



North Tyneside Council

Planning Committee

4 March 2022

To be held on **Tuesday, 15 March 2022** in room Room 0.02, Quadrant, The Silverlink North, Cobalt Business Park, NE27 0BY **commencing at 10.00 am.**

Agenda Item	Page
<p>1. Apologies for absence</p> <p>To receive apologies for absence from the meeting.</p>	
<p>2. Appointment of substitutes</p> <p>To be informed of the appointment of any substitute members for the meeting.</p>	
<p>3. Declarations of Interest</p> <p>You are invited to declare any registerable and/or non-registerable interests in matters appearing on the agenda, and the nature of that interest.</p> <p>You are also requested to complete the Declarations of Interests card available at the meeting and return it to the Democratic Services Officer before leaving the meeting.</p> <p>You are also invited to disclose any dispensation from the requirement to declare any registerable and/or non-registerable interests that have been granted to you in respect of any matters appearing on the agenda.</p>	
<p>4. Minutes</p> <p>To confirm the minutes of the previous meeting held on 15 February 2022.</p>	5 - 10

Members of the public are welcome to attend this meeting and receive information about it.

North Tyneside Council wants to make it easier for you to get hold of the information you need. We are able to provide our documents in alternative formats including Braille, audiotape, large print and alternative languages.

For further information please call 0191 643 5359.

Agenda Item	Page
5. Planning Officer Reports	11 - 16
To receive the attached guidance to members in determining planning applications and to give consideration to the planning applications listed in the following agenda items.	
6. 21/01271/FUL, St Johns Church, Killingworth	17 - 70
To determine a full planning application from St Johns Church for an extension to provide new accessible entrance and toilets.	

Circulation overleaf ...

Members of the Planning Committee:

Councillor Ken Barrie
Councillor Julie Cruddas
Councillor Margaret Hall
Councillor Chris Johnston
Councillor John O'Shea
Councillor Willie Samuel (Chair)

Councillor Trish Brady (Deputy Chair)
Councillor Muriel Green
Councillor John Hunter
Councillor Frank Lott
Councillor Paul Richardson

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee

Tuesday, 15 February 2022

Present: Councillor W Samuel (Chair)
Councillors K Barrie, T Brady, M Green, M Hall,
C Johnston, F Lott, J O'Shea and P Richardson

Apologies: Councillors J Cruddas

PQ65/21 Appointment of substitutes

There were no substitute members appointed.

PQ66/21 Declarations of Interest

Councillor M Hall declared a non-registerable personal interest in relation to planning application 21/00920/FUL, Land at Former Tynemouth Victoria Jubilee Infirmary, Hawkeys Lane, North Shields because her daughter is a partner at the Collingwood Surgery, Hawkeys Lane which is adjacent to the site and she also declared a registerable personal interest in relation to the same item because she is a Director of Rising Sun Farm Trading Co. Ltd.

PQ67/21 Minutes

Resolved that the minutes of the meeting held on 18 January 2022 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

PQ68/21 Planning Officer Reports

The Committee received guidance in relation to the principles of decision making when determining planning applications and then gave consideration to the planning applications listed in the following minutes.

PQ69/21 21/01891/FUL, Land at former Coleman N E Ltd Site, Walker Place, North Shields

The Committee considered a report from the planning officers in relation to a full planning application from P North Developments Limited for the variation of condition 1 (approved plans) of planning approval 17/00835/FUL, revised elevation details to house types, revised ridge heights, addition of basements to plots 12 and 13 and a retaining wall.

A planning officer presented details of the application with the aid of various maps, plans and photographs.

In accordance with the Committee's Speaking Rights Scheme Samantha Curtis of Curtis Planning and Development Surveyors, had been granted permission to speak to the Committee on behalf of residents living in Renaissance Point, North Shields. She stated that whilst the residents had no objections to the principle of the development they believed that the proposed alterations to the design of plot 3 would have a detrimental impact on privacy, amenity and on the conservation area because of:

- a) the larger windows to be installed on the southern and western elevations overlooking neighbouring properties in Renaissance Point and the Irvin Building;
- b) the increase in height of the development; and
- c) the increased area of black cladding which would be overbearing and inappropriate in the conservation area.

She stated that the proposals did not accord with Policy S1.4 of the Council's Local Plan and she asked that the Committee either to refuse the application or defer consideration to enable the applicant to submit a revised plan.

Stephanie Linnel of George F White LLP addressed the Committee to respond to the speakers' comments on behalf of the applicants. She described the history of the site and the challenges faced by the applicant in progressing the development. She explained that the proposed materials were in keeping with the area, the changes in the height of the development would allow for the homes to be accessible for those with disabilities, the windows on the western elevation overlooking Renaissance Point would not be habitable rooms and would be obscure glazed and the additional cladding would align with the remainder of the development. She stated that the proposed amendments would deliver a high quality development without any harm to the conservation area and there had been no objections from any statutory consultees.

Members of the Committee asked questions of the speakers and officers and made comments. In doing so the Committee gave particular consideration to:

- a) the location and design of the proposed windows in the western and southern elevations of plot 3 and their relationship with neighbouring properties in Renaissance Point and the Irvin Building;
- b) details of recent planning enforcement complaints and investigations in relation to the site; and
- c) the need to secure a Deed of Variation to ensure that the terms of the Section 106 Agreement previously secured in relation to the original planning application also applied to the grant of any variation.

Resolved that (1) the Committee is minded to grant the application subject to a variation to the existing legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the addition, omission or amendment of any other conditions considered necessary; and
(2) the Director of Housing, Environment and Leisure be authorised to determine the application following the completion of the Section 106 Legal Agreement.

PQ70/21 21/02281/FUL, Land Adjacent to 36 Falkirk, Killingworth

The Committee considered a report from the planning officers, together with an addendum circulated prior to the meeting, in relation to a full planning application from Mrs Jackson for a change of use from open space to residential C3 garden space including the erection of a 1.8m fence.

A planning officer presented details of the application with the aid of various maps, plans and photographs.

In accordance with the Committee's Speaking Rights Scheme, Councillor Janice Mole, a councillor for the Camperdown Ward, had been granted permission to speak to the Committee on behalf of Councillor Jim Allan. Councillor Mole explained that the fence had been erected in April 2021 and it had drawn numerous objections from residents living nearby the property. The land was not owned but maintained by the Council therefore permission would need to be granted by the Council as the responsible body but no permission had been sought nor approved. The fence was contrary to the area and posed a safety issue because of its height and impact on both natural light and street lighting, creating a narrow pathway contrary to public safety. Councillor Mole asked that the application be declined and that the enforcement team be requested to take immediate action.

Marcus Jackson on behalf of his wife, the applicant, addressed the Committee to respond. He explained the problems that he had experienced with people using the land as a dog toilet, an escape route for anti-social behaviour and littering and so he had investigated the possibility of acquiring the land. He described the steps he had taken to establish who owned the land, understand the Council's and the developers interests in the land and the implications of fencing off the land under the Land Registry's adverse possession rules. He had read guidance on whether planning permission would be required but was not aware that a change of use would be required. Since the land had been fenced off the anti-social problems had stopped. He did not believe that the fence blocked views of the estate, he considered that there were few local objections and there was support for the fence from the nearest neighbour who overlooked the area.

Members of the Committee asked questions of the speakers and officers and made comments. In doing so the Committee gave particular consideration to:

- a) the applicant's intention to use the area of land as a garden;
- b) the process requiring the applicant to publish a public notice seeking to establish ownership of the land; and
- c) the loss of open space and the impact of the development on the character and visual amenity of the area.

Resolved that (1) the Committee is minded to refuse the application for the reasons set out in the Planning Officers report; and

(2) the Director of Housing, Environment and Leisure be granted delegated authority to determine the application following the expiry of the consultation period associated with the publication of a public notice by the applicant relating to the ownership of the land.

PQ71/21 21/02389/FUL, Whitley Bay High School, Deneholm, Whitley Bay

The Committee considered a report from the planning officers, together with two addendums, one circulated prior to the meeting and another at the meeting, in relation to a full planning application from the Department for Education for the demolition of existing school buildings and development of a replacement school building and sports hall, along with car parking, hard and soft landscaping and access arrangements.

A planning officer presented details of the application with the aid of various maps, plans and photographs.

Members of the Committee asked questions of officers and made comments. In doing so the Committee gave particular consideration to:

- a) the scope, beyond the terms of the planning application, for the improvement of access to Whitley Bay High School from Deneholm;
- b) the design and appearance of the proposed school building;
- c) the provision of a lift within the school building to aid access to all areas.

Resolved that (1) the Committee is minded to grant the application subject to the consultation period expiring on 24th February 2022, and the conditions set out in the planning officers report and addendums and the addition or omission of any other considered necessary, subject to the receipt of any additional comments received following expiry of the consultation period; and

(2) the Director of Environment, Housing and Leisure be authorised to determine the application providing no further matters arise which in the opinion of the Director raise issues not previously considered which justify reconsideration by the Committee.

PQ72/21 20/01271/FUL, 2 Eastern Villas, Springfield Park, Forest Hall

The Chair reported that following publication of the agenda, the applicant's agent had notified the Council that the applicant would be submitting a viability appraisal and that they wished for the matter to be deferred until the viability matter was resolved. The application had therefore been withdrawn from the agenda.

PQ73/21 21/02172/FUL, Park Hotel, Grand Parade, Tynemouth

The Committee considered a report from the planning officers in relation to a full planning application from The Inn Collection Group for a two storey extension to provide 20 hotel bedrooms, a single storey Fish & Chip takeaway and ice cream parlour, hotel kitchen, internal plant room, toilets and core circulation space, extended and improved external terrace area, car parking and landscaping. External works to existing building including replacement of all windows and doors, removal of existing render and re-rendering, and repairing external boundary walls. Wall mounted CCTV cameras.

A planning officer presented details of the application with the aid of various maps, plans and photographs.

Members of the Committee commented on their support for the proposed development which would improve the physical appearance of the site, create employment and complement other neighbouring visitor attractions.

Resolved that (1) the Committee is minded to grant this application subject to an Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the addition, omission or amendment of any conditions considered necessary; and

(2) the Director of Housing, Environment and Leisure be authorised to determine the application following the completion of the Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure the following:

- Employment and Training: £10,000 towards employment initiatives within the borough

- Coastal mitigation: £6,682 towards the Coastal Mitigation Service

PQ74/21 21/02355/FUL, Former Motor Hog, Wallsend Road, North Shields

The Committee considered a report from the planning officers in relation to a full planning application from Mandale Construction Ltd for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of 39no. hybrid units for Use Class B2 and B8.

A planning officer presented details of the application with the aid of various maps, plans and photographs.

Members of the Committee asked questions of officers and made comments. In doing so the Committee gave particular consideration to:

- a) the definition of Use Classes B2 (General Industrial) and B8 (Storage and Warehousing); and
- b) the adequacy of access to the site for heavy goods vehicles.

Resolved that (1) the Committee is minded to grant this application subject to an Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the addition, omission or amendment of any other conditions considered necessary; and (2) the Director of Housing, Environment and Leisure be authorised to determine the application following the completion of the Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure the following:

- Employment and Training: £15,000 towards employment initiatives within the borough
- Travel Plan Bond: £10,000
- Travel Plan Monitoring Fee: £1,250 (£250 per annum).
- Ecology: £18,900 towards habitat creation, management and monitoring

PQ75/21 21/00920/FUL, Land At Former Tynemouth Victoria Jubilee Infirmary, Hawkeys Lane, North Shields

The Committee considered a report from the planning officers, together with an addendum circulated prior to the meeting, in relation to a full planning application from Sea Island Developments for a proposed 51no. of extra care accommodation. Use Class C2 (residential Institutions).

A planning officer presented details of the application with the aid of various maps, plans and photographs.

Members of the Committee asked questions of officers and made comments. In doing so the Committee gave particular consideration to:

- a) the provision of outdoor garden space for residents and whether this satisfied any minimum national standards;
- b) provision within the development to accommodate 24 hour care support; and
- c) the adequacy of vehicular access to the site from Hawkey's Lane and its impact on the neighbouring doctors' surgery.

Resolved that (1) the Committee is minded to grant the application subject to
i) the receipt of a scheme of off-site habitat creation to secure a net gain in biodiversity and comments from the Biodiversity Officer and Landscape Architect to confirm this

- information is satisfactory;
- ii) any agreement under Section 106 of the Land and Country Planning Act 1990 considered necessary to deliver this scheme; and
- (2) the Director of Environment, Housing and Leisure be authorised to determine the application subject to the conditions listed below and the addition, omission or amendment of any conditions considered necessary, providing no further matters arise which in the opinion of the Director, raise issues not previously considered which justify reconsideration by the Committee.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 15 March 2022

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORTS

Background Papers - Access to Information

The background papers used in preparing this schedule are the relevant application files the numbers of which appear at the head of each report. These files are available for inspection at the Council offices at Quadrant East, The Silverlink North, Cobalt Business Park, North Tyneside.

Principles to guide members and officers in determining planning applications and making decisions

Interests of the whole community

Members of Planning Committee should determine planning matters in the interests of the whole community of North Tyneside.

All applications should be determined on their respective planning merits.

Members of Planning Committee should not predetermine planning applications nor do anything that may reasonably be taken as giving an indication of having a closed mind towards planning applications before reading the Officers Report and attending the meeting of the Planning Committee and listening to the presentation and debate at the meeting. However, councillors act as representatives of public opinion in their communities and lobbying of members has an important role in the democratic process. Where members of the Planning Committee consider it appropriate to publicly support or oppose a planning application they can do so. This does not necessarily prevent any such member from speaking or voting on the application provided they approach the decision making process with an open mind and ensure that they take account of all the relevant matters before reaching a decision. Any Member (including any substitute Member) who finds themselves in this position at the Planning Committee are advised to state, prior to consideration of the application, that they have taken a public view on the application.

Where members publicly support or oppose an application they should ensure that the planning officers are informed, preferably in writing, so that their views can be properly recorded and included in the report to the Planning Committee.

All other members should have regard to these principles when dealing with planning matters and must avoid giving an impression that the Council may have prejudged the matter.

Planning Considerations

Planning decisions should be made on planning considerations and should not be based on immaterial considerations.

The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as expanded by Government Guidance and decided cases define what matters are material to the determination of planning applications.

It is the responsibility of officers in preparing reports and recommendations to members to identify the material planning considerations and warn members about those matters which are not material planning matters.

Briefly, material planning considerations include:-

- North Tyneside Local Plan (adopted July 2017);
- National policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, including the National Planning Policy Framework, Planning Practice Guidance, extant Circulars and Ministerial announcements;
- non-statutory planning policies determined by the Council;
- the statutory duty to pay special attention the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas;
- the statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses;
- representations made by statutory consultees and other persons making representations in response to the publicity given to applications, to the extent that they relate to planning matters.

There is much case law on what are material planning considerations. The consideration must relate to the use and development of land.

Personal considerations and purely financial considerations are not on their own material; they can only be material in exceptional situations and only in so far as they relate to the use and development of land such as, the need to raise income to preserve a listed building which cannot otherwise be achieved.

The planning system does not exist to protect private interests of one person against the activities of another or the commercial interests of one business against the activities of another. The basic question is not whether owners and occupiers or neighbouring properties or trade competitors would experience financial or other loss from a particular development, but whether the proposal would unacceptably affect amenities and the existing use of land and buildings, which ought to be protected in the public interest.

Local opposition or support for the proposal is not in itself a ground for refusing or granting planning permission, unless that opposition or support is founded upon valid planning reasons which can be substantiated by clear evidence.

It will be inevitable that all the considerations will not point either to grant or refusal. Having identified all the material planning considerations and put to one side all the immaterial considerations, members must come to a carefully balanced decision which can be substantiated if challenged on appeal.

Officers' Advice

All members should pay particular attention to the professional advice and recommendations from officers.

They should only resist such advice, if they have good reasons, based on land use planning grounds which can be substantiated by clear evidence.

Where the Planning Committee resolves to make a decision contrary to a recommendation from officers, members must be aware of their legislative responsibilities under Article 35 of the Town & Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) to:

When refusing permission:

- state clearly and precisely the full reasons for any refusal including specifying all the policies and proposals in the development plan relevant to the decision; or

When granting permission:

- give a summary of the reasons for granting permission and of the policies and proposals in the development plan relevant to the decision; and
- state clearly and precisely full reasons for each condition imposed, specifying all policies and proposals in the development plan which are relevant to the decision; and
- in the case of each pre-commencement condition, state the reason for the condition being a pre-commencement condition.

And in both cases to give a statement explaining how, in dealing with the application, the LPA has worked with the applicant in a proactive and positive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the application, having regard to advice in para.s 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Lobbying of Planning Committee Members

While recognising that lobbying of members has an important role in the local democratic process, members of Planning Committee should ensure that their response is not such as to give reasonable grounds for their impartiality to be questioned or to indicate that the decision has already been made. If however, members of Committee express an opinion prior to the Planning Committee this does not necessarily prevent any such member from speaking or voting on the application provided they approach the decision making process with an open

mind and ensure that they take account of all the relevant matters before reaching a decision. Any Member (including any substitute Member) who finds themselves in this position at the Planning Committee are advised to state, prior to consideration of the application, that they have taken a public view on the application.

