

Report Title	PLANNING APPLICATIONS
Meeting	COLNE AND DISTRICT COMMITTEE
Meeting Date	05TH MARCH 2026
Report Author	NEIL WATSON
Directorate	PLACE
Lead Executive Member(s)	COUNCILLOR L. WHIPP
Wards Affected	BOULSWORTH & FOULRIDGE AND WATERSIDE & HORSFIELD
Public. Part Exempt, or Fully Exempt	PUBLIC
Appendices (if any)	NONE

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To determine the attached planning applications.

REPORT TO COLNE & DISTRICT AREA COMMITTEE 05TH MARCH 2026

Application Ref: 25/0479/FUL

Proposal: Full: (Major): Formation of a 3G Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) and hardstanding area to side of pitch, a long/triple jump facility and access footpath, siting of 1 no. storage container and erection of perimeter fencing, 6 no. floodlights, and sports hall extension.

At: Park High School, Venables Avenue, Colne

On behalf of: Apex Collaborative Trust

Date Registered: 16/07/2025

Expiry Date: 16/10/2025

Case Officer: Alex Cameron

This application was deferred from November's Committee meeting.

Site Description and Proposal

The application site is on the playing field to the east of Park High School. There are dwellings to the north and south and open land to the east.

The proposed development is the formation of a 3G Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) and hardstanding area to side of pitch, a long/triple jump facility and access footpath, siting of 1 no. storage container and erection of perimeter fencing, 6 no. floodlights, and sports hall extension.

Relevant Planning History

None.

Consultee Response

LCC Highways – No objection regarding the proposed development, there are no highway grounds to support an objection as set out by NPPF. Comments made in relation to the need for a car park management plan and construction management plan, which can be controlled by condition

Lead Local Flood Authority – No objection subject to conditions.

United Utilities – No objection subject to a condition for the implementation of the drainage strategy.

PBC Environmental Health – The evidence submitted to date has not demonstrated that the proposed operating hours would avoid significant adverse impact on nearby residents. The modelling presented so far does not provide sufficient confidence in the baseline noise environment, nor does it adequately capture variations across school hours, evenings, weekends, and holiday periods. Without this information, we cannot reasonably conclude that the impact would remain below the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level (SOAEL).

The applicant has not yet provided robust evidence to justify the extended hours they are seeking. The noise assessments and subsequent reviews—including Dragonfly's—indicated a likely

significant adverse impact during the periods proposed for community use. Additional monitoring was therefore necessary to either validate or challenge those findings.

With regard to references to WHO and Sport England criteria, these benchmarks cannot be applied in isolation, nor do they override the requirements of the Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE), the National Planning Policy Framework, or local policy DM13. The thresholds used within WHO guidance relate to general environmental noise and do not directly account for the impulsive and characterful nature of sports noise, which is a central factor in this case. Our assessment must consider both absolute levels and acoustic characteristics, as well as the sensitivity and proximity of nearby dwellings.

The applicant notes that even a 5m acoustic barrier would not reduce the predicted impact below major levels; this is consistent with our current concerns and illustrates why further baseline data and impact analysis are essential.

Given the applicant's intention to proceed to committee without submitting the requested evidence, the most likely route is that Environmental Health would maintain our position that the information is insufficient to support approval as submitted. This does not prevent the applicant from appealing, but without the required data, our recommendation would remain unchanged.

If the applicant is seeking an alternative way forward, the only viable option would be to provide the outstanding monitoring and updated assessment so that all parties can establish whether any acceptable set of hours or mitigation is achievable.

Sport England – No objection subject to a condition

Colne Town Council – The Town Council has concerns about a number of issues relating to the proposed development, as do the local residents. This application, in its current form, will lead to excessive light and noise pollution affecting both local residents and wildlife on the upper rough. Councillors also expressed concerns about emerging evidence of environmental damage and potential health impact to both humans and animals of the materials used for the 3G Pitch, namely microplastics and rubber crumb. The Town Council also recommends that a full consultation with residents be undertaken to review operational issues and to help look for ways to reduce the noise and light pollution for homeowners living in the vicinity.

