
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

by **S J Papworth DipArch(Glos) RIBA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20 February 2017

Appeal A: APP/D3830/W/16/3163344

The Priory, Syresham Gardens, Haywards Heath, West Sussex RH16 3LB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Lunar Office Sarl against the decision of Mid Sussex District Council.
 - The application Ref DM/15/3508, dated 21 August 2015, was refused by the Council by notice dated 5 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is conversion of former convent building (B1 and D1 use) and part of former Chapel (A3 use) to 41 residential units (17x1 bed, 17x2 bed and 7x3 bed flats) together with associated internal and external alterations. Construction of one new build residential block for 12 residential units (5x1 bed and 7x2 bed flats). Creation of new access to Syresham Gardens, reconfiguration of on-site car parking, provision of cycle parking and new hard and soft landscaping works.
-

Appeal B: APP/D3830/Y/16/3163352

The Priory, Syresham Gardens, Haywards Heath, West Sussex RH16 3LB

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Lunar Office Sarl against the decision of Mid Sussex District Council.
 - The application Ref DM/15/3515, dated 21 August 2015, was refused by the Council by notice dated 5 August 2016.
 - The works proposed are conversion of former convent building (B1 and D1 use) and part of former Chapel (A3 use) to 41 residential units (17x1 bed, 17x2 bed and 7x3 bed flats) together with associated internal and external alterations. Construction of one new build residential block for 12 residential units (5x1 bed and 7x2 bed flats). Creation of new access to Syresham Gardens, reconfiguration of on-site car parking, provision of cycle parking and new hard and soft landscaping works.
-

Decision Appeal A

1. I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for conversion of former convent building (B1 and D1 use) and part of former Chapel (A3 use) to 41 residential units (17x1 bed, 17x2 bed and 7x3 bed flats) together with associated internal and external alterations. Construction of one new build residential block for 12 residential units (5x1 bed and 7x2 bed flats). Creation of new access to Syresham Gardens, reconfiguration of on-site car parking, provision of cycle parking and new hard and soft landscaping works at The Priory, Syresham Gardens, Haywards Heath, West Sussex RH16 3LB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DM/15/3508, dated 21 August 2015, subject to conditions 1) to 14) on the attached schedule.
-

Decision Appeal B

2. I allow the appeal and grant listed building consent for conversion of former convent building (B1 and D1 use) and part of former Chapel (A3 use) to 41 residential units (17x1 bed, 17x2 bed and 7x3 bed flats) together with associated internal and external alterations at The Priory, Syresham Gardens, Haywards Heath, West Sussex RH16 3LB in accordance with the terms of the application Ref DM/15/3515, dated 21 August 2015 and the plans submitted with it subject to conditions 1) and 2) on the attached schedule.

Main Issue

3. In both appeals this is the effect of the proposals on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and its setting, together with the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Preliminary Findings

4. The Council's reasons for refusal are specific in both cases to the effect of the new-build, described in the application as being the '*construction of one new build residential block for 12 residential units (5x1 bed and 7x2 bed flats)*' as set out in the bullet points above. In the listed building consent refusal notice substantial harm is alleged to the setting of the listed chapel, whilst in the planning permission refusal notice this is repeated, with a second reason alleging visual detriment to the character and appearance of the area.
5. As is also made clear in the application descriptions, carried forward into the refusal notices, the proposals include conversion works to form 41 units involving internal and external alterations. Whilst the refusal notice refers to the listed chapel, the whole of the building is listed by attachment, the Council's statement that '*the former convent chapel is Grade II listed, but the attached former convent accommodation is not of special interest*' accords with the listing description. The Council further state that '*the alterations to the convent accommodation do not affect fabric which is covered by the listing and raise no listed building issues*'. Certainly the convent is not described or given any significance in the listing description, but the fact remains that it is listed by attachment and shared a common use. It is clear that the listing was made at the time that the chapel was in restaurant, club and squash court use.
6. It appears on the information provided that although the objections in each case were to only the new-build block, and no objection is raised to either the internal works or the external alterations and works, the whole of both applications were refused, notwithstanding the option of the Council at least considering a split decision. That is a matter for the Council, but as a result, despite the specificity of the reasons for refusal, the whole of both applications is to be considered and determined at appeal. For that reason the site inspection included a tour of the building accompanied by the appellant's agent for security and safety reasons, but no discussion of the merits of the case occurred during that extensive inspection.
7. Having said that, it is the case that the new-build should not have been the subject of a listed building application or refusal notice. The new building would be within the curtilage of a listed building, but would not be attached to the listed building nor to any curtilage structures. As such, listed building

consent is not required, although clearly planning permission is. As a result, the listed building consent appeal is actually considering only works to which the Council raise no objection. Nevertheless, the statutory duties that will be referred to shortly remain for the decision taker.

