

CUMBERLAND COUNCIL DELEGATED PLANNING DECISION

1.	Reference No:	4/24/2008/0F1	
2.	Proposed Development:	PRIOR NOTICATION APPLICATION TO DEMOLISH CATTLE SHED; DUTCH BARN; STONE BARN; PIGGERY; HOUSE; OUTBUILDING	
3.	Location:	NEW HOUSE FARM, DRIGG	
4.	Parish:	Drigg and Carleton	
5.	Constraints:	ASC;Adverts - ASC;Adverts, Coal - Off Coalfield - Data Subject To Change, Key Species - Potential areas for Natterjack Toads, DEPZ Zone - DEPZ Zone, Outer Consultation Zone - Drigg 3KM, Outer Consultation Zone - Sellafield 10KM	
6.	Publicity Representations &Policy	Neighbour Notification Letter	No
		Site Notice	Yes
		Press Notice	No
		Consultation Responses	See Report
		Relevant Policies	See Report
7.	Report: Site and Location		
		This application relates to New House Farm, located within the centre of the village of Drigg. The site is bounded to the north by the B5344 to the north and Station Road to the east.	

Residential dwellings bound the east and south west, with open countryside to the south. The property comprises of a main farmhouse, outbuilding, cattle shed, dutch barn, stone barn, and piggery.

Relevant Planning History

4/23/2298/0F1 – Prior notification application for demolition of cattle shed; dutch barn; stone barn; piggery; house, outbuilding – Withdrawn.

Proposal

This application gives prior notification of the demolition of the house, cattle shed, dutch barn, stone barn, piggery, and outbuilding. The application is supported by a structural assessment which concludes the following:

- Cattle Shed – Timber columns nearing end of their life with rot expected to worsen over time and roof cladding needs replaced. Advised to replace rather than refurbish.
- Dutch Barn - The concrete columns, rafters, purlins and side rails to the building have suffered carbonation and spalling of the concrete and are therefore nearing the end of its life. Despite the survey finding the building to be structurally adequate, it is recommended it will need replacing within 5 years. It was deemed that the concrete could be repaired, however it would be more cost-effective to replace the building rather than refurbish.
- Stone Barn - The walls to the barn are at risk of collapse. It was deemed to be more cost-effective to demolish the barn and byre and rebuild a new modern structure more suited to modern farming.
- Piggery - In very poor structural condition, with the masonry heavily weathered and the front wall significantly out of plumb it was deemed to be more cost-effective to demolish the building and replace it with a new framed structure.
- Farmhouse - Property in a very poor condition with significant structural defects. The potential for the right hand gable to locally collapse rendered the property unsafe, therefore the property should be vacated, and the adjacent farm yard cordoned off until the gable wall is made stable. The property needs total refurbishment and modernisation.
- Outbuilding - The property was weathered and affected by historic movement; it was deemed to be structurally adequate at the time of inspection.

In terms of method of demolition, it is proposed that residual parts of the building will be taken down by mechanical means and loaded into wagons or equivalent for removal from the site. Best practice methods will be followed with regards to noise, dust control, etc. All waste from the site will be removed and recycled wherever possible. Road sweeping will be carried out on a reactive basis where required. The buildings will be demolished to foundation level and will be left tidy in appearance and secured by way of existing boundary treatment.



Cumberland Council

Consultation Responses

Subject to Part 11 Class B paragraph (b)(v) of the Town and County Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, the applicant must display a site notice on or near the land on which the building to be demolished is sited, and must leave the notice in place for not less than 21 days in the period of 28 days beginning with the date on which the application was submitted to the local planning authority. The applicant has confirmed that this site notice has been erected. Three letters of objection have been received in relation to this notification period.

One letter of objection has been received from members of the public raising the following concerns:

- The redevelopment block plan is not adequate and contains no set time frame for completion, or for a planning application to be submitted. The design of the house and barns is not detailed enough with no specifics given for the design of the house redevelopment in particular.
- This is of huge concern as it is stated that all spoil from the demolition will be removed from site. I object to the traditional stone and slate being removed from site. This should be kept onsite and reused in the redevelopment, ensuring the new house design is traditional in look and building materials. I object to this application being determined before a full design and planning application is submitted for redevelopment.
- The application states the village is sparse. This is incorrect. There are a number of properties directly adjacent to the site.
- There are no details of exactly how the contractor aims to minimise noise, dust, and disruption and disturbance to neighbouring properties.
- There is no road traffic plan that shows how the contractor will ensure the road to the rail station, and spindle craft business, and residential properties will be kept clear and accessible at all times during the demolition and removal of spoil.
- There are to be no contractor movements in or out between school bus times as per local agreement with LLWR (7.45am-8.45am and 3.15pm-4.30pm). I would expect this to be detailed in the planning application and object to contractor movements within these times.
- I object to the smaller buildings (piggery and out building) being removed completely. They are traditional and could be renovated as they do not have major structural issues.
- The application states that bats have been found during the ecological survey. They are a protected species and I object to any license to disturb them.