Public Response

Site notice posted and nearest neighbours notified – Responses received objecting on the following grounds:

- Noise pollution
- The proposed hours are too long and should be restricted
- Light pollution
- Inadequate noise and lighting assessments
- Contamination, health and environmental risks from the materials used in 3G pitches
- Disposal of waste at the end of the development's life
- Harm to wildlife and loss of habitat, including protected species
- There should be landscaping of the site to improve biodiversity
- Anti-social behaviour
- Inappropriate location for the proposed use, other locations should be considered
- Highway capacity and safety impacts from increased traffic and parking
- There should be a green travel plan

- Flood risk and inadequate drainage details
- Concerns relating to safeguarding with general public access to the facility
- Non-compliance with planning policy
- Inadequate public consultation
- Use of public funds
- Impact on property values

Responses received in support on the following grounds:

- High demand for all-weather pitches in the area
- Benefits to local children and football clubs
- Community and health benefits and benefits to the school's pupils
- Sports facilities are required to tackle childhood obesity, inactivity and mental health issues
- The noise and light assessments satisfactorily demonstrate there will not be unacceptable impacts
- Lack of evidence of danger of the materials proposed

Officer Comments

Policy

Pendle Local Plan Fourth Edition

Policy SP01 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development) echoes the presumption set out in National Policy and promotes the three strands of sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. Applications which accord with policies contained within the Local Plan will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Policy SP09 (Water Management) Requires that developments do not increase flood risk rates and that water quality and groundwater resources are not compromised.

Policy SP13 (Transport and Connectivity) States that new development should have regard to the potential impacts they may cause to the highways network, particularly in terms of safety and the potential to restrict free flowing traffic, causing congestion.

Policy DM02a (Flood Risk) The policy seeks to manage and reduce the risk of flooding. It also seeks to ensure that new development is not vulnerable to the impacts of climate change.

Policy DM02b (Surface Water and Foul Water Management) Requires that where appropriate, applications should be supported by a strategy for foul and surface water management. Any discharge should employ the most sustainable drainage option in accordance with the drainage hierarchy, which should be demonstrated by the applicant.

Policy DM10 (Landscape Character) States that development proposals will be expected to respect and wherever possible enhance the landscape in which they are located.

Policy DM13 (Environmental Protection) seeks to minimise air, water, noise, odour and light pollution and states that potential noise levels within the vicinity of any new development must be at acceptable levels.

Policy DM14 (Contaminated and unstable land) Development must not result in groundwater pollution. Where the potential to release contaminants into the soil exists, during either the

construction or operational phases of a development, applicants must address the relevant requirements of Policy SP09.

Policy DM16 (Design & Place Making) Seeks high quality design in all new developments. Proposals should promote local character and distinctiveness and demonstrate a good standard of amenity for existing and future occupants and encourage active lifestyles.

Policy DM31 (Open Space, Sport and Recreation) States that built facilities for sport and recreation together with any land identified as open space on the Policies Map, or in the most recently adopted Open Space Audit (or Strategy), will normally be protected from development.

Colne Neighbourhood Development Plan

CNDP13 (Conserving and Enhancing Landscape Features) States that development should conserve and where possible enhance the landscape in the neighbourhood area. It identifies significant viewpoints the impact on which should be assessed within applications impacting upon them and states that developments which have an unacceptable impact upon them will not be supported.

Open Space

The proposed development would redevelop an existing playing field which is designated as open space, Sport England have assessed the additional details submitted and are satisfied that, subject to conditions, the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable impact on the provision for sport and recreation. The proposed development is therefore acceptable in accordance with Policy DM31.

Visual Amenity and Landscape Impact.

The development would potentially be seen in elevated long distance views from across the valley, including viewpoints identified as significant in the Neighbourhood Plan, and from the public right of way running approximately 150m to the east of the site from Windermere Avenue to Castle Road.

The development would not be excessively prominent and would be seen in the context of and set against or screened by the existing school buildings, boundary fencing, trees and hedgerows. The lighting would also be seen in the context of the lighting of the school buildings, surrounding houses and street lights. The development would not result in an unacceptable impact upon the landscape character and visual amenity of the area in accordance with policies DM10, DM16 and CNDP13.

