

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	25/00407/LBC	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Lee Osborne
<u>WARD:</u>	Whiston & Cronton	<u>PARISH:</u>	Cronton Parish Council
<u>LOCATION:</u>	Wayside, Pex Hill, Cronton		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	DEMOLITION OF GRADE 2 LISTED BUILDING, LINKED WITH PLANNING APPLICATION FOR ERECTION OF 1NO. TWO STOREY DWELLING ON SITE (25/00317)		

Site Description

The application relates to a substantial site on the west side of Pex Hill, Pex Hill being within the Green Belt and on the western edge of Hough Green.

The north end of the site is relatively flat where the Listed Building and access are and slopes down southwards. There is substantial vegetation within the site, particularly to the southern part of the site, extending into the former orchard area, which is not within the application site area but is part of the property grounds (edged blue on the location plan) and to the perimeter of site (in parts).

The carriageway is to the east of the site with an access road adjacent the northern boundary. At the northern end of Pex Hill, beyond the application site is Pex Hill Country Park, with Leighton Observatory being sited adjacent the north boundary of the country park. Housing extends slightly further north on the east side of Pex Hill than the western side, and then there is a couple of houses opposite the observatory with a field between. There is housing at the end of Pex Hill. The dwellings, mostly houses although there are a few bungalows, are detached for the most part although there are some semi-detached dwellings.

Wayside is a Grade II Listed Building (listed in 2012) within the site, a house formerly belonging to the Diocese. The building suffered an extensive fire in 2014 the significant damage caused by the fire has been further aggravated by additional fires and vandalism which has resulted in further and significant loss of fabric such that vestiges of walls are all that remain with little architectural or historical details remaining. To the west of the listed building structure and adjacent is a modern 'extension' of a contemporary style and materials.

Proposal

This application seeks listed building consent to demolish the remaining fire damaged elements of the Grade II listed building, Wayside. The listed building consent application is linked to a current planning application to demolish the remaining elements of the fire damaged listed building and to erect a two-storey house in the same vicinity to link into the existing extension.

Consultations

Historic England - No objections but request a recording condition.
Conservation & Design Officer - No objections in principle.

Joint Committee of the National Amenity Societies - Society for the Protection of Ancient Monuments have confirmed no objections subject to a recording condition.

Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings – No objections, request a building recording condition.

The Georgian Group - No comments received.

National Amenity Societies Historic Buildings & Places - No comments received.

Ancient Monuments Society – No comments received.

Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service - No objections, request a CEMP condition which includes RAMS, breeding bird advice, a lighting scheme submission condition and archaeological recording.

Merseyside Fire and Rescue Authority - No objections, informative given.

Cronton Parish Council - No comments received.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 44 neighbours. It has also been advertised by Site Notice and a Press Notice.

There has been 1 letter of support. The representations are summarised as follows:

- Why was the building was listed?
- The building is an eyesore and has been the subject of fires on several occasions.
- Youngsters are attracted to it, and an accident is waiting to happen.
- The application is supported, and it is hoped that it is demolished.

Relevant Planning History

16/00009/FUL - RE-FURBISHMENT OF EXISTING DWELLING FOLLOWING FIRE DAMAGE TO INCLUDE THE DEMOLITION OF A TIMBER PORCH & LEAN TO STORAGE UNIT TO REAR OF GARAGE AND THE ADDITION OF A TWO STOREY EXTENSION CONNECTED BY GLAZED LINK TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED BOUNDARY TREATMENTS & LANDSCAPING WORKS.
Granted: 03.05.2017.

16/00010/LBC - LISTED BUILDING CONSENT FOR THE RE-FURBISHMENT OF EXISTING DWELLING FOLLOWING FIRE DAMAGE TO INCLUDE THE DEMOLITION OF A TIMBER PORCH & LEAN TO STORAGE UNIT TO REAR OF GARAGE AND THE ADDITION OF A TWO STOREY EXTENSION CONNECTED BY GLAZED LINK TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED BOUNDARY TREATMENTS & LANDSCAPING WORKS. Granted: 03.05.2017.