Lobbying of Other Members

While recognising that lobbying of members has an important role in the local democratic process, all other members should ensure that their response is not such as to give reasonable grounds for suggesting that the decision has already been made by the Council.

Lobbying

Members of the Planning Committee should ensure that their response to any lobbying is not such as to give reasonable grounds for their impartiality to be questioned. However all members of the Council should ensure that any responses do not give reasonable grounds for suggesting that a decision has already been made by the Council.

Members of the Planning Committee should not act as agents (represent or undertake any work) for people pursuing planning applications nor should they put pressure on officers for a particular recommendation.

**PLANNING APPLICATION REPORTS
CONTENTS**

6 21/01271/FUL

Killingworth

**St Johns Church Killingworth Village Killingworth NEWCASTLE
UPON TYNE**

Speaking rights granted to Maureen McKeown of Killingworth Village

This page is intentionally left blank

Application No: 21/01271/FUL Author: Maxine Ingram
Date valid: 2 December 2021 ☎: 0191 643 6322
Target decision date: 27 January 2022 Ward: Killingworth

Application type: full planning application

Location: St Johns Church, Killingworth Village, Killingworth, NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE

Proposal: Extension to provide new accessible entrance and toilets (amended description and plans received 02.12.2021)

Applicant: St John's Church, C/o Agent St John's Church West Lane Killingworth Village NE12 6BJ UK

Agent: David Pirie, Ainsworth Spark Associates 9 Summerhill Terrace Newcastle Upon Tyne NE4 6EB UK

RECOMMENDATION: Application Permitted

INFORMATION

1.0 Summary Of Key Issues & Conclusions

1.0 The main issues for Members to consider in this case are:

- Impact on the Grade II Listed Building and the character and appearance of the conservation area,
- Impact on residential amenity,
- Impact on highway safety,
- Impact on biodiversity and trees; and,
- Other issues.

1.1 Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Members need to consider whether this application accords with the development plan and also take into account any other material considerations in reaching their decision.

2.0 Description of the Site and Listed Building Description

2.1 The site to which this application relates is the Church of St. John the Evangelist, a Grade II Listed Building. This ecclesiastical property and associated grounds fall within the Killingworth Village Conservation Area (CA) (1974). Immediately to the east the site is bound by West Lane. Pedestrian access into the church is gained from West Lane via the existing entrance sited on the west elevation of the church.

2.2 The site is bordered by several mature trees, particularly adjacent to the north, west and south boundaries, with most of the trees believed to be included within an area/group Tree Preservation Order (TPO).

2.3 Immediately to the north of the site is a lane/bridleway which is accessed from West Lane. A stone wall extends along part of the southern side of this lane. To the north of the lane are residential properties. This lane also provides access to other residential properties located to the west of the application site and pedestrian/cyclist access to East Bailey.

2.4 The application site also falls within a Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and a wildlife corridor.

2.5 Listed Building Description

Church of St. John the Evangelist – Grade II Listed Building Parish church. 1869 by E. Bassett Keeling. Sandstone, coursed and squared, with bands of red sandstone; rendered north nave wall. Welsh slate roof with stone copings. Nave and chancel with continuous shorter south aisle; 3-sided apse. West door in aisle has nook shafts and 2-centred arch under high pointed drip mould. 2-centred arches and red impost bands to cusped lancets, paired in clerestory; plate tracery to larger west and east windows. Crescents carved in coping of buttresses, clasping to nave and aisle. Interior: brick with ashlar dressings; rendered blind north arcade; ashlar lower section to chancel and plaster above. Scissor-braced roof. Stiff-leaf arcade capitals; bracketed shafts to moulded chancel arch and blind arch in north chancel wall. Priest's door under high pointed crocketed hood-mould. Stencilled decoration to chancel roof. Chancel floor of tiles and Frosterley marble contains brass memorial to first vicar, J. S. Blair, died 1890. Historical note: the crescent is the emblem of the Dukes of Northumberland.

3.0 Description of the Proposed Development

3.1 Planning permission is sought for an extension to provide a new accessible entrance and toilets.

3.2 The proposed extension will be sited on the north elevation. It will be single storey and accommodate a pitched roof (overall height approximately 5m). The floor area will measure approximately 7.1m by 4.0m. It will be linked to the church by a glass connection and the remainder will be constructed using stone. These glazed connections will be recessed by approximately 0.5m from the east and west elevation. The roof will be constructed using zinc. The entrance doors will be oak, and the window frames will be constructed using hardwood. The high-level windows will be obscured or patterned glass. The window from the north elevation, which needs to be removed to accommodate this extension, will be sited in the east elevation. This extension will accommodate a lobby and toilets.

3.3 The existing render to the north elevation will be replaced.

3.4 The supporting information advises:

“The present entrance to the Church is positioned at the west gable and hidden from the principal access from West Lane. This presents an uncomfortable and

undignified entry for ceremonial occasions with inconvenient and dangerous parking on the bend of West Lane for the ceremonial vehicles. In inclement weather, ceremonial vehicles sometimes use the lane to provide direct, safer access. Informal parking is currently utilised by the congregation in the area off the lane.

The church does not currently contain accessible toilets.

The present proposal results from extensive consultation with the congregation and wider community using a combination of meetings and events within the church building, face-to-face during the summer fayre, during a session within the Killingworth centre and an online survey via social media.

The churches 'The Way Forward Group' identified a number of needs for the church building to bring it back into the 21st century, to improve the comfort and flexibility of use for the worship and as a key part, plans to engage more widely in mission and witness with the community of the Parish."

4.0 Relevant Planning History

4.1 The planning history relevant to this wider site relates to tree works and St John's Church Hall.

5.0 Development Plan

5.1 North Tyneside Local Plan (2017)

5.2 Other documents

5.3 Killingworth Village Conservation Area Character Appraisal (February 2008)

5.4 Design Quality Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (May 2018)

6.0 Government Policies

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (July 2021)

6.2 National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) (As amended)

6.3 Planning applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF is a material consideration in the determination of all applications. It requires Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development in determining development proposals. Due weight should still be attached to Development Plan policies according to the degree to which any policy is consistent with the NPPF.

PLANNING OFFICERS REPORT

7.0 Detailed Planning Considerations

7.1 The main issues for Members to consider in this case are:

- Impact on the Grade II Listed Building and the character and appearance of the conservation area,
- Impact on residential amenity,
- Impact on highway safety,

- Impact on biodiversity and trees; and,
- Other issues.

7.2 Consultations responses and representations received as a result of the publicity given to this application are set out in the appendix to this report.

8.0 Impact upon the Grade II Listed Building and the character and appearance of the conservation area

8.1 The Council has a statutory duty under Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting.

8.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) places this desirability to protect and enhance our historic environment at the core of achieving sustainable development. In terms of enhancement, the NPPF goes further by requiring local planning authorities not only to preserve but to look for opportunities to enhance and better reveal their significance (paragraph 206).

8.3 Paragraph 199 of the NPPF advises that, in respect of designated heritage assets, in determining planning the impact on the significance of a heritage asset great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset the greater the weight should be. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

8.4 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 (paragraph 200).

8.5 Paragraph 201 of the NPPF 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 loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss...."

8.6 Paragraph 202 states "Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use."

8.7 LP Policy S6.5 'Heritage Assets' states that the Council aims to pro-actively preserve, promote and enhance its heritage assets.

8.8 LP Policy DM6.6 'Protection, Preservation and Enhancement of Heritage Assets' states: "Proposals that affect heritage assets or their settings, will be permitted where they sustain, conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the significance, appearance, character and setting of heritage assets in an appropriate manner. As appropriate, development will:

- a. Conserve built fabric and architectural detailing that contributes to the heritage asset's significance and character;

- b. Repair damaged features or reinstate missing features and architectural detailing that contribute to the heritage asset's significance;
- c. Conserve and enhance the spaces between and around buildings including gardens, boundaries, driveways and footpaths;
- d. Remove additions or modifications that are considered harmful to the significance of the heritage asset;
- e. Ensure that additions to heritage assets and within its setting do not harm the significance of the heritage asset;
- f. Demonstrate how heritage assets at risk (national or local) will be brought into repair and, where vacant, re-use, and include phasing information to ensure that works are commenced in a timely manner to ensure there is a halt to the decline;
- g. Be prepared in line with the information set out in the relevant piece(s) of evidence and guidance prepared by North Tyneside Council;
- h. Be accompanied by a heritage statement that informs proposals through understanding the asset, fully assessing the proposed affects of the development and influencing proposals accordingly.

Any development proposal that would detrimentally impact upon a heritage asset will be refused permission, unless it is necessary for it to achieve wider public benefits that outweigh the harm or loss to the historic environment and cannot be met in any other way.”

8.9 The NPPF advises that the creation of high-quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. It states that developments should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting; and establish or maintain a strong sense of place. Paragraph 134 of the NPPF makes it clear that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents.

8.10 Paragraph 93 states “To provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should,,,,b) take into account and support the delivery of local strategies to improve health, social and cultural well-being for all sections of the community.....”

8.11 LP Policy S7.10 ‘Community Infrastructure’ states “The Council and its partners will ensure that local provision and resources for cultural and community activities are accessible to the neighbourhood they serve. In order to achieve this, amongst other matters: c) Existing provision will be enhanced, and multi-purpose use encouraged, providing a range of services and resources for the community, at one accessible location....”

8.12 LP Policy DM6.1 ‘Design of Development’ makes it clear that applications will only be permitted where they demonstrate high and consistent design standards. Amongst other matters proposed developments are responsive to their location, including topography, wildlife habitats, site orientation and existing

buildings; ensuring a positive relationship to neighbouring buildings and spaces; ensuring sufficient parking is well integrated into the layout; and a good standard of amenity for existing and future residents.

8.13 LDD11 'Design Quality' SPD applies to all planning applications that involve building works. The SPD provides advice on design in historic environments. It states:

"New buildings clearly need to meet the current needs and reflect the availability of modern materials and techniques whilst also respecting established forms and materials that contribute towards the character of an area. As with development, understanding significance of the place is crucial. Proposals should have a good understanding of the historic development of an area and the significance of its heritage assets. This understanding establishes the sensitivities of the place, defines opportunities for new development and inform its design.

The historic environment provides a rich source of inspiration for an imaginative approach for the design of new development. Contemporary architecture has the potential to sit successfully alongside historic buildings and enhance existing areas that already have their own distinctive historic value. It is the quality of the relationship between old and new that is critical, not the architectural approach."

8.14 The objections from both consultees and residents regarding impacts on the listed building, design of the extension, proposed materials and the need for the development are summarised in the Appendix to this report. Objections refer to the inaccuracies shown on the visual image included within the Design and Access Statement. This visual image is indicative and should planning permission be granted the Design and Access Statement will not be listed as an approved document.

8.15 The Killingworth Village Conservation Area Character Appraisal states:

"There are two buildings that, by their design, siting and use, do have true landmark qualities: the Parish Church of St. John the Evangelist and its Church Hall (both listed buildings). The buildings sit at the corner of West Lane turning into the village and are therefore very prominent".

8.16 St. Johns Church was built in 1869 by architect Enoch Bassett Keeling. The consultee comments received advise that Keeling was numbered one of the Victorian 'Rogue' architects by the twentieth-century architect H S Goodhart Rendel. The consultee comments further advise that Keeling's buildings can now be appreciated for interest and experimentation, and they possess a significance as unusual and imaginative manifestations of the Gothic Revival. Many of Keeling's churches do not survive intact and must be treated with respect.

8.17 The applicant has advised that the Killingworth Township did not exist at the time of the church construction and the church's responsibilities have changed and expanded. The applicant has confirmed that they have considered several options to enable this church to function in a 21st century environment. The requirements include making provision for toilets in a discrete and practical area and provide an improved access into the church. The applicant considers that the

current access is not functional for all requirements of the church. The applicant has considered the location of drainage and plumbing as well as considering whether the internal arrangements of the church could be amended to accommodate the toilets. These considerations have informed the decision to apply for the consideration of an extension to the north side of the church.

8.18 Since the application was originally submitted amendments have been made, some of which address the points raised by consultees. To confirm the applicant is no longer applying for the internal alterations which included a mezzanine. The applicant has made the following amendments to the proposed extension:

- The railings, steps and planters have been removed. The existing levels do not require these alterations to gain access to the extension. Stone paving is proposed to the northern edge and eastern edge of the extension only (approximately 0.6m deep paving).

- A buttress has been removed to enable the corridor access to be improved and the toilet wall extended towards the church.

- The visual has not been amended but the applicant's agent has confirmed that the stonework would be coursed as requested by consultees and they would be prepared to accept a condition for the stone and detailing to be submitted for agreement.

- The window from the north will be salvaged and will be used in the east elevation.

- The applicant's agent has confirmed that they are happy to use patterned or opaque glass to all the high-level windows rather than an opaque film. The windows will be adjusted to be formed in hardwood.

- As the entrance is now level access, there is no need to re-surface. The surface of the existing lane will remain as is.

8.19 The Killingworth Village Conservation Area Character Appraisal makes specific reference to negative parts of the conservation area. It states:

"Unfortunately, possibly the conservation area's most prominent and important building St. John's Church, has suffered from inappropriate development. The north elevation of the building (where unlike the south side, an aisle was never built) has a harsh cement covering, which is completely out of keeping with the church's sandstone construction, and the church's windows have been covered over with translucent plastic, reducing the effect of their stained-glass quality".

8.20 It also states:

"Unusually, the doorway for St. John's Church is not of particular significance. It is of reasonable detail: it consists of a two-centred arched door under a high pointed drip moulded stone surround but being that it is situated on the west side of the church renders it of little role within the character of the village as a whole...."

8.21 The north elevation detracts from the visual appearance of the church and the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area. It is clear from the consultee comments that they understand that the site of the unbuilt north aisle is an appropriate place for any extension to the church. Whilst the principle of an extension is accepted, some of the consultee comments still raise

concerns regarding the design of the porch and materials. Some of these comments have been addressed and are detailed in paragraph 8.18. Members need to consider whether the design of the proposed porch and materials are acceptable.

8.22 Internal advice received regarding heritage and design has been sought. This advice considers that this proposal has been well considered and informed by how the church can best function and meet current and future needs. The proposal has also been informed by consultation with the congregation and wider community.

8.23 Members are advised that the north aisle was never constructed. The north elevation is partially rendered which is clearly visible and does not present a particularly attractive elevation. It is therefore a logical place to locate an extension.

8.24 Rather than introduce a traditional extension, the applicant is proposing a modest addition which they consider respects this listed building. The width of the extension and distance from the western edge of the church balances closely with the south aisle. The junction of the extension has been carefully considered and is dealt with by using a glass connection providing a clear distinction between this addition and the existing rendered façade. This glass connection is also recessed from the elevations of the extension. The proposed stone will complement the existing bands of sandstone on the church. The applicant has confirmed that this stone will be coursed. The roof will be constructed using zinc. It is noted that some of the consultees would prefer a more traditional design and for natural stone and slate to be used. It is clear from the internal advice received that this extension would complement the form and character of the original building through an appropriate contrast of contemporary design with high quality materials. Should planning permission be granted, a condition is recommended for details of the final materials to be used to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority (LPA) for consideration.

8.25 The applicant also intends to salvage the window to be removed from the north elevation and reuse this in the east elevation of the extension. The applicant has also confirmed that the high-level windows will be obscured or patterned glass. The window frames will also be constructed from hardwood. The entrance doors will be in oak matching the west gable entrance. The remaining north render will be re-surfaced in a self-coloured finish to minimise maintenance and add a more visually acceptable façade. Should planning permission be granted, a condition is recommended to secure details relating to the salvaged window, details of the glazing to the high-level windows and details of the materials to be used for the window frames, doors and render.

8.26 The proposed extension will assist in reducing the amount of the currently rendered north façade. This will improve the visual aesthetics of the church and remove part of a negative façade from within the conservation area. The internal advice regarding heritage and design considers this to be a modern addition to a listed building. The extension is relatively small scale and does not detract from the original design.

8.27 This proposal will cause harm to the existing external fabric through the opening of the original arch to connect to the extension. The glazed connections seek to limit the harm by limiting the disturbance at the junction of the existing church. Any harm caused is not substantial and is outweighed by the community benefit this proposal will bring to the functionality of the church.

8.28 Historic England have not commented on this application. Instead, they have advised that the LPA consults their own specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant. The LPA have sought advice internally regarding heritage and design. It is clear from their comments that they have recommended conditional approval.

8.29 Paragraph 205 of the NPPF states “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.”

8.30 LP Policy DM6.7 ‘Archaeological Heritage’ seeks to protect, enhance and promote the borough’s archaeological heritage and where appropriate, encourage its interpretation and presentation to the public.