8. The application site does not include the chapel as shown as blue-edged land on drawing 802_PR/000c. To be correct that drawing as submitted to the Planning Inspectorate should show the re-edged land surrounding that excluded area with the red line proceeding around the outside of the blue line, rather than along the road frontage. Nevertheless the extent of the site was clear, as was the extent of the works and development.

Policy

9. The statutory duties are in sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which require special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
10. Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, such as a listed building, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. The courts have determined that considerable importance and weight should be given to harm found to the significance of listed buildings. Paragraph 56 of the Framework states that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment; good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.
11. With regard to the development plan, Mid Sussex Local Plan Policy B1 seeks a high standard of design, construction and layout, and Policy B10 sets out detailed requirements with regard to the protection of listed buildings and their setting. Within built-up areas permission for residential development will be granted under Policy H3, subject to criteria which include efficient use of land and respect for the character and form of the area. The Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan was 'made' on 14 December 2016 and is now part of the development plan. Policy E9 requires that developers demonstrate how proposals would protect and reinforce local character, including having regard to the height, scale, spacing, layout, orientation, design and materials of buildings.
12. There are emerging policies in the Pre-Submission Draft District Plan, DP24A and DP32 concern making efficient use of land and the protection of listed buildings and their setting, which appear to share the same aims as those presently adopted.

Listed Building Consent

13. It is appropriate to consider first those matters that are properly the subject of the listed building consent regime. The main part of the works would involve the less significant parts of the convent buildings as they presently stand, altered already to an extent by uses subsequent to the original use as a convent. There are indications that fire precautions such as fire-check doors

had been added, and the use of cellular spaces as offices has resulted in some sub-division.

14. The proposed residential use would result in a degree of demolition, all separately annotated on drawings 32 to 36 which also show the extent of new internal walls. Drawings 41 to 45 show the proposed division of the floor plans into the various residential units and the remaining communal circulation areas. Some units are proposed to be 'duplex' with internal stairs to rooms on a second level and this arrangement accounts for the use of the narrow floor plan of the third floor, being the higher of two floors within the north-east and south-east ranges. The resulting elevations are shown on drawings 83 to 87 with a roof plan as drawing 40.
15. From observations at the site inspection and having regard to the remaining architectural or historic significance of the parts within the red-line site boundary, the proposals would be acceptable in their effect on the fabric and interest of the building and would retain the contribution it makes to the street-scene and the wider townscape, as a distinctive building in a prominent position. As a result of these findings and the fact that the new-build does not require listed building consent, such consent may now be granted for the remaining works subject to conditions which will be discussed later.

Setting, Character and Appearance

16. From the forgoing and having mind to the Council's approach, there is no reason either to withhold planning permission for the change of use of the site, or for the physical changes to the convent building so far as they are covered by the planning permission regime. The contentious item is the new-build in the north corner.
17. That new-build would be placed on what is at present open car parking visible from Franklynn Road to the south alongside the convent building Block G, and its open nature is apparent from Syresham Gardens, Caxton Way and surrounding roads and buildings to the north and west. The building would not be visible at all from the east along Franklynn Road due to the roadside convent building.
18. The character and appearance of the area is mixed, but the red-brick convent building and its roof-scape are dominant features in an otherwise suburban, low-density area of houses and flats, with more commercial development on the main road and towards the town centre. The chapel and its forward projection to the roadside are however of greater significance architecturally and in the contribution to townscape, as well as historically, being evidence of a previous use.
19. The Glossary of the Framework defines setting as '*the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.*'
20. The setting of that chapel extends over the main road and approaches along it from some way along the shopping street, and some way on the hill from the hospital, as well as from the car park opposite to the south. It is here that the main architectural detailing and the southern projection, as well as the roof and

its octagonal cupola and weathervane, are significant elements of the street-scene. The setting extends also over the courtyard as the centre of convent life. To the north-west of the chapel the purity of form is diluted by the attached and lower, more domestic-styled building, annotated Block G and bearing the name 'Franklynn Cosmetic Laser Centre', and to the north of the courtyard the visually isolated Block A cuts-off the view of the chapel from the north and interposes a more utilitarian form and plain unadorned roof.

