

Consultation Statement

August 2006

The statement of consultation is considered to be in accordance with Newcastle City Councils Submission Statement of Community Involvement [SCI] [September 2005].

This statement sets out how the community has been involved in the development and production of the Draft Local List and Draft Supplementary Planning Document [SPD] for the Local List of Buildings, Structures, Parks, Gardens and Open Spaces of Special Local Architectural or Historic Interest [Local List], in order to ensure a transparent and open planning process.

The steps taken to ensure effective community involvement are explained below, and cover the headings of:

1. Scoping of the exercise
2. Consultation with the Councils Planning Authority
3. Mapping of community groups and other stakeholders
4. Building capacity and creating partnerships
5. Undertaking consultation and encouraging participation
6. Ensuring everybody has an opportunity to be involved
7. Feedback
8. Evaluation and external assessment.

Scoping – Background and Intention

The development of a Local List is encouraged by English Heritage and The Department for Culture, Media and Sport [DCMS]. In 2004 approximately 44% of Local Authorities in England had produced a Local List and saw it as a way to identify and encourage protection of locally important heritage assets as well as raise the profile of local history and heritage and conserve local distinctiveness. In addition it is viewed that a Local List could assist in delivery of the City Council's Visions and Values namely, "to build on the heritage, cultural and economic strengths of Newcastle and the sense of identity and civic pride of our people" as well as deliver parts of the Newcastle Plan, namely, "... to learn more about, care for and develop all parts of our heritage..."

No formal guidance exists for the development and production of a Local List. PPG 15, para 6.16 '...it is also open to planning authorities to draw up lists of locally important buildings and to formulate local plan policies for their protection, through normal development control procedures.'. The protection of buildings, structures or landscapes on a local list is assisted when it is supported by the adoption of local plan policies endorsing their conservation. In this respect local lists can go a long way in helping to maintain 'local distinctiveness'.

Nationally, local lists have been maintained by a substantial amount of local authorities since grade III buildings were removed from the process of

statutory listing in 1968. Previous studies by Oxford Brookes University for English Heritage and the Institute of Historic Building Conservation (IHBC) (2003) and P. Boland, Conservation Officer for Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council (1997/8) on the compilation and value of local lists, concluded that it is widely considered that an additional response is required in order to conserve many aspects of local heritage currently left unprotected by statutory designation, and that local lists carry most weight where they are backed up by local plan policies. P. Boland also concluded that 83% of respondent local authorities believed statutory controls to be inefficient to sustain the 'cherished local scene' as well as that respondents found the planning system can be an ineffective tool for the protection and enhancement of locally listed buildings and that Inspectors were very accepting of, and sympathetic to, the concept of local lists and their role in maintaining local distinctiveness.

In 2004, within Tyne and Wear one authority, South Tyneside possessed a Local List of Buildings and had a UDP policy for their protection and enhancement. One authority, North Tyneside had a Local List of Buildings which it intended to adopt and one local authority, Gateshead, was going through a rigorous process of compiling a Local List of buildings and parks and gardens which it intended to adopt with a UDP policy underpinning it.

Furthermore when the initial report, seeking approval of the outlined local list preparation process, was taken to Development Control Committee on 8th April 2004, it was an opportune time for Newcastle City Council to push the boundaries of current central government initiatives i.e. Power of Place (a review of the role and future of England's historic environment), A Force for Our Future (a statement of government policy on the historic environment which set out a vision to unlock the potential of the historic environment) and the Review of Heritage designation and Protection (a consultation document on possible changes to the current system to improve the designation and protection of the historic environment) and to establish policies for the conservation and enhancement of buildings on any list within the emerging Local Development Framework [LDF], more specifically the overarching LDF policy SD2.

In summary, the intention of a Local List as set out in the report to Development Control Committee of 8th April 2004 was to, "proactively conserve and enhance the 'cherished local scene'; adhere to Government guidance on local lists and bring the authority into line with other local planning authorities (nationally and regionally) that have already compiled local lists; involve a rigorous process of public involvement and consultation as promoted by the Government; positively raise the profile of 'heritage' and the Council; and realise the opportunity to establish new policies for the conservation and enhancement of buildings [structures] and parks and gardens of special local interest within the emerging LDF."

In this report it was also highlighted that, "Inclusion on local lists will not be a hindrance to regeneration, it will just ensure that any proposals take into consideration the local significance of the building and seek, in the first instance, imaginative restoration and reuse similar to many successful

schemes which have previously been approved by the Council, for example the Biscuit Factory, Shieldfield and Central Square.”.

Preparation and Formation of the Local List

Development Control Committee of 8th April 2004 formally approved the process as set out in the report.

Conservation Advisory Committee of 28th April 2004 [comprising members and representatives from national and local heritage organisations and statutory amenity bodies] welcomed the proposal to prepare a Local List.

Following the above reports a Local List Co-ordinator was appointed to oversee the process.

Below is a summary of the process to date:

- 8th April 2004 - Development Control Committee approved the Local List process and suggested nomination criteria, as reported to the committee.
- 28th April 2004 – Conservation Advisory Committee welcomed the proposal to prepare a Local List.
- June 2004: 5000 nomination leaflets & posters distributed to all Newcastle TICs, Customer Service centres and 20 libraries including mobile library. Also distributed to staffed cultural attractions throughout the city.
- Approximately 260 letters and leaflets were sent to a broad range of interested individuals and organisations as well as sending similar information to Conservation Advisory Committee (CAC) and Newcastle Conservation Advisory Panel (NCAP) members and all Ward Councillors.
- 1st – 31st July 2004: Nominations period.
- In light of excellent public response and demand nomination period extended to end August 2004.
- A dedicated website www.newcastle.gov.uk/localheritage providing the ability to make nominations and to check if buildings, structures, parks or gardens were already Listed or Registered went live on the 24 June 2004. This was advertised on the Council's website homepage as well as on NEMLAC's website and through their bulletin and email bulletin services. The URL was prominent in all promotional information e.g. leaflets, press releases, posters, emails etc, City Council website and was ranked number 1 on a Google UK search for 'local list'.
- BBC radio Newcastle interview conducted, ¾ page article appeared in Saturday 26th June's issue of the Journal and a full page article appeared in City Life, 21st June 2004. Follow-up articles were printed in the Herald & Post as well as the Evening Chronicle that printed a 2-page spread on the success of the public consultation period.
- 983 nominations were made with 460 individual buildings, structures, parks and gardens being nominated. Of the 460 sites nominated 86 were already either Listed, Registered, outside the boundary of

Newcastle upon Tyne or too large an area to be put forward for the local list. Therefore 374 were to be surveyed¹.

- 374 site visits were conducted (conducted as detailed in report to DC Committee, 8th April 2004), corresponding to the number of eligible nominations. Where possible, photographic sample images were taken of the sites with important information recorded regarding the sites age, layout, occupancy / ownership, general conditions, points of interest (POIs), architecture type, materials etc.
- The information was brought together and presented to an independent panel of experts comprising a core panel of three plus industry recognised, local, subject specialists – These included Graham Bell (Director of the North of England Civic Trust) who chaired the panel, a member of Conservation Advisory Committee, a lecturer in conservation and planning from The University of Newcastle upon Tyne as well as specialists such as John Grundy, David Lovie, Cyril Winskell, Stafford Linsley, Fiona Green and Grace McCombie.
- Panel meetings were held in early 2005 and their recommendations formed the Draft Local List, comprising 274 sites from the original 374.
- Statements of Significance were drafted for every site on the Draft Local List.
- A draft SPD and Sustainability Appraisal were prepared.
- A report was taken to the Supplementary Planning Documents Committee (presently the Planning and Transport Strategy Committee) seeking permission to move on to a stage of formal consultation with owners / occupiers and statutory consultees on the draft SPD and Sustainability Appraisal.
- Following the approval of Planning & Transport Strategy Committee of 16th June 2005 to go out to public consultation on the Draft Local List Supplementary Planning Document the Council spent considerable time researching and collating details of ownership and / or tenancy for each site. The Council also spent considerable time drafting a sustainability appraisal, supplementary planning document (SPD) and guidance on the SPD in preparation for consultation with owners / occupiers, statutory bodies and other potentially interested parties including MPs.
- Statutory consultees were consulted regarding the intention of the City Council to carry out a non-SEA compliant Sustainability Appraisal, prior to the formal period of SPD and Sustainability Appraisal consultation. None of these raised concerns about not carry out a Strategic Environmental Assessment.
- A consultation on the Draft Local List SPD and Sustainability Appraisal was formally opened on the 24th January 2006 and ended on the 28th February 2006 though much of the documentation was sent to owners /

¹ As set out in paragraph 10 of the report to Development Control Committee of 8th April 2004, “The documentation of every recommendation would involve recording (including digital images) the basic period/form/materials etc of the building or park and garden.” (online, <http://www.newcastle.gov.uk/cab2003.nsf/allbykey/7741DC287526AD3280256E68004548F4?opendocument>)

occupiers prior to the official start-date because of the sheer volume and variety of consultees and material requiring to be sent to them.

- 1163 letters including consultation documents were sent out during this period to owners and / or tenants dependant upon the details that were available to the co-ordinator. Further details on the consultees and consultation can be found below in section 'The Draft SPD'.
- All responses were logged as they were received including items 'returned to sender' by the Royal Mail.
- The Council afforded a number of organisations and / or individuals further time to make representations where it was necessary.
- 1st September 2006 – Letter sent to all those objecting to the Local List SPD / their property being on the Draft Local List confirming where they can obtain copies of the report to be submitted to the Planning and Transport Strategy Committee and supporting documentation [Draft Local List, Statement of Community Involvement & Representations, Sustainability Appraisal, Draft Supplementary Planning Document]

The Draft SPD

Consultation on Proposal Not to Carry Out an SEA Compliant Sustainability Appraisal on the Draft SPD for the Local List

Consultees:

- Countryside Agency – no objection
- English Heritage - no objection
- English Nature Northumbria Team - no objection
- The Environment Agency - Northumbria Area - no objection

SPD Consultation – interested public bodies / organisations

The consultation ran from 24th January 2006 – 28th February 2006.

- 1) An advisement was placed in the Journal on 24th January 2006.
- 2) Copies of the draft SPD, SPD Matters and Consultation Statement, and draft Sustainability Appraisal were made available on the internet [www.newcastle.gov.uk] and at the Customer Service Centre at the Civic Centre.
- 3) Copies were made available from Officers on request.
- 4) Letter drop to all residents, businesses and property owners with a site on the Draft Local List.
- 5) Letters to statutory consultees as listed below including full copies of the draft SPD
- 6) Letters & full documentation to all Ward Members including full copies of the draft SPD
- 7) Letters & full documentation to all Newcastle MPs including full copies of the draft SPD
- 8) Presentations were made to Inner East Area Committee, Ouseburn Ward Sub-Committee and South Heaton Ward Sub-Committee on request from the co-ordinators.