Residential Amenity

The proposed development would not result in a material change in use of the land, however, it would potentially be result in a change to the intensity and duration of the use for sport and recreation and have potential for noise and light nuisance.

A noise assessment was submitted with the application by ACL a second noise assessment by Druk commissioned and submitted by member of the public was then received.

The two reports have contradictory findings with the ACL report finding that the development would not result in unacceptable noise impacts and the Druk report finding that it would result in unacceptable noise levels. Additional clarification was provided by ACL, however, the Council's Environmental Health officers advised that they were not satisfied with conclusions of the ACL

report and were minded to agree with the Druk report's conclusion that the development would result in unacceptable impacts. The council's Environmental Health officers initially advised that this could be mitigated by restricting the hours of use of the development, however, the applicant responded that the hours proposed would make the development unviable and submitted further details intended to justify the house they propose.

Following the deferral of the determination of the application in November the Council commissioned an independent assessment of noise impacts by Dragonfly. This assessment correlated with the Druk report and the Environmental Health officer's conclusion.

The evidence submitted to date has not demonstrated that the proposed operating hours would avoid significant adverse impact on nearby residents or, notwithstanding earlier recommendations, that impacts could be satisfactorily mitigated by restricted hours or other mitigation. The modelling presented so far does not provide sufficient confidence in the baseline noise environment, nor does it adequately capture variations across school hours, evenings, weekends, and holiday periods. Without this information, we cannot reasonably conclude that the impact would remain below the Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level (SOAEL).

The applicant has referenced World Health Organisation (WHO) and Sport England criteria in justification, however, these benchmarks cannot be applied in isolation, nor do they override the requirements of the policy DM13, the National Planning Policy Framework and Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE). The thresholds used within WHO guidance relate to general environmental noise and do not directly account for the impulsive and characterful nature of sports noise, which is a central factor in this case.

The Council's assessment must consider both absolute levels and acoustic characteristics, as well as the sensitivity and proximity of nearby dwellings.

The applicant has requested that the application proceed to determination at Committee based on the information submitted and that they do not intend to submit further information. Therefore, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the development would not result in unacceptable noise impacts or that impacts could be satisfactorily mitigated contrary to policy DM13.

Whilst the development would have community benefits from improving the school's facilities and offering sports facilities to the wider community, this would not outweigh the potential impact of the development on the amenity of nearby residents.

Concerns have also been raised in relation to the impact of external lighting on residential amenity. Being able to see an illuminated area is not an unacceptable residential amenity impact in itself, it is only where illumination causes an unacceptable level of glare or light spill into windows of an adjacent residential property that the impact of illumination can be unacceptable. A lighting assessment has been submitted and this acceptably demonstrates that the proposed lighting of the development would not cause an unacceptable level of glare or light spill to surrounding residential properties.

Contamination

Concerns have been raised in relation to the materials that are used in 3G pitches and the potential for contaminants to be present in and migrate from them. 3G pitches use a rubber crumb material that is made from recycled rubber, often from recycled tyres, this potentially contains contaminants such as heavy metals and is a potential source of microplastic pollution.

This is an established issue, Sport England along with other related sports bodies have issued a position statement identifying the issue and DEFRA has identified 3G pitches as the highest

source of microplastics found in the environment. However, there are currently no UK legislative controls over the use of rubber crumb and DEFRA's report recognises containment measures as a viable approach.

This has been raised with the applicant and details of proposed containment measures for the rubber crumb have been submitted.

With a condition to ensure that either a rubber crumb or alternative that has been validated as not being a potential source of contamination is used or that necessary measures are in place to ensure that contaminants will be adequately contained, the proposed development would not cause an unacceptable risk to the environment and human health.

Flood Risk

Concerns have been raised in relation to flood risk. The surface of the 3G pitch would be permeable and there would be a stone subbase which would act as an attenuation area, surface water would then be carried via drains to an adjacent watercourse. This would result in an overall benefit in terms of off-site flood risk as it would control and reduce the rate of surface water runoff from the area of the pitch compared to the existing. The other elements of the development are minor, acceptable drainage of the sports hall extension could be ensured by condition.