8.31 The Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer has been consulted. She has advised that she shares the concerns raised by other consultees regarding the design of the new porch and considers that the proposed extension is not sympathetic enough to the character of the church. However, it is clear from her comments that she does not object. Following further consultation she welcomes the changes to the design of the extension, in particular those to the glazing of the eastern gable, which now sits more harmoniously with the main body of the church.

8.32 The NPPF, paragraph 55 states “Local Planning Authorities should consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations.” Paragraph 56 states “Planning conditions should be kept to a minimum and only imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.” It is the advice of officers that conditions to control the materials and joinery details are required to ensure a satisfactory external appearance is secured.

8.33 Members need to consider whether this proposal is acceptable in terms of its impact on the Grade II listed building and the conservation area. Subject to the imposition of the suggested conditions, it is officer advice that this proposal is acceptable, and accords with the NPPF, Local Plan policies S6.5 and DM6.6 and the Design Quality SPD.

9.0 Impact on residential amenity

9.1 Paragraph 185 of the NPPF states “Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health,

living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should: a) mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life; b) identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational amenity value for this reason; and c) limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation”.

9.2 LP Policy S1.4 “General Development Principles” states “Proposals for development will be considered favourably where it can be demonstrated that they would accord with the strategic, development management or area specific policies of this Plan.” Amongst other matters this includes being acceptable in terms of their impact upon local amenity for new or existing residents and businesses, adjoining premises and land uses; and be accommodated by, and make best use of, existing facilities and infrastructure, particularly in encouraging accessibility and walking, cycling and public transport, whilst making appropriate provision for new or additional infrastructure requirements”.

9.3 LP Policy DM5.19 Pollution states “Development proposals that may cause pollution either individually or cumulatively of water, air or soil through noise, smell, smoke, fumes, gases, steam, dust, vibration, light, and other pollutants will be required to incorporate measures to prevent or reduce their pollution so as not to cause nuisance or unacceptable impacts on the environment, to people and to biodiversity.

Development proposed where pollution levels are unacceptable will not be permitted unless it is possible for mitigation measures to be introduced to secure a satisfactory living or working environment.....”

9.4 The objections received regarding the impacts on residential amenity are summarised in the Appendix to this report.

9.5 The proposed extension will be sited on the north elevation of the church. Residential properties are located to the northeast and west of the site. It is the advice of officers that the extension, by virtue of its siting, will not significantly affect the residential amenity of these neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy.

9.6 The Manager of Environmental Health has been consulted. She has not objected to the principle of this application but has recommended conditions to control the hours of construction, dust mitigation and the submission of a noise scheme should any external plant or equipment be operated at the site.

9.7 Members need to determine whether the proposed development is acceptable in terms of its impact on the amenity of neighbouring and nearby properties. It is officer advice that the proposed development is, subject to the imposition of the suggested conditions. As such, it is officer advice that the proposed development accords with the advice in paragraph 185 of the NPPF and LP policies DM5.19 and DM6.1.

10.0 Impact on highway safety

10.1 The NPPF paragraph 111 makes it clear that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

10.2 The NPPF paragraph 112 states, amongst other matters, that applications for development should give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas and address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport.

10.3 LP Policy DM7.4 'New Development and Transport' makes it clear that the Council will ensure that the transport requirements of new development, commensurate to the scale and type of development, are taken into account and seek to promote sustainable travel to minimise environmental impacts and support resident's health and well-being.

10.4 The Council's maximum parking standards are set out in the Transport and Highways SPD (LDD12).

10.5 The objections regarding the width of the lane, conflict between vehicles and pedestrians/cyclists/other users, inaccurate parking provision information provided, ownership and surfacing are set out in greater detail in the Appendix to this report. Objectors refer to previous highway safety concerns relating to parking on West Lane.

10.6 The church does not have any formal off-street parking provision. However, informal off-street parking provision can currently be accommodated to the north and west of the church. These areas are accessed from West Lane by a lane which is bound on its northern side by existing residential dwellings and its southern side (part way only) by a stonewall. This lane provides vehicular and pedestrian access to several residential properties. It also provides pedestrian/cyclist access between West Lane and East Bailey, including access to George Stephenson High School.

10.7 This lane is a bridleway, and the surfacing material varies. This lane is hardsurfaced up to the raised table. The section up to the raised table forms part of the adopted highway.

10.8 The submitted plans demonstrate that this extension will reduce the amount of informal parking currently available to the north side of the church. The submitted plans show that two parking bays can be accommodated to the eastern side of the extension. These bays will not be formally demarcated; instead, they will be highlighted with parking markers within the ground. The location of the bays will not conflict with the lane/bridleway. The applicant has demonstrated that vehicles can access and turn within the site and leave in a forward direction.

10.9 The Highways Network Manager has been consulted. He has recommended conditional approval.

10.10 The Public Right of Way comments are noted. However, it is not considered that this development warrants works to the bridleway.

10.11 Members need to consider whether this development is acceptable in terms of its impact on highway and pedestrian safety and whether appropriate parking provision can be achieved. Subject to the imposition of the suggested conditions, it is officer advice that this development will not significantly affect highway or pedestrian safety and it has been demonstrated that parking provision can be accommodated adjacent to the extension and that vehicles can access and egress the site. This extension will not prevent the use of the existing bridleway. As such, the proposed development accords with both national and local planning policies.

11.0 Biodiversity and trees

11.1 An environmental role is one of the three dimensions of sustainable development according to NPPF, which seeks to protect and enhance our natural environment.

11.2 Paragraph 174 of the NPPF states that the planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. Amongst other matters, this includes minimising the impacts of biodiversity and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.

11.3 Paragraph 179 of the NPPF states that when determining planning applications LPAs should aim to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity by following the principles set out in paragraph 180 which includes, amongst other matters, if significant harm cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or as a last resort, compensated from the planning permission should be refused.

11.4 LP Policy S5.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity seeks to protect, create, enhance and manage sites within the borough relative to their significance.

11.5 LP DM5.5 'Managing effects on Biodiversity and Geodiversity', amongst other matters, seeks to protect the biodiversity and geodiversity value of land, protected and priority species and buildings and minimise fragmentation of habitats and wildlife links. Proposals should maximise opportunities to create, restore, enhance, manage and connect natural habitat. Net gains to biodiversity should be considered, unless otherwise shown to be inappropriate. Proposals that are likely to significantly affect nationally or locally designated sites, protected species, or priority species and habitats (as identified in the BAP), identified within the most up to date Green Infrastructure Strategy, would only be permitted where: the benefits of the proposal clearly demonstrably outweigh any adverse impacts, applications are accompanied by the appropriate ecological surveys that are carried out to industry guidelines, and for all adverse impacts of the development appropriate on site mitigation measures, reinstatement of features, or, as a last resort, off site compensation to enhance or create habitats must form part of the proposals. This

must be accompanied by a management plan and monitoring schedule, as agreed by the Council.

11.6 LP Policy DM5.7 'Wildlife Corridors' states: "Development proposals within a wildlife corridor, as shown on the Policies Map, must protect and enhance the quality and connectivity of the wildlife corridor. All new developments are required to take account of and incorporate existing wildlife links into their plans at the design stage. Developments should seek to create new links and habitats to reconnect isolated sites and facilitate species movement."

11.7 LP DM5.9 'Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows' supports the protection and management of existing woodland trees, hedgerow and landscape features. It seeks to secure new tree planting and landscaping scheme for new development, and where appropriate, promote and encourage new woodland, tree and hedgerow planting schemes and encouraging native species of local provenance.

11.8 The objections regarding the inaccuracies between the submitted reports, impacts on trees and biodiversity are summarised in the Appendix to this report.

11.9 The Council's Landscape Architect and Biodiversity Officer have been consulted. They have considered the supporting information which includes a revised Arboricultural Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan.

11.10 No trees require removal but there is the potential for damage to retained trees from construction works.

11.11 The submitted information provides details for protecting the trees during the construction process by the installation of appropriate protective fencing and maintaining the agreed construction exclusion zones. Access during construction will be via the existing lane/bridleway which is within the root protection areas (RPA's) of trees. As this area is already largely hardsurfaced and gravel, no significant impact is expected. Some further access for construction is expected within the RPA of Tree 5 but as this area is part surfaced it will not be vulnerable to compaction. A link to the existing utility run will be made between the RPAs of Tree 4 and Tree 5, but within the RPA of Tree 8. Root damage is expected to be minimal, but a condition will be required to ensure that all works in this location are undertaken by hand.

11.12 A preliminary bat roost assessment of the church has been undertaken to assess the potential impacts on bats from the proposal. This report determines whether any further survey work is required or not. The key findings of the building assessment indicated multiple potential roost features and access points across the roof structure (+2m above the proposed works area) with no gaps or potential roosting opportunities identified within or adjacent to the proposed works area and no field signs indicating the presence of bats recorded during the survey. A roost identified in 2016 at the opposite end of the building will be unaffected by the works. There is mature woodland adjacent to the church with several scattered mature trees, including sycamore and yew. Several high potential roost features were present within adjacent trees, however, the trees on

site are noted in the Report as being retained as part of the project. The Report concludes that the development is considered to result in a low risk of disturbing any bats present on site at the time of works with some temporary disturbance to adjacent habitat. Several mitigation measures are therefore, recommended in section 6.3 (Mitigation & Compensation Strategy) to address these impacts, including working to a 'Precautionary Method Statement' and sensitive lighting design to minimise light spill.

11.13 It is clear from the Landscape Architects and Biodiversity Officer's comments that appropriate mitigation to protect trees and bats can be achieved by imposing their suggested conditions.

11.14 Members need to consider whether the proposal is acceptable in terms of its impact on biodiversity and landscaping. It is officer advice that subject to conditions it is acceptable. As such, the proposed development accords with both national and local planning policies.

12.0 Other Issues

12.1 Contaminated Land

12.2 NPPF paragraph 183 seeks to ensure that planning decisions have regard to ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination.

12.3 NPPF paragraph 184 states "Where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rest with the developer and/or landowner".

12.4 LP Policy DM5.18 "Contaminated and Unstable Land" seeks to ensure that the future users or occupiers of a development would not be affected by contamination or stability issues.

12.5 The Contaminated Land Officer has been consulted. She has raised no objection to the proposed development.

12.6 Members need to consider whether the proposed development is acceptable in terms of its impact on ground conditions. It is officer advice that it is.

12.7 Flood Risk

12.8 The objections received regarding flood risk are summarised in the Appendix to this report.

12.9 The applicant has advised that the proposed extension's foul and surface water will connect to the mains. To address some of the consultee comments previously raised the applicant has created a level access. This requires some alteration to existing levels to achieve this (approximately 0.46m to the west side of the extension). It is not considered that this adjusted level will cause significant surface water runoff.

12.10 The applicant has confirmed that there are no surfacing changes proposed to the lane/bridleway or parking located to the east side of the extension.

12.11 Members need to consider whether the proposed development is acceptable in terms of flood risk. It is officer advice that it is.

12.12 Representations

12.13 It is noted that the applicant has signed Certificate D which advises the council that they do not know who owns the land. Whilst it would have been appropriate for Certificate C to have been signed, the signing of Certificate D is worst-case scenario particularly as the issue of ownership has been raised by objectors regarding the lane/bridleway. It is not considered that the signing of Certificate D prevents this application from being determined.

13.0 Conclusions

13.1 Members should consider carefully the balance of issues before them and the need to take in account national policy within NPPF and the weight to be accorded to this as well as current local planning policy.

13.2 Specifically, NPPF states that LPA's should look for solutions rather than problems, and decision-takers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible. A core planning principle within NPPF requires that every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth.

13.3 The design of the extension has been amended to address some of the objections raised by the consultees. Subject to these amendments and subject to imposing conditions to control materials, joinery details and final finishes, this extension would not significantly affect the setting of this Grade II Listed Building or result in a significant adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the site, its surroundings or this part of the Killingworth Village Conservation Area.

13.4 The proposal would not significantly affect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy. Conditions are suggested to control the hours of construction and dust suppression to minimise the impacts on the amenity of immediate neighbouring properties during construction.

13.5 The proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on highway or pedestrian safety.

13.6 The proposal, subject to imposing the suggested conditions, would not have an unacceptable impact on trees or protected species.

13.7 The proposal would not significantly increase flood risk in this area.

13.8 It is officer advice that planning permission should be granted subject to the suggested conditions.

RECOMMENDATION: **Application Permitted**

Conditions/Reasons

1. The development to which the permission relates shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following approved plans and specifications:
 - Location plan Dwg No. 250 Rev C002
 - Existing elevations Dwg No. 002
 - Existing plan Dwg No. 001 Rev C004
 - Existing plan Dwg No. Rev
 - Proposed ground floor plan Dwg No. 100 Rev C007
 - Proposed north elevation Dwg No. 140 Rev C001
 - Proposed east and west elevation Dwg No. 114 Rev C001
 - Proposed porch roof plan Dwg No. 101 Rev C002
 - Technical Dwg Stainless Steel Marker
 - Elliot Consultancy Ltd Aboricultural Survey, Aboricultural Impact Assessment, Aboricultural Method Statement, Tree Protection Plan (Dated February 2022) Ref: ARB/AE/2631
 - EcoNorth Bat Survey (Dated October 2021)
 - Reason: To ensure that the development as carried out does not vary from the approved plans.
2. Standard Time Limit 3 Years FUL MAN02 *
3. No demolition/development shall take place until a programme of archaeological building recording has been completed, in accordance with a specification provided by the Local Planning Authority. A report of the results shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any development or demolition work taking place.
 - Reason: To provide an archive record of the historic building or structure and to accord with paragraph 199 of the NPPF, Local Plan S6.5 and policies DM6.6 and DM6.7.
4. The construction site subject of this approval shall not be operational and there shall be no construction, deliveries to, from or vehicle movements within the site outside the hours of 0800-1800 Monday - Friday and 0800-1400 Saturdays with no working on Sundays or Bank Holidays.
 - Reason: To safeguard the amenity of nearby residents having regard to policy DM5.19 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017) and National Planning Policy Framework.
5. No sound reproduction equipment which is audible outside the curtilage of the premises shall be operated on the site.
 - Reason: In order to protect the amenities of occupiers of nearby properties having regard to policy DM5.19 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017).
6. Notwithstanding Condition 1, prior to the installation of any external plant or equipment a noise scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be submitted in accordance with

BS4142 to determine the noise rating level of external plant and equipment operating at the site and that appropriate mitigation measures are taken where necessary to ensure the rating level of the plant and equipment does not exceed the existing background noise level. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with these agreed details and verification details pursuant to condition 7.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities of adjoining properties having regard to policy DM5.19 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017).

7. Within one month of the installation of any plant and equipment acoustic testing shall be undertaken to verify compliance with condition 6. These details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA prior to the operation of the plant and equipment being brought into permanent use. Thereafter the plant and equipment shall be operated and maintained in full working order.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities of adjoining properties having regard to policy DM5.19 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017).

8. Notwithstanding Condition 1, prior to the commencement of any works hereby approved details of the fixing method for any internal works where they adjoin the historic fabric of the listed building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development hereby approved shall be carried out in full accordance with these agreed details.

Reason: These details are required from the outset to ensure that the significance of the listed building is protected having regard to the NPPF and Policy DM6.6 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017).

9. Notwithstanding Condition 1, prior to the commencement of any works hereby approved details of the following materials and external finishes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- a) A sample of the stone to be used for the external walls, including mortar details and how the stone will be coursed. A detailed drawing to show the construction of the external stone walls.
- b) A sample of the hardwood to be used for all new windows.
- c) A specification of the glazing to be used, including the obscured or patterned glass to the high-level windows.
- d) A sample of the oak to be used for the new doors.
- e) A sample of the render, including specification, to be used to the existing north façade.
- f) Details of the external finishes for the rainwater goods and a sample of the material.
- g) A sample of the paving to be used to the perimeter of the extension.
- h) A sample of the zinc roof.

Thereafter, the development hereby approved shall be carried out in full accordance with these agreed details.

Reason: These details are required from the outset to ensure that the significance of the listed building is protected having regard to the NPPF and Policy DM6.6 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017).

10. Notwithstanding Condition 1, the high-level windows shall be obscure or patterned glass. The window(s) shall thereafter be retained as such.

Reason: To ensure that the significance of the listed building is protected having regard to the NPPF and Policy DM6.6 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017).

11. Notwithstanding Condition 1, prior to the commencement of any works hereby approved details of the removal and storage of the window to be salvaged from the north elevation and re-locating to the east elevation of the extension shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: These details are required from the outset to ensure that the significance of the listed building is protected having regard to the NPPF and Policy DM6.6 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017).

12. Notwithstanding Condition 1, the scheme for parking shall be marked out with ground markers in the location shown on the proposed ground floor plan Dwg No. 100 Rev C007 prior to the commencement of the use of the extension. These parking areas shall not be used for any other purpose and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and of the development having regard to policy DM7.4 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017).