- 9) The Draft SPD and Sustainability Appraisal were presented to Conservation Advisory Committee for consultation on 28th January 2006 for consultation.

Consultees:

- Highway Agency
- North East Assembly
- North East Chamber of Commerce
- North East Civic Trust
- Northumberland and Newcastle Society
- One North East
- Countryside Agency
- English Heritage
- English Nature Northumbria Team
- The Environment Agency - Northumbria Area

A summary of representations from consultees is tabled below including Council's response and officer recommendations to the Planning and Transport Strategy Committee.

Consultation Responses

A number of representations were received regarding the sites on the Draft Local . These are summarised, together with the Council's response and recommendations below

Support

Name + Organisation + List ID + List Name	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Recommendation
<p>List ID & Name: 3 127 Kenton Road, Gosforth.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Scott M. Houghton</p>	<p>Also the building is now double storey. As the owner of the property I can substantially confirm the public's interest in our home. It was originally named The Turrets when constructed, a name which we have chosen to continue on our address. Many people congratulate us when they find out that we are 'the lucky people' who have ended up with The Turrets. The house seems to endear itself to the public on a large scale and indeed is used as a landmark. We would be happy to have our house included on the Local List</p>	<p>Welcome the support. Welcome additional information.</p>	<p>Amend Statement of Significance</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 12 299 - 307 Westgate Road.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Judith Porter</p>	<p>I am delighted that this lovely building in which I live has achieved recognition and preservation status. However the ground floor is occupied by a saw mill company which results in many problems such as fumes, dirt, noise pollution and</p>	<p>Welcome the support.</p>	<p>None</p>

	deterioration of the premises; a company such as this should be operating from a trading unit.		
<p>List ID & Name: 30 Belle Grove Pub.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Roy Russell, Belle Grove Pub</p>	I fully support this initiative and am delighted that Belle Grove Terrace has been included on the list. A particular feature of the Terrace is the retention of front fences, hedges and mature trees. I consider it very important that this should be preserved and that no premises should be permitted to destroy front gardens to create parking spaces. This comment also applies to the Belle Grove Pub (ID 30). Indeed, it would be delightful if the pub could be encouraged to improve its frontage in order to complement the rest of the Terrace.	Welcome the support. Welcome additional info and comments.	None
<p>List ID & Name: 31 Belle Grove Terrace.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Roy Russell</p>	I fully support this initiative and am delighted that Belle Grove Terrace has been included on the list. A particular feature of the Terrace is the retention of front fences, hedges and mature trees. I consider it very important that this should be preserved and that no premises should be permitted to destroy front gardens to create parking spaces. This comment also applies to the Belle Grove pub (ID 30).	Welcome the support. Welcome additional info and comments.	None

<p>List ID & Name: 31 Bellegrove Terrace, City Centre.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): R W Bell</p>	<p>I agree with reasoning for the proposed draft list. Should have been done 20 years ago before some developers removed part of chimney stacks etc. Does the process have to be so bureaucratic? I hate to think what this process have cost to this point!</p>	<p>Welcome the support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process has been conducted in this fashion to ensure it's long term viability, sustainability and that it foundations will have a positive impact within the planning system. 	<p>None</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 31 Bellegrove Terrace.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Richard McLellan</p>	<p>We have just repaired the magnificent glass bay window (no.6) for the upper floors. We would be very keen that the occupant of the lower floors should maintain the matching lower half of the bay window. Area has lost lots of natural charm and should be preserved. Is there anything that could be done about the ugly satellite dishes!</p>	<p>Welcome the support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local List SPD will only be a consideration where a planning application is made. The Council can not force owners occupiers to do work on Locally Listed sites but can seek sympathetic development / conservation when a planning application is made. 	<p>None</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 43 Blue House, Great North Road, Gosforth.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any):</p>	<p>The Freeman of Newcastle Upon Tyne are of course owners/ occupiers of the Blue House. Whilst the anecdote regarding the name of the Blue House is possible, it is more likely to have been named much earlier. My research shows</p>	<p>Welcomes additional comments on origins of the name 'Blue House' and further historical information.</p>	<p>Amend Statement of Significance to reflect additional information.</p>

Mrs Patricia Ansell	<p>a dwelling on this site in 1771, and on the Town Moor in the opposite corner was the 'Blue House Pond'. May be of interest to note that agricultural link continues, in that it is a tied house occupied by one of our agricultural staff.</p>		
<p>List ID & Name: 62 Clarendon House, Clayton Street West.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): N Aldred</p>	<p>Re the Local List, I believe Clarendon House would make a good addition. The architectural design of the building, use of red and white brick, is very unique to the city centre. The building still maintains some of it's original features i.e. all flats still have original sash windows, the staircase, frames and mouldings, Clarendon House signage also original.</p> <p>Due to its current status the building is being abused and losing it's character; you will see totally unacceptable signage on retail outlets which are unsympathetic to the building and lower the quality of the street. Opposite there is a Georgian? terrace and adjacent a magnificent Cathedral.</p> <p>I would greatly appreciate and support the building being added to the list and to bring it back to a style and character</p>	Welcome the support.	None

	befitting a fine example of late Victorian/early Edwardian architecture.		
<p>List ID & Name: 62 Clarendon House, Clayton Street West, City Centre.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Garrie Keam</p>	<p>I am delighted with this proposal as I feel that the building is a stunning example of late Victorian architecture and back the council's proposals fully.</p> <p>The listing gave Clarendon House as Jesmond, but it is actually in the City Centre.</p>	<p>Welcomes the support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes address error 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend address error
<p>List ID & Name: 68 Crossling, Coast Road, Heaton.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Charles Errington, Crossling Plumbers and Engineers Merchants</p>	<p>We are happy for our building to be included on Newcastle City Council's Local List. We have owned this building since 1968 and purchased it from Smiths.</p>	<p>Welcome the support</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 69 Cumberland Arms, Back Stephen Street, Ouseburn.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Michael - owner</p>	<p>Supports listing. Notes that the pub is a three storey building, and that the last sentence be removed. The haymarket bar really has nothing to do with the building and is misleading as it is upstairs at the moment and likely to be moved. A good traditional interior is also unhelpful, as it is not clear what it means. It places some sort of expectation on the visitor and is outside</p>	<p>Welcomes the support. Acknowledges comments re Haymarket Bar and, "a good traditional interior.</p>	<p>Amend Statement of Significance.</p>

	the scope of the list, implying some burden on the running of the place and misleading where change is made for economic need. Should there be a legal battle over wording the phrase would be uninterpretable.		
List ID & Name: 77 Fenwick Close, Jesmond. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): R. Haggart	I respect the need to preserve the integrity of the building(s) in FENWICK CLOSE. At the same time the house is 40 years old and some features need modification and improvement as well as maintenance to avoid degradation of the fabric. I wish to make some alterations at ground floor level at the rear of the building; these would not be visible from the Boston Terrace perspective (i.e. They would be below the level of the external back door wall). We have had plans drawn up by M. Dragt (???) architect which when submitted should comply with the requirement "that any alterations should be carried out in a sympathetic, high quality manner." I would not wish to be unnecessarily constrained re wind or solar panels (photo-voltaic) to provide eco-friendly sources of power in the future.	Welcome the support. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If proposed changes require planning application the Council will take into account that the site is Locally Listed. If proposed works are sympathetic, necessary and potentially eco-friendly (as suggested) the application is unlikely to be refused wholly on the grounds that the site is Locally Listed. 	None
List ID & Name: 82 Former Brewery Stables,	The site is owned by St Mary Magdalene Trust, who sub-let it to Home Housing,	Welcome information. Note there is no formal objection.	None

<p>St Thomas Street, City Centre.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): John Eversley, Damaged Business Space Ltd T/A St Thomas Business Centre</p>	<p>who sub-let it to ourselves. The building was completely refurbished by ENTRUST in 1985/6 and used as a business centre. There are currently 17 businesses employing 35 persons.</p>		
<p>List ID & Name: 86 Former Malings Pottery - Clock Tower Building.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Fred Hoult, Hoult's Estates Ltd</p>	<p>We support the idea of preserving what are good and fine local buildings, and hope that the idea of the list is to enable these buildings to be used and adapted economically to provide a return for the owner and create jobs for the community.</p> <p>We would be happy to discuss what we have done so far and considering in the future so we can reach a mutual understanding.</p> <p>Since working as a pottery in 1963, a great proportion of buildings were used as furniture storage, but has been adapted for use as offices, studios and workshops. The site probably has 50 businesses on it</p>	<p>Welcome the support.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 87</p>	<p>We support the idea of preserving what</p>	<p>Welcome the support.</p>	<p>None</p>

<p>Former Maling Pottery - Main Building.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Fred Hoult, Hoult's Estates Ltd with approximately 50 business tenants</p>	<p>are good and fine local buildings, and hope that the idea of the list is to enable these buildings to be used and adapted economically to provide a return for the owner and create jobs for the community. We sincerely hope that by being listed the process of adaptation is not too delayed. We hope our track record in this regard has set a good example. However we would be happy to discuss what we have done so far and what we are considering doing in the future so that we can understand your objectives and you can understand ours. P.S. Since working as a pottery in 1963 a great proportion of the buildings were used as furniture storage but subsequently much of the space has been adapted to other uses such as offices, studios and workshops.</p>		
<p>List ID & Name: 88 Former Mission House.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mr. Steve McGuire</p>	<p>As stated the building was formerly Ouseburn Mission House. I am currently converting the property which used to be a restaurant, into a single dwelling house. Structural tests have proved that the east and west gables have a serious leaning defect which needs to be resolved. This will require dismantling of the gables and rebuilding. The western gable which is constructed with brick</p>	<p>Welcome the support.</p>	<p>Open discussion with owner / occupier to establish where Historic Environment Section / Newcastle City Council may be able to assist.</p>

	<p>also houses the plaque. The gable is also finished in ornate brick and sandstone. I would like to preserve these features as opposed to re-building in new materials. I have contacted English Heritage for financial assistance but was informed that their budget for our areas was depleted. I would welcome any advice or assistance with a view to obtaining any available grants to help me preserve this unique building. Certified technical data regarding the remedial work is available if required. The Ouseburn Heritage Association have also taken a keen interest in the preservation of the building</p>		
<p>List ID & Name: 108 Gosforth Squash Club and Moor Court, Gosforth.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Toby Brandon</p>	<p>I believe that the above site is of great significance and importance locally. The buildings are of iconic Art Deco design and their position overlooking the town moor makes a strong statement. Unfortunately during the 1950s Art Deco lost architectural favour resulting in many buildings being demolished. However more recently it has been increasing in both aesthetic and economic value. It is therefore vital to protect, preserve and celebrate classic buildings such as these. I feel very strongly as a resident and lover of most things Art Deco that</p>	<p>Welcome the support and additional information.</p>	<p>None</p>

	listing this building under æhistoric interest would be a positive move for the city council.		
List ID & Name: 108 Gosforth Squash Club and Moor Court, Gosforth, Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Patricia Wressell,	Comments that it is a pity that there was no SDP in place before Moor's Court's original windows were replaced by UPVC 'copies', and that other features such as the front door and garage door of the squash club are out of keeping with the rest of the building.	Welcomes comments and notes no objection.	None
List ID & Name: 116 Hawthorn House. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Richard Clark	Having lived in this building for 15 years it is not ideal. I believe it would benefit from selective demolition and a new roof. Please note we are no longer a tenant as from the 31.12.2005	Welcomes comments and notes that respondee is no longer tenant..	None
List ID & Name: 136 Lime Street Chimney. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Susan Stokel-Walker, Acting Parks & Countryside Manager	Supports listing comments: "suprised to see this is our responsibility. would strongly suggest it should be Regeneration or Development."	Welcome support. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes issue of responsibility. • Internal consultee information came from 'The Terrier' section. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review responsibility status
List ID & Name: 138 Lodge in Freeman Park, Freeman Road, Heaton. Respondent Name &	supports listing comments: typo, its PADDY FREEMAN'S Park, and	Welcome support. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Typo and name corrections noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend Name's in Local List as per representation.