One letter of support was received raising the following comments:

- I have seen that there appears to have been an objection from the Parish Council and now from the Conservation Officer to the demolition and rebuilding of the house and buildings. Despite living and working this farm no one from the Parish Council or the Conservation Officer has sought my views or input before making their decisions which is a great disappointment. Let me just say this farm is family home and a WORKING farm, my family's livelihood. It is not simply there for people to look at, its there for my family to live in and to operate a viable, functional and sustainable farming business.
- The farmhouse is in a very poor state. It suffers from subsidence and structural movement as can be seen from the cracks in the front and side of the house. Some of these cracks go right through to the inside. Buttresses have been added to the house historically but have not solved the problem. Previous excavations have revealed inadequate foundations. The gable end is very unsafe. Previous work to re-render the external walls were abandoned because the outer leaf stones started to fall out. The house has no damp course or wall cavities the house has always suffered with severe damp problems. Because of health conditions within my family, we cannot live in a damp house.
- The NDA conducted a cost benefit exercise when deciding to renovate or demolish and re-build the house. It was found that it would be more cost effective and faster to demolish and re-build rather than fight on with the significant structural defects that may never be resolved in this way. The NDA asked my views and I am in agreement with their proposals, am I not entitled to live in a warm, dry and damp proofed house? The house will be rebuilt in modern materials but from the outside will look almost exactly the same as it does now. What is the problem with that?
- The "outbuilding" has very little functional use. It has a number of large cracks in the walls. It has an asbestos roof and I would say it has very little aesthetic qualities or character.
- The "piggery" is falling down! It has been badly constructed with significant cracks in the walls and the roof has all but caved in. It has very little functional use in modern farming. The piggery is subdivided into three very small loose housing units with insufficient windows and ventilation. Historically these housed pigs and calves and they were all "mucked out" by hand with a form and wheel barrow. Farming practices and regulations have changed from these times and animal housing like these are now redundant. The conservation officer suggested that this could be converted into a house! Who on earth could live in a house this size - a hobbit?
- The dutch barn is mostly asbestos and is crumbling and at the end of its life. Again in modern farming, it has very little functional use. These barns are for storing small bales of hay. Small bales have not been made on the farm for 15 years. It is currently used to dry store machinery and equipment. In my view it has very little aesthetic



Cumberland Council

qualities or character.

- The barn comprises hay lofts (for storing loose and small bales of hay) and byres (for tying cattle up by their necks) . As previously said, we no longer make small bales of hay and we cannot even get in with a tractor a trailer if we wanted to as the barn entrance is too narrow. It was made for horse and carts. We cannot tie cattle in byres as this practice is now illegal. So what are we to use this barn for exactly? Should it exist simply to look at it?
- There are significant structural defects in the barn as detailed in the report. There is a large "bulge" in the side of the barn. The whole roof has shifted sideways and as a result the top and bottom of the side walls are significantly out of plumb. The structural engineer was so concerned we immediately had to stop entering the barn. Should the barn be taken to the ground and re-built in sandstone and slate just so people can look at it? It would take years and cost an astronomical amount and the end result would be unfunctional and redundant.
- None of the buildings at Newhouse Farm are listed so they have never been deemed to have much heritage value or architectural value.
- Since I took over the farm from my father I have been unable to live in the farmhouse and unable to use most of the buildings due to serious structural defects. This has had a serious impact on our farming business and could impact on the welfare of our livestock as we are unable to be there as we would be if we lived on site. Most importantly, my family needs a home on the farm so that my children can grow up at Newhouse farm, like I did and my father before me.
- To conclude, the NDA have taken fully into consideration my views and needs as a successional tenant at Newhouse Farm and I fully support the application. I wonder if any of the negative views expressed have taken into account the needs of my family or my farming business? The farmhouse once rebuilt will look exactly the same. The farm buildings are structurally dangerous or past their life expectancy so need to be replaced as fast as possible so that my farming business can function. This farm is a working farm that is my families livelihood, it is not simply there for passers by to admire.