13. Notwithstanding Condition 1, a scheme for the provision of refuse storage and collection shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, this scheme shall be carried out in accordance with these agreed details prior to the development hereby approved being brought into use and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and of the development having regard to policy DM7.4 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017).

14. Notwithstanding Condition 1, no development shall commence until a Construction Method Statement for the duration of the construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved statement shall: identify the access to the site for all site operatives (including those delivering materials) and visitors, provide for the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors; storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development; provide a scheme indicating the route for heavy construction vehicles to and from the site; a turning area within the site for delivery vehicles; a detailed scheme to prevent the deposit of mud and debris onto the highway and a dust suppression scheme (such measures shall include mechanical street cleaning, and/or provision of water bowsers, and/or wheel washing and/or road cleaning facilities, and any other wheel cleaning solutions and dust suppressions measures considered appropriate to the size of the development), temporary parking, on site welfare facilities, loading, unloading and storage of equipment, materials, fuels and waste as well concrete mixing and use of fires and tree protection measures for trees to be retained. No cabins, storage of plant and materials or parking shall be located within the root protection areas of the retained trees as defined by the Tree Protection Plan. The approved statement shall be implemented and complied with during and for the life of the works associated with the development.

Reason: This information is required pre-development to ensure that the site set up does not impact on highway safety, pedestrian safety, retained trees (where necessary) and residential amenity having regard to policies DM5.19 and

15. All measures set out in section 6.3 (Mitigation and Compensation Strategy) of the Bat Survey Report (Oct 2021 EcoNorth) shall be implemented throughout the development hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure that local wildlife populations are protected in the interests of ecology having regard to the NPPF and Policies DM5.5 and DM5.7 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017).

16. Notwithstanding Condition 1, prior to the commencement of any part of the development hereby approved above damp-proof course level a lighting strategy and a timetable for its implementation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This strategy shall include light spill plans and shall demonstrate a sensitive lighting scheme created in line with current guidance, with light levels of no more than 2 lux around the mature trees, baffles used on lights to help minimise light spill, and LEDs to be used which do not emit blue light (BCT, 2018). Thereafter, this agreed scheme shall be implemented in accordance with these agreed details and permanently maintained and retained.

Reason: To ensure that local wildlife populations are protected in the interests of ecology having regard to the NPPF and Policies DM5.5 and DM5.7 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017).

17. Notwithstanding Condition 1, prior to the commencement of any part of the development hereby approved above damp-proof course level details of three general purpose woodcrete bat boxes (Schwegler 2F or similar) including specification, and locations on appropriate trees within the adjacent woodland and a timetable for their installation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, this agreed scheme shall be implemented in accordance with these agreed details and permanently maintained and retained.

Reason: To ensure that local wildlife populations are protected in the interests of ecology having regard to the NPPF and Policies DM5.5 and DM5.7 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017).

18. No vegetation removal or building works shall take place during the bird nesting season (March-August inclusive) unless a survey by a suitably qualified ecologist has confirmed the absence of nesting birds immediately prior to works commencing.

Reason: To ensure that local wildlife populations are protected in the interests of ecology having regard to the NPPF and Policies DM5.5 and DM5.7 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017).

19. If the works hereby approved do not commence within twelve months of the date of the Bat Survey Report (Eco North October 2021), an updated survey will be required to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to inform the assessment and to ensure that the site conditions remain the same and no alterations are required to the mitigation contained within this document.

Reason: To ensure that local wildlife populations are protected in the interests of ecology having regard to the NPPF and Policies DM5.5 and DM5.7 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017).

20. All trees on site are to be retained. No trees, shrubs or hedges shall be felled, uprooted, wilfully damaged or destroyed, cut back in any way or removed during the development phase other than in accordance with the approved plans or without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Thereafter, this agreed scheme shall be implemented in accordance with these agreed details and permanently maintained and retained

Reason: To ensure that local wildlife populations are protected in the interests of ecology and to ensure tree cover is retained having regard to the NPPF and Policies DM5.9, DM5.5 and DM5.7 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017).

21. Notwithstanding Condition 1, prior to the commencement of any site works (including clearance, demolition works, tree works, soil moving, hardstandings, temporary access construction and / or widening or any operations involving the use of motorised vehicles or construction machinery, site security fencing, services), tree protection is to be installed in accordance with Elliot Consultancy Tree Protection Plan (ARB/AE/2631/TPP February 2022). The tree protection fence is to be of a type and height as described in the AMS. The area surrounding each tree group within the approved protective fencing shall be protected for the full duration of the development and shall not be removed or repositioned without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. Photographic evidence is to be submitted on completion of the installation of the fence and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: This information is required pre-commencement to ensure that the existing trees are appropriately protected during construction Policy DM5.9 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017).

22. Notwithstanding Condition 1, prior to the commencement of any drainage works a revised Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The revised AMS shall include the proposed working method for the installation of new drainage and drainage connections which is to be undertaken by hand, Air Spade or similar method. The AMS is to include details of tree root protection including covering of exposed roots, cutting of roots etc. Thereafter, the development hereby permitted shall only be carried out in accordance with the revised Arboricultural Method Statement, Tree Protection Plan, BS5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations', and the National Joint Utilities Group (NJUG) 'Guidelines for the Planning, Installation and Maintenance of Utility Apparatus in Proximity to Trees'.

Reason: This information is required to ensure that the existing trees are appropriately protected during construction Policy DM5.9 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017).

23. Notwithstanding Condition 1, no development shall take place until plans of the site showing the existing and proposed ground levels and levels of thresholds and floor levels of the proposed building and surrounding land required to provide level access has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning

Authority. Such levels shall be shown in relation to a fixed and known datum point. Thereafter, the development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: This needs to be pre-commencement condition to ensure that the work is carried out at suitable levels in relation to the surrounding area, having regard to amenity, access, trees highway and drainage requirements having regard to policy DM5.9 and DM6.1 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017).

24. Notwithstanding Condition 1, prior to any pruning works details of these works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any agreed pruning works shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved specification and the requirements of British Standard 3998: 2010 - Recommendations for Tree Works.

Reason: This information is required to ensure that the existing trees are appropriately protected during construction Policy DM5.9 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017).

25. Notwithstanding Condition 1, prior to any works hereby approved commencing on site, an arboricultural consultant shall be appointed by the developer/applicant to advise on the tree management for the site and to undertake regular supervision visits to monitor and oversee the implementations of the works as set out in the AMS. Details of regular monitoring works and compliance, including photographic evidence, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority throughout the duration of the works hereby approved and following completion of the works.

Reason: To ensure that the existing trees are appropriately protected during construction Policy DM5.9 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017).

26. Notwithstanding Condition 1, prior to the commencement of any part of the development hereby approved above damp-proof course level a landscape plan for the planting of 1 no tree and a schedule of landscape maintenance for a minimum period of five years, including details of the arrangements for its implementation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The tree shall be a minimum of 12-14 cm girth and planted in accordance with the approved details and to a standard in accordance with the relevant recommendations of British Standard 8545:2014. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the timetable agreed with the Local Planning Authority. Should that tree, within a period of five years after planting, is removed, dies or becomes seriously damaged or defective, it shall be replaced with others of species, size and number as originally approved, by the end of the first available planting season thereafter. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule.

Reason: To ensure that the existing trees are appropriately protected during construction Policy DM5.9 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017).

Statement under Article 35 of the Town & Country (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015):

The Local Planning Authority worked proactively and positively with the applicant to identify various solutions during the application process to ensure that the proposal comprised sustainable development and would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area and would accord with the development plan. These were incorporated into the scheme and/or have been secured by planning condition. The Local Planning Authority has therefore implemented the requirements in Paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informatives

Building Regulations Required (I03)

Consent to Display Advertisement Reqd (I04)

The applicant is advised that it is an offence to obstruct the public highway (footway or carriageway) by depositing materials without obtaining beforehand, and in writing, the permission of the Council as Local Highway Authority. Such obstructions may lead to an accident, certainly cause inconvenience to pedestrians and drivers, and are a source of danger to children, elderly people and those pushing prams or buggies. They are a hazard to those who are disabled, either by lack of mobility or impaired vision. Contact Highways@northtyneside.gov.uk for further information.

The applicant is advised that a license must be obtained from the Highways Authority for any scaffold placed on the footway, carriageway verge or other land forming part of the highway. Contact Streetworks@northtyneside.gov.uk for further information

The applicant is advised that no part of the gates or garage doors may project over the highway at any time. Contact New.Developments@northtyneside.gov.uk for further information.

The applicant is advised that it is an offence to obstruct the public highway (footway or carriageway) by depositing materials without obtaining beforehand, and in writing, the permission of the Council as Local Highway Authority. Such obstructions may lead to an accident, certainly cause inconvenience to pedestrians and drivers, and are a source of danger to children, elderly people and those pushing prams or buggies. They are a hazard to those who are disabled, either by lack of mobility or impaired vision. Contact Highways@northtyneside.gov.uk for further information.

The applicant is advised that they should contact Highway Maintenance to arrange for an inspection of the highways adjacent to the site. The applicant should be aware that failure to do so may result in the Council pursuing them for costs of repairing any damage in the surrounding area on completion of construction. Contact Highways@northtyneside.gov.uk for further information.

The applicant is advised that free and full access to the Public Right of Way network is always to be maintained. Should it be necessary for the protection of route users to temporarily close or divert an existing route during development, this should be agreed with the council's Public Rights of Way Officer. Contact Highways@northtyneside.gov.uk for further information.


The applicant is advised to contact the council's Public Rights of Way Officer prior to construction arrange a joint inspection of the Public Right of Way network on and adjacent to the site. If this inspection is not carried out, the Local Highway Authority may pursue the developer for any costs to repair damage to these routes. Contact Highways@northtyneside.gov.uk for further information.

Take Care Proximity to Party Boundary (I21)

Advice All Works Within Applicants Land (I29)

Coal Mining Standing Advice (FUL,OUT) (I44)

Any spoil from foundations shall be disposed of at a suitably licensed facility.



Application reference: 21/01271/FUL


Location: St Johns Church, Killingworth Village, Killingworth

**Proposal: Extension to provide new accessible entrance and toilets
(amended description and plans received 02.12.2021)**

Not to scale

Date: 03.03.2022

© Crown Copyright and database right
2011. Ordnance Survey Licence Number
0100016801



Consultations/representations

1.0 Internal Consultees

1.1 Heritage and design

1.2 The revised plans are acceptable. The following conditions are recommended:

Render specification

The fixing method for internal works where they adjoin historic fabric.

Rainwater goods

New doors

New windows

Sample of materials

Hard surfacing

Landscape design proposals

1.3 Heritage and Design initial comments:

1.4 The Church of St. John is grade II listed and is located within Killingworth Village conservation area. A side extension is proposed on the north elevation to provide an accessible entrance and toilets. A mezzanine is also proposed within the church to provide a meeting space with storage below.

1.5 The proposal has been well considered and informed by how the church can best function and meet current and future needs. The proposal has also been informed by consultation with the congregation and wider community.

1.6 The application includes information setting out that the north aisle was never completed which resulted in there being a rendered external wall. This is clearly visible and does not present a particularly attractive elevation. It is therefore a logical place to locate an extension. The extension is relatively small scale and does not detract from the original design. The extension will complement the form and character of the original building through an appropriate contrast in contemporary design with high quality materials. New render is proposed to replace the existing render on the remainder of the north elevation; details for the specification of this should be conditioned.

1.7 Internally, the removal and re-positioning of the organ is proposed to provide space for storage and a staircase to a mezzanine level. This will reveal the stained-glass window to the Nave as originally designed. A glass balustrade to the mezzanine level is proposed. The principle of this work is acceptable, although the works should be reversible, and details should be conditioned for any fixings required to the listed building.

1.8 It is also proposed to remove two trees. Trees make a valuable contribution towards the character and appearance of the conservation area and should only be removed where it is clearly justified. The Council's tree officer will comment on this further.

1.9 Overall, subject to the issue of trees being addressed, the works are acceptable. Conditions should be attached to the application for the detailed specification of materials and for internal fixings to historic fabric.

1.10 Officer note: Members are advised the internal alterations referred to in the initial comments from Heritage and Design relating to the mezzanine and internal alterations have now been omitted from this proposal.

1.11 Highways Network Manager

1.12 This application is for an extension to provide a new accessible entrance and toilets. The site is long-established and is accessed from an adopted highway that connects to West Lane. There is currently no designated parking on site, although the area in the north part of the site has been used informally for this purpose. Whilst some of the informal parking area will be lost as a result of the proposal, the applicant is proposing that two spaces are marked out on-site formally to maximise parking in the remaining area. The access road is single-vehicle width and is a shared access to several properties. The applicant has demonstrated that appropriate vehicles can access and turn within the site and leave in a forward direction. Conditional approval is recommended.

1.13 Recommendation - Conditional approval

1.14 Conditions:

Notwithstanding Condition 1, the scheme for parking shall be marked out with ground markers in the location shown on the proposed ground floor plan Dwg No. 100 Rev C007. These parking areas shall not be used for any other purpose and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and of the development having regard to policy DM7.4 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017).

Notwithstanding Condition 1, a scheme for the provision of refuse storage and collection shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, this scheme shall be carried out in accordance with these agreed details prior to the development hereby approved being brought into use and retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and of the development having regard to policy DM7.4 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017).

Notwithstanding Condition 1, no development shall commence until a Construction Method Statement for the duration of the construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved statement shall: identify the access to the site for all site operatives (including those delivering materials) and visitors, provide for the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors; storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development; provide a scheme indicating the route for heavy construction vehicles to and from the site; a turning area within the site for delivery vehicles; a detailed scheme to prevent the deposit of mud and debris onto the highway and a dust suppression scheme (such measures shall include mechanical street cleaning, and/or provision of water bowsers, and/or wheel washing and/or road cleaning facilities, and any other wheel cleaning solutions and dust suppressions measures considered appropriate to the size of the

development), temporary parking, on site welfare facilities, loading, unloading and storage of equipment, materials, fuels and waste as well concrete mixing and use of fires and tree protection measures for trees to be retained. No cabins, storage of plant and materials or parking shall be located within the root protection areas of the retained trees as defined by the Tree Protection Plan. The approved statement shall be implemented and complied with during and for the life of the works associated with the development.

Reason: This information is required pre-development to ensure that the site set up does not impact on highway safety, pedestrian safety, retained trees (where necessary) and residential amenity having regard to policies DM5.19 and DM7.4 of the North Tyneside Local Plan (2017) and National Planning Policy Framework.

1.15 Informatives:

The applicant is advised that it is an offence to obstruct the public highway (footway or carriageway) by depositing materials without obtaining beforehand, and in writing, the permission of the Council as Local Highway Authority. Such obstructions may lead to an accident, certainly cause inconvenience to pedestrians and drivers, and are a source of danger to children, elderly people and those pushing prams or buggies. They are a hazard to those who are disabled, either by lack of mobility or impaired vision. Contact Highways@northtyneside.gov.uk for further information.

The applicant is advised that a license must be obtained from the Highways Authority for any scaffold placed on the footway, carriageway verge or other land forming part of the highway. Contact Streetworks@northtyneside.gov.uk for further information

The applicant is advised that no part of the gates or garage doors may project over the highway at any time. Contact New.Developments@northtyneside.gov.uk for further information.

The applicant is advised that it is an offence to obstruct the public highway (footway or carriageway) by depositing materials without obtaining beforehand, and in writing, the permission of the Council as Local Highway Authority. Such obstructions may lead to an accident, certainly cause inconvenience to pedestrians and drivers, and are a source of danger to children, elderly people and those pushing prams or buggies. They are a hazard to those who are disabled, either by lack of mobility or impaired vision. Contact Highways@northtyneside.gov.uk for further information.

The applicant is advised that they should contact Highway Maintenance to arrange for an inspection of the highways adjacent to the site. The applicant should be aware that failure to do so may result in the Council pursuing them for costs of repairing any damage in the surrounding area on completion of construction. Contact Highways@northtyneside.gov.uk for further information.

The applicant is advised that free and full access to the Public Right of Way network is always to be maintained. Should it be necessary for the protection of route users to temporarily close or divert an existing route during development,

this should be agreed with the council's Public Rights of Way Officer. Contact Highways@northtyneside.gov.uk for further information.

The applicant is advised to contact the council's Public Rights of Way Officer prior to construction arrange a joint inspection of the Public Right of Way network on and adjacent to the site. If this inspection is not carried out, the Local Highway Authority may pursue the developer for any costs to repair damage to these routes. Contact Highways@northtyneside.gov.uk for further information.

1.16 Public Rights of Way (PRoW)

1.17 The link into the site is a bridleway which then links into East Bailey and the high school. The access controls at that point may need to be updated (or removed) if the project which is aimed at access, is fully realised.

1.18 Manager for Environmental Health (Pollution)

1.19 No objection in principle to this application but would recommend construction hours and dust mitigation conditions are attached. If new external plant and equipment is installed as part of the development a condition to require a noise scheme will be necessary.