Business Name (if any): Susan Stokel-Walker, Acting Parks & Countryside Manager	the Lodge's name is "North East Lodge"		
List ID & Name: 143 Mansion House, Fernwood Road, Jesmond,. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Ian Poll, Head of Democratic Services	Welcomes Local Listing. Being the official residence of the Lord Mayor the property plays a significant role within the governance of the council as well as the life of the city overall. The inclusion on the list will raise the profile of the house and reinforce the council's commitment to maintaining the premises to an appropriate standard.	Welcomes the support	None
List ID & Name: 147 M E A House, Ellison Place, City Centre. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Sue Pearson, Age Concern Newcastle Upon Tyne	Welcomes Local Listing. M E A House's historic purpose is worthy of recognition ...	Welcomes the support	None
List ID & Name: 153 Moffat Pavilion, Leazes Park, City Centre,. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Susan Stokel-Walker	Welcomes Local Listing	Welcomes the support	None

Acting Parks & Countryside Manager			
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth,.	It is an actively lived in building where the residents contribute to the upkeep of it and surrounding landscaping features.	Notes no objection	None
Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mrs Malini Ranasinghe			
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth,.	Lived at the West Block for past 14 years and are opposed to any major structural changes that would detract from the building and surrounding area.	Welcome support	None
Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mr & Mrs B P Stoddart			
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth,.	supports the listing	Welcome support	None
Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mr Bernard Schwartz			
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth,.	supports the listing	Welcome support	None
Respondent Name & Business Name (if any):			

Miss Lys Schwartz			
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth,. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Miss Bryony Schwartz	supports the listing	Welcome support	None
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth,. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): John & Wendy Richardson	Comments that the development has interesting features as both blocks sit on pillars, a design originally incorporated to sympathise with the surrounding environment.	Welcome support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note additional comment. 	None
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth,. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mark Wilson, MSW Consultancy Ltd, MSW Consultancy	On behalf of the Directors of the freehold owners of Montagu Court. The building is confirmed as being built circa 1967 and no longer has the restaurants to the rooftop section. Proposals are in place for redevelopment of lower section. They are close to submission of a formal planning application for the construction of 9 units and associated works/improvements. The improvements allow for additional car parking.	Welcome support. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes that restaurant no longer there. 	Amend Statement of Significance

<p>List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mrs Joyce Heatherland</p>	<p>It is an actively lived in building where the residents contribute to its upkeep and that of surrounding landscaping features</p>	<p>Welcome the support.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth,.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Dr M E Elder</p>	<p>It is an actively lived in building where residents contribute to the upkeep of it and of surrounding landsaping features.</p>	<p>Welcome the support.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth,.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mr H O & Mrs N Van Asselt</p>	<p>It is an actively lived in building where the residents contribute to its upkeep and that of the surrounding landscaping features.</p>	<p>Welcome the support.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth,.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any):</p>	<p>It is an actively lived in building where the residents contibute to its upkeep and of the surrounding landscaping features.</p>	<p>Welcome the support.</p>	<p>None</p>

Mrs M Tait,			
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth,. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): M U Wells	Is an actively lived in building where the residents contribute to the upkeep of it and surrounding landscape featurers.	Welcome the support.	None
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth,. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): A D Wood	It is an actively lived in building where the residents contribute to its upkeep.	Welcome the support.	None
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth,. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Judith Moorin	Actively lived in building where residents contribute to the upkeep of the building and its surrounding landscape features.	Welcome the support.	None
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth,. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Judith and Tony Scrivener	Feel it is of the utmost importance that the building be maintained in its present form and that any alterations should not detract from the building's original concept. They express concern at proposals presently being considered by the	Welcome the support • Concern over proposals to drastically alter appearance noted.	None

	Montagu Court Residents Council and a developer to drastically alter the appearance of the building.		
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth,. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): D E Lowery	Would like to see Montagu Court become a listed building because of its unique stature	Local Listing goes part of the way towards listing. A separate Listed Building evaluation would need to be conducted to assess worthiness of putting forward for national Listed Building Status	List on the Local List as initial step. Conduct Listed Building assessment. If the assessment finds in favour of putting forward for national Listed Building Status submit to English Heritage for assessment.
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth,. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Miss C B Insley	Supports listing of the building.	Welcome the support.	None
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth,. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Helene Blake	Welcomes Local Listing. Notes that Montagu Court is an actively lived in building where the residents contribute to its upkeep and that of surrounding landscaping features.	Welcomes the support	None
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth.	Re adding to Local List; good, please ratify if you can. As a retired architect and university lecturer, I strongly oppose the	Welcomes the support • Note opposition to development of	None

Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Richard Turley	development of Montagu Court. Good design of the period and views to the Mooe excellent. Proposed 7/8 flats etc will spoil amenities and increase parking, all services and be an over-development.	Montagu Court though this is a matter separate to Local Listing.	
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth,. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mrs Peggy Beadnell	supports listing of building	Welcome the support.	None
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mr & Mrs Mark Fawcett	supports listing of building	Welcome the support.	None
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth,. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mr Michael Hoadley	supports listing of building	Welcome the support.	None
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu	supports listing of building	Welcome the support.	None

Avenue, Gosforth,. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mrs Patricia Kermath			
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth,. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Miss Jennifer Charlebois	supports listing of building	Welcome the support.	None
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth,. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mr Jonathon Gould	supports listing of building	Welcome the support.	None
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth,. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mrs Christine Schwartz	supports the listing of the building	Welcome the support.	None
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth.	Supports proposal, Mr Cohen and his wife having lived in house since 1982.	Welcome the support.	None

Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mr Donald Cohen			
List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth,. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mrs Lilian Insley	Supports listing of building as it is a well known landmark.	Welcome the support.	None
List ID & Name: 162 Northumberland Lead Works Remains, Lime Street, Ouseburn,. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Susan Stokel-Walker, Acting Parks & Countryside Manager	supports listing comments: questionning ownership - should be Regeneration or Development as they are the ones operating from there.	Welcome the support. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ownership query noted but 'The Terrier Section' have confirmed Parks & Countryside as owners. 	None
List ID & Name: 169 Osborne Court, Osborne Avenue, Jesmond. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): unknown	Very positive, but two errors in description. View of North Elevation can be seen from Osborne Avenue (not Road) and the East Elevation is not flat, it has bay windows as well.	Welcome the support. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note errors in description / statement of significance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alter statement of significance
List ID & Name: 169	Confirms that the Directors have no	Welcome the support.	None

<p>Osborne Court, Osborne Avenue, Jesmond.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mr R A W Clark, for Brannen & Partners</p>	<p>objection to put Osborne Court on the local list, as a fine example of an Art Deco building constructed in the 1930's.</p>		
<p>List ID & Name: 169 Osborne Court, Osborne Avenue, Jesmond.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): W. Roy Large</p>	<p>Points out 2 errors in the Statement of Significance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Osborne Court is visible from Osborne Avenue, not Osborne Road. 2. East elevation is not flat, as stated, but has the same rendered bay windows as on the other 3 sides. <p>Would like to see a stronger statement of intention to preserve buildings etc, as it may need more than 'encouragement' to deter future developers. Also "it would be of great benefit ... if 'to encourage' was replaced by 'to ensure' and if 'reasonable' were given a ... sharp definition".</p>	<p>Welcome the support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note errors in description / statement of significance • Comments on wording in SPD noted. Local List not backed by legislation so difficult to be more prescriptive than it already is. Should be seen as an encouraging policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alter description / statement of significance to correct details. • Leave SPD wording as is.
<p>List ID & Name: 172 Paddy Freemans/Castle Farm, Freeman Road, Heaton.</p> <p>Respondent Name &</p>	<p>supports listing.</p> <p>Corrections:</p> <p>The park is in Dene Ward- not Heaton, not Jesmond</p>	<p>Welcome the support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note Ward query – Local List information came from GIS data • Ownership and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change ward info to Dene in Local List • Pass ownership query to 'The Terrier'

Business Name (if any): Susan Stokel-Walker, Acting Parks & Countryside Manager	it is NOT partly owned by Regeneration, totally Leisure.	responsibility information came from ‘The Terrier’ section	
List ID & Name: 175 Park Education Centre, Leazes Park, City Centre,. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Susan Stokel-Walker, Acting Parks & Countryside Manager	Supports. Ownership: Leisure services only, nothing to do with Freeman of the City.	Welcome the support. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes query of ownership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pass ownership query to ‘The Terrier’
List ID & Name: 189 Railway Bridge, Mitchell Street, Walker. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Susan Stokel-Walker, Acting Parks & Countryside Manager	Supports listing Comments: must have been Engineers at one time - again questioning ownership.	Welcome the support. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes query of ownership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pass ownership query to ‘The Terrier’
List ID & Name: 194 Richardson Road Lodge, Leazes Park, City Centre. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any):	Supports. Ownership: leisure services only, nothing to do with Freeman of the City.	Welcome the support. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes query of ownership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pass ownership query to ‘The Terrier’