21. With regard to Block A, it appears from information provided that this was connected for a considerable period of the convent's use to the school buildings that occupied land to the north, so that the open views of the listed building now have only been in place since demolition of that school. However it is acknowledged that the listing dates from 1987, after demolition, but these facts add weight to the lack of significance attaching to Block A.
22. The proposed new-build would be placed in the north corner, parallel with the Syresham Gardens frontage, turning at the right-angled north corner to run parallel with the boundary fence to the private grounds of the flats on Caxton Way. There would be an archway part-way along the Syresham Gardens range to form a relocated vehicle entry to the remaining area of car park behind. The building would be flat-roofed with a panel system to recessed parts and to the second floor. It is the fact that the building would not copy architectural features of either the convent or the nearby residential development. The latter comprises unremarkable two storey pitched roof houses or three storey flats with a top-heavy tile treatment of the top floor under a flat roof. To copy either building type would risk diluting the presence and significance of the convent. The situation calls for a design and use of materials that does not apologise for its presence. Being of a different design, the proximity to the bland Block A causes no harm to the appreciation of that part of the building.
23. The new-build would obscure some views of the chapel walls due to the falling level of Syresham Gardens to the north-west, but much of this is already compromised or its effect lessened by the unattractive Block A. As the viewer moves round onto Caxton Way the effect of the new-build on the setting of the chapel is only as another building in the same view, and having limited effect on the appreciation of its qualities, less so than the present framing by the two modern flats. In views from Franklynn Road and the car park to the south, the chapel would remain the dominant feature, with the new-build being seen only as a recessive form to the rear. The overall effect on the setting of the listed chapel, or the convent as a whole, would be limited and mostly benign.
24. The council identify 'substantial harm', but that is generally acknowledged in such as the web-based Planning Practice Guidance to be a high test that may not arise in many cases (Paragraph: 017 Reference ID: 18a-017-20140306). In this case there is limited harm to the significance of the listed building through the limited adverse effect of the new-build on only a limited extent of a less important part of the chapel's setting. The level of harm is 'less than substantial', a differentiation required between paragraphs 133 and 134 of the Framework. In this case the latter applies and this states that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.
25. Turning to the effect on the character and appearance of the street-scene, the block would be placed forward on the site, a situation that is not common in

the immediate area, where the houses sit behind short gardens and the flats sit in a landscaped green space, but such a situation does however appear nearer the town centre at the roundabout. But, the buildings already on the appeal site are significantly different in scale, architectural treatment, use of materials and layout than that which surrounds it, and the forward placement relative to Syresham Gardens would balance the tall but set-back presence of the north-east range.

26. The Council have referred to a previous application for new-build, Ref; HH/04/01004/FUL, which was refused and a subsequent appeal dismissed for the development of 14 apartments within the car park. A quotation from the Inspector's summing-up is provided; "*..in terms of the contextual relationship with both the surrounding housing development and the town centre, the proposal would neither preserve nor enhance the setting of The Priory complex or satisfy the requirements of policy CH9 and policy B10. Rather, it would result in a marked deterioration in local environmental quality. This would, I consider, be seriously damaging to the town and to the setting of The Priory complex as whole.*" No further information is provided on which to judge the similarities or otherwise, and the situation pertaining at the present will likely be different, and will be weighed in the planning balance later. It is of note however that the Inspector spoke of the effect on '*The Priory complex as a whole*' whereas it is accepted within the listing that the '*attached former convent accommodation, now offices, not of special interest*' and the present concern is the chapel.
27. In conclusion, the erection of a new building where there is, since the demolition of the school buildings, no built form, will alter the character and appearance of the area and the appreciation of the listed building. However, on the first, the proposed limited footprint, height and detailing of the proposal would accord with Policies B1, H3 and E9 with regard to the quality of design and its effect on the surrounding townscape. On the second, the significance of the listed building and its setting is affected only at the lower end of the long '*less than substantial*' scale, a matter that will be addressed in the planning balance.

