies to the granting of planning permission affecting a listing building or its setting [Section 66(1)].

Section 72 of the 1990 Act states that "special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of [a conservation] area."

Paragraph 192 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that "In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation..."

NPPF para. 193 states, in the case of designated heritage assets, "great weight should be given to the asset's conservation", irrespective of whether potential harm is substantial, less-than-substantial, or total loss. Where harm to a designated heritage asset is less-than-substantial, it should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal (para. 196).

Referring to assets in a conservation area, NPPF para. 201 states that loss of an element that makes a positive contribution to a conservation area should be treated as either substantial (under para. 195) or less-than-substantial harm (under paragraph 196). In new development, opportunities should be sought to enhance or better reveal the significance of conservation areas (NPPF para. 200).

This application seeks Listed Building Consent for a number of internal and external alterations as

part of the renovation and refurbishment of the existing buildings, which have previously been granted permission to be converted to terrace dwellinghouses. As part of the application process extensive discussions have been undertaken with the Council's Conservation Officer to secure amendments to the information submitted as part of the application. Whilst the Conservation Officer was supportive in general of the proposal and has now confirmed that based on the amended detail the proposal show sensitivity and good practice, the main issue with the application was the replacement of the existing windows with double glazed unit. This concern was also echoed by the Victorian Society who thought the use of double glazing in all windows within the front elevations of the properties would cause a great deal of unjustified harm to the significance of the buildings given that the windows make an important contribution to the character of the terrace.

In order to progress the application and allow other critical works to be undertaken to the properties it has been agreed that the element of the proposal to replace/repair the existing windows will be dealt with by an appropriately worded planning conditions. This condition will require the submission of an independent survey carried out by a suitably qualified person, and will detail the extent, condition, and location of historic glass and windows, providing justification for a proposed repair or replacement strategy for each existing window. The use of this condition has been agreed by the agent, the Councils Conservation Officer and the Victorian Society as this will allow the Local Planning Authority to establish and justify the approach for each window, whilst allowing other works to safeguard the heritage asset to continue.

On the basis of the amended information for this application, and the inclusion of a condition requiring a condition survey of all windows, it is considered that the proposal complies with policies of the Copeland Local Plan and the NPPF.

Planning Balance & Conclusion

This application seeks Listed Building Consent for a number of internal and external works to a Grade II Listed terrace. Based on extensive discussions with the agent the proposed works are now considered to be sensitive and good practice. Although concerns were raised with the proposal to replace the existing windows with double glazed units the proposal has been amended to allow for the repair or replacement of windows, which will be agreed with the Local Planning Authority and fully justified by a condition survey controlled by condition. This will allow for critical works to be undertaken to the properties, whilst the agent and Local Planning Authority agree a justified approach for each window within the properties to ensure the development conserves and enhances the heritage asset. Based on the inclusion of this conditions the proposed development is therefore considered to be compliant with the objectives of Policies ST1, ENV4 and DM27 of the Copeland Local Plan 2013-2018 and the relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and LBCA Act.

| | |
|----|---|
| 8. | <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Approve Listed Building Consent (start within 3yr)</p> |
| 9. | <p>Conditions:</p> <p><u>Standard Conditions</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The works hereby permitted must be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this consent. <p>Reason</p> <p>To comply with Sections 18 and 74 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. This permission relates to the following plans and documents as received on the respective dates and development must be carried out in accordance with them:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Location Plan, Scale 1:1250, Drawing No P300.00.01, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 26th May 2021. - Block Plan as Existing and Proposed, Scale 1:500, Drawing No P300.00.02, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 26th May 2021. - Gate Details as Proposed, Scale 1:500, Drawing No P300.00.03, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 26th May 2021. - AE Elevation from Lonsdale Terrace and Rear Elevation, Scale 1:100, Drawing No P200.00.01, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 26th May 2021. - Elevations as Proposed (Amended), Scale 1:100, Drawing No P201-02, Rev F, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 17th November 2021. - Ground and First Floor Plans as Existing, Scale 1:1250, Drawing No P100.00.01, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 26th May 2021. - Ground and First Floor Plans as Proposed (Amended), Scale 1:100, Drawing No P101-01, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 13th August 2021. - Basement Floor Plan AE, Scale 1:100, Drawing No P100.00, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 26th May 2021. - Basement Plans as Proposed, Scale 1:100, Drawing No P101.00, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 26th May 2021. - Attic Floor Plans as Proposed (Amended), Scale 1:100, Drawing No P101-02, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 13th August 2021. - Existing Attic and Floor Plan (Amended), Scale 1:100, Drawing No P100-00-01, Rev A, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 11th October 2021. - Door Blade, Scale 1:10 & F:5, Drawing No 2019.303 received by the Local Planning |

Authority on the 26th May 2021.

- Handrail, Scale 1:10, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 26th May 2021.
- Design and Access Statement (Amended), Revision D, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 15th November 2021.
- Demolition Plan, Scale 1:100, Drawing No P101-01, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 13th August 2021.
- Heritage Statement, Revision D, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 17th November 2021.
- Lighting Information, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 13th August 2021.
- Store Plans and Elevations as Existing and Proposed (Amended), Scale 1:100, Drawing No P202-02, Rev B, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 17th November 2021.

Reason

To conform with the requirement of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Prior to Commencement of Works Conditions:

3. Prior to the commencement of any works to the existing windows (excluding any dormer windows or rooflight) within the application site, an independent survey carried out by a suitably qualified person must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This survey must detail the extent, condition, and location of historic glass and windows, and must provide justification for a proposed repair or replacement strategy for each existing window. Any works to the existing windows within the application site must be carried out in accordance with this approved survey and must be maintained as such at all times thereafter.

Reason

In the interest of protecting the heritage asset.

Statement:

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received, and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| Case Officer: C. Burns | Date : 17.11.2021 |
| Authorising Officer: N.J. Hayhurst | Date : 19.11.2021 |
| Dedicated responses to:- N/A | |