Susan Stokel-Walker, Acting Parks & Countryside Manager			
List ID & Name: 195 Ridley Villas, Shieldfield. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Jean Heppell, City of Newcastle Housing Department	Since February 1979 the building has been used as temporary accommodation for homeless families by the City of Newcastle Housing Department. During this period 2,943 families have resided in the building from around the UK and the World, and the building has been part of the local strong community; a "city centre oasis". Over the last 15 years much of the grounds have been swallowed by adjacent developments. Ridley Villas needs to be saved, protected and restored to its former glory to benefit future generations, keeping with the history, diversity and culture of this city.	Welcomes the support.	None
List ID & Name: 200 Royal Grammar School, Jesmond. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Richard Metcalfe, Royal Grammar School	In the Statement of Significance, please note that the Edwardian section of the building is only two storeys high.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes the inconsistency 	Amend Statement of Significance
List ID & Name: 202 Northern Counties School, Tankerville Terrace	The school is now called Northern Counties School, while it was previously named Northern Counties School for the	<p>Welcomes the support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes concerns over 	None

<p>Jesmond.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Bruce Parvin, Northern Counties School and College</p>	<p>Deaf.</p> <p>I cautiously welcome recognition and strongly support many of the 16 sustainability objectives (e.g. 4, 6 & 9), however it is important, in light of the aims and objectives of the Percy Hedley Foundation, that any alterations to adapt and improve access to the site would not be adversely affected. Such work would be entirely consistent with the sustainability objectives and the DDA. Also it seems anomalous that the whole site can be listed, given the diversity of the buildings and that the whole site does not share the same distinctive characteristics.</p>	<p>ability to improve access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is extremely unlikely, given the statutory obligations of the DDA that the Local List SPD would impinge on operational abilities to further extend accessibility to the site. 	
<p>List ID & Name: 215 Springbank Pavilion, Leazes Park, City Centre.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Susan Stokel-Walker, Acting Parks & Countryside Manager</p>	<p>Supports</p> <p>Ownership: leisure services only, nothing to do with Freeman of the City.</p>	<p>Welcome the support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes query of ownership 	<p>Raise query</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 219 St Gabriel's Parish Centre.</p>	<p>Please alter to this name (St Gabriel's Vicarage is 9 Holderness Road).</p> <p>Since the Local Listing implies no</p>	<p>Welcomes the support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes request to change listing name. 	<p>Change name and address details as indicated in representation.</p>

<p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Canon Michael Webb</p>	<p>additional planning restrictions or costs, we are content to allow the Parish Centre to go on the Local List.</p> <p>We agree with N. Pevsner that the whole range of buildings at St Gabriel's makes a considerable impression.</p>		
<p>List ID & Name: 220 St James & St Basil's Church Gardens, Fenham Hall Drive, Fenham.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Susan Stokel-Walker, Acting Parks & Countryside manager</p>	<p>Supports venture "Again, questioning ownership - this is not on our list of closed churchyards and not something we currently maintain.</p>	<p>Welcomes the support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes query on ownership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pass ownership query to 'The Terrier'
<p>List ID & Name: 222 ST JAMES PARK CITY CENTRE.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Eddie Rutherford, Newcastle United Football Company Limited</p>	<p>Supplementary Planning Document: In principle the Football Club being on the local list is good news. Additional Information I required:- 1- Would planning application time scale be the same as at present? 2- Would the Club be kept informed if any changes are made to Local list documentation? 3- How soon will the local list be implemented?</p>	<p>Welcomes the support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note that response to questions was made previously however: • Planning application timescale would remain unaltered • NUFC would be kept informed and would be consulted on any major changes to Local List 	<p>None</p>

<p>List ID & Name: 225 St Francis Church, Cleveland Gardens, High Heaton.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Revd. Christopher J. Clinch, Church of England</p>	<p>The original wooden mission church of St Francis opened in 1935, and was replaced by present church in 1953; a good example of austere post-war architecture. The side chapel was added in 1957 and a memorial stained glass window was included, with further internal wood and stained glass additions in 2003. The permanent place of worship was built by personal contributions and efforts of the local community. The inclusion of this building on the Local List would recognise and reflect the commitment stated above, preserve local character and add a greater significance to the local community, enhancing the contribution to the environment, social and cultural heritage of the City.</p>	<p>documentation.</p> <p>Welcomes the support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes additional historical information. 	<p>Amend Statement of Significance to include additional information provided in representation.</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 227 St Nicholas' Cemetary Chapels.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Susan Stokel-Walker, Acting Parks & Countryside Manager</p>	<p>Supports listing</p> <p>comments: "would like further evidence that this is our responsibility as it is not on our list of closed churchyards that we have."</p>	<p>Welcomes the support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes query over ownership. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pass ownership query to 'The Terrier'

<p>List ID & Name: 235 Terraces - group, Eslington / Kingsland / Haldane Terraces & adjoining section of Clayton Road, Jesmond.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mrs Christine Rowland</p>	<p>Would like to see their home and rest of block of Clayton Road officially recognised and included in list.</p>	<p>Welcomes the support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjoining section of Clayton Road has been included as per numerous, separate communications. This initial omission was a typing error. 	<p>None</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 235 Terraces - group, Eslington / Kingsland / Haldane Terraces & adjoining section of Clayton Road, Jesmond.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mr Gerard Loushran</p>	<p>Supports idea but comments that Eslington Terrace is in a state of deterioration. They feel surrounded by continuous building works in progress. They hope the council will ensure all garden restoration works are concluded and adequate internal soundproofing installed in the houses.</p>	<p>Welcomes the support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes lateral concerns 	<p>None</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 235 Terraces - group, Eslington / Kingsland / Haldane Terraces & adjoining section of Clayton Road, Jesmond.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any):</p>	<p>They feel that in order to maintain the integrity of the blocks chosen Clayton Road must be included in the grouping.</p> <p>Herself and other residents have gone to great lengths to restore the interiors, and the exteriors exhibit many of their original features.</p>	<p>Welcomes the support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjoining section of Clayton Road has been included as per numerous, separate communications. This initial omission was a typing error. 	<p>None</p>

Ruth E S Niven	The houses on Clayton Road demonstrate as much architectural merit as the others.		
<p>List ID & Name: 235 Terraces - group, Eslington / Kingsland / Haldane Terraces & adjoining section of Clayton Road, Jesmond.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Dr Robert and Dr Alison Shiel</p>	<p>"We were astonished to find, by an unconventional route" of the nomination of sites of interest, having heard nothing of this even though they've lived on Clayton Road for 15 years. They feel its been going on behind their backs and are disgusted by the management of the process.</p> <p>They were even more concerned that Clayton Road has been excluded from the list even though it was designed and constructed from the same plans as Eslington etc. They believe the drafting zoning to be vague and want it to include the whole of the architecturally homogenous terraces.</p> <p>They also wish to express some more concern, about the state of 37 Clayton Road which has been empty for some time, and do not want to see it getting plastic windows like other places on the street, which contravenes the Conservation Area status.</p>	<p>Welcomes the support for local listing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjoining section of Clayton Road has been included as per numerous, separate communications. This initial omission was a typing error. • Numerous communications have been made with these residents and apology for their property not having been included on original list of consultees made. Again this was a clerical error arising because the listing area and boundary originally omitted the adjoining section of Clayton Road – as point above. 	None
List ID & Name: 235	It has been drawn to my attention that	Welcome the support.	None

<p>Terraces - group, Eslington / Kingsland / Haldane Terraces & adjoining section of Clayton Road, Jesmond.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mrs B Cawthorne</p>	<p>Clayton Road, namely the block between Eslington Terrace and Bowden Terrace, has been omitted from the draft list. I feel this terrace should be added to the list.</p> <p>My house has a date stone of 1907 built into the front bay which would indicate that it was the first home of the block. Maybe you could confirm to me that Clayton Road Terrace will be added to the list.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjoining section of Clayton Road has been included as per numerous, separate communications. This initial omission was a typing error. • Confirmation has been made to the respondent that the adjoining section of Clayton Road is on the Draft Local List. 	
<p>List ID & Name: 235 Terraces - group, Eslington / Kingsland / Haldane Terraces & adjoining section of Clayton Road, Jesmond.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mrs S & Prof W Dunlop</p>	<p>Pleased that Eslington Terrace is being considered.</p> <p>Also hopes Clayton Road will be included in the list as the houses are of the same architectural interest.</p> <p>Comments that hopefully the local listing protection will prevent internal division of the houses into student/professional apartments.</p>	<p>Welcomes the support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjoining section of Clayton Road has been included as per numerous, separate communications. This initial omission was a typing error. • This is a planning decision. 	<p>Adjoining section of Clayton Road has been included as per numerous, separate communications. This initial omission was a typing error.</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 235 Terraces - group, Eslington / Kingsland / Haldane Terraces &</p>	<p>Kingsland</p> <p>Pleased to hear the group of terraces have been put forward for list.</p> <p>Hopes the council will encourage all</p>	<p>Welcomes the support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes suggestion to check dates of 	<p>None</p>

<p>adjoining section of Clayton Road, Jesmond.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mrs Jane Macalister</p>	<p>annexes to take care of their property and respect architectural features. Suggests a full check of date of construction is carried out as they believe some of the properties may predate period 1907-1912 which council mentioned.</p>	<p>construction.</p>	
<p>List ID & Name: 235 Terraces - group, Eslington / Kingsland / Haldane Terraces & adjoining section of Clayton Road, Jesmond.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): P & PM Magnay</p>	<p>Pleased to know the property will have some protection in the future, having lived there for 20 years. Their main concern is "the creeping in of HMO and the resulting multiple parking" Also, their neighbour's tree is overhanging, causing damage to their property and concealing architectural features even after council attempts to have it pruned.</p>	<p>Welcome the support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes concerns and however such concerns cannot be addressed by the Local List SPD 	<p>None</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 235 Terraces - group, Eslington / Kingsland / Haldane Terraces & adjoining section of Clayton Road, Jesmond.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Christopher May</p>	<p>Concerned that the properties on Clayton Road, of the same design and part of the same development (by Elliot Brothers of Jesmond in 1910) have not been included. Clayton Road houses are also examples of the Arts & Crafts styles with the majority remaining unaltered with original front doors and leaded window panes.</p>	<p>Welcome the support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjoining section of Clayton Road has been included as per numerous, separate communications. This initial omission was a typing error. 	<p>None</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 235 Terraces - group,</p>	<p>Dear Sir, We note that the draft local list (ID 235) omits to include the Clayton</p>	<p>Welcome the support</p>	<p>None</p>