16/00009/NMA - APPLICATION FOR A NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT FOLLOWING GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION 16/00009/FUL (REFURBISHMENT OF EXISTING DWELLING FOLLOWING FIRE DAMAGE TO INCLUDE THE DEMOLITION OF A TIMBER PORCH & LEAN TO STORAGE

UNIT TO REAR OF GARAGE AND THE ADDITION OF A TWO STOREY EXTENSION CONNECTED BY GLAZED LINK TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED BOUNDARY TREATMENTS & LANDSCAPING WORKS) TO ALLOW FOR AMENDMENT TO PROPOSED ELEVATION TREATMENTS. Granted: 10.09.2019.

25/00317/FUL - DEMOLITION OF GRADE 2 LISTED BUILDING AND ERECTION OF 1NO. TWO STOREY DWELLING. Ongoing.

Relevant Policy

National Planning Policy Framework: Chapter 16 – Conserving and enhancing the Historic Environment.

Para. 210 of the NPPF states in determining planning applications local planning authorities should take account of:

- a. The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b. The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c. The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Para. 212 states that when considering the impact of proposals on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be applied. This is irrespective of whether any harm is identified as being substantial, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Para. 213 states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- (a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
- (b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

Para. 214 states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
- b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
- c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
- d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

Para. 217 states that local planning authorities should not permit the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred.

Para. 218 states that local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportional to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.

Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that planning decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

Paragraph 12 of the NPPF clarifies that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan, permission should not normally be granted. Local planning authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed.

The development plan in Knowsley comprises the Saved Policies of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan, the Core Strategy Local Plan and the Joint Waste Local Plan. The following policies are relevant to the determination of this application.

KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN: CORE STRATEGY

CS2 - Development Principles

CS8 - Green Infrastructure

CS19 - Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development

CS20 - Managing the Borough's Historic Environment

SAVED POLICIES - KNOWSLEY REPLACEMENT UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN (ADOPTED JUNE 2006)

DQ7 – Listed Buildings

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating with the applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Assessment

This application is for Listed Building Consent and has been made in tandem with a full planning application (25/00317/FUL) which proposes the demolition of the

building and the erection of a two storey dwelling. The main issue with regards this listed building consent application whether any substantial public benefits outweigh the complete loss of the significance of the listed building against the special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Significance of the site

Wayside was listed for its special architectural and historic interest.

The listing identifies the building's significance as arising from:

- Surviving 16th-century timber framing, including daub panels, down-braces, ceiling timbers and a clasped-purlin queen-strut roof structure.
- Notable internal historic fabric, such as early chimney, winder staircase, and plank-and-batten doors with wrought-iron strap hinges.
- Legibility of its early form, illustrating the evolution from medieval open-hall houses to later chimney-heated domestic layouts.

The listing also notes that the building also holds significance due to:

- Approximately 500 years of historic development, showing successive phases of alteration from the 16th century through to the 20th century.
- Clear evidence of changing domestic practices, including the transition from smoke-bay heating to a later inserted chimney and subsequent adaptations in the 1930s and 1970s.

The building suffered an extensive fire in 2014 which caused damage to the historic and architectural fabric of the building. This damage has been further aggravated by several additional fires and vandalism which has resulted in substantial further loss of fabric to an extent that the remaining structure are vestiges of the walls. The building is now in a ruinous and structurally degraded condition, with the remaining fabric having lost the architectural and historic integrity for which the building was originally designated. The surviving elements no longer meaningfully illustrate the significance identified in the original listing description, and the building's evidential, aesthetic, and communal heritage values have been lost.

Historic England accepts and has confirmed that the significance of this listed building has been harmed as a result of events that have led to its current condition, and that the building has been like this for some time. Part of the current planning application proposal is for the demolition of the remaining elements of the fire damaged listed building, and to build a new house on the approximate site of the current listed building. The proposals will result in the total loss of the listed building.