Other Considerations

28. The constituency Member of Parliament has passed on a letter from a local resident, expressing similar concerns to those of the Council, on the effect on the listed building and the street-scene. However, further concerns were expressed as to the level of car parking to be provided and the perceived risk of vehicles parking on the local roads. As pointed out by the appellant, the objection concerns later applications, DM/16/4357 and DM/16/4337, but it is appropriate to address them all the same.
29. Whilst it is the case that the car park would be reduced from its present size by the erection of the new-build, the Council do not object to the level of car parking. The new dwellings would be in a highly accessible location with regard to day-to-day needs such as shopping and employment, with ready access to transport, schools and healthcare. Were any displacement of cars to occur, and were that to lead to highway or environmental problems, the Council would be able to address those under other legislation.

Planning Balance

30. The first observation is that the Officer's Report casts significant doubt on the deliverability of the scheme. The District Valuer has advised that the scheme is not capable of supporting either affordable housing or infrastructure contributions. The conversion of listed buildings, and as stated the whole of the building is listed by attachment and previous use, can be onerous and expensive, and the resulting residential units can have a suppressed sales value compared with purpose-built accommodation. This strengthens the case for there being a new-build element but there is no argument that this is enabling development as defined by Historic England. The proposal is not contrary to the Development Plan so far as location is concerned.
31. The Council are unable to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land, as sought in paragraph 47 of the Framework, but the view of the Council that Policy H3 should not be considered out of date is concurred with in this case since the site is in a suitable location for housing, and the criteria concern the effect rather than the supply, with good design being a requirement of the Framework. Nevertheless, the need for housing in this location again strengthens the case for the new-build in addition to the conversion works as adding to the housing to be provided.
32. In particular, the balance required in paragraph 134 of the Framework where 'less than substantial' harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use, rests in favour of the new-build, but only as part of the complete scheme to bring the unused convent buildings back into use. It is accepted that the attached convent building is not of special interest in heritage terms, but it is a distinctive and attractive feature of the street-scene and town-scape and the appeal proposal is to retain and make use of it. The development of housing in the new-build in addition to the conversion would be a benefit in view of the supply situation, but would not be sufficient alone to outweigh the harm, particularly since it is the cause of the harm.
33. The planning balance, including that under paragraph 134 is therefore in favour of the grant of permission for the new build provided a mechanism can ensure that it is developed as part of the whole. That is to say, to ensure that the harm alone does not occur without the necessary benefit of bringing the convent buildings into residential use.
34. The parties were canvassed on their views regarding such a mechanism for securing this beneficial work. The Council put forward a condition as follows; *'No development shall commence in respect of the approved new build until such time as the conversion of the convent accommodation has been completed in accordance with the approved drawings and is available for occupation'*. This would have objectives similar to those referred to in section 7 of the Historic England guidance *'Enabling Development and the Conservation of Significant Places'*, which whilst not applicable to this case, looks at similar problems of ensuring that benefits weighed in the balance actually accrue, and not just the harm.
35. The appellant considered that too restrictive and to risk adversely affecting viability through not allowing any work on the new building to proceed, whereas certain below ground and services work might need to be tied-in with

that to the conversion. A condition requiring a phasing scheme to be submitted and approved was suggested instead.

36. Whilst leaving the details to be discussed between the Council and the Appellant, a phasing scheme would prevent the harm occurring without the certainty of the benefits accruing, but would allow the total scheme to be developed in a cost-effective way that delivers the housing in a timely manner. On that basis, the scheme as whole would accord with Government guidance on the supply of housing and the preservation of listed buildings, as well as the Development Plan policies and statutory tests previously detailed.

Conditions

37. The Council suggested conditions for both appeals, those for the listed building consent need only require the works to commence within three years and for reconstruction and making good to match the original materials. The planning conditions should require details of drainage, land de-contamination, a Construction Environmental Management Plan, materials, road accesses, and hard and soft landscaping to be submitted for approval. Such details are required to ensure the quality of the development. Specific requirements with regard to lighting, the acoustic performance of services and parking are necessary to safeguard the environment and neighbouring occupiers. Lastly a condition is required naming the drawings, because otherwise than as set out in this decision and conditions, it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as this provides certainty.