<p>Eslington / Kingsland / Haldane Terraces & adjoining section of Clayton Road, Jesmond.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Linda and Tom Moore</p>	<p>Road element of the group of terraces listed (Eslington/Kingsland/Haldane) - though this forms an integral part of the group and demonstrates all of the same features as outlined in your correspondence dated 30 January 2006 (ref LL Phase II Consultation). We believe that it is vital to maintain the integrity of the blocks and the unique features that they exhibit in common with each other. It would be a gross oversight to omit Clayton Road. We believe that it is vital to encourage current and future owners to preserve and maintain the unique arts and crafts features of these very special properties. We believe that the Clayton Road block is integral to the site and we would urge you to include it.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjoining section of Clayton Road has been included as per numerous, separate communications. This initial omission was a typing error. 	
<p>List ID & Name: 235 Terraces - group, Eslington / Kingsland / Haldane Terraces & adjoining section of Clayton Road, Jesmond.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mrs Sheila Thornton, Methodist Homes</p>	<p>The tenants of Pilgrims' Court were deeply shocked when Mr Cousins (M.P.) informed us that the owners of the Metro had sold 'air space' above the metro to a firm called Victoria Hall Ltd. The area concerned is between Jesmond Station and the Bridge at Clayton Road. The intention is to erect 5-7 storey buildings over the metro line. These buildings would be a complete blight on the area. At the moment we look out on to beautiful trees. The traffic chaos would</p>	<p>Notes indirect support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes concerns over potential development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pass concerns to relevant officers / councillors

	<p>be horrendous. There are already 3 schools in this area - Royal Grammar, Central High are a private school in addition to several businesses. Jesmond cannot take the chaos which would result from the building of tower blocks of flats. I think we are entitled to have some lovely greenery opposite our flats and not be inundated with ugly buildings and crowds of people who will all have their exits on to Eslington Terrace. I beg you to protect our area from being desecrated.</p>		
<p>List ID & Name: 235 Terraces - group, Eslington / Kingsland / Haldane Terraces & adjoining section of Clayton Road, Jesmond.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): David B Inness, Medical Insurance Bureau Ltd and others</p>	<p>Having read the consultation paper dated 30th January, I am fairly happy with the proposals. My only concern is that this does not become a first step to full listing with the constraints that this imposes. Can you assure me of this? Whilst the front of the buildings along the terrace are largely unaltered, the backs are a varied hotch-potch and it is too late to do anything about that. "sympathetic" development here would be pointless and in particular the wheely bins have made the back lanes an unpleasant sight. On this topic, the recycling boxes are collected from the front of the properties which means that the appearance is spoiled. Could they not be</p>	<p>Welcomes the support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was noted to consultee by response that this will not be initial step towards full listing and that constraints of Statutory Listing are much tighter. 	<p>None</p>

	collected from the rear like the wheely bins? Incidentally, the "statement of Significance" on page 2 of your document is factually incorrect. Eslington Terrace is not two blocks of red-brick houses, but one terrace of grey brick. Also Kingsland is just Kingsland, not Kingsland Terrace. Sorry to be pedantic!		
<p>List ID & Name: 235 Terraces - group, Eslington / Kingsland / Haldane Terraces & adjoining section of Clayton Road, Jesmond.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Alan Johnson</p>	<p>North Side Clayton Road, being part of Edwardian red brick terraced houses, should be included. In general agreement with the proposal. Most of houses are owner/occupier and are, in the main, well cared for. Please check date of construction, we thought Kingsland was built in 1904, not 1907-1912 as in your Statement of Significance</p>	<p>Welcomes the support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjoining section of Clayton Road has been included as per numerous, separate communications. This initial omission was a typing error. • Motes request to check date of construction. 	<p>Check date of construction of Kingsland Terrace</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 245 The Town Moor, City Centre.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mrs Patricia Ansell</p>	<p>Confirmed the Town Moor is owned/occupied by the Freemen of Newcastle Upon Tyne.</p>	<p>No direct objection.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 252 Trent House Bar.</p>	<p>I welcome the Trent being put on the Local List. I have run it for 22 years and</p>	<p>Welcomes support</p>	<p>None</p>

Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Tom Caulker, The Trent House Bar	we always try to retain character and keep it special.		
List ID & Name: 254 Turner's Building, 7 - 13 Pink Lane. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Richard Clark, North East Workspace Ltd	It is nice to know someone appreciates what we have done. We only wish we did not have a mass of wheelie bins parked outside our rather nice frontage.	Welcomes support	None
List ID & Name: 268 Wilson's Court, Pudding Chare. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Gary Haughton, Pudding Chare Developments Ltd	Supports the local list. Comments that their property, although maintained to a high standard, is in an area troubled with vermin and refuse which damages the social, architectural and historic sites and streets.	Welcomes the support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes problems with refuse and vermin 	Notify relevant City Council departments
List ID & Name: 271 Wylam Waggonway Bridge, Station Road. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Susan Stokel-Walker, Acting Parks &	Supports listing. Typo in last sentence - "new bridge was built FOR the railway."	Welcomes the support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes 'typo' 	Amend Draft Local List to correct typo.

Countryside Manager			
---------------------	--	--	--

Neutral

Name + Organisation + List ID + List Name	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Recommendation
<p>List ID & Name: 17.</p> <p>73 - 75, Grainger Street, City Centre.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Gary J Robinson, Senior Surveyor</p>	<p>Response from Surveyors on behalf of owner of premises. Initial letter was addressed to current tenants of upper floors of the building, Pearson & Caulfield, therefore the actual owner of the premises has not received any direct correspondence. Therefore would like longer to consider his position and make a decision regarding his premises being included on the Local List.</p>	<p>Permission to consider over longer period of time given.</p> <p>No further response received.</p>	<p>Include on Local List</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 191.</p> <p>Railway Terraces Ebor, Cleghorn and Richardson Street, Heaton.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mrs Elaine Anderson</p>	<p>We have a boot scraper set into the right hand side of front door (when facing it) We also have an outside loo still in working order. The original coalhouse is used as storage for garden equipment but you can see where the 'door/window" was for putting the coal in.It is now bricked up. We have been told that our house was the "Boss's House"</p>	<p>Notes further information</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Include on Local List</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 206.</p> <p>Shilling House, 342 West Road, Fenham.</p>	<p>The architects are well known - are you interested in their names, etc. Less a porch, more a canopy over the front door. Renovated 1999.</p>	<p>Notes further information</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Include on Local List</p>

Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): David Wallace			
--	--	--	--

Undeliverable

Name + Organisation + List ID + List Name	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Recommendation
List ID & Name: 32 Bentinck Crescent. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Royal Mail	Addressee has gone away	None	Include on Local List
List ID & Name: 2 1 - 6 Trafalgar Street, City Centre. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Royal Mail	Addressee has gone away	None	Include on Local List
List ID & Name: 135 Lemington Power Station. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Royal Mail	Address inaccessible	None	Include on Local List
List ID & Name: 134 Leminton Hotel, Lemington Road, Lemington	Addressee has gone away	None	Include on Local List

Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Royal Mail			
List ID & Name: 103 Goldborough Court, Richardson Road, City Centre. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any):	Returned to sender: Incomplete address	Address used was the one best known to us.	Include on Local List
List ID & Name: 89 Former National Provincial Bank, Shield's Road, Byker. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any):	addressee has gone away	None	Include on Local List
List ID & Name: 79 Fleming Memorial Patients Shelter, Great North Road/Clayton Road. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mrs Patricia Ansell	The Stewards Committee are not owners/ part owners or occupiers of this property.	Information given to us by The Terrier Section <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes ownership / responsibility query. 	Raise query
List ID & Name: 153 Moffat Pavilion, Leazes Park, City Centre.	The Stewards Committee are not owners/ part owners or occupiers of this property.	Information given to us by The Terrier Section	Raise query

Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mrs Patricia Ansell		Notes ownership / responsibility query.	
List ID & Name: 32 Bentinck Crescent. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Royal Mail	Addressee has gone away	None	Include on Local List
List ID & Name: 175 Park Education Centre, Leazes Park, City Centre. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mrs Patricia Ansell	The Stewards Committee are not owners/ part owners or occupiers of this property.	Information given to us by The Terrier Section <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes ownership / responsibility query. 	Raise query
List ID & Name: 31 Belle Grove Terrace. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Royal Mail	Address inaccessible	None	Include on Local List
List ID & Name: 31 Belle Grove Terrace. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any):	Address inaccessible	None	Include on Local List

Royal Mail			
List ID & Name: 29 Beavans, Shields Road, Byker. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any):	addressee has gone away	None	Include on Local List
List ID & Name: 23 Anderson Jones, Shield's Road, Byker. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any):	addressee has gone away	None	Include on Local List
List ID & Name: 2 1 - 6 Trafalgar Street, City Centre. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Royal Mail	Addressee has gone away	None	Include on Local List
List ID & Name: 2 1 - 6 Trafalgar Street, City Centre. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Royal Mail	Addressee has gone away	None	Include on Local List
List ID & Name: 55 Central Buildings, 7 - 9	Unoccupied	None	Include on Local List

Bigg Market, City Centre. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Royal Mail			
List ID & Name: 244 The Sungold Building, Beech Street, Benwell. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any):	addressee has gone away/ address incomplete	The building has now been demolished and a new development of 17 new house is proceeding on site.	Delete from the Draft Local List.
List ID & Name: 269 Wincomblee Workshops, White Street, Walker. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any):	address is empty	None	Include on Local List
List ID & Name: 269 Wincomblee Workshops, White Street, Walker. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any):	address is empty	None	Include on Local List
List ID & Name: 269 Wincomblee Workshops, White	address is empty	None	Include on Local List

Street, Walker. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any):			
List ID & Name: 269 Wincomblee Workshops. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Royal Mail	Addressee has gone away	None	Include on Local List
List ID & Name: 269 Wincomblee Workshops, Willow Tree Country Kitchens, Unit 11. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Royal Mail	Addressee has gone away	None	Include on Local List
List ID & Name: 266 West Jesmond Cinema, Lonsdale Terrace, Jesmond. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any):	Royal Mail returned mail - 'not called for'	None	Include on Local List
List ID & Name: 147 MEA House, Ellison	Addressee has gone away	None	Include on Local List

PLace, City Centre. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Royal Mail			
List ID & Name: 254 Turner's Building, 7-13 Pink Lane, City Centre. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Royal Mail	Addressee has gone away	None	Include on Local List
List ID & Name: 269 Wincomblee Workshops, White Street, Walker. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any):	address is empty	None	Include on Local List
List ID & Name: 241 Former Odeon Cinema. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Royal Mail	Address incomplete, address inaccessible	None	Include on Local List
List ID & Name: 235 Terraces - group, Eslington / Kingsland / Haldane Terraces &	Returned to sender: Addressee has gone away/no longer at address.	None	Include on Local List