The property was to have been refurbished in 2016 following the granting of planning permission and listed building consent for such was applied for and granted in 2016 for the refurbishment of the property following the fire. This consent was not implemented for various reasons and factors. The applicant began to implement the scheme, which is when the shell of the new part was constructed; however work then stopped due to rising costs, personal commitments, further deterioration of the structure etc. The architect / project manager at that time did not realise how bad the state of repair of the existing structure was. When stone masons, conservation specialists etc were approached to carry out works it was evident that the full structure was beyond saving as nearly all of the stone was spalled to the facing. Additionally the mortar was in worse condition than realised due to water ingress and every timber had been lost together with signs of structural movement. As such it was evident at that point that to progress with the scheme would have been in breach

of the planning issued as in effect the remaining structure required dismantling and rebuilding for safety reasons, and the dismantled material recording condition was unachievable due to structural collapse. The building has suffered further decay, vandalism and arson attacks since this time.

The fire attacks, vandalism and weather damage has resulted in the loss of internal features apart from one chimney stack and a beam, substantial loss and damage to the external envelope on all elevations, and the total loss of the roof structure. This is compounded by the fact that the soft sandstone walls element of the structure had been extensively repointed in cement prior to the listing. Therefore, all of the heritage values assigned to the building are considered to have been substantially harmed. The architectural interest resided in the building's level of survival which made it a good example of a C17 lobby-entry house of local vernacular character. The extent of surviving historic fabric, including most of the features of interest, have been considerably and significantly reduced, and the architectural merits have been severely compromised. Consequently, the building's legibility has been adversely affected. Whilst the main structural layout can still be interpreted from remaining structural elements, many internal walls and the whole of the first floor have been lost and the remaining walls are vestiges of the original. The C18 stair window remains but its significance is now limited, being an isolated surviving feature. The interest based on interior survival is no longer there due to the fire attacks, vandalism damage and structural collapse.

Consequently, whilst the building retains some heritage significance in the surviving masonry its significance is now considered to be low.

The Proposed Demolition

Policy CS2 states that development principles should include the protecting and enhancement of the historic environment. Policy CS20 states that development proposal should preserve and enhance the borough's historic and architectural assets including listed buildings. As such the Council will prevent demolition and/or development that would result in substantial harm or loss of a designated asset unless the proposal would result in substantial public benefits which clearly outweigh the loss. Where a proposal would result in less than substantial harm such harm should be assessed against the benefits of the proposal. Saved Policy DQ7 states that total or substantial demolition will not be granted unless every possible effort has been made to repair and secure the future of the building.

The proposal is for the total loss of the listed building. Due to its current ruinous condition, the significance of the building is considered to be low. Any harm to a heritage asset, regardless of condition and level of significance, however, needs to be justified. Wayside remains listed as grade II and therefore will be assessed as a designated heritage asset. Para. 213 of the NPPF states that the loss of grade II listed buildings should be exceptional. Therefore, the proposal would cause the total loss of significance of the building.

Where it is identified that harm will be caused, the decision maker (i.e. the local planning authority in this case) should be satisfied that this is supported by a clear and convincing justification. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision (para. 209). There is no evidence of deliberate neglect. The site has been subject of arson attacks, with fire service call out to site and the damage is related to these attacks, vandalism on site and resulting subsequent weathering from the elements.

In order to assess whether in this case there are exceptional circumstances which would allow the loss of this heritage asset, reference needs to be made to para 214 of the NPPF. It states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss. The submitted structural report is clear about the instability of substantial elements of the structure and there is a risk to the owners of the site, especially as there is an already constructed new build extension to the ruin. The listed building has been the subject of repeated arson attacks, vandalism and associated anti-social behaviour, but this does not per se justify its loss. The proposal would replace a ruinous dwelling by a new enlarged dwelling incorporating the existing habitable extension, with no additional housing unit created. Therefore, the public benefits of the proposal may not be considered as substantial in the context of this NPPF policy. The following criteria from the same paragraph should be examined instead, as the submitted Heritage Statement addressed.

Para 214 states that all of the following should apply:

a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site.

A review of the planning of the site indicates that the applicants have tried, unsuccessfully, to secure the asset's most viable use as a dwelling. Whilst the rest of the site can be further developed, the ruinous and unstable condition of the structure is undermining the safe use of the site as residential. The ruin is capable of being consolidated, but due to having only low heritage significance this option would result in very limited public benefits. This would also conflict with the site's existing and original use as residential and given the (ongoing) criminal history of the site, it would be unreasonable and undesirable to maintain the structure as a ruin.