Installation of External Plant and Equipment:

A noise scheme must be submitted in accordance with BS4142 to determine the noise rating level of external plant and equipment operating at the site and that appropriate mitigation measures are taken where necessary to ensure the rating level of the plant and equipment does not exceed the existing background noise level.

It will be necessary following installation of the plant and equipment that acoustic testing is undertaken to verify compliance with this condition within one month of its installation and submitted for written approval prior to the operation of the plant and thereafter maintain in working order.

HOU04

SIT03

NOI02

1.20 Manager for Environmental Health (Contaminated Land)

1.21 No objection. Any spoil from foundations to be disposed of at a suitably licensed facility.

1.22 Biodiversity Officer and Landscape Architect

1.23 Additional supporting information (28th January 2022) and a revised Arboricultural Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan has been submitted (dated February 2022).

The supporting information confirms the following:

- The entrance is level access and there is no requirement to re-surface the existing gravel.
- 600mm paving adjacent to the new building will be provided as a connection with the existing surface where construction work will occur.
- The surface of the 'Bridleway' remains as existing

- The areas for marked on the plan for parking is indicative and will not be formally marked out other than highlighting the areas with parking markers within the ground
- The drainage is shown on the revised plan.

1.24 No trees require removal but there is the potential for damage to retained trees from construction works.

1.25 The AIA and AMS provides details for protecting the trees during the construction process by the installation of appropriate protective fencing and maintaining the agreed construction exclusion zones. Access to the construction area will be via the current driveway which is within the RPA's of trees; however as this area is already hardsurfaced, no significant impact is expected. Some further access for construction is expected within the RPA of Tree 5 but again this area is part surfaced and therefore not vulnerable to compaction etc. A link to the existing utility run will be made between the RPA's of T4 and T5, but within the RPA of Tree 8 which is located on the opposite side of the church and bridleway. The new utility line is located at an angle to T8 following the radial pattern of the tree roots rather than being at right angles to the tree RPA's. This links to an existing pipe network under a hardsurfaced and non-permeable tarmac access driveway so root damage is expected to be minimal. Nevertheless, a condition stating that all works should be undertaken by hand in this location is to be applied.

1.26 The following conditions should be attached to the application:

All measures set out in section 6.3 (Mitigation and Compensation Strategy) of the Bat Survey Report (Oct 2021 EcoNorth) will be implemented throughout the development.

A sensitive lighting design will be created in line with current guidance, with light levels of no more than 2 lux around the mature trees, baffles used on lights to help minimise light spill, and LEDs to be used which do not emit blue light (BCT, 2018). A Lighting Strategy including light spill plans will be submitted to the LPA for approval within 4 weeks of development commencing on site for any new lighting associated with the scheme.

3no. general purpose woodcrete bat boxes (Schwegler 2F or similar) will be installed on appropriate trees within the adjacent woodland. Details of bat box specification and locations must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority within 4 weeks of development commencing on site and will be installed in accordance with the approved plans.

No vegetation removal or building works shall take place during the bird nesting season (March-August inclusive) unless a survey by a suitably qualified ecologist has confirmed the absence of nesting birds immediately prior to works commencing

In the event that works do not commence within 12 months of the date of the Bat Survey Report (Eco North October 2021), an update survey will be required to

inform the assessment, to ensure the site condition remains the same and no alterations are required to the mitigation contained within this document.

All trees on site are to be retained. No trees, shrubs or hedges shall be felled, uprooted, wilfully damaged or destroyed, cut back in any way or removed during the development phase other than in accordance with the approved plans or without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Prior to the commencement of any site works (including clearance, demolition works, tree works, soil moving, hardstandings, temporary access construction and / or widening or any operations involving the use of motorised vehicles or construction machinery, site security fencing, services), tree protection is to be installed in accordance with Elliot Consultancy Tree Protection Plan (ARB/AE/2631/TPP February 2022). The tree protection fence is to be of a type and height as described in the AMS. The area surrounding each tree group within the approved protective fencing shall be protected for the full duration of the development and shall not be removed or repositioned without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. Photographic evidence is to be submitted on completion of the installation of the fence.

A revised Arboricultural Method Statement is to be submitted to incorporate the proposed working method for the installation of new drainage and drainage connections which is to be undertaken by hand, Air Spade or similar method as approved by the Local Planning Authority. The AMS is to include details of tree root protection including covering of exposed roots, cutting of roots etc. Thereafter, the development hereby permitted shall only be carried out in accordance with the revised Arboricultural Method Statement, Tree Protection Plan, BS5837:2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations', and the National Joint Utilities Group (NJUG) 'Guidelines for the Planning, Installation and Maintenance of Utility Apparatus in Proximity to Trees')

No changes in levels shall be implemented unless wholly in accordance with the approved details or otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Any pruning works shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved specification and the requirements of British Standard 3998: 2010 - Recommendations for Tree Works, detail of which are to be submitted for approval.

The contractor's construction method statement relating to traffic management/site compounds/contractor access, temporary parking, on site welfare facilities, loading, unloading and storage of equipment, materials, fuels and waste as well concrete mixing and use of fires must be submitted in writing and approved by the Local Planning Authority and include tree protection measures for the trees to be retained. Cabins, storage of plant and materials, parking are to be shown on a plan and not to be located within the RPA of the retained trees as defined by the Tree Protection Plan.

An arboricultural consultant is to be appointed by the developer to advise on the tree management for the site and to undertake regular supervision visits to monitor and oversee the implementation of the works as set out in the AMS. This condition may only be fully discharged on completion of the development subject to satisfactory written and photographic evidence of regular monitoring and compliance by the pre-appointed tree specialist during construction.

Within one month from the start on site of any operations such as site excavation works, site clearance (including site strip) for the development, a landscape plan for the planting of 1 no tree shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The tree shall be a minimum of 12-14 cm girth and planted in accordance with the approved details and to a standard in accordance with the relevant recommendations of British Standard 8545:2014. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the timetable agreed with the Local Planning Authority. Should that tree, within a period of five years after planting, is removed, dies or becomes seriously damaged or defective, it shall be replaced with others of species, size and number as originally approved, by the end of the first available planting season thereafter. No development shall take place until a schedule of landscape maintenance for a minimum period of five years including details of the arrangements for its implementation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule.

2.0 Representations

2.1 Objections

2.2 15 objections have been received from seven individual properties. These objections are set out below, some of which have been summarised. Some objections have been accompanied by photographs, figures of ordnance survey editions, title documents and appendices from meetings which took place prior to the submission of this application.

- Affect character of conservation area
- Affect setting of listed building
- Inappropriate design
- Inappropriate materials
- Loss of/damage to trees
- Poor traffic/pedestrian safety
- Poor/unsuitable vehicular access
- Impact on landscape
- Inadequate parking provision
- Loss of residential amenity
- Out of keeping with surroundings
- Within greenbelt/no special circumstance
- Nuisance: disturbance, dust, dirt
- The Heritage statement informs us that the "churches [sic] 'The Way Forward Group' identified a number of needs for the church building to bring it into the 21st century. These include improving comfort and flexibility of use for worship and as a key part of plans to engage more widely in mission and witness with the community of the Parish."
- The revised plans now show no alterations to the internal layout of the Church. This is a significant change and means that the kitchen, extra storage and

cleaner's cupboard, along with the proposed new mezzanine floor are gone. The hope for unobscured view of the large stained-glass window is also not realised. What remains is an additional entrance and two toilets (one of which is to be accessible).

-An opportunity appears to have been missed to reassess how the ambitions of The Way Forward Group should be realised. Instead, a tunnel vision has developed with a fixation on having a new entrance with less focus on what it is that stops people engaging with the Church community. Is it really the position of the door?

-In common with other respondents, I recognise the need for the toilet facilities but question the need for a new entrance. The space realised by the proposed extension could be re-imagined accommodating at least some of the stated aims of the original application (storage, kitchen, cleaner's cupboard). This could easily be achieved if the Church were to retain its current accessible entrance.

-Worryingly, despite this being the third set of plans to be submitted for this application, a number of errors and inconsistencies still remain: 1. Aboricultural Impact Assessment: It is still unclear how many trees may be felled. The AIA has identified 3 trees for felling (numbers 2, 3 and 4 on AIA). Two of these trees are category B2 which means they make a substantial contribution to the site, have landscape value and should be retained wherever possible. It seems odd then that they have been identified to be felled solely to allow construction space and perceived aesthetics. However, it is even odder that the Design and Access statement states that "existing trees on the site are to be retained"(section 1.4). Has the wrong AIA been submitted? 2. Bat Report - this report states that it is a "draft report and is not currently suitable to support a planning application." Has the wrong bat survey been submitted? 3. Materials for building - there is still little detail regarding the external styling of the porch. a) The agent states that the intention is to reuse the stained-glass window which is being removed to make the new entrance. This is encouraging but the windows are described in the application form as having aluminium window frames. This is not sympathetic to the listing. b) The roof is planned to be zinc "matching the zinc copings to the present rendered north wall". The copings are stained and corroded - not an aspiring aim for a match. The main roof and that on the opposite side of the Church is Welsh slate as specified in the listing. Surely, the roof should match with those surfaces. c) The stonework for the walls refers to pink sandstone, there is no mention of the bands of red sandstone specified in the listing. d) Also linked to the building, the Christian name of the original architect is still mis-spelt, and the Heritage Statement (1.3) still refers to the lane leading to the Church as Vicarage Lane. It has never been called this - either officially or informally. It is shown as a bridle way on OS maps. 4. Parking - the application form now states that there are four parking spaces which will reduce to two on completion of the extension - the four spaces are referred to as "informal", presumably because there are no bays marked out on the gravel and rough surface. The number of spaces (formal or otherwise) is disputed. Especially as the Design and Access statement itself contains a photo showing that five cars can more than easily accommodated in the current space. How many spaces will be lost? 5. Car park surface - the Design and Access statement (1.4) states that the carparking area is to be re-surfaced. There is no indication of the material other than in the application form which states that the surface will remain gravel. Equally importantly, there is no indication as to the size or area to be re-surfaced. Other missing dimensions include the flat paved area surrounding the proposed

extension. 6. Access for hearse - the Design and Access statement (1.3) states that "A hearse has attended the site to confirm the accessibility, see photos below." A hearse does not appear in any of the photos. Even if it did, hearses are usually part of a cortege of several vehicles. The lack of parking would mean that each would have to drive up the lane in turn, coffin, coffin bearers and mourners get out, and the vehicle then turn round and drive back down the lane to allow the next one to 'unload'. The reverse procedure would have to happen at the end of the ceremony. Currently, all are able to park at the front of the Church on West Lane. 7. Suitability of lane for additional vehicles and pedestrians - the lane (erroneously referred to as 'Vicarage Lane' presumably to make it sound more substantial) is very narrow, uneven, has no pavements and much of it is only about 3 metres wide, narrowing to 2.6m in places. As recorded by the NT public rights of way officer: "The link into the site is a Bridleway which then links into East Bailey and the high school." Just because it is possible for a vehicle to use this, and the fact that others do, does not mean that it is a sound idea to encourage more to do so! The construction of Garden Cottage, further down the track a few years ago, was conditioned on the installation of a substantial rumble strip. This was in recognition of the extra vehicles from one family home due to the number of pedestrians and cyclists using the lane. If this is to become the main entrance, then presumably all Church goers would use the lane - adding to the footfall. 8. Parking on West Lane - again the applicant continues to refer to parking on West Lane as "inconvenient and dangerous" for the ceremonial vehicles. It is difficult to understand how parking next to the pavement, outside the Church, can be described as "inconvenient". As to it being "dangerous", this is also difficult to understand. If the drivers of these vehicles currently thought this was the case, surely, they would avail themselves of the "informal" spaces next to the Church. This does not happen. 9. The stated need for a ceremonial entrance- it remains a puzzle as to why the applicant insists on referring to the present entrance as being "uncomfortable and undignified". I would imagine that a quick straw poll of brides would show that they would prefer to enter the Church by processing up the path, through the listed gate posts and archway rather than being driven up a bumpy narrow lane and deposited at the door. Photographers certainly make the most of the current entrance and walkway. As the applicant points out, in inclement weather the option is available to drive to the current, accessible entrance. In a previous application the agent expressed concern regarding accessibility for coffins via the current accessible entrance due to an internal porch. This is blamed on an internal door, installed some years ago (in living memory of some parishioners), and was not part of Keeling's original design. If after, 40 years this is proving to be an issue there is a simple solution. Additionally, the replacement of pews with chairs has provided further flexibility at this entrance. 10. Ceremonial entrance/exit next to toilets? A further reason for this extension not to include an entrance is that ceremonial events would find themselves entering and leaving next to the toilets - perhaps not the ambience that many look for. 11. An invisible entrance? The applicant tries to justify the need for this new doorway by referring to the current accessible entrance as being "invisible and inconvenient, [which] ignores the wider community and Killingworth Township". Where to start - an invisible entrance that ignores a community? The Church serves communities a full 360 degrees round its current position - it cannot have a door to face each one. How an inanimate object can ignore part of the community in one position but be "welcoming" less than 25 metres to the other side of a large church is a mystery. 12. True purpose of

extension? If the aim is to encourage wider engagement with the community then the toilets (in addition to those already in the nearby Church Hall) would clearly benefit some. However, this could be achieved without having a new entrance. Perhaps the Church community of St. John the Evangelist could investigate more creative, cost-effective ways to raise its profile and/or simply improve the surface from the link to Killingworth to the current entrance?

-Affect character of conservation area- Killingworth Village conservation area was designated in 1974, the boundary being based on the medieval village and the open space and development plan around it. The Conservation Area Character Appraisal, published in 2008, stated the importance of a clean undeveloped backdrop. The suggestion that the applicant would like to discuss the possibility of opening up the area to the North is a great concern in this regard. The addition of this porch will not enhance the conservation area.

-Affect setting of listed building - this grade 2 listed building already has a fully accessible entrance. The listing entry for the church includes the rendered north nave wall. This has been neglected over time, along with the planters, the broken lights and the damaged window covers. A comparatively small investment would see these repaired and restored to the state it was in when listed originally.

-Inappropriate design - there is little detail of the design for example size and shape of stone work, inclusion of banding of red sandstone (as per listing), stated intention to use aluminium window frames.

-Inappropriate materials - the grade 2 listing describes the church roof (nave, chancel and south aisle) as being Welsh slate, yet the applicant is proposing to use zinc to match the zinc copings rather than the roof itself. Given the corroded state of the zinc this seems doubly inappropriate. Many of the other materials are not specified and expert consultees have commented on the style and sizing of the proposed stonework.

-Loss/damage to trees - solely for construction purposes. Trees are in Conservation Area. There has been significant concern, and surprise at their potential loss by passers-by, including regular Church goers. The AIA states three trees will be felled, the agent states there will be none.

-Poor/unsuitable vehicular access - the stated intention is for this extension to become the main entrance. This means many more pedestrians and ceremonial vehicles on an unnamed track shown as a bridleway on OS maps. As recorded by the NT public rights of way officer: "The link into the site is a Bridleway which then links into East Bailey and the high school." Just because it is possible for a vehicle to use this, and the fact that others do, does not mean that it is a sound idea to encourage more to do so. The construction of Garden Cottage, further down the track a few years ago, was conditioned on the installation of a substantial rumble strip.

-Poor traffic/pedestrian safety - there are no pavements along its length and it is regularly, and primarily used by students from Percy Hedley School, cyclists and pedestrians of all ages. It is not possible, let alone safe, for a car and a pedestrian to use this route at the same time. There is very poor visibility from this track onto West Lane and from the track to the cut through to Killingworth and the High School.

-Discrepancies on the application form: 1) Section 6: It is claimed there is no new or altered access proposed to pedestrian or vehicular access from a public highway, but this application proposes both, by requesting a new north entrance for pedestrians and ceremonial vehicles, congregation and wider community.