Drigg and Carleton Parish Council

Objection.

This building is a local landmark built in traditional materials and style. It should be preserved and used as a model for other developments due to be built nearby. If the building cannot be saved it should be rebuilt like for like on the same footprint in the same style using the same materials. Likewise the outbuilding could be saved.

If bats are present in the buildings, the demolition should not be allowed to take place.

The application states no public rights of way are near the building yet the site is flanked by

public footpaths on two sides.

Demolition work is likely to further damage the drains causing problems upstream. This drain must be preserved and if necessary repaired.

No thought has been given to preservation of a building that is valued by local people. The very fabric of it is part of the local heritage which the owners and developers choose to ignore.

Ponsonby Parish Council

Objection.

This application does not lie within our Parish boundary but other similar NDA properties do. We have some concerns that there is a pattern developing, in some of the agricultural properties acquired by NDA, of leaving properties untenanted, unoccupied and unrepaired until they believe the only viable action available to them is demolition. This removes valuable housing stock and local business opportunities from our communities. It would be far better for NDA to either release such property in a timely manner to the private sector, who would repair and reuse at a fraction of the cost. For those properties on land which may have a future strategic value we believe NDA should adopt an asset management approach which keeps them in a good state of repair and constantly tenanted. Where now demolition is indeed the only viable option then we believe an equivalent property should be rebuilt and tenanted. Ultimately we object to the demolition which could have been prevented. We would request for consideration to be given that this is replaced with local occupancy housing.

Cumberland Council – Highway Authority & Local Lead Flood Authority

No objection to the proposal subject to the inclusion of conditions relating to highway drains, and construction traffic management plan.

Cumberland Council – Environmental Health

Further to the above planning application.

Parts of this site are potentially affected by historical contaminated land issues, that were laid out in the previous planning submission reference 4/23/2298/0F1.

The use of the site for agricultural purposes also brings possible risk of ground contamination from fuel spills, use of pesticides and chemicals etc.

It is also unclear if the existing septic tank will be removed / filled in / left in situ.

It was understood that (eventual) redevelopment of the site as a working farm (with a residential farm dwelling) may be undertaken though there is no detail of the end use of the site within this planning submission.

In summary, the end use of a site of potentially contaminated land would affect the risk assessment methodology applied to it.

Given that Natural England have no objections to the planning application, this does allay



Cumberland Council

concerns about possible contamination to local sensitive ecosystems.

As a stand-alone demolition project, the risk to human health (demolition workers) can be minimised through careful work procedures and use of personal protective equipment.

During works, if any evidence of ground contamination is encountered (leachate, discoloured sub-soil, malodour etc) the works should be stopped and further ground investigation carried out.

The site, when cleared, should be covered by 300 – 600 mm of clean soil.

Any later redevelopment of the site, with residential end use, may require a phase 1 contaminated land report.

Cumberland Council – Conservation & Design Officer

29th January 2024

Assessment:

- As before, I object to the wholesale loss of this farmstead.
- I concede that there are some repair needs, however I do not believe that they are insurmountable, or would fail to be worth the investment considering the heritage value of these buildings.
- The site is a coherent example of a 19th century farmstead cluster and makes a positive contribution to its surroundings.
- The buildings have historic, aesthetic and communal value.
- All the buildings are being treated equally, even though, from what I have seen and read, the farmhouse is less architecturally valuable than the barn and the piggery, and the outbuilding behind the house is also slated for demolition even though it has no particular structural issues. This is not a fine-grain plan proposed on the basis of a thorough understanding of the significance of the buildings and the group (in accordance, for example, with Historic England's Farmstead Assessment Framework), but is instead blunt in its execution.
- The heritage values of these buildings appear to be treated as an externality that is not factored into the cost/benefit calculation, but there is a cost and it will be sustained both immediately and over time.
- I would question whether the NDA has mission policies that promote the stewardship of its inherited estate, and the protection of things important to the community of West Cumbria in its decision-making where it affects that community.
- If the demolition of the buildings goes ahead, I would suggest as much material as possible is retained on-site for future use as this will minimise transport carbon and ensure it is available for reuse in replacement buildings as easily as possible.

- Additionally, I would request the field boundary be left undisturbed if demolition proceeds.

30th January 2024

I appreciate that this is only a prior notification app rather than a planning app, however I can't speak to the business case. Purely on conservation grounds, my view is that the decision to demolish the farm rather than adapt it is of net harm to its heritage value.