The listed structure could be reinstated as a dwelling, but this would involve substantial and significant works which would be considered to be at the cost of most of the remaining heritage asset's significance. Indeed, the submitted structural report considers that most of the surviving masonry would need to be re-built and, in many cases, replaced. The extent of the rebuilding would also require the use of modern construction techniques and materials which would further dilute the significance of the heritage asset. An accurate restoration of the heritage asset, which would be limited to the elements that have been fully recorded at the time of listing, could be considered unreasonable as most of the building's original significance resided in the survival of its historic fabric, and reconstruction would only hold limited significance with low authenticity. Any resulting reconstruction would largely be a pastiche of the original building. There would only be very limited public benefits for the reconstruction of such a heritage asset.

b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation.

The site has been marketed through Adams estate agents, a leading independent estate agent in the area, with branches in Widnes, Runcorn and Stockton Heath and an expected outlet for sale of such a property sited on Pex Hill. The estate agents confirm that the site was first marketed from June 2017 through to April 2018, and later for 21 months from October 2022. The estate agents note two offers were made, one could not proceed as the person needed a sale and the other was withdrawn. Issues listed for lack of sale / lack of interest are stated as the uninhabitable and ruin state of the property; planning conditions unable to be met;

drugs paraphernalia and vandalism plainly evident at the property making the site location seem undesirable; the length of time the property was on the market off-putting; build costs and mortgage costs (in this part specialist contractor costs could be factored in). As such it is considered that the marketing through a leading estate agent for the area was appropriate, and did not generate any meaningful interest, with the estate agent citing these reasons for the lack of interests of what would have usually been a property of significant interest and demand potential.

The case office has previously had telephone conversations from persons interested in the site, but the interests was taken no further due to the remaining asset on site and that redevelopment with a new house was not on the cards at that point due to the previous refurbishment planning approval in place (16/00009/FUL), the conditions attached which were unable to be met (recording of materials and location unable to be undertaken due to structural collapse, fire damage and vandalism) together with the cost and unviability of those works. It is considered that allowing the asset remains to be demolished and a modern house built in this location would generate considerable and significant interest if it were on the market but that there would be no such interest with the asset remaining.

c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible.

Evidence has been provided in the Heritage Statement that there would be no obvious possibility nor interest for funding the conservation of the heritage asset. Additionally as noted above the potential for conserving the heritage asset and associated public benefits of doing so are also very limited.

d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

The site has remained vacant and in a deteriorating condition for a prolonged period, contributing negatively to the character of the area and offering no beneficial use. The redevelopment of the site for residential purposes would deliver public benefits, including the provision of new housing, regeneration of a derelict site, and associated economic and social benefits. Furthermore the site coming back into use as residential would curtail the arson and vandalism that has occurred for a number of years now. All 10 representations received support the application with among reasons stated that it would remove a derelict unsightly structure and replace with a house, and that the site has and does experience significant anti-social behaviour issues and been the subject of fire attacks which would not occur with a house built on the site and the site becoming a residence. These factors weigh in favour of the proposal. On balance, while the harm to the heritage asset is significant, it is considered that the public benefits arising from bringing the site back into active use are sufficient to outweigh this harm, in accordance with paras 210, 212 and 213 of the NPPF.

Local planning authorities should not permit the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred (para. 217). This can be achieved through a contract condition requiring details of a contract for redevelopment of the site (relating to current planning application 25/00317/FUL and the proposed redevelopment proposals therein) once demolition has occurred, and the development only carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Local planning authorities should require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part)

in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted (para. 218). Building recording prior to any demolition works occurring in accordance with Heritage England advice can be a requirement through condition of any demolition approval. This concurs with Heritage England comments. Thus the requirements of para 218 can be met.

Historic England has no objection to the application on heritage grounds, with the provision that the requirements of paragraphs 214, 217, 218 of the NPPF are met (and taken in conjunction with planning application 25/00317/FUL for redevelopment of the site).