Right of Way Consultation: The ROW officer advises "The link into the site is a

Bridleway which then links into east Bailey and the high school. The access controls at that point may need to be updated (or removed) if the project which is aimed at access, is fully realised". If access controls were removed or re designated at that point to allow access to ceremonial vehicles in 2021, that means there would be a legal/planning requirement for that point to be brought up to 2021 standards of safety, width, surface covering, signage etc. 2) Section 9: Also some of the materials proposed differ from those in the current listed church and the existing buildings in that location of the conservation area e.g. zinc roof instead of existing slates, aluminium window frames instead of timber, vehicle access and hard standing on gravel. Tarmac exists on the "adopted" section together with much needed existing traffic calming measures, a Planning Condition stipulated before approval for a single dwelling down the access lane. Are they to be resurfaced with grave? 3) Section 10: It is also questionable on the number and type of parking claimed and proposed. For example, replacing the space on the west gable currently used for disabled parking, for parking for 1 ceremonial vehicle, and demarcation of 1 new space for disable parking, and 1 space for the congregation. All parking proposed is concealed. If the toilets are built as proposed and removes half of the area available currently. 4) Section 12: The amended plan shows an extended sloped area around the porch. As there are already flooding problems with water from the village travelling along the lane in heavy downpours, the slope will exacerbate this. Resurfacing of vehicle access and parking area is mentioned. But where, to what extent and what materials where, what happens to the much-needed traffic calming control, a planning requirement stipulated for the building of one new dwelling along the lane? New slopes or any increase in tarmac surface area must be done with due regard to drainage. 5) The EcoNorth Bat Survey Report submitted is based on past records, existing environment and what is proposed by the applicant. The proposed visualisation used in page 8 of the report shows all existing trees to remain. Under those conditions i.e., all trees remain, it states the proposed building will cause little adverse impact. (N.B. It also states this is a draft and is currently not suitable to support a planning application). 6) Section 15: The re-submitted Elliott Consultancy AIA report from July, states no trees needs to be removed to allow construction. Then recommends felling trees in its Appendix 2. This would merge the character of the township and conservation areas, causing detrimental impact to both. 7) Section 18: The existing floor space of the church is much larger than that of the church hall. They both serve the same congregation and community. The church hall provides toilets within its footprint. An extension is not needed to provide toilets. They can be provided within the existing floor space. (Especially as no internal facilities are now applied for i.e., no lift, stairs, mezzanine, meeting rooms, storage room, kitchen, cleaners' storage). 8) Section 24: Within the amended application, there is an amended site plan, which now includes the proposed access lane and footpath, neither owned by the applicant. I note a Public Notice was placed in the Journal Newcastle on 1st December 2021 and responses to this were required to be made to planning within 21days of the notice. I emailed made my response to that, evening 20th December 2021 with regard to ownership, easement and rights of way.

-Comments on the Design and Access Statement: Use: As a resident living near the church for over of over 30 years, and part of the congregation during numerous ceremonies, although the agent mentions that sometimes in inclement weather ceremonial vehicles use the access lane, this is not the case. There is

no precedence for it being used as such. The lane access is neither “direct” or “safe” access for ceremonial vehicles with limited manoeuvrability and their large size compared with “domestic” vehicles. This lane is of limited width 2.6m, poor construction, and used as a footpath, cycleway, wheelchair commuter route together with sole access for residents with homes along the lane. Amount: The consultations in the congregation and wider community resulted in the previous application being put forward to include a lift, stairs, mezzanine, meeting rooms, storage room, kitchen, cleaners storage, it now seems those facilities identified in the consultations and included in the previous submission, are not required in this amended application. Is this to be planning by stealth? Indeed, if those facilities are no longer being provided internally, then there is internally room for toilets. As you will note there is already a Planning Approved accessible entrance to the church. (Plan A Pg. 7). Layout: A welcome lobby, library and notice board already exist at the current accessible entrance to the church. The only additional facility is two toilets and as mentioned they could be accommodated internally. The location of a new entrance to the north does not provide “safe” access and reduces current parking capacity. The proposal also creates additional hazards by creating concealed parking and traffic movement, inevitable with this layout. (Plan A Pg.7) Landscaping: This statement says existing trees on the “site” are to be retained. Does this mean within the extent of amended site plan? Does the resurfacing of the car parking area intend to be gravel re-surface top up as suggested in the Application Form, or would it be made suitable for increased traffic movement, turning and parking? Current congregation traffic movement and parking churns up the existing area. Appearance: The existing church did use local materials during its “High Victorian Rouge Gothic” construction. The initially intended north facade was not completed at time of construction, and indeed expanding its footprint is not required to accommodate the number of people within the current congregation. Architecturally, this application must be a difficult design task. Although in the main, expensive, and “sustainable” materials are specified, much is unsuitable for this building and its location within this conservation area. Sadly, this modest design looks exactly what it is i.e. an added on toilet block with a tin roof.

-Comments on the Heritage Statement: This Heritage Statement gives the listed building entry and claims that because the north facade was never built, there is no room within the existing footprint for toilets. However, the initial application applied for approval for the internal inclusion of lift, stairs, mezzanine, meeting rooms, storage room, kitchen, cleaners’ storage. The amended application asks for no such internal facilities leaving room inside the current footprint for toilets. (Plan A Pg.7)

As stated above the materials proposed are neither appropriate for this listed building nor its location and context with adjacent buildings within the conservation area. The church parish also serves West Moor and Forest Hall to the South, Holystone and part of West Allotment to the East, reaching Gosforth Park boundary to the West. All with much expanded housing since the church was built, as well as Killingworth Township. (Church of England Commissioners maps updated June 2021). When Killingworth Township was built a sister Church was included at its centre. However, during the NTC Township Centre updating for the 21st century i.e. The Morrison Centre, library, community offices, cafe etc, a replacement church was originally discussed. The Church declined this option to serve at the centre of the Township community. There seems a movement to bring older churches into the 21st century by widening their appeal and use by

providing kitchen facilities, improved heating and seating, and toilets, often together with a grand welcoming entrance. This is usually achieved by adjusting the existing main entrance and footprint, not by creating a new access causing detrimental impact on the safe passage of the whole community, local environment, and amenity and conservation area.

-Blocking Access, Parking On a Dangerous Bend, Offered Parking: The amended Design and Access statement suggest “ceremonial vehicles sometimes use the access lane in inclement weather”, but this is not the case. Similarly, (from the Agents Response published 19,20th Additional Information published 29th July 2021), what is “advised” and “designated” and “ceremonial occasion parking managed”, is questionable. In reality this is what happens at ceremonial occasions and other church activities, access blocked by funeral attendees parking on the narrow lane, yet again. In the recent past, NTC proposed to prohibit parking on the bend of West Lane outside the church as it considered it dangerous. However, those who park on the bend to attend the church claimed it was “not a problem”, “and adequate parking was offered along the north side of the church. Now the church agrees with NTC assessment “dangerous parking on the bend”. If this amended application is built, much of the offered parking along the north side of the church will be removed, the raised concrete plinth at 95cm cannot be parked on. A function of this proposal is to increase the usage of church beyond its current level but does not address issues of safe pedestrian and vehicle access or the parking needs of increased usage. The application does propose ceremonial vehicle parking at the west gable, currently offered as disabled access parking to the main church entrance. However, to reach the reallocated parking area, the ceremonial procession would need to drive along the bridleway at its narrowest point 2.6m, to the detriment of other users in terms of safe passing and blocking access. In the case of funeral entourage, generally stretch limousines and hearse, all with limited manoeuvrability. Where do other ceremonial attendees/congregation park?

-Although the original church plan had the aspiration of a north aisle, it was never built. Architecturally and historically that aspiration did not include a North Entrance, however the original plan does show an expansion of the current main access. (See the Applicant’s Amended Heritage Statement 2.12.2021).

-Creating another access on the North side of the Church was never intended and is detrimental to its Grade II Listing Building Status.

-Heritage of Area Affected – Background Information: Published maps show the lane running west from Killingworth Village has been in existence since early 1800. It originally connected the Village with the mineral line, West House Farm and onward. Around 1830 Wesleyan Chapel (currently Wesleyan Cottage) was built. This, together with some later adjacent properties, lines the north of the lane. In the late 19th century, Matthew Bell gave an area of his land so Saint John’s Church could be built, including The Vicarage (currently The Old Vicarage) and Vicarage Cottage. At this time a stone wall, still existing today on the south side of the lane, was built to create the boundary with the Church, graveyard, Vicarage and Vicarage Cottage. Now privately owned, Vicarage Cottage (since 1948), The Old Vicarage (since 1990), the residents of those properties having legal right of vehicular access. Definitive maps were introduced to record rights of way. Initially Path 22 on Northumberland County Council and Longbenton Local Council now amalgamated into North Tyneside Council and included on its Definitive Map. Path 22 was originally a bridleway connecting a small village and surrounding farming area. Around 1960 Killingworth Township

was built, including George Stephenson High School. The population residing and commuting in the area increased dramatically. But building the township and school over the footpath effectively made it redundant. However, NCC, and LLC re-routed Path 22, so retained a footpath link between the Village, Forest Hall and the new Township. Albeit across residential vehicular access. Unfortunately, although this re-routing seemed a good alternative in the 1970's, it created a pinch point. Part of the route is alongside a high wall, obliterating the view of footpath users, to incoming vehicles. It stops incoming drivers seeing pedestrians approaching. It is now a major link between Killingworth Township, Killingworth Village, Forest Hall, GSH, Percy Hedley Complex and surrounding areas, all continually expanding in density and population. Being also an NTC walking and cycling route, this dangerous situation is further exacerbated.

-21st Century Safe Access: Moving the footpath 20m or so west, of its current position along the high wall, would improve visibility immensely. Reinstating a speed bump is essential and fencing off the current position. Government Guidelines do allow local councils powers in these matters, and a formal framework for Definitive Map Modifications Order exists (DMMO). There are also Guidelines for Landowners not to allow anything which may endanger the users of the right of way. As NTC is responsible for maintaining the footpath, and owns some of the footpath/lane, would allowing this application fall into that "endanger" category. The graveyard is "Closed", no further burials will happen there. It is now NTC responsibility to maintain it. As there are no graves directly beside the narrow pinch point on the lane, it may be possible to widen access at that point.

-Visibility/ Up to Date Facilities/ Listed Building: Pruning the oversized, evergreen trees at the east side of the church, would open the view from West Lane to St Johns dramatically. This may be within Conservation Area Character and Tree Preservation policies. Expanding the main entrance as in the original plans would increase the available footprint for modern facilities, toilets, and kitchen without compromising its Grade II Listed Building status. This amended plan no longer includes extensive new internal facilities i.e. lift, stairs, mezzanine, meeting room, kitchen, store room, cleaners store so gives room for internal toilets. Stipulating dedicated safe parking is essential before increasing and expanding usage of the church.

-The agent paints a rosy picture of lane use but the fact is that most people living along the lane have written and objected to the proposal citing traffic concerns. The proposal will make a bad situation worse.

-The 3 metres minimum width regulation for a Bridleway is being ignored.

-It is said that an Englishman's home is his castle, our recurring problem is – people keep blocking the drawbridge.

-I have daily experience of this footpath for over 30 years, which is car and van access for 7 residential properties. I live in one of the 3 properties located at the west end of the lane beyond this proposed application. This also provides access to and from George Stephenson High School (1200 pupils), White Swan Library facilities, and offices, Morrison's Shopping Centre and Bus Station, St Johns Church, Killingworth Village and Township, The Percy Hedley Foundation Complex and Forest Hall etc. Unfortunately, the lane is very narrow being only 2.6m at one point, its busiest point. This narrowness means that a car, and pedestrian or cyclist or wheelchair user or pushchair cannot pass simultaneously. This situation requires co-operation with both users which is often not offered, not understood, and sometimes results in aggressive conversation and actions.

-A law has existed for many years now, requiring a minimum width of 3.5m for emergency fire engine and ambulance access. Possibly as the width of the lane is not clearly stated on the submitted plans it has slipped passed the scrutiny of the Highways Department. I would expect them to reassess the problem on site. There are 3 properties, 14 people, 7 cars at the west end of the lane

-An additional danger is the registered footpath/ cycleway joining the lane at right angles from the north. This has a high wall on its edge. This wall blocks the view of any cyclist/pedestrian/wheelchair users approaching from Killingworth Township of any vehicle travelling west along the lane. This has resulted, in my case, of 3 cyclists hitting my car, which was stationary before collision. Two of these collisions involved a former Vicar of St Johns Church, now retired. Fortunately, none resulted in serious injury or damage.

-The additional housing in the area and the expansion of the Percy Hedley Complex results in continual rising numbers of pedestrians, wheelchair users and cyclists. This increases the problems and difficulties and this planning application which includes the addition of "ceremonial vehicles" to this narrow lane should not be permitted because the lane will be blocked accessing these ceremonies. The drawings submitted do not record the narrowness of the footpath / lane at 2.6m in reality. It is no longer a quiet lane in a remote country village, but a well-used thoroughfare surrounded by huge housing estates and used by many people daily. These problems have been escalating slowly for decades. Indeed, NTC Highways Department recognised the traffic dangers of this lane some time ago. They imposed a Planning Condition on the builder of "Garden House" along the lane to build the traffic calming speed bump outside the north side of the church. This was around 15years ago and the number of lane users has considerably increased since. I would expect the Highways Department and the applicant to devise a scheme to continue to address these problems and make them a condition of Planning Approval. This would demonstrate NTC Planning Department does value safety concerns of its residents and their right to travel unhindered around the community. If the applicant wishes to bring the church into the 21st century, they should be required to bring its access into the 21st century. This would improve safety for all users of this lane and allow the three properties and 14 residents living at the west end, fire engine and ambulance services when required.

-The continued lack of attention to detail, and missing or incorrect information, should be a real concern to those who have to consider whether or not this application, to extend a Grade 2 listed church in a conservation area, should be approved. The agent appears to be using this process as an opportunity for those reading the various submissions to act as proof-readers. As one commentator or another submits a response, the agent amends some of the errors and adds some of the missing information. There are still several errors and omissions - pressure of time necessitates that this response focuses on just two of them. 1. The plans fail to show the correct number of buttresses. The photos in the Design and Access statement clearly show six buttresses. However, the plans show only five. Crucially, the missing one is at the west end of the proposed extension. This makes the position of the extension ambiguous. If measurements are taken from the furthest buttress, then how is the second to be incorporated into the extension's footprint? If measurements are taken from the second, then it would appear to encroach on another window and reduce vehicle manoeuvrability. In either case, missing a buttress seems quite fundamental. 2. The 'visual of the proposed north facade extension', section 1.6 of the latest Design and Access

statement, does not match the plans. a) No parking bays are shown, giving a false impression of more space, especially given the perspective of the visualisation. b) The end wall is shown as being flat whereas the plans show a significantly protruding window area. c) The stonework is shown as regular. This is a concern given the comments of Historic Buildings and Places: "repeat our observations of June that the sandstone blocks to the new porch should be coursed so as to appear irregular as with the masonry on the host building". d) The surface of the bridleway, the area around the church and proposed extension appears to be tarmac, the application form states they will remain as gravel. e) The green spaces do not exist as shown.

-For more than 30 years I have lived in Vicarage Cottage. It is located at the west end of the lane running alongside St Johns Church. As well as our legal vehicular access, part of this lane is a registered footpath/bridle way, initially Path 22 when registered by Northumberland County Council and Longbenton Council, now amalgamated into North Tyneside Council.

-Access: There are currently 2 entrances into the church building, a doorway on the southeast leading to a significant area not surveyed by the application. The other, the main entrance to the southwest corner providing accessible access with approved ramps and step. Both entrances can be used directly from West Lane Killingworth Village and are within the safe curtilage of the church. There seems a movement to bring old churches into the 21st century by widening their appeal and use by providing kitchen facilities, as well as comfort by modernising toilets facilities, improved heating and seating, often together with a grand welcoming entrance. This is usually achieved by modernising the existing main entrance, not by creating a new access causing detrimental impact on the safe passage of the whole community, local environment, and amenity and conservation area. This application proposes a north access in addition to the 2 current safely accessible entrances, for use by the congregation and ceremonial vehicles. Again, accessed from West Lane, but across a public footpath/bridleway only 2.6m wide at its busiest junction. Much narrower than current legal requirements of safe vehicular access. A high wall alongside the path connecting Killingworth Township and Killingworth Village etc, obliterates the view of users to incoming traffic travelling west along the lane. Although the applicant's submitted location plan shows another footpath route, it is an unlit dirt path, through the graveyard, and in many cases directly on top of graves. Part of the graveyard is a Local Site of Scientific Interest (LSSI). It is unsuitable.

- Conservation Area and Listed Buildings: This church was built in Killingworth Village, now part of Killingworth Village Conservation Area. The lane along the north side of the church, and continuing westward, is lined on both sides by an avenue of mature trees forming a green boundary to the conservation area. The applicant asks for removal of trees contributing significantly to the tree canopy. This is a detrimental impact on the conservation character, and tree policy within the conservation area. The applicant wants the church to be more visible, initially removing 3 trees facing Killingworth Township on the submitted plan, then more in the future. This merges the character of the township and conservation areas, against current policies of NTC, and causes detrimental impact to both. Although the original church plan had the aspiration of a north aisle, it was never built. Architecturally and historically that aspiration did not include a North Entrance, however the original plan does show an expansion of the current main access. (See the Applicants Heritage Statement). Creating another access on the North

side of the Church was never intended and is detrimental to its Grade II Listing Building Status.

-Tarmac, Speed Bump, Drainage, Flooding: The submitted proposal plan shows the area north of the church as tarmac, however much of this area is gravel. Does the applicant intend to tarmac the area if so, who maintains it? Resurfacing of the proposed parking area is also mentioned. Where and what surface is this? Currently the only area of tarmac is across the NTC adopted section of the footpath. It includes the much needed "speed bump" controlling the speed of cyclist, motor bikes and vehicles. It must be retained. As well as problems with surface runoff from the wide expanse of tarmac in George Stephenson High School, there are already flooding problems with water from the village travelling along the lane in heavy downpours. Any increase in tarmac surface area must be done with due regard to drainage.