Natural England

No objections.

Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on statutorily protected nature conservation sites.

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

On 1st April 2023, Copeland Borough Council ceased to exist and was replaced by Cumberland Council as part of the Local Government Reorganisation of Cumbria.

Cumberland Council inherited the local development plan documents of each of the sovereign Councils including Copeland Borough Council, which combine to form a Consolidated Planning Policy Framework for Cumberland.

The inherited the local development plan documents continue to apply to the geographic area of their sovereign Councils only.

The Consolidated Planning Policy Framework for Cumberland comprises the Development Plan for Cumberland Council until replaced by a new Cumberland Local Plan.

Copeland Local Plan 2013 – 2028 (Adopted December 2013)

Core Strategy

Policy ST1 – Strategic Development Principles

Policy ST2 – Spatial Development Strategy

Policy ENV3 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Development Management Policies (DMP)

Policy DM10 – Achieving Quality of Place

Emerging Copeland Local Plan 2021 – 2038 (ELP):

Cumberland Council are continuing the preparation and progression to adoption of the emerging Copeland Local Plan 2017-2038.



Cumberland Council

The emerging Copeland Local Plan 2017-2038 comprising the Publication Draft (January 2022) and Addendum (July 2022) have recently been examined by the Planning Inspector and their report on the soundness of the plan currently remains awaited.

As set out at Paragraph 48 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Local Planning Authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to the stage of preparation of the emerging plan; the extent to which objections to relevant policies have been resolved; and the degree to which emerging policies are consistent with the NPPF.

Given the stage of preparation of the emerging Copeland Local Plan 2017-2038 some weight can be attached to policies where no objections have been received or objections have been resolved. The Publication Draft (January 2022) and Addendum (July 2022) 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 NPPF.

Strategic Policy DS1PU: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development

Strategic Policy N1PU: Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Other Material Planning Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework (2023)

The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)

The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (CHSR).

Assessment

Demolition is classed as permitted development under Schedule 2 Part 11 Class B of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. This order sets out certain conditions for the prior approval of demolition, which requires the submission of a method of demolition and details of the proposed restoration of the site.

Under this schedule, the applicant is only required to give prior notification of the demolition. This does not permit the Local Planning Authority to object to the removal of the buildings but does ensure that the method of demolition is satisfactory and the site is restored appropriately. The submitted details for this application are considered adequate for the purpose of this prior notification application.

Method of Demolition

A demolition method statement has been submitted to support this application. The statement provides details of the site set up, the removal of debris, asbestos removal, the method of demolition, site finishes, and removal of materials from the site. The measures are appropriate and proportionate to the scale and location of the proposed demolition.

Proposed Restoration of the Application Site

It is proposed to demolish to foundation level and will be left tidy in appearance and secured

by way of existing boundary treatment.

The proposed finish is acceptable given the location of the application site.

Concerns have been raised with regard to the loss of the buildings at this site, in particular the main farmhouse. The submitted documentation for this application confirm that the site will be redeveloped to incorporate a replacement residential dwelling and two modern agricultural buildings. This will be subject to separate planning applications. The submitted documents also confirm that the applicant will endeavour to retain the boundary wall of the property and utilise and recycle materials associated with the property where possible within the redevelopment of the site, which were concerns raised by statutory consultees and the public.

Ecology

All bat species are designated and protected as European protected species (EPS). EPS are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (CHSR). Regulation 9(1) states that a competent authority must exercise the functions which are relevant to nature conservation, so as to secure compliance with the requirements of the Habitats Directive.

This application is supported by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal which concluded that House and Stone Barn were of high suitability for roosting bats while the Outbuilding, Piggery and the sole tree were of moderate suitability. Three nocturnal presence/absence (dusk 'emergence' and dawn 'return to roost') surveys of the high are required to evaluate if bats are entering/exiting the buildings at dawn/dusk, in addition to identifying bat species and numbers/type of roosts (if present). A minimum of two nocturnal surveys of the moderate suitability buildings are required. Detailed inspection (via tree climbing) of the moderate suitability tree, potentially followed by nocturnal surveys are required. No further survey work is necessary in relation to the Sheep Shed or Dutch Barn are required.