The groundworks related to the proposed new build have the potential to encounter below-ground archaeological remains related to the Listed Building including artefact assemblages which could contribute to the archaeological resource. As such the Council's archaeological consultant advises that a programme of archaeological monitoring and recording (watching brief) to be undertaken during any development works.

Taking the above into account and that Heritage England (HE) have no objections in principle to the proposal in principle it is considered that the loss of the remains of the listed building heritage asset house and the redevelopment of the site with a new house would be acceptable in this instance provided suitable records were made.

The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings have also confirmed that they have no objections to the LBC application or to the planning application. As HE have no objections to the demolition, and none of the Six Societies have objected the application does not need to be referred to the Secretary of State. As such it is considered that the proposal is acceptable provided suitable building recording is undertaken as required by condition, and that redevelopment occurs as required by a demolition and redevelopment condition, an accordingly the application would accord with the NPPF.

Policy CS2 states that development principles should include the protecting and enhancement of the historic environment. Policy CS20 states that development proposal should preserve and enhance the borough's historic and architectural assets including listed buildings. As such the Council will prevent demolition and/or development that would result in substantial harm or loss of a designated asset unless the proposal would result in substantial public benefits which clearly outweigh the loss. Where a proposal would result in less than substantial harm such harm should be assessed against the benefits of the proposal. Saved Policy DQ7 states that total or substantial demolition will not be granted unless every possible effort has been made to repair and secure the future of the building.

As identified above the state of the building means that the previous application approval conditions cannot be adhered to, and the development would not be undertaken even if they could be due to the state of the building. The building has lost nearly all the architecture and history that warranted listing and the site would continue to deteriorate if the current proposal were not allowed as evidenced by the lack of interest in the site. The redevelopment of the site is supported by all those residents who wrote in with regards the planning application, and demolition of the listed building by the resident who wrote in supporting the listed building consent. Both HE and Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings do not object to the demolition (if recording of the remains of the building is undertaken beforehand) due

to the lack now of historic or architectural merit, and that the property would not lead to any interests with regards the redevelopment of the listed building due to the ruinous state of the property. It should also be noted that due to the remaining vestiges instability they would need to be taken down and rebuilt (possibly using new materials) and this, together with the fire damage, vandalism and structural collapse of most of the building would mean that any resulting building would in effect be a pastiche of the original building. As such it is considered that the proposed demolition does not conflict with Policies CS2 and CS20 or with Saved Policy DQ7.

Given that the decision is based upon the public benefits of a new residential unit being delivered, it is reasonable to require the applicant to enter into a contract with for the redevelopment of the site to implement planning permission 25/00317/FUL. This is in accordance with the provisions of S17 (3) of the Planning (Listed Building & Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Conclusion

In line with Officer's statutory duty, considerable importance and weight has been given to the harm arising from the proposal. It is found that the heritage significance of the listed building due to extensive fire damage from arson attacks, significant vandalism of the site and resulting weathering and stability issues arising as a result is considered to be low. Due to the low existing heritage significance of the listed building and inability to comply with previous conditions development as previously identified, and that there is unlikely to be any interests in the property as it is with the building ruins on site an inability to comply with conditions and unviability of rebuilding (and the resulting pastiche as a result) balanced against the greater public interest of the remains of a listed building which has lost most of the reasons for listing and redevelopment of the site in tandem with planning application 25/00317/FUL the demolition of a listed building and which Heritage England has no objections to in this instance is considered acceptable.

In accordance with paragraph 215 of the NPPF, the harm has been weighed against the public benefits of demolition and redevelopment (in tandem with planning application 25/00317/FUL). Officers acknowledge that there would be substantial benefits to demolition of the asset and redevelopment of the site and bringing it back into residential use and which at present would generate little or no interest to do so and so in this instance is considered sufficient to outweigh the harm that has been identified.

Given the above, it is concluded that, on balance, subject to conditions, the proposed demolition is robustly justified and would satisfy the requirements of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended), the NPPF and local planning policies.