<p>adjoining section of Clayton Road, Jesmond.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any):</p>			
<p>List ID & Name: 215 Springbank Pavilion, Leazes Park, City Centre.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mrs Patricia Ansell</p>	<p>The Stewards Committee are not owners/ part owners or occupiers of this property.</p>	<p>Notes query of ownership / responsibility</p>	<p>Raise query</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 198 Royal Court Yard, 11 - 15 Bigg Market.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Royal Mail</p>	<p>Unoccupied</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Include on Local List</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 194 Richardson Road Lodge, Leazes Park, City Centre.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mrs Patricia Ansell</p>	<p>The Stewards Committee are not owners/ part owners or occupiers of this property.</p>	<p>Notes query of ownership / responsibility</p>	<p>Raise query</p>

<p>List ID & Name: 193 Retaining Wall, Amethyst Road, Elswick.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Dysart Developments Ltd</p>	<p>addressee has gone away</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Include on Local List</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 254 Turner's Building, 7 - 13, Pink Lane, City Centre.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any):</p>	<p>addressee has gone away.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Include on Local List</p>

Object

Name + Organisation + List ID + List Name	Summary of Representation	Council Response	Recommendation
<p>List ID & Name: 1 1 - 24, Barras Bridge, City Centre.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): University of Newcastle Upon Tyne c/o Robert Muckle LLP</p>	<p>Feel SPD is subjective and open to wide interpretation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feel emphasis is on encouraging owners to conserve and given this emphasis the draft SPD should not impose unnecessary burden. Burdens will deter rather than encourage especially where repairs using traditional materials are costly. • Consideration should be given to the availability of grant funding to encourage maintenance of sites on Local List in a state of good repair. • Concerned regarding restriction of rights to demolish. • "The points that the Council will look to take into account when determining planning applications is a 'wish list'. The Council should encourage owners to take into account the guidelines but they should not be used to resist or 	<p>Acknowledge points raised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis is on encouragement and though a consideration within the planning process the SPD does not impose unnecessary burdens upon the owner. The SPD clearly states 'wherever practicable and appropriate'. • No funding is currently available from Council for such purposes. It is possible that Local List status help in grant funding application to external bodies such as the HLF however this entirely untried and untested. • The Local List SPD 	<p>Formerly known as The Grand Hotel this site is a prominent landmark opposite the Civic Centre and fronting the Grade II Listed Grand Assembly Room, now university PE and fitness centre.</p> <p>No reasonable architectural or historical argument against Local Listing has been put forward. The Head of Planning & Transportation therefore recommends that this site be inscribed on the Local List.</p>

	refuse planning permission.	cannot stop 'demolition' of a building on the Local List however the site owner may still need to apply for consent if such site(s) are within a conservation area or have other protections with statutory and enforceable regulations. The emphasis is on 'encouraging owners' to retain, conserve and alter sympathetically where practicably possible'. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a site is Locally Listed it will be a consideration within the planning process but is unlikely to be the sole decision maker in any planning applications. 	
List ID & Name: 19 Aero Club, Newcastle Airport, Newcastle Airport.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Airport company requires full flexibility to maintain its operational and developmental requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council recognises the need to retain control over operational and development 	Though we recognise operational flexibility is a necessity for any business, we do not

<p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Pippa Nelson, Newcastle International Airport</p>		<p>requirements however, it is considered that the proposed SPD will not unnecessarily obstruct nor lay down over-prescriptive requirements.</p>	<p>believe that Local List status will unnecessarily or unreasonably overburden or restrict. No reasonable architectural or historical argument against Local Listing has been put forward. The Head of Planning & Transportation therefore recommends that this site be inscribed on the Local List.</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 52 CASSIE BUILDING, CLAREMONT ROAD/KENSINGTON TERRACE.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE C/O ROBERT MUCKLE LLP</p>	<p>See 1 - 24, Barras Bridge, City Centre.</p> <p>Concerned about intention and application of the draft SPD in determining planning applications given the purpose is not to exert any additional planning controls.</p> <p>"The University has recently confirmed... that the Cassie Building is incorrectly identified as 'contributing significantly' or 'making a contribution to the area' of the proposed Civic Conservation Area.</p> <p>Object on grounds that it has, "little in common with the buildings within the historic core of the University..., on the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intention and application of the draft is SPD is to encourage conservation and sympathetic change when change is necessary. It is not envisaged that the draft SPD will hinder business and / or operational development where development is necessary but it will provide guidance when change is necessary that ensures our local 	<p>Built in 1955 in similar style to the Stephenson Building this is an excellent example of a post-war, 1950s building that formed part of the masterplan for post World War II Kings College, which was to become the University of Newcastle.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended for inscription on Local List.</p>

	<p>far side of Claremont Road, or with the group of late-Victorian terrace houses in Kensington Terrace.</p>	<p>that ensures our local cultural assets are well catered for.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The significance of unlisted buildings in this area has not been formally agreed by all stakeholders concerned with the proposal to designate a Civic Conservation Area. • A panel of respected, independent, local experts has confirmed this building as being of 'local significance'. • Though this building may have little in common with the surrounding environs this does not necessarily mean that it does not have local significance. As with Statutory Listing the Local List identifies sites, judged on their merits both in isolation 	
--	--	---	--

		and where appropriate on group value. Expert panel felt this building had group value with ID 231 – The Stephenson Building	
<p>List ID & Name: 71 East Lodge, Gosforth Park, Gosforth.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): PETER GOTOBED, NORTHERN RACING PLC</p>	<p>The lodge is not listed but is subject to a range of other local policies that protect the structure. Green Belt and Area of Exceptional Landscape Value. We would suggest that this building would not be offered any additional protection by local listing as the chimney, pyramidal roof, quoins or lintels would not require any sort of consent to alter and are offered no further protection by this designation.</p>	<p>Welcomes comments on other protections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Though the other designations may offer greater protection within the planning system, being listed on a Local List will ensure that the sites 'local significance' is taken into account as well its other positive attributes when any planning applications are necessary. • It should be noted that the Local List is not just a 'planning tool' but is also a means of promoting our local environment and heritage and raising 	<p>No reasonable architectural or historical argument against Local Listing has been put forward. The Head of Planning & Transportation therefore recommends that this site be inscribed on the Local List.</p>

		public awareness and consciousness.	
<p>List ID & Name: 78 Fenwick's Store, Nothumberland Street, City Centre.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): David R. Nimmo for Willaim Nimmo and Partners, Fenwick</p>	<p>Minor issues requiring correction: -only a part of the main facade dates back to1913. Around half the facade as it presently stands was constructed by Fenwick between 1994 and 1996 when the old facade was also refurbished. Fenwick have ongoing concerns about the possible restriction of their ability to respond to business requirements. While Fenwick appreciates the positive motivation behind proposal they believe the best way of preserving it's status as 'most famous shop' in the face of competition would be to omit it from the list.</p>	<p>Welcomes the issues requiring correction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council recognises Fenwick's concerns. It is not anticipated that the draft SPD will stifle business development. The draft SPD is there to help conserve and protect where practicable, fair and possible. The draft Local List aims also to promote Newcastle's heritage to the wider public. Buildings on the draft Local List will by default receive a certain amount of kudos. 	<p>Approximately 50% of the façade was refurbished in the 1990s and restored as faithfully as possible. The site therefore does not represent a good example of surviving, original fabric.</p> <p>It is a notable local landmark, however, given the low proportion of surviving original fabric it is on balance the recommendation of The Head of Planning & Transportation that this site not be inscribed on the Local List.</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 96 Galen House, Low Friar Street, City Centre.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any):</p>	<p>Pleased to see one of their developments recognised but concerned at potential for restrictions and increased costs. For any future refurbishment works, in order to compete in the residential lettings market it is essential to keep the</p>	<p>Welcomes support in principle.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The intention and application of the draft is SPD is to encourage 	<p>No reasonable architectural or historical argument against Local Listing has been put forward. The Head of Planning & Transportation</p>

<p>John Hanson, Operations Director, Paramount Homes Ltd</p>	<p>product up to date.</p>	<p>conservation and sympathetic change when change is necessary. It is not envisaged that the draft SPD will hinder business and / or operational development where development is necessary but it will provide guidance when change is necessary that ensures our local cultural assets are well catered for.</p>	<p>therefore recommends that this site be inscribed on the Local List.</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 107 HIGH GOSFORTH PARK. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): PETER GOTOBED, NORTHERN RACING PLC</p>	<p>THE FEATURES LISTED AS OF INTEREST ARE AS FOLLOWS: 1) THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY PARKLAND- ONLY REMNANTS OF THIS CAN BE TRACED. MOST ARE 19TH CENTURY ELEMENTS. ALL ARE PROTECTED BY UDP POLICIES FROM DEVELOPMENT OR CHANGE 2) THE WALL, ENTRANCE AND WEST LODGES ARE ALREADY LISTED BY ENGLISH HERITAGE AND SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED IN THE LOCAL LIST 3) BRANDLING HOUSE IS GRADE 2* AND</p>	<p>Welcomes details on elements within the park that are already protected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft Local Listing of High Gosforth Park is as a park and garden where the elements within the park form a part of the whole and without such included in the draft Local Listing would erode the 	<p>Given that the local importance of the park is recognised within the UDP and supporting policies it is the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Transportation that the site be inscribed on the Local List to ensure that it's local significance is recognised to a significant degree within the UDPs</p>

	<p>THE GRANDSTAND GRADE 2 AND SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED IN THE LIST 4) THE DEFINITION OF THE ELEMENTS OF THE PARK IS INACCURATE - THERE ARE TWO GOLF COURSES AND A DRIVING RANGE, A LAKE AND PONDS, AN EXHIBITION CENTRE AND RACE FACILITIES, PUBLIC HOUSE, STABLES BUT NO CAMPSITE 5) THE SITE IS CRISS CROSSED BY PRIVATE ROADS AND PATHS AND IS ONLY OPEN TO THE PUBLIC BY THE OWNERS GOODWILL. 6) THE WOODLAND IS ALL PROTECTED BY TREE PRESERVATION ORDER NO 17/95 AND REQUIRES NO FURTHER PROTECTION 7) THE LAKE IS A SSSI AND IS THEREFORE SUBJECT TO STATUTORY PROTECTION. 8)THE OPEN AREAS ARE IN GREEN BELT AND ALL PROTECTED SPECIES ARE SUBJECT TO THE WILDLIFE COUNTRYSIDE ACT 1981 AND CROW ACT 2000. ALL HAVE STATUTORY PROTECTION AND DO NOT REQUIRE ANY FURTHER PROTECTION FROM LOCAL LISTING. THE LOCAL IMPORTANCE OF HIGH GOSFORTH PARK IS RECOGNISED IN THE UD</p>	<p>Listing would erode the value of a locally listed park and garden.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Though local significance may be recognized within the UDP this document is in a period of transition as the Council prepares its successor, the Local Development Framework. Local Listing will ensure that the park's 'local significance' is recognised with the LDF. 	<p>successor, the Local Development Framework [LDF].</p>
--	---	--	--