This application is therefore also supported by an Ecological Constraints Study which concludes and recommends the following:

- There are five statutorily designated sites and six non-statutorily designated sites within 2km of the site. Considering the nature of the proposed works, no effects to designated sites are predicted, assuming all works strictly follow pollution prevention best practice.
- None of the habitats identified on-site were considered to be of significant ecological value and are not considered to represent a constraint to the proposed works.
- Retained trees on/near site should be protected in line with BS 5837:20127 .
- Where vegetation clearance is required, vegetation should be reinstated on at least a like-for-like basis.
- Standard pollution control measures should be implemented during construction to



**Cumberland
Council**

protect all habitats.

- No evidence of roosting bats was identified within the house, piggery, outbuilding, sheep shed and dutch barn during the surveys and bat activity in the general area was relatively low. No further survey work is considered necessary prior to demolition works.
- In the apparently unlikely event that bats are encountered during the works to these buildings, all works must cease and the advice of a Suitably Qualified Ecologist (SQE) obtained.
- In the stone barn one roost access point has been found but the specific roost site has could not be determined.
- The proposed works will result in the loss of the roost.
- The confirmation of a roosting bat within Barn 2 means that a licence from Natural England will be required to enable the proposed works to proceed lawfully. Given the identified roost is of low conservation status, the site can be registered under the Bat Mitigation Class Licence (BMCL) scheme through a Registered Consultant (RC). Following submission of appropriate forms, the application takes up to ten working days to be assessed by Natural England.
- Any works that could destroy/modify a bat roost/access point or disturb 10 roosting bat/s will require a Natural England licence to enable the works to be completed legally.
- There are no restrictions with regards to when (e.g. certain months of the year) works can take place, although it would be best practice to avoid low winter temperatures when bats may be in torpor (pipistrelles can use the same roosts year-round).
- To inform the BMCL application surveys must have been completed during the most recent bat active season. Consequently, if works do not occur before May 2024 at least one update survey will be required.
- Prior to demolition, when safe access to the interior is achievable, survey of the interior will be needed to try and ascertain the roost location.
- Works in the area of the roost will need to be supervised by an RC (or accredited agent). Prior to works commencing, the RC would provide a 'toolbox talk' to those contractors on site in which details of e.g. best working practices and what to do in the event of discovering a bat would be discussed.
- During supervised works to the area of the roost the RC would capture any bats that do not fly away and move them to a temporary bat box (erected on a nearby tree/structure prior to works commencing).
- Although there is no requirement for any compensatory roosting features to be installed under the BMCL scheme (favourable conservation status is maintained

without any compensation), it is recommended that two Schwegler 2F11 bat boxes with double front panels are installed on trees around the periphery of the site.

- No Badger setts were present within the site or adjacent accessible areas. Nevertheless, the occasional presence of foraging Badgers is considered possible; it would therefore be prudent to consider Badgers during renovation works, including covering trenches and capping of open pipes.
- If possible, any vegetation clearance/building works should be completed outside the nesting bird season (1 March to 31 August).
- If any protected species are encountered during the works, all works in the vicinity should stop immediately and a SQE contacted for advice on how to proceed.

The report also sets out opportunities for enhancements for the site which include the following:

- The creation of habitat areas through landscape planting using native, locally sourced plants/trees.
- The planting of native fruiting species to provide a food source for invertebrates, birds and mammals.
- The installation of bird and bat boxes on retained tree/s. S41 priority species such as the House Sparrow (which were noted in the area) and Barn Owl *Tyto alba* could potentially benefit from the provision of appropriate boxes.
- Pond creation.

The mitigation and enhancement measures set out within the Ecological Constraints Study will be secured as part of any decision notice for this application.

In accordance with the CHSR, it is necessary to consider the likelihood of a license being granted by Natural England and in doing so engage with the three derogation tests. The rigour and stringency with which the tests are applied increase with the importance and significance of the roost.

Is the proposed development necessary for imperative reasons of overriding public interest?

The proposed works are a permitted development. For these reasons it is considered that the test is passed.

Is there a satisfactory alternative?

Given the low conservation significance of the building as a bat roosting site, the level of consideration of alternatives should be correspondingly low. It is unlikely that the development could proceed in such a way as to avoid the licensable activities.