-I have lived next to St John's Church for over 40 years. In that time, I have come to respect the Church and the Conservation Area in which it sits. I am lucky to live here with a listed building on the doorstep. I have always felt some responsibility to protect the local area. I have always tried to contribute to the maintenance of the Church's surroundings and the Conservation Area. I have spent many hours, over the years, cutting shrubs, weeding in the car park area, litter picking, clearing off graffiti, reporting fly-tipping and stolen cars and supporting my neighbour in the best way I could. It is disappointing to be told the area is dismal and unattractive. This is not helped by the lack of maintenance to the building especially the North wall: crumbling render, damaged window guards, old rusty disused lighting and degrading buttress covers. I tried to tackle the area to the North of the Church with some volunteers, removing brambles and planting bulbs and wildflowers but could not get any help from the Church.

-I note the Church's new interest in its surrounding area and would also like to discuss this with the NTC conservation team to establish a plan and offer my support.

-Over the years schemes have been put forward to address the 'unfinished' North wall. This culminated in a grand design of a structure, reinstating the North transept with a glass wall, entrance, meeting rooms and a toilet. This has now been reduced in scope to a porch and toilets.

-I had a discussion in the eighties with the then vicar and was told a toilet would be installed. We did some investigations on the drains; the Church was modified internally but no toilet was ever installed.

-I attended a number of meetings with Church representatives in the Church, the most recent being in 2019. Specific proposals were put forward and I was told no trees would be removed and that the scheme would respect the Conservation Area. Although the indicative drawings show trees in place, the plans clearly show this is not the case. I feel angry and deceived as this was less of a consultation and more of this is what we intend to do. To my knowledge no feedback was ever provided.

-The trees formed the bridleway before the wall was removed to form a carpark. Most of the trees in the Conservation Area are self-seeded, are over 50 years old and provide habitat and sources of food to wildlife including owls, woodpeckers, tree creepers and bats.

-In the last few years, a small porch was added to our (non-listed) cottage, facing the churchyard. Understandably, extensive research was carried out to ensure the structure and materials met NTC requirements for building in a Conservation

Area. The Church is grade 2 listed and I do not feel the materials proposed are in keeping with the building's listed status.

-My main concern is safety particularly where the path from East Bailey meets the bridleway. The width of the car park allows some flexibility when encountering pedestrians. The gap between the graveyard wall and the cottage garden wall is tight. Whilst it is possible to get a hearse through, the challenge of a number of limousines trying to negotiate the site may prove undignified but more importantly unsafe when pedestrians are involved. After all, it is primarily a footpath. The parking issue would obviously get worse as the number of spaces are reduced. More cars would now park at the front of the Church thus reducing the visibility of these large vehicles as they leave the lane. Accessing the Church from the North makes no sense from a safety point of view.

-I care about the building, its environment and would like to see the Church thrive. Its use by other groups, the installation of a kitchen and toilet should have been done years ago. I cannot understand the link between attracting more people and moving the entrance. You surely use all the building's attributes to your advantage, including its current very attractive original entrance. The number of walkers taking pictures of the Church in lockdown has been staggering.

-As a neighbour, I would ask the Church to respect the area in which it is situated. In these uncertain times, when the current building needs attention in so many areas, is this a good use of resources?

-There is little doubt that the Church would benefit from the addition of an accessible toilet, there being no toilets there at all. One can also understand wanting the ability to provide a hot beverage. However, I believe that these good intentions have rather grown beyond the identified needs. As many an episode of Channel 4's "Grand Designs" programme testify, just because you can do something doesn't mean it is a good idea or that the costs won't spiral out of control.

-The Community Hall (still referred to locally as the Church Hall) and its facilities are not mentioned in the planning application. This nearby property was refurbished about ten years ago, at significant cost. It provides ramp access to the Hall which has toilets (including an accessible one) and a re-vamped kitchen. Equipped with stackable chairs and folding tables, with storage area, it provides an accessible and very flexible space. It is not over-used). Indeed prior to the lockdown, it was being advertised locally to encourage more users.

-Affect setting of listed building: this grade 2 listed building already has a fully accessible entrance. The listing entry for the church includes the rendered north nave wall. This has been neglected over time, along with the planters, the broken lights and the damaged window covers. A comparatively small investment would see these repaired and restored to the state it was in when listed originally.

-Inappropriate design: there are dimensions missing from the plans (neither of the planters have full dimensions) so it is not possible to comment fully due to this omission as its full size is ambiguous. There are no details of the design just a mention that there will be "references to the original architecture". It is difficult to have confidence in this claim especially given the missing dimensions, lack of detail, inappropriate materials (see below) and misleading statements regarding the lane and the trees (see below). The planters are optimistically described as "adding a colourful opportunity for seasonal flowers and shrubs". Given that this is a North wall, and the lack of attention paid to the grounds to date, this seems

overly ambitious. Internally, this new main entrance includes the toilets; not a feature that most ceremonial occasions have on their preferred list.

-Inappropriate materials: the grade 2 listing describes the church roof (nave, chancel and south aisle) as being Welsh slate, yet the applicant is proposing to use zinc to match the zinc copings rather than the roof itself. Given the corroded state of the zinc this seems doubly inappropriate. Many of the other materials are not specified but there is mention of the use of pink sandstone. The listing describes the church as having “bands of red sandstone” – not pink which is a different stone.

-The subtext of this proposal appears to be not so much about providing toilets but having an entrance on the North side of the Church because, to quote the Design and Access statement “The present entrance in the west gable ... ignores the wider community and Killingworth Township which the church serves.” (1.3). This begs the question as to why there are not going to be entrances on all four sides of the Church as its parish extends significantly in all directions. The implied suggestion that the Church is not used by many people because they do not know it is there, reflects more on the effectiveness of the Church’s mission/publicity rather than people’s inability to locate a Church that is not under their nose. A simple ‘google’ search or noticing the large cross and display poster on the fence near the High School are two possible sources to its location. It should be noted that Killingworth Town was built in the sixties and is not a recent development. There is no doubt that, if arriving at the Church on foot from Killingworth, the area from the footpath to the Church entrance can become muddy. The addition of some attractive block paving could provide a clear, welcoming link from the track to the existing entrance.

-Many of the comments submitted by those objecting to the development should not come as a surprise to the Church. At the two most recent meetings, March 2018 and November 2019, those attending were asked to express their views which were to be compiled and circulated to all present. No such circulation took place. My views, which echoed those of many, were submitted within a few days of each meeting and are attached for information.

-Comments and assertions in the Heritage Statement and Design and Access Statement are misleading and do not present a true view of the current position:

1) The church entrance has been hidden since 1869. From West Lane, a gateway with significant listed stone gateposts, opens onto a path that leads to the main door. 2) There is nothing uncomfortable or undignified about this entrance with its stone arch and large wooden door accessible by a ramp or steps. Indeed, by accessing the Church from West Lane, those taking part in ceremonial occasions can walk up through the Churchyard and stop for photos etc. 3) The proposed location for the extension is successfully used as a carpark for the Church. It is almost exclusively used by cars rather than ceremonial vehicles – presumably either because those drivers do not find the parking “inconvenient or dangerous” or they do not want to drive their large vehicles up the very narrow lane to the car park. 4) There will be space for such facilities within the current footprint of the Church if the internal alterations go ahead as proposed in this application. 5) The space allocated as storage is five times the area of an accessible toilet. This is in addition to a cleaner’s cupboard. If the mezzanine floor is abandoned space would be freed as no staircase would be required. 6) The available parking space would be significantly reduced (by an area of approximately 95 square metres). 7) Apart from the important issue of accessibility, it is unclear why a mezzanine meeting room is required. The

Church has the flexibility to hold meetings of all sizes and it seems unlikely that meetings could be held simultaneously in the body of the Church and the mezzanine level. 8) As the font will be moveable to allow to be “positioned with liturgical integrity for differing occasions” this seems irrelevant. It is unclear when a bookcase becomes a library. 9) We disagree regarding the harm caused and are unclear as to how this will allow more people to enjoy the church. 10) This unfinished facade – completed in 1869 – has been neglected with two planters that are rarely shown any attention. A great deal could be done to improve this facade without adding an extension. 11) Despite attending, and contributing written feedback, none of the promised summaries have been circulated to those who attended. At a meeting in November 2019 (the most recent communication) those present were told that no trees would be cut down as a result of the extension. Surprisingly, the Church has not advertised this planning application. No information has been put in its external noticeboard and the circulated church notices have not included any details or the planning reference number. Some documents have been on display in church, but this is often locked and, due to the current restrictions, those wishing to attend a service have to book one of the limited places. This means many churchgoers are unaware of much of the detail.

-An objector has provided a copy of Appendices regarding meetings discussing the proposals from 2018 and 2019. These appendices have been summarised. It is difficult to comment on a project for which there were no drawings or plans of any kind. Nor was there any firm indication as to how any additional space would be used: other than the addition of a kitchen, toilet, and storage area. The assumption was made that there is a need for additional meeting space in the local area. However, the hall has long periods every day when it is not used, and the change from pews to chairs in the Church ensures that the space will be more flexible. Clearly, there would then be a need for a toilet, and some form of kitchen space could be useful but not essential. In addition, there are other hireable spaces in the immediate area such as: White Swan Centre, Sports Centre and local social club. The Vicarage, as I recall, also had provision added some years ago to facilitate meetings of small groups. Given the physical needs of the Church, a new heating system and rot in the roof, the spending of what could easily be a seven figure sum, on an extension to the Church is surprising. It is true that the current North wall is unattractive but doubt that it has served as a deterrent from anyone attending St John's. Indeed, anyone using the clearly delineated entrance from West Lane does not see, or pass, this wall. Having said this, we are not against modifications to the North wall but, as residents who live closest to the Church, we have significant concerns regarding access both during any construction and once it is complete. The issues raised relate to construction issues, highway and pedestrian safety, strongly opposed any move to allow access from East Bailey to the church and any extension that would provide any form of shelter or hiding place for loitering. The objector has made specific reference to the points made on the display boards. Further meeting notes provided sought clarification on the measurements of the extension, earlier proposal to extend the full length of the north wall has been reduced to a toilet and entrance facility, suggested toilets are provided within the church, review the need for a mezzanine, reduce storage area, the need for another entrance.

-Why is the St. John's Church Hall listed as a related case? If it is due to proximity, then our home should be included as it much nearer the application site.

-Costly design for two toilets.

-Is the disabled toilet wheelchair accessible?

-The agent states that the intention is to reuse the stained-glass window which is being removed to make the new entrance: "[subtly echoing] the arched modern stained glass window ... of the adjacent Wesleyan Chapel, converted to a house." This is a puzzling comparator. A more suitable way to echo surroundings would be for the proposed Church extension to have a Welsh slate roof (as specified in its grade 2 listing) - also in keeping with the porch of the aforementioned converted Chapel. The material for the roof has not been addressed in either of the agent's responses despite objections and comments as to its suitability from expert consultees and other objectors.

-The applicant made much of the need for a better entrance for ceremonial occasions. However, the Agent's response, when addressing Traffic Movement (5.01) reveals that in 2019 there were only 5 funerals and 3 weddings; this is equivalent to only one ceremonial occasion every 6.5 weeks. Either the hope is that this will increase (in which case there are implications for traffic movement) or this is a huge outlay for such a paucity of ceremonial occasions, especially as the need for a new 'ceremonial entrance' is disputed.

-The description of the current route for coffins entering the Church is worthy of a literary prize. Some of the movement described is as a result of an internal door, installed some years ago (in living memory of some parishioners), and was not part of Keeling's original design. If after, 40 (?) years this is proving to be an issue there is a simple solution.

-A further issue is designated parking. The agent reports there is normally a maximum of 4 vehicles in the Church car park. This is because drivers often prefer to park on West Lane to enter the Church by the listed gateway - that is in a location described as "inconvenient" in the Design and Access statement.

-The agent also comments on the day-specified nature of the yellow lanes and bus bay behind the Church. It is only the access road to the High School that displays this limitation. The bus bay and yellow lines have no such limitation to school days on display.

-As well as the ceremonial entrance, the applicant still seems fixated on the need for an entrance to "reach out" to Killingworth Township, claiming that the current, fully accessible entrance "ignores" the Township. How an inanimate object can ignore a town in one position but be 'welcoming' less than 25 metres to the other side of a large church is a mystery.

-The need to store chairs and tables is again mentioned. However, the pews were removed from the Church and replaced with individual chairs to allow for more flexibility. While some folding tables may be needed, they scarcely warrant the extensive storage. If large scale catering is anticipated, then the nearby St John's Community Hall can be used. This was refurbished at significant expense less than ten years ago to "provide a fully functional and accessible community facility ... making the building a highly value and usable community asset ..."[quote from Design and Access statement for Hall in 2011]. It seems that this under-used community asset is being side lined. On a practical level, it is uncarpeted (unlike the Church) and so easier to clean after catered events.

-It is pleasing to see that the external planters are no longer planned and that the internal mezzanine floor will now be accessible by a wheelchair lift. However, the need for the mezzanine remains unclear. It is not acoustically separate from the body of the Church. This means it could only be used as an area for meetings and prayer if the Church was not in use i.e. the Church itself would be available for meetings and prayer.

-Detailed comments have been received regarding the ownership and status of the lane this application wants to use as its access. This is of great interest to us as it is the only vehicular and pedestrian access to our home. The objector has researched ownership and status from 1792 to more recent times. Ordnance survey editions from 1860 and 1897 have been provided. Title documents have been provided advising land was registered by North Tyneside in 1986 and 2006 (to shows roads, footpath and section of the lane). The applicant has submitted a Certificate of Ownership Certificate D stating they do not own all the land they wish to use in their application. Land Registry information contradicts that. Details provided by the objector advises that North Tyneside Council confirmed that the access lane to their home was a registered bridleway on the Definitive Map. At that time, Land Registry confirmed right of access along the lane to the property, but the owner of the lane was not registered. Only those residing along it had a right of vehicular access. Although George Stephenson High School and much of Killingworth Township was built over the route of Path 22, we were informed by Northumberland County Council and North Tyneside Council that it was still current. In 2018, the objector was advised it was not confirmed by a Definitive Map Modification Order in 1998. This has bearing on everyone residing along this lane. We seek clarity from North Tyneside Council on the status of the lane.

-As a resident to one of the homes at the bottom of the lane, this proposed extension is a major concern to me and my family. For start, the building of the extension will cause major disruption to vehicles that use that lane, I have 4 children of which one is severely disabled and can become unwell very quickly and need emergency care requiring an ambulance. If an ambulance cannot get down for any reason that puts my child at risk. Having an entrance on the lane side of the church will increase people traffic coming in and out and using the lane. We find it hard enough driving up and down the lane with the already busy lane with it being a through fare to Killingworth itself and the high school. Also, if people want to use the accessible entrance, then they will want to park closer to that entrance thus increasing the car volume on that lane.

-The church does not get used enough to warrant this extension and the church itself could be reconfigured inside to accommodate what the church wants without the extension. I have been inside this church myself and it doesn't get very full and there is plenty of space already there for them to do what they want.

2.3 Support

2.4 11 representations of support from 10 individual properties have been received. These are summarised below:

-This development will greatly enhance both the appearance and the accessibility of the church building. The addition of toilet facilities will provide a much needed facility for those using the church building, especially for the elderly, infirm and those with disabilities.

-St Johns Church is used by many community groups who will benefit greatly from the new amenities.

-The creation of the new entrance will also provide much improved access.

-The proposed alterations to St John's Church will be a great benefit to the congregation and visitors by adding toilet /refreshment facilities etc which won't replace the church hall, but will make it easier during services, weddings, baptism etc to have such facilities in the Church.

-Our own church (Community Church Killingworth) has on numerous occasions used St John's for weddings, funerals, worship services, community functions

and engagement with local schools. The lack of toilet facilities in the building has been a real issue as has the limited access for the disabled. For a building that is at the heart of the community the proposals can only benefit the community that it serves so faithfully.

- The current narrow entrance also creates problems of access for funeral directors, both as corteges access and leave the building.

- A greater issue perhaps, is the lack of toilet provision in the church building, the only toilets available being in the separate church hall over 100 metres away; again an issue for all, but especially the disabled, the elderly and children.

- Improved storage space, as well as being much needed by the church, would also provide the opportunity for local churches to work together to support our regional foodbank and benefit the local community.

- As a parent with small children there is currently no suitable space for baby changing, other than on the floor at the back of the church. With toddlers and children needing the toilet (often frequently) currently you have to cross over to the church hall, in all weathers, unlock the hall (or have someone unlock it) take the child to the toilet, then lock the hall, cross back over to the church. With twins you can end up missing most of the service.