	WITH SPECIFIC POLICY AND ALL ELEMENTS OUTLINED IN THE STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AND DO NOT REQUIRE ANY FURTHER PROTECTION FROM LOCAL LISTING		
<p>List ID & Name: 121 Heaton Methodist Church.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Cyril J Davies</p>	<p>The Methodist Church requires all its buildings to be subject to a quinquennial inspection by a qualified architect or surveyor. This church was last inspected in 2002 when the architect reported to the Church Council that in his opinion buildings, opened in 1901, had reached the end of their useful life. They required re-roofing, complete re-pointing and renewal of all electrical circuits was required; even then the premise would not conform to current buildings standards. Required work is way beyond financial capacity of present membership and in the architect's opinion the buildings are incapable of being modernised to the expected standards. Accordingly the Church Council are following a policy of minimum maintenance whilst decisions are made as to the future of the congregation.</p>	<p>Acknowledges note of buildings suitability and viability.</p>	<p>Heaton Methodist Church is an impressive religious structure, built in 1902 by Hope and Maxwell. This large church is built from solid stone and possesses ornate floral décor with curved crenulations, together with arched doorways and stain glass windows. The design also includes a small spire on one side of the church.</p> <p>Furthermore, it was the opinion of the expert panel that the building was of such quality that it be recommended for statutory Listed Building Status.</p> <p>It is therefore the opinion of the Head of Planning</p>

			and Transportation that the structure be inscribed on the Local List in order to protect it as best as possible until a an assessment can be carried out as to its viability for Listed Building status.
<p>List ID & Name: 154 Montagu Court, Montagu Avenue, Gosforth.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Secretary & Treasurer Mr T H Brannen, on behalf of: Moorside Maintenance Limited</p>	<p>Their objections are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are more suitable properties that are examples of 1970's construction 2. The rooftop restaurant has been closed for about 15 years and there are no public amenities at Montagu Court 3. The West Block does sit on stilts reaching 7 storeys high while the East Block is 17 storeys high supported by thin pillars, and the original construction of the stilts has raised concerns and faults since being built in 1967. <p>A planning application will shortly be lodged with Newcastle City Council to infill the stilts with new apartments.</p>	<p>Acknowledges objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An independent expert panel has confirmed this site as being of 'local significance' – this panel debated for all sites on the draft Local List whether more suitable / appropriate examples exist within Newcastle. • Draft Local Listing details should be altered. • None 	<p>Of 29 representations received relating to this site there were 28 supportive and this, one objection.</p> <p>No reasonable architectural or historical argument against Local Listing has been put forward. The Head of Planning & Transportation therefore recommends that this site be inscribed on the Local List.</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 158 Newcastle University Quadrangle.</p> <p>Respondent Name &</p>	<p>The university are concerned about the intention and application of the draft SPD in determining planning applications given the purpose is not to exert any additional planning controls. See 1 - 24</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intention and application of the draft is SPD is to encourage conservation and sympathetic change 	<p>One of the best spaces in Newcastle city centre, surrounded by statutorily Listed buildings, its high quality makes it an</p>

<p>Business Name (if any): University of Newcastle Upon Tyne c/o Robert Muckle LLP</p>	<p>Barras Bridge and Cassie Building.</p> <p>The University are also concerned about being burdened with buildings that are unfit for use but cannot be demolished and redeveloped due to Local List status.</p>	<p>when change is necessary. It is not envisaged that the draft SPD will hinder business and / or operational development where development is necessary but it will provide guidance when change is necessary that ensures our local cultural assets are well catered for.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local List status cannot in itself prevent demolition of a building – the SPD encourages where possible, viable and reasonable and seeks that owners / developers explore avenues of retention before rebuild. 	<p>obvious candidate for the Local List.</p> <p>No reasonable architectural or historical argument against Local Listing has been put forward. The Head of Planning & Transportation therefore recommends that this site be inscribed on the Local List.</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 161 Northern Rock Office Block.</p> <p>Respondent Name &</p>	<p>"Minded to Grant" consent given to demolish and redevelop the tower given by City Council in March 2005. Following completion of a section 106 Agreement full consent is expected any day.</p>	<p>Acknowledges the permission for demolition which superceeded the original nomination and that the building no longer exists.</p>	<p>Therefore this site clearly needs to be deleted from the Local List</p>

Business Name (if any): A G Leslie, Northern Rock Plc	Asbestos stripping is nearing completion and demolition will start in February.	Owner received consent for redevelopment and the building was demolished by March 2006.	
List ID & Name: 163 Northumberland Record Office, Melton Park. Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Mike Robbins, Northumberland County Council	Object to the proposal to include this property on the Draft Local List, based on the following factors. The building has been: 1. substantially altered from the original and is in a poor state of repair. 2. The existing building does not compliment the surrounding area of good quality housing and is not well known locally. 3. There are similar properties elsewhere, bringing into question the need to protect this one. 4. Additionally a new County Records Office is being constructed at the Woodhorn Colliery Museum in Ashington. 5. Redevelopment for residential use has been identified as most appropriate for this site after the transfer, and if this is restricted alternative uses for the building would be limited, with it possibly becoming the subject of vandalism and neglect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledge that the site owners have highlighted the site for redevelopment and that it has been agreed for the building to be recorded. 	Given that the building has been substantially altered, that similar properties exist elsewhere within the vicinity of Newcastle upon Tyne and that an agreement has already been reached to record the site it is the recommendation of the Head of Planning & Transportation that this site be excluded from the Local List.
List ID & Name: 182 Premises of Barr Ltd,	BUILDING ON LIST OBJECTION - factory cannot be considered unique	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independent expert panel's view was that 	The architectural merits of the building are at best

<p>Benfield Road.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Jay Everett, A G Barr</p>	<p>and local sentimental reasons/experience is "a tenuous reason" to suggest historical interest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The factory building is a common design with no architectural merit - That saying the building is constructed of red brick and has an interesting roof line does not justify inclusion <p>DOCUMENT OBJECTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contradiction in paragraph 3, existence of Local List means the council is attempting to make inclusion on the list a material consideration to the Planning Application Process. - Would like to see date of survey, name and qualifications of surveyor, actual research carried out, dates, architect and building significance. - The policy attempts to introduce a presumption against demolition and the building should be listed or within a conservation area if it is of such architectural merit. 	<p>it's local interest came in it's history of soft drinks manufacturing (e.g. Tizer) and its industrial components]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roofline of the building has been highlighted by the expert panel as architecturally interesting. • Paragraph 3 wording needs to be reconsidered • Details supplied by post – no further response. Also noted that site survey was general – full architectural surveys not required for Local Listing as list looks at local significance rather than purely architectural value. • National Listed Building status would not be applied to such a building as it is not of 	<p>questionable. In agreement with the representation the local significance of the building as a soft drinks manufacturer of 'Tizer' is arguably tenuous. The Head of Planning and Transportation therefore recommends that this site be excluded from the Local List.</p>
---	---	--	---

		<p>National significance but it has been deemed by the expert panel to be of local significance both architecturally and historically.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation Area status as implied by the name applies to 'areas' not individual buildings and would not be a suitable method of protection in this case. 	
<p>List ID & Name: 214 Spiller's Tyne Mill, St. Lawrence Road, Byker.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Nicola Forster, NAI Fuller Peiser</p>	<p>Oppose listing Acting on behalf of client, ADM Milling. Considered not of sufficient architectural or historic interest to satisfy listing criteria for following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The background info laid out in draft statement of significance does not identify what sources the factual info has been based on. - The mill is typical of its type and there are better examples in the UK including Baltic Mill. - It is no longer the tallest Mill in the world (there is one known in Edinburgh, owned by ADM Milling that beats it by 29 feet) 	<p>Acknowledge objection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources not acknowledged in representation. • Subjective response • Acknowledged in the Statement of Significance • Agreed except that as sole surviving sample in Newcastle upon Tyne it stands as testament to Newcastle's industrial heritage and 	<p>This site is the only surviving, dominating representation of Newcastle's important milling industry heritage. Though the Baltic does stand as testament to the milling industry on Tyneside, Spiller's Mill is the only landmark example surviving on the banks of the Tyne and within Newcastle City limits. Architecturally the building is no longer unique, though it once</p>

	<p>- They are unaware of there being any historical associations with local persons or events, or any group value with surrounding properties.</p> <p>- Designating the site as a locally listed building would constrain future commercial operations and could frustrate future regeneration opportunities in the immediate area.</p> <p>They also add: " In respect of Best Practice, PPS 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' and PPS 12 'Local Development Frameworks' advocating that Councils should engage in community involvement and public consultation with landowners in respect of planning documents and specific planning proposals. Given that our client was not notified of the original consultation process, we do not feel that we have been involved in the consultation process. On this basis we wish to be notified by the Council of any future decision and reserve the right to submit further representations, in advance of the proposal to locally list the building being determined.</p>	<p>importance as an industrial and milling centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPD unlikely to be so prescriptive as to prevent necessary change, however criteria for Local List do not allow for 'non-listing' because being on the list may cause future development / redevelopment issues. • Council made every effort to identify and notify owners and tenants. ADM Milling was notified by letter at the beginning of the consultation period. On being informed that ADM Milling had not received Council's communication, deadline submission was extended and full details sent to ADM Millings agents. 	<p>was (as the tallest flour mill in the world) and in its hay day made a statement throughout the milling industry as the tallest flour mill. Furthermore, the city and river-scapes benefit significantly from its existence. The surrounding environs have been highlighted for potential redevelopment which would only be complemented by such an extraordinary building.</p> <p>The Head of Planning and Transportation therefore recommends that the site be inscribed on the Local List.</p>
List ID & Name: 214	Representation opposes the Local Listing	Acknowledges objection.	Alter Statement of

<p>Spiller's Tyne Mill, St. Lawrence Road, Byker.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Donna Swan, Robert Muckle LLP on behalf of Port of Tyne Authority</p>	<p>of Spiller's Tyne Mill on the following basis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that it is architecturally typical of this type of building and that although it illustrates Newcastle's importance as a milling centre it does not , "appear to have any contribution to make in terms of illustrating any important aspect of economic history." Furthermore it does not appear to be associated with any important Tyneside people or events. • Final representation adds that the mill was always electrically powered and that its visual prominence and therefore impact and 'landmark' status will be severely reduced once the planned redevelopment of the area takes place and other buildings are constructed in close proximity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None • Council acknowledge correction to powering of building 	<p>Significance to reflect that mill was never steam powered and that it was always powered by electricity.</p> <p>This site is the only surviving, dominating representation of Newcastle's important milling industry heritage. Though the Baltic does stand as testament to the milling industry on Tyneside, Spiller's Mill is the only landmark example surviving on the banks of the Tyne and within Newcastle City limits. Architecturally the building is no longer unique, though it once was (as the tallest flour mill in the world) and in its hay day made a statement throughout the milling industry as the tallest flour mill. Furthermore, the city and river-scapes benefit</p>
---	---	--	---