Cumberland Council

	<p>In conclusion there is no satisfactory alternative.</p> <p><i>Will the favourable conservation status of the species be maintained within its natural range?</i></p> <p>Taking into account the use of the site by bats, together with the potential mitigation and compensation measure to be secured as part of the licencing application the favourable conservation status of the species will be maintained within its natural range.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the three tests are met and a licence would be likely to be granted by Natural England.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>The Planning Legislation only allows the consideration of the proposed method of demolition and also the restoration of the site after demolition. Whilst the other comments raised as part of the consultation process are noted, these fall outside the remit of what can be considered by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The method of demolition and proposed restoration of the application site as submitted are appropriate. The proposed scheme of mitigation in relation to the presence of bats and other protected species is acceptable.</p> <p>It is recommended that prior approval is required and be approved subject to the imposition of planning conditions securing completion of the works in accordance with the submitted details and specifications.</p>
8.	<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Prior notification required and approved.</p>
9.	<p>Conditions:</p> <p><u>Standard Conditions:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The demolition/works must be carried out within a period of 5 years from the date of this decision. <p>Reason</p> <p>To comply with the requirements of Part 11 Class B.2 (b) (ix) (aa) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).</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 shall be carried out in accordance with them:-

- Application Form (Amended), received by the Local Planning Authority on the 8th January 2024.
- Covering Letter, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 8th January 2024.
- Location Plan, Scale 1:1250, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 8th January 2024.
- Statement of display of site notice, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 8th January 2024.
- Demolition Method Statement, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 8th January 2024.
- Visual Structural Inspection of New House Farm Piggery, Prepared by WDS Ltd March 2021, Reference: WDS/05/6942/REP04, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 8th January 2024.
- Visual Structural Inspection of New House Farm House, Prepared by WDS Ltd March 2021, Reference: WDS/05/6942/REP01, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 8th January 2024.
- Structural Inspection, Dutch Barn, New House Farm, Prepared by WDS Ltd April 2021, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 8th January 2024.
- Visual Structural Inspection of New House Farm Outbuilding, Prepared by WDS Ltd March 2021, Reference: WDS/05/6942/REP03, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 8th January 2024.
- Structural Inspection, Cattle Shed, New House Farm, Prepared by WDS Ltd April 2021, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 8th January 2024.
- Visual Structural Inspection of New House Farm Hay Barn & Byre, Prepared by WDS Ltd March 2021, Reference: WDS/05/6942/REP02, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 27th October 2023.
- Ecological Constraints Study, Prepared by BiOME Consulting June 2023, Version 2, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 8th January 2024.
- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, Prepared by BiOME Consulting May 2021, Version 2, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 8th January 2024.

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.



Cumberland Council

Pre Commencement Conditions:

3. The highway and all drains must be protected at the access and within the development site (possible culvert) prior to the development commencing in accordance with details which must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works to protect the drains must be carried out in accordance with a specification approved by the Local Planning Authority and retained as such thereafter.

Reason

In the interests of highway safety and environmental protection.

4. The demolition/development hereby approved must not commence until a Construction Traffic Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CTMP must include details of:
 - retained areas for vehicle parking, manoeuvring, loading and unloading for their specific purpose during the demolition/development;
 - cleaning of site entrances and the adjacent public highway;
 - details of proposed wheel washing facilities;
 - the sheeting of all HGVs taking spoil to/from the site to prevent spillage or deposit of any materials on the highway;
 - construction vehicle routing;
 - the management of junctions to and crossings of the public highway and other public rights of way/footway;
 - surface water management details during the demolition/construction phase;
 - verge protection on narrow roads;

Reason

To ensure the undertaking of the development does not adversely impact upon the fabric or operation of the local highway network and in the interests of highway and pedestrian safety.

Other Conditions:

5. Demolition must be carried out in strict accordance with the approved document

	<p>'Demolition Method Statement, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 8th January 2024'.</p> <p>Reason</p> <p>To ensure a satisfactory standard of demolition.</p> <p>6. Demolition must be carried out in strict accordance with and implement all of the mitigation and compensation/enhancement measures set out in the following approved documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Ecological Constraints Study, Prepared by BiOME Consulting June 2023, Version 2, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 8th January 2024.- Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, Prepared by BiOME Consulting May 2021, Version 2, received by the Local Planning Authority on the 8th January 2024. <p>Reasons</p> <p>To protect the ecological interests evident on the site.</p> <p>Informatives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. During construction if any bats or evidence of bats is found within this structure the application should contact the National Bat Helpline on 0345 1300 2288 for advice on how to do works lawfully.2. During works if any evidence of ground contamination is encountered the works should be stopped and further ground investigations carried out. The applicant is advised to contact the Council's Environmental Health Team should evidence be encountered.	
Case Officer: C. Burns		Date : 02.02.2024
Authorising Officer: N.J. Hayhurst		Date : 02.02.2024
Dedicated responses to:-		