Conclusions

38. The conversion of the convent buildings to provide housing is acceptable and accords with Development Plan and national policies, as well as the statutory tests on works to listed buildings. The new-build block causes some limited harm to the setting of the chapel, but this is outweighed by the public benefits of the provision of housing and the re-use of the convent buildings, and this benefit is secured by condition. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should be allowed.

S J Papworth

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions Appeal A Planning Permission

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: demolition 802-32, 33a, 34a, 35a and 36. Proposed 802-HH-040e, 41, 42b, 43b, 44b, 45b, 83c, 84b, 85a, 86c, 87b, 88a and 89a.

- 3) No development shall take place until a programme of phasing for implementation of the whole development has been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall not proceed until details of the proposed foul water drainage and means of disposal have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and no building shall be occupied until all approved drainage works have been carried out in accordance with such details.
- 5) The development hereby permitted shall not proceed until details of the proposed surface water drainage and means of disposal have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and no building shall be occupied until all drainage works have been carried out in accordance with such details as approved by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include a timetable for its implementation and a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime. Maintenance and management during the lifetime of the development should be in accordance with the approved details.
- 6) Part 1. No development shall take place until an investigation and risk assessment has been completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The contents of the scheme are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The report of the findings must include:
 - a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;
 - an assessment of the potential risks to:
 - human health,
 - property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,
 - adjoining land,
 - groundwaters and surface waters,
 - ecological systems,
 - archaeological sites and ancient monuments;
 - an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11'.

Part 2. A detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human

health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment must be prepared, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

Part 3. The approved remediation scheme must be carried out in accordance with its terms prior to the commencement of development other than that required to carry out remediation, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Part 4. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of part 1, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of part 2, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with part 3.

- 7) Prior to the commencement of the development a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Construction Environmental Management Plan shall include amongst other matters details of:

hours of construction working;

measures to control noise affecting nearby residents;

wheel cleaning/chassis cleaning facilities;

dust control measures;

pollution incident control and site contact details in case of complaints.

The construction works shall thereafter be carried out at all times in accordance with the approved Construction Environmental Management Plan, unless any variations are otherwise first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

- 8) Prior to the installation of any external lighting on the site details of light intensity, spread and any shielding and times of use together with a report to demonstrate its effect on nearby residential properties are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. It is recommended that the information be provided in a format that

- demonstrates compliance on the ILP Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light. Only the approved lighting scheme shall be installed.
- 9) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, to install the hot water and heating systems in the plant room an acoustic assessment shall be undertaken to determine the impact of noise arising from the plant. The noise rating level (L_{Ar,Tr}) of these units shall be at least 10dB below the background noise level (L_{A90,T}) at the nearest residential facade. All measurements shall be defined and derived in accordance with BS4142: 2014. The results of the assessment and details of any mitigation measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures shall be implemented before the development is brought into use and thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved details.
 - 10) No development shall be carried out unless and until samples/a schedule of materials and finishes to be used for external walls/roofs/fenestration of the proposed new building have been submitted to and approved agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 11) The access from the site to the public highway shall be designed, laid out and constructed with kerb radii/visibility splays/and sight lines in all respects in accordance with plans and details to be submitted to and approved agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any other operation or use authorised by this permission is commenced, or otherwise in accordance with a programme that has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
 - 12) No dwelling hereby approved shall be occupied until the parking areas shown on the approved layout have been constructed and made available for use, unless first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The parking areas shall only be used for the parking of motor vehicles and for no other use.
 - 13) No development shall take place unless and until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority full details of both hard and soft landscaping, which shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, and details of those to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of development and these works shall be carried out as approved.
 - 14) Hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the programme agreed with the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Schedule of Conditions Appeal B Listed Building Consent

- 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.

- 2) Any reconstruction/making good of the building to complete the execution of the works for which consent is hereby granted shall be carried out as far as may be practicable with original materials. Any variation from the original materials must be with the written approval of the Local Planning Authority.