			<p>significantly from its existence. The surrounding environs have been highlighted for potential redevelopment which would only be complemented by such an extraordinary building.</p> <p>The Head of Planning and Transportation therefore recommends that the site be inscribed on the Local List.</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 231</p> <p>Stephenson Building, Claremont Road/Kensington Terrace.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): University of Newcastle Upon Tyne c/o Robert Muckle LLP</p>	<p>-The rear elevations, extension and upper storeys of the building are unattractive and of poor quality.</p> <p>-The building has nothing in common with buildings within historic core of the university, or the late victorian terraced houses of Kensington & Park Terraces.</p> <p>-There is an opportunity to redevelop the site.</p> <p>- Parts of the building are operationally compromised.</p> <p>- The university is concerned about the intention and application of the draft SPD in determining planning applications given the purpose is not to exert any additional planning controls.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expert panel recommended that in the future this building be considered for Statutory Listing. • Expert panel consider this building to have group value with ID 52 – The Cassie Building • Accept that for the University’s purposes part of the building may be operationally compromised. • The intention and application of the draft 	<p>Recommended for inscription on Local List given that the site was part of the masterplan for post World War II Kings College, which was to become the University of Newcastle. Furthermore the expert panel felt the building was good enough to be put forward for statutory Listed Building status.</p>

		<p>application of the draft SPD is to encourage conservation and sympathetic change when change is necessary. It is not envisaged that the draft SPD will hinder business and / or operational development where development is necessary but it will provide guidance when change is necessary that ensures our local cultural assets are well catered for.</p>	
<p>List ID & Name: 235 Terraces - group, Eslington / Kingsland / Haldane Terraces & adjoining section of Clayton Road, Jesmond.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Anonymous</p>	<p>Mail returned from tenant who stated that she is not happy about enclosed information.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tenant also called and left abusive messages. • Local List Co-ordinator responded to letter and phone calls offering to meet with the tenant to clarify enclosed information. • This was never taken up. 	<p>As this is not a direct objection to the site being locally listed and considering the extensive number of supporting representations for this site it is the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Transportation that this site be inscribed on the Local List.</p>

<p>List ID & Name: 237 The Conservatory, Royal Victoria Infirmary, Newcastle upon Tyne.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): The Newcastle upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Trust</p>	<p>The setting of the Conservatory is subject to a detailed planning permission for the redevelopment of the wider Royal Victoria Infirmary site and works are in progress now. The Trust would be concerned at a mid-project change in the planning status of the conservatory that might compromise the programme, cost or content of the scheme that is being developed. Nevertheless, there are some informal early thoughts about the future of the conservatory and one is the possibility of moving it to a location next to the new office block complex. The Trust would welcome the opportunity to discuss this consultation further.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No current planning application has been submitted where the conservatory would be either demolished or moved. 	<p>No reasonable architectural or historical argument against Local Listing has been put forward. The Head of Planning & Transportation therefore recommends that this site be inscribed on the Local List.</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 241 The Old Odeon Cinema, Pilgrim Street, City Centre.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Stephen Levrant, Multiplex Ltd</p>	<p>The owners, Multiplex PLC wish to object to inclusion on the list because the significance of the building has been eroded to the point that there is now nothing remaining worthy of particular preservation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accept that internally the building is significantly altered. • As a building of 'contention' and in the public eye in Newcastle, the building itself, though altered significantly internally clearly still holds significance with a portion of the local population. 	<p>This site was originally considered for its exceptional interior and the expert panels' decision based primarily on this.</p> <p>Although the site has a strong local resonance and fondness, based on the architectural and historical criteria laid down for the Local List and supported by the</p>

			evidence produced in the representation that shows minimal, original fabric survives it is the recommendation of the Head of Planning and Transportation therefore recommends that the site be excluded from the Local List.
<p>List ID & Name: 242 The People's Theatre, Benton Bank, Heaton.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Tony Childs, Newcastle People's Theatre Arts Trust</p>	<p>While the Trust appreciates the historical interest of the building they would like the freedom to continue to develop the building sympathetically in the future. They are concerned about the weight planners might place on local listing concerning development and maintenance.</p> <p>Also constraints, for example changing the facade, and restraints, for example maintenance that would adversely affect them financially - because they are a voluntary organisation, and the financial implications of listing has no guarantee of access to funding.</p>	<p>Understand financial concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The intention and application of the draft is SPD is to encourage conservation and sympathetic change where reasonable. It is not envisaged that the draft SPD will hinder business and / or operational development where development is necessary but it will provide guidance when change is necessary that ensures our local 	<p>No reasonable architectural or historical argument against Local Listing has been put forward. The Head of Planning & Transportation therefore recommends that this site be inscribed on the Local List.</p>

		cultural assets are well catered for.	
<p>List ID & Name: 262 WALLED GARDEN, Gosforth Park</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): PETER GOTOBED, NORTHERN RACING PLC</p>	<p>THE SOUTHERN WALLED GARDEN IS CERTAINLY LISTED BY ENGLISH HERITAGE AND SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED IN THE LOCAL LIST. THE NORTHERN WALLED GARDEN MAY ALSO BE LISTED AS WHEN WE LAST CONSULTED THE EH LISTS THIS WAS UNCLEAR. NO FURTHER PROTECTION IS REQUIRED AS MUCH STRONGER PROTECTION THAN A LOCAL LIST ALREADY EXISTS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Listed Building information held by the Council does not identify the south walled garden as Listed. The north walled garden is not Listed. 	<p>No reasonable architectural or historical argument against Local Listing has been put forward. The Head of Planning & Transportation therefore recommends that this site be inscribed on the Local List.</p>
<p>List ID & Name: 265 West Denton Hall (St Vincent's Home), A69, West Denton.</p> <p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Sean Hedley for St Cuthbert's Care, St Cuthbert's Care</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - site has not been fully surveyed or researched - development is already closely protected by other Development Plan policy - property has been in poor state of repair for number of years, investment to secure long term viability of home should not be stifled by further bureaucracy - insufficient justification given for proposed protection - not seen schedule of responses from consultation exercise - would be unreasonable to seek to protect curtilage development, object to this imposition and draft guidance notes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permission to enter the property grounds or building to survey was refused by the owners. Other development plan policy does not necessarily identify local significance Local Listing as a consideration within the planning process does not create further bureaucracy, it is just one more fact to take into account. The draft SPD seeks to 	<p>No reasonable architectural or historical argument against Local Listing has been put forward.</p> <p>The owners, St. Cuthbert's Care, denied access to internally inspect the site. A view of the site was therefore taken through archive material as the next best means of assessment. Given the sites local prominence and</p>

	for local list as it is overly prescriptive.	<p>encourage long-term, viable use that, “where practicable and appropriate” uses appropriate materials and is sympathetic to a sites original appearance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are not many large houses, surviving in such extent, with such extensive history left in the west of the City. • Schedule of nomination responses was never requested. All nominations were vetted by an independent expert panel, negating the need to rely upon original nomination material. • Acknowledge concern. Policy section to review this. 	<p>connections it is the recommendation of the Head of Planning & Transportation that this site be inscribed on the Local List.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The section of the darft SPD regarding curtilage development has been reviewed and in the opinion of NCC policy officers is necessary to protect the setting of a ‘locally significant building’, in similar fashion to the curtilage protection that is afforded Statutorily Listed buildings.
List ID & Name: 270 WW2 Bellman Hanger.	The Airport Company would object to the inclusion of the WW2 Bellman Hanger on	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledge that the building may be 	No reasonable architectural or historical

<p>Respondent Name & Business Name (if any): Pippa Nelson, Newcastle International Airport</p>	<p>the Local List. The hanger has outline planning permission to be demolished. It is envisaged that with the first phase of apron development commencing, detailed planning permission will be sought in the near future for the re-development of this site. Recent high winds have also made the building structurally unsafe.</p>	<p>structurally unsafe.</p>	<p>argument against Local Listing has been put forward. Though the structure may be unsafe this has not been evidenced to Council.</p> <p>The Head of Planning & Transportation therefore recommends that this site be inscribed on the Local List.</p>
---	---	-----------------------------	---

Summary

The following sites have been recommended to be excluded from the Local List (detailed reasoning may be found within the tabulated information above):

Draft List ID	Ward	Name_Address
244	Elswick	The Sungold Building, Beech Street, Benwell,
161	West Gosforth	Northern Rock Office Block (Original Building), Regent Farm Road, Gosforth,
78	Westgate	Fenwick's Store, Northumberland Street, City Centre,
163	Parklands	Northumberland Record Office, Melton Park, Gosforth,
182	North Heaton	Premises of Barr Ltd, Benfield Road, Heaton,
241	Westgate	The Old Odeon Cinema, Pilgrim Street, City Centre,

Summary of SPD objections:

1. The SPD is too subjective.
2. The SPD is too prescriptive especially in consideration of point C on page 2.
3. There is concern that the SPD may direct planning officers to enforce use of traditional materials (materials that respect the 'distinctiveness' of the building) / materials that match original, for alterations, additions, extensions etc which may overburden the owner financially.
4. The SPD will inhibit potential for regeneration / redevelopment of sites unfit for purpose.

Response to SPD Objections:

1. The SPD is too subjective.

The purpose of a Supplementary Planning Document is to clarify and expand on policies adopted by Council through a statutory document. As such, it can not prescribe, only guide and it is believed that the current SPD achieves this.

2. The SPD is too prescriptive especially in consideration of point 7.3.

This aspect of the policy clarifies the requirements of Policy EN1.1 part C and D of the UDP as it relates to the setting of buildings on the local list. Provided the value of a local list and what it is trying to achieve is recognised, then this aspect of the SPD could not be considered as over prescriptive.

3. There is concern that the SPD may direct planning officers to enforce use of traditional materials (materials that respect the 'distinctiveness' of the building) / materials that match original, for alterations, additions, extensions etc

which may overburden the owner financially.

The use of traditional material is perhaps the easiest way to comply with this aspect of the SPD. However, the stated requirement deliberately uses the term 'appropriate materials' in preference to 'matching', 'identical' or 'traditional', to ensure that consideration can be given to other materials, provided that these are sympathetic to the characteristics of the building the listing is trying to protect. To do otherwise would defeat the intent of listing the building in the first instance.

4. The SPD will inhibit potential for regeneration / redevelopment of sites unfit for purpose