Highways

The proposed development raises no unacceptable highway safety impacts.

Ecology

An ecology appraisal of the site, with supporting bat and bird surveys, has been submitted this concludes that the site is of very limited wildlife value due to its current sports use. Recommendations are made to protect hedgehogs during construction and the lighting scheme has been designed to acceptably reduce impacts on commuting bats. With conditions to ensure that the mitigations measures are implemented the development would not result in any unacceptable impact on ecology, including protected species.

Whilst details of observations of wildlife, including protected species, on the site have been raised in public comments, and detailed in the ecology appraisal, this is not indicative of the site forming a habitat for those species. The site itself is an intensively mowed and used sports field, it has little ecological and habitat value and any impacts that it would have can be acceptably mitigated with mitigation and enhancement measures controlled by condition.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

The development would result in the loss of an area of poor quality modified grassland. It is proposed for this to be mitigated on site by the formation of a new area of modified grassland replacing an existing shale pitch, an area of mixed scrub to the east of the site and hedgerow enhancements, these on-site mitigations would meet the 10% BNG requirement. A section 106 Agreement is necessary to ensure this and provide a contribution for the Council's monitoring costs over 30 years.

Concerns have been raised regarding BNG affecting the usability of the playing fields for sport and recreation, the modified grassland area would not prevent use for sport and recreation and the mixed scrub areas would not be in an area suitable for such use.

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

Subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not result in unacceptable noise impacts or that impacts could be satisfactorily mitigated, the proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy DM13 of the adopted Pendle Local Plan Fourth Edition (2021-2040).

Application Ref: 25/0479/FUL

Proposal: Full: (Major): Formation of a 3G Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) and hardstanding area to side of pitch, a long/triple jump facility and access footpath, siting of 1 no. storage container and erection of perimeter fencing, 6 no. floodlights, and sports hall extension.

At: Park High School, Venables Avenue, Colne

On behalf of: Apex Collaborative Trust

REPORT TO COLNE & DISTRICT AREA COMMITTEE 05TH MARCH 2026

Application Ref: 25/0773/LBC

Proposal: Listed Building Consent: Demolition and rebuild of boundary wall.

At: Saint Bartholomews School, Exchange Street, Colne

On behalf of: Mr Shah

Date Registered: 19/11/2025

Expiry Date: 14/01/2026

Case Officer: Alex Cameron

This application has been brought before Committee due to the number of objections that have been received.

Site Description and Proposal

The application site is a grade II listed mid 19th century school building built in a 17th century vernacular style located within the Albert Road Conservation Area. The building is surrounded by a stone boundary wall.

Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent has previously been granted for erection of a single storey extension to the north side, running the length of the existing boundary wall and a single storey extension to south west corner of the building, the repositioning of the pedestrian gates on Exchange Street and formation of a new pedestrian access on School Street. This included permission for demolition and rebuild of the parts of the boundary walls involved in those works, but not for the other sections of the wall.

This application is for Listed Building Consent for the demolition and rebuild of the entire boundary wall. The applicant states that this is necessary to make the wall structurally sound and safe and to provide construction traffic access to the site.

Relevant Planning History

13/01/0590P - Convert former school building to 7 residential flats and one warden's flat. Approved.

13/01/0693P - Conservation Area Consent to demolish scout building. Approved.

19/0314/FUL - Full: Erection of single storey extensions to rear, side (North) and front for Use Class D1 purposes, alterations to windows to all elevations and creation of pedestrian link from School Street.

19/0316/LBC - Listed Building Consent: Erection of single storey extensions to rear, side (North) and front, alterations to windows to all elevations and creation of pedestrian link from School Street. Approved

24/0198/LBC - Listed Building Consent: Erection of single storey extensions to front, side and rear for Use Class F.1 (f) purposes, insertion of a first floor, replacement windows and formation of pedestrian access. Approved

24/0193/FUL - Full: Erection of single storey extensions to front, side and rear for Use Class F.1 (f) purposes, insertion of a first floor, replacement windows, formation of pedestrian access. Approved

Consultee Response

Conservation Consultants – The report suggests the lean is quite severe and it states it is unsafe so I can see it is justified as per paragraph 213 of the NPPF. Please attach conditions for a method statement detailing how it will be recorded photographically with accompanying plans, taken down, stored securely, then a method statement for the actual retaining structure itself and a sample panel showing the coursing and pointing mix.