Recommendation

That Listed Building Consent is granted subject to the following conditions: -

- 1) The works must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents listed in Schedule 1.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

- 3) The demolition of the listed building shall not take place until the Local Planning Authority has approved in writing:

(i) a certified copy of the executed redevelopment contract for the complete redevelopment of the site. The contract must include the scope of works, programme, and obligations necessary to secure the comprehensive redevelopment of the site and the Principal Contractor must be identified. Contracts limited solely to enabling works, site clearance, or investigations shall not satisfy this condition; and

(ii) evidence that funding required to deliver the redevelopment is in place, such as a lender's confirmation, funding agreement, or equivalent legally binding financial guarantee.

Following demolition the approved redevelopment shall be commenced within 6 months of the date of demolition, or as otherwise agreed by virtue of the timescale being within the contract of the carrying out of redevelopment works required to be submitted and agreed in writing pursuant to this condition, and thereafter such redevelopment works carried out only in accordance with planning permission 25/00317/FUL.

Reason: To ensure that demolition of the listed building structure is only undertaken where the approved redevelopment of the site is secured and implemented, in the interests of safeguarding the historic environment and visual amenity of the area in accordance with Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4) Prior to the commencement of any demolition, dismantling, or other works that would affect the fabric of the listed building structure, a programme of building recording must be carried out by a suitably qualified heritage specialist in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) previously submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The WSI must include:

- The level of recording to be undertaken (usually Historic England Level 1-4).
- Methodology for survey, photography and written description.
- Timetable for the recording work.
- Details of archive deposition in an appropriate local Historic Environment Record.

No demolition or other works to the listed building structure shall take place until the Local Planning Authority has confirmed in writing that the requirements of the WSI have been met. A copy of the completed building structure record shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority to be approved in writing and a copy deposited in the local Historic Environment Record before demolition commences.

Reason: To secure an appropriate level of historic building recording prior to the loss of any remaining significance arising from demolition in accordance with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, NPPF para. 208-210 and Saved Policies CS2 and CS20 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016.

- 5) The applicant or their agents should secure the implementation and submission of a report on a programme of archaeological monitoring and recording (watching brief) to be undertaken during any development works including demolition/dismantling. That programme of archaeological works should be undertaken in accordance with a Project Design which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any works including demolition taking place. The Project Design must include the following five steps:

- A phased programme and methodology of site investigation and recording.
- A programme for post-investigation reporting to include production of a final report of the significance of the below-ground archaeological interest.
- Provision for appropriate publication and dissemination of the archaeology and history of the site.
- Provision for archive deposition of the report, finds and records of the site investigation.
- Nomination of a competent person or persons / organisation to undertake the works set out within the approved Project Design.

Reason: To secure an appropriate level of archaeological recording prior to the erection of the building hereby permitted in accordance with NPPF para. 208 and Saved Policies CS2 and CS20 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
02/07/2025	19-AC-3748A	-	STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS REPORT - ADDENDUM REPORT
02/07/2025	9137-ADS-XX-XX-RP-S-001	-	STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS REPORT
02/07/2025	-	-	THE LOCATION PLAN
02/07/2025	WAY-002	-	EXISTING PLANS AND ELEVATIONS
02/07/2025	WAY-004	-	EXISTING SITE PLAN

Signed Case Officer¹: Lee Osborne

¹ I confirm that I do not have a personal relationship with the applicant, agent or other interested parties; I also confirm that I do not have a financial interest in the site or the development proposed

**Signed Authorising
Officer²:**

Jo Sheridan

Date:

19/12/2025

Informatives

- 1 The proposed development lies within a coal mining area which may contain unrecorded coal mining related hazards. If any coal mining feature is encountered during development, this should be reported immediately to the Mining Remediation Authority on 0345 762 6846 or if a hazard is encountered on site call the emergency line 0800 288 4242.

Further information is also available on the Mining Remediation Authority website at: Mining Remediation Authority - GOV.UK

Standing Advice valid from 1st January 2025 until 31st December 2026

- 2 Merseyside Fire Authority

² I confirm that I do not have a personal relationship with the applicant, agent or other interested parties; I also confirm that I do not have a financial interest in the site or the development proposed