- As the leader of a community group based in Killingworth (Killingworth Community Choir) we have benefitted from, and enjoyed tremendous support from the Church, its leadership and indeed many of our members are part of the Church congregation. My support is offered for this proposal due to what I see as a need for investment and development of spaces that can be used by a range of community groups. Our choir currently rehearse in a local primary school hall, and we enjoy a very positive relationship with the school - their generosity and support in terms of providing a space to rehearse and perform has been invaluable in allowing our choir to develop and flourish. That being said, we are conscious of the imposition we make on the school for use of their facilities, and that the proposals submitted by St John's Church would allow us to rehearse and perform in a space that would, realistically, allow more flexibility. Currently the church is used as a 'backup' rehearsal space, but in the current configuration, this is not always ideal due to space issues, and issues around accessibility. Our choir is very much driven by a sense of community, and we are keen to grow. We would be able to make regular, purposeful use of such a space as that which is proposed through these developments, one which is based on enhanced accessibility from a physical perspective, and accessibility in the sense of community use. In time, we would very much see our community choir continuing to expand and be able to provide wider musical opportunities for our community, including concerts, workshops and other musical events with the aim of raising awareness, a sense of cultural capital and community cohesion. In summary, I see nothing associated with the proposal to give cause for concern; rather I see potential for community growth, church growth and opportunities for the residents of Killingworth and its surrounding areas.

- My full support for this planning application follows my careful personal study of the proposed changes to St. John's Parish Church, which has answered the needs of its parishioners for over 150 years. If permission is granted, the historic building will be enabled to continue to fulfil its purpose but complying in future with modern Health and Safety requirements. This will increase its usefulness within the community i.e. to be a hub for a variety of groups to use, with such amenities as toilet facilities and a useful kitchen, which any reasonable person would consider essential in the 21st Century.

-The design of the new entrance will greatly improve access for special services such as funerals and I understand that local undertakers have welcomed the proposed design. Weddings and Baptisms would benefit also from improved access, as would all kinds of public meetings that could be held there in future. Improved vehicular access for a wedding car or a hearse would be most advantageous and access to the Church through the new entrance greatly improved for all pedestrians, including people with mobility problems or disabilities.

-Due care and attention to detail by the Architect and P.C.C. have already ensured that plans were drawn up to encompass real and necessary improvements and avoid, wherever possible, any nuisance or loss of amenity to neighbours. The materials to be used are in harmony with the Victorian style and will incorporate new elements appropriately in this sylvan setting. Any necessary landscaping will be carried out sensitively to enhance the beauty of the whole site.

-This will be a great development for the church which is the hub of the community for many. Making the building more accessible and providing essential facilities will make the building more useable for all in the community and the plans are tasteful and in keeping with such a beautiful building.

3.0 External Consultees

3.1 Newcastle International Airport Limited (NIAL)

3.2 No comments to make.

3.3 Historic England

3.4 On the basis of this information, we do not wish to offer any comments. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant.

3.5 Tyne and Wear Archaeology Officer

3.6 I welcome the proposed changes to the design of the extension, in particular those to the glazing of the eastern gable, which now sits more harmoniously with the main body of the church.

3.7 The Church of St. John the Evangelist (HER 7260

<http://www.twsitelines.info/SMR/7260>) was built in 1869 as a parish church. It is listed Grade II (<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1184227>).

3.8 The graveyard for the church (HER 12414

<http://www.twsitelines.info/SMR/12414>) is shown on the Ordnance Survey second edition map, lying principally to the south of the church but also extending to the west and east. It is not clear from the existing mapping whether the north side of the church has ever been used for burials, although there is currently no evidence to suggest that it has. I would urge the applicant to ensure that every available source has been checked to confirm that no burials have been located here in the past.

3.9 I share the concerns of the Victorian Society regarding the design of the new porch and consider that the proposed extension is not sympathetic enough to the character of the church.

3.10 I consider that the church merits historic building recording (Historic England Level 2, Understanding Historic Buildings: A Guide to Good Recording Practice (2016)) prior to the proposed construction taking place (NPPF para 199). Existing architects' drawings may be used as a basis for the survey, for which I can provide a specification. The work must be carried out by a suitably qualified archaeologist or historic buildings expert. This work may be secured using the following condition:

Archaeological Building Recording Condition

No demolition/development shall take place until a programme of archaeological building recording has been completed, in accordance with a specification provided by the Local Planning Authority. A report of the results shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any development or demolition work taking place.

Reason: To provide an archive record of the historic building or structure and to accord with paragraph 199 of the NPPF, Local Plan S6.5 and policies DM6.6 and DM6.7.

3.11 The Northumberland and Newcastle Society (N&N)

3.12 The N&N has considered this re-submission of an application on which the committee commented in a letter dated 4th August 2021. We understand this was treated as withdrawn as information requested was pending. The new application appears to show there have been no pre-application discussions as might have been expected. We note some of the answers given under section 6 re access require clarity.

3.13 The new application omits the internal alterations at the west end and concerns only the proposed new north access and new porch including vestibule and toilets. It was noted that the existing south ramp access previously not shown on the drawings has now been added to the floor plan.

3.14 We note the design of the porch appears to be unchanged and the points we made in our earlier letter have not been addressed. To summarise the amendments, we believe are appropriate:

- The window from the north porch should be salvaged in full, including the long-and-short work surround which is seen on the internal photo of the window in the Heritage Statement, this should be shown accurately on the drawings.

- The use of patterned or opaque glass all-round the high-level windows, instead of opaque film used on the toilets only. The use of aluminium frames was not considered acceptable.

- We strongly object to the use of ashlar faced stone throughout, it is used only in backs of pink sandstone on the church itself. The main walling material is rock-faced yellow sandstone of random sizes and only occasionally brought to courses. The design of the porch is clearly modern, and a better choice of stone, both for colour and finish will provide a stronger link to the design of the original church. We note that the consultant society Historic Buildings and Places has in their letter of 17th December reiterated its similar objections to the stonework proposed. We would expect detailed drawings should be provided and samples approved.

3.15 Trees: The proposals regarding trees on the north side, in particular those numbered B2, B3 and B4 are unclear. The Heritage Statement at para 1.5 states that they will be retained. In the letters of objection there is a suggestion that the trees are the remains of a former boundary hedge and should therefore be retained. The Elliot Consultancy Ltd Report however, having placed them in category B – “trees of moderate quality and value that still make a substantial contribution to the site” (para 3.2.2) goes on to play down their condition in para 4.3 and state they should be removed because this will provide “necessary construction space and benefit access and outlook from the new extension”. This does not seem to be a proper basis for their removal: the trees contribute significantly to the overall greenery round the church, and there appears to be ample space for construction sites of what is a fairly small building. Protection during construction can secure their future contribution to the site.

3.16 Access: We note there are several detailed objections concerning rights of access which will affect whether the proposed access can be legally created. This clearly needs to be resolved however the N&N feels it is not in a position to comment on these issues. Notwithstanding this it would be helpful to know whether Keeling’s original drawings proposed a north access.

3.17 In conclusion the N&N supports the intention to make sympathetic additions to this Grade II listed church. We believe the attention to detail suggested above in the design of these additional will deliver an attractive, sustainable and enduring building that will be cherished by the community in perpetuity.

3.18 The Victorian Society

3.19 Thank you for continuing to consult the Victorian Society on these amended proposals. Having reviewed them we wish to offer the following comments.

3.20 We are grateful for the responses the applicant has made to our concerns and those of other bodies. We welcome the amendments which have been made to the design: the alterations to the WC layout to make it more discreet, the removal of steps and ramps from the proposals, and the intention to retain *Bassett Keeling’s* original font.

3.21 However, despite the alterations made to the design of the porch and the improvements such as the incorporation of an original window and greater separation by increased glazing, the design continues to be substantially the same as before and continues to raise concerns. In our previous letter we said that features of the design contributed to a *‘commercial idiom that is alien to the character of the church’* and this would detract from the significance and interest of a listed building. This idiom is most clearly expressed by the palette and finish of materials. The zinc roofing would be especially alien to the historic materials elsewhere in the building. The use of sandstone ashlar while taking a cue from the existing details would still be insensitive by its finish. St. John’s is a church characterised by its ‘rogue’ gothic design, which at the time was in direct opposition to the prim, ‘correct’ gothic revival which many architects embraced.

3.22 Ultimately, any acceptable design must engage more fully with this character taking greater inspiration from the existing design, palette of materials and finishes. Whatever is proposed must be something which is more sympathetic and sensitive to a building by an interesting 19th century architect.

3.23 We also understand that the proposals were not recommended at the last meeting of the Diocesan Advisory Committee. Considering that approval by the DAC and a faculty will be required under the ecclesiastical exemption we would urge that planning permission is not granted.

3.24 Initial comments:

3.25 I am writing on behalf of the Victorian Society in response to the above planning application. Although not listed as a formal consultee, as a National Amenity Society there is a statutory obligation to consult the Society on applications which would affect listed buildings of Victorian interest. The application was presented at a previous meeting of the Society's Northern Buildings Committee. I now write to offer the following comments.

3.26 St. John's is a nationally significant church by the noteworthy and interesting architect *Enoch Bassett Keeling*. Keeling was numbered as one of the Victorian 'Rogue' architects by the twentieth-century architect *H S Goodhart Rendel*, this 'rogue' architecture is characterised by a freer use of Gothic design and an often strident use of polychromatic detail. Although derided as debauched by contemporary critics and practitioners of the more correct Gothic favoured by the Ecclesiological Society, *Keeling's* buildings can now be appreciated for their interest and experimentation, and they possess a significance as unusual and imaginative manifestations of the Gothic Revival. Many of *Keeling's* churches do not survive intact and, due to this, what does remain of his oeuvre has an added significance and must be treated with respect.

The Society can accept the principle behind the proposals for a new porch and entrance. The desire to provide a dignified entrance and WCs is uncontentious, and we recognise that the site of the unbuilt north aisle is an appropriate place for any extension to the church. However, the Society has serious concerns over the design of the new porch.

3.27 Firstly, the Committee was concerned that if this is to function as a ceremonial entrance for civic services, marriages, funerals, etc. the entrance to the WCs would be too visible and should be more discreet. If to achieve this the porch would need to be bigger, this would not be a concern, and, if designed appropriately, an extension which covered the footprint of the proposed north aisle could be acceptable. While the Society appreciates some aspects of the design of the porch, such as the use of sandstone to match that used in the main body of the church and pitched roof mimicking the pitch found on the south aisle, we continue to have serious misgivings about the overall design. It is a strident design in an ostensibly commercial idiom that is alien to the character of the church. Functioning as the new principal entrance it would detract from the interest of *Keeling's* design and harm its significance. The Victorian Society does not advocate a pastiche of *Keeling's* style, nor do we maintain that any extension would harm the aesthetics of the north aisle. However, any proposed porch should be designed with more interest and greater respect and responsiveness for *Keeling's* architecture. This is especially so where the roof would join the north elevation, which could certainly work more elegantly with the existing flashing atop the rendered areas. Some members of the Committee also suggested that a more cubic design, clearly separated from the body of the church, could work more successfully.

3.28 Similarly, the ramp and steps could benefit from improvement. We note a discrepancy within the application: the drawings showing a ramp with a single run, and the artist's impressions showing a returned ramp. We echo the Ancient Monuments Society's recommendation that options are explored that may negate the need for steps or a ramp.

3.29 The Society has no major concerns with the interior proposals, other than that *Keeling's* original font should be retained, even if another moveable font is introduced.

3.30 Historic Buildings and Places (formerly Ancient Monuments Society)

3.31 We have no further comments to offer on the revised plans other than to repeat our observations of June that the sandstone blocks to the new porch should be coursed so as to appear irregular as with the masonry on the host building. Otherwise, the newcomer will appear mechanical by comparison.

3.32 Initial comments: As the Victorian Society have explained, St. John's is by the architect, Enoch Bassett Keeling, who is renowned for his use of "roguish" Gothic. The design has vigour and a love of display.

3.33 We are glad to see it listed and to know that its future in the original ecclesiastical use seems guaranteed.

3.34 The extension sits on part of the site of the unbuilt north aisle, and we can appreciate the logic of its function and design. It performs an incidental role in disguising the exceptionally ugly scar.

3.35 We welcome the rendering of the remainder of the scar to disguise its present rawness. We welcome the use of sympathetic red sandstone for the facing of the new build, but can we double-check that "stone to match" means the use of natural not artificial stone

3.36 We note that the surface is to be in ashlar not rock-faced as with the main church. We can appreciate the differentiation which will allow the new to be recognised as such as well as being contextual, but can we urge the use of irregular coursing which will create "liveliness". The visuals imply the use of blocks of stone of uniform size which would be a shame and create a dead surface when compared with the walling by Bassett Keeling.

3.37 We note that the approach is by steps and by ramp, with all the railings which that requires. Is it really necessary to have both? Might not a gentle incline alone preclude the need for any step?

3.38 Killingworth Village Residents Association

3.39 We appreciate that the Church wants to install a toilet that is accessible to all worshippers. However, we do not believe that the case has been made that an extension is needed to facilitate this. For example, the proposed large store area appears to be more than five times the area of the accessible toilet – surely it could be included within that footprint, along with a buffer area between the body of the Church and the toilet itself.

3.40 We are also puzzled by references to increased accessibility. The Church already has a fully accessible entrance which is reached via a listed gateway and path from West Lane, or by parking beside it.

3.41 The stated choice of materials for the extension do not sit comfortably with this grade 2 listed building. The roof is proposed to be zinc “to match the present copings”; these copings are corroding badly in places. We believe that the extension’s roof should match the actual roof and the South aisle. These are specified in the Grade 2 listing as Welsh slate. We are unclear regarding the stated choice of Ashlar stone for the walls. This refers to how the stone is dressed not its source or colour. Reference is made in the application to “pink sandstone”, however, the Grade 2 listing specifies “bands of red sandstone”. We trust that the Council’s team will be able to advise as to the suitability of all the materials for this extension to a grade 2 listed building in a Conservation Area.

3.42 Details of the windows, glass, styling etc are not included in the plans so it is impossible to comment on their suitability.

3.43 The access lane to the extension is very narrow, predominately about 3m, less in places. It is shown as a bridle way on OS maps which is indicative of its width, complete lack of footpaths and poor surface. The proposal that hearses and other ‘ceremonial’ vehicles drive up this narrow lane, from West Lane, in order to access the new entrance, is a great safety concern as it is regularly used by a large number of pedestrians and cyclists. The current surface is not suitable, and, despite being indicated as such on the plans, is not tarmacked in front of the proposed extension – it is rough stones. There is already a fully accessible entrance. We do not recognise the applicant’s description of the current entrance as being “uncomfortable and undignified”.

3.44 The loss of mature trees which form the boundary of the original bridle way. In the application these have been referred to as “self-seeded, believed to be sycamore” – we feel this implies saplings rather than substantial trees which have been there for at least 50 years.

3.45 The loss of parking spaces in this area next to the Church will lead to more cars parked on the road. In the application, it notes that there is “inconvenient and dangerous parking on the bend of West Lane”. While one could debate why parking outside the main entrance to the Churchyard is described as inconvenient, the proposed extension will remove a significant area that is regularly used for parking by Church users, thus meaning more cars will be on the road.

3.46 In summary, we understand that the Church wishes to install an accessible toilet. We do not believe, especially given the proposed internal changes, that an extension is necessary to facilitate this. We have serious concerns regarding the style and size of the extension and the stated intention for this to become the main, ceremonial entrance.

3.47 It would seem that the need for a kitchen and further storage, now no longer planned as part of the current Church footprint, could easily be accommodated

by using the extension for these purposes. All that would be required would be that the extension was not used as an entrance as well.

3.48 We are puzzled by references to increased accessibility. The Church already has a fully accessible entrance which is reached via a grade 2 listed gateway and path from West Lane, or by parking beside it.

3.49 The application form states that the window frames are to be aluminium. This is in stark contrast to the current materials.

3.50 The access lane to the extension is very narrow, predominately about 3m, less in places. It is shown as a bridle way on OS maps which is indicative of its width, complete lack of footpaths and poor surface. The proposal that hearses and other 'ceremonial' vehicles drive up this narrow lane, from West Lane, in order to access the new entrance, is a great safety concern as it is regularly used by a large number of pedestrians and cyclists – and, if the plans are approved, by church goers too. The current surface is not suitable, and no change to it is planned. The application form states that the vehicle access and hard standing are to remain as gravel. There is already a fully accessible entrance with a ramp. We do not recognise the applicant's description of the current entrance as being "uncomfortable and undignified".

3.51 There is ambiguity regarding the loss of mature trees which form the boundary of the original bridle way. The arboreal impact assessment, submitted by the applicant, states that 3 trees will be felled during the construction phase. However, the Heritage Statement section 1.5, implies they are to remain. We are disappointed to read that the applicant has persisted in referring to them to as "self-seeded" even though they follow the line of the bridleway.

3.52 The loss of parking spaces in this area next to the Church will lead to more cars parked on the road. In the application, it notes that there is "inconvenient and dangerous parking on the bend of West Lane". While one could debate why parking outside the main entrance to the Churchyard is described as inconvenient, the proposed extension will remove a significant area that is regularly used for parking by Church users, thus meaning more cars will be on the road.