Colne Town Council - If the existing wall is dangerous then Colne Town Council sees no reason to object, however the applicant must ensure that the wall is re-built using the same materials and that any works are not delayed unnecessarily. The re-build must be done to a reasonable time scale. The Town Councillors were of the view that PBC Officers should undertake an independent inspection of the structural integrity of the wall to ensure that this is not being demolished unnecessarily.

Public Response

A press and site notice have been posted and nearest neighbours notified – Responses received objecting on the following grounds:

- Concerns that if the wall is taken down it will not be rebuilt
- If it is rebuilt it will not be the same as before
- The length of time it will probably take to rebuild it if it does get done - given that it has been several weeks, or months even since the slates were removed from the roof and they are still not completely replaced
- Don't understand the need to demolish the wall
- Object to the conversion of the building, inadequate parking, noise, impact on house prices and undermining the historic character of the site.
- Response from The Victorian Society: St Bartholomew's Church School (1844, alterations 1894 and 1966) is a Grade II-listed building, meaning that it is recognised for its national significance and special interest. It is built in a loose, C17th vernacular style, with Gothic influences which were common for schools of this period. Almost all schools in the mid C19th (pre the Education Act 1870) were run by ecclesiastical bodies, often using influences of ecclesiastical architecture as a result. This was usually also coupled with walls and gates/railings, which would be used to divide students and regulate access to the schools. The walls are key to the building's conception and identity as a Victorian School house. The Society is concerned regarding the proposal for complete demolition and subsequent rebuilding of the perimeter wall. This wall is highlighted specifically in the Historic England Listing Description as contributing directly to the national significance of this building. The Society objects to the complete removal of this wall on principle. Regarding the wider application, we fail to see how the erection of single storey extensions requires the complete (or even substantial) demolition to intrinsic parts of a listed building. There seems to be little to no 'clear and convincing justification' for the works, which is key to fulfilling the National Planning Policy Framework (2024, paras. 212-215). We also wish to raise concerns regarding the application to move the gate way into the building. It would appear that this is a historic feature and is therefore covered by the building's national

listing. Moving this feature 'so as to align with the centre of the eastern transept gable' also does not fulfil the convincing justification required for changes to listed building, as referenced above. Your Authority will have to satisfy itself that the apparent changes to the windows shown in the Existing and Proposed plans/elevations were made clear in the last application.

Officer Comments

Policy

As with all applications the statutory requirement is that the application must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The consideration of the application must also be in accordance with primary legislation which in this case is primarily the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) act 1990 (“the Act”).

The Act states in section 16:

“In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority or the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”

Pendle Local Plan Fourth Edition (2021-2040)

Policy SP01 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development) echoes the presumption set out in National Policy and promotes the three strands of sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. Applications which accord with policies contained within the Local Plan will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Policy SDP2 sets out the spatial development principles for developments in Pendle. Proposals to develop outside of a defined settlement boundary will only be permitted for exceptions to Policy DM09 that are identified in the NPPF, an adopted development plan document, or a made neighbourhood plan, or that are in accordance with Policy SP04 part 5 when the Council is unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply.

Policy SP11 (Historic Environment) requires designated and non-designated heritage assets to be conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Policy DM16 (Design & Place Making) seeks high quality design in all new developments. Proposals should promote local character and distinctiveness and demonstrate a good standard of amenity for existing and future occupants.

Policy DM18 (Heritage Assets) states that the Council will support proposals which conserve and enhance Pendle’s historic environment. Where a proposal would result in harm or loss of significance to a heritage asset, this must be balanced against any public benefit associated with the scheme.

Policy DM35 (Cultural and community facilities) relates to proposals for cultural and community facilities. Any proposal to change the use of a building or land which is already in cultural or community use will be supported where consistent with Policy DM31 as applicable, and:

(a) Replacement facilities of a similar scale and function, which maintains or enhances local built character, and are accessible via sustainable transport links to the community served, are provided;

- (b) It is evidenced that there is no need or demand for the facility to remain in that use; or
- (c) The existing use is no longer viable and cannot be reasonably made viable.

Colne Neighbourhood Development Plan

Policy CNDP3 states that, as appropriate to their scale, nature and location, development proposals should:

- a) retain, re-use and, where necessary, sympathetically re-configure existing street patterns;
- b) use and re-use traditional local materials (such as stone, stone slates, slate, and timber). Where appropriate to their setting, such materials should be traditional materials which have been recycled, or have a significant recycled content, and make a positive contribution to the overall quality of the character area;
- c) retain key features of the local vernacular, such as stone flags, stone setts, ironwork, building details and ornamentation; and
- d) ensure building form and layout responds to and is sympathetic to the form and layout within the Urban Character Area within which it is located.

National Planning Policy Framework

The Framework states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. It states that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. The policies in the Framework, taken as a whole, constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development in England means in practice for the planning system.

Para 116 states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

Para 139 of the framework states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.

Para 213 of the NPPF requires 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 215 of the Framework sets out that where development proposals would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

Heritage Impact

The proposal is for the full demolition and rebuild of the boundary wall, adequate justification has been provided that this is necessary to ensure the structural stability and safety of the wall.

The demolition would also allow for construction access from Exchange Street to enable the previously approved works to the building, which would safeguard its future.

Taking into account the above the demolition and rebuild of the wall is clearly and convincingly justified in accordance with paragraph 213 of the Framework.

Concerns have been raised that the wall may not be rebuilt following demolition, however, this and appropriate retention and reuse of the existing stone can be controlled by conditions.

Other matters

Concerns have been raised in relation to the wider works / development, this application merely relates to the demolition and rebuilding of the wall, the works to and extension of the building have been approved by the previous applications.

Reason for Decision

In accordance with Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation) Act 1990, special regard has been made to the desirability of preserving the special historic or architectural interest of the building. The proposed impact on the original fabric special historic or architectural interest of the Grade II Listed Building has been clearly and convincingly justified and as such there is no reason to refuse consent.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve

Subject to the following conditions:

1. The works approved shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this consent. No later than three days after works first begin on site, written notice shall be given to the Local Planning Authority of the date on which works are first commenced.

Reason: To comply with Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and to ensure the Local Planning Authority is informed of the commencement of the first works on the site.

2. The works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 25/0130/L01, 25/130/E01, 25/0130/P01.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. The demolition hereby approved shall not commence unless and until a method statement for the demolition and rebuilding of the wall has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The method statement shall include:

- Method of demolition
- Method of recording photographically with accompanying plans
- Retention and secure storage of existing stone
- Method of rebuilding
- Details of proposed retaining / internal wall structure/s
- Details of mortar and pointing mix
- Details of how the works will be protected from weather
- Timing of rebuilding

The walls shall thereafter be demolished and rebuilt in strict accordance with the approved method statement and within the approved timescale.

Reason: To ensure that the historic fabric and character of the wall is preserved.

4. Prior to erection of the wall a 1m x 1m sample panel of stone showing coursing and pointing finish shall be made available on site for inspection by the Local Planning Authority and the works shall not continue until approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the works shall thereafter be carried out in strict accordance with the approved sample panel.

Reason: To ensure that the historic fabric and character of the wall is preserved.

5. The existing stone shall be retained and reused where possible, if any new or replacement stone is required a sample of the stone shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to its use and the works thereafter carried out in accordance with the approved materials.

Reason: To ensure that the historic fabric and character of the wall is preserved.

Application Ref: 25/0773/LBC

Proposal: Listed Building Consent: Demolition and rebuild of boundary wall.

At: Saint Bartholomews School, Exchange Street, Colne

On behalf of: Mr Shah

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

Planning Applications

NPW/MP

Date: 05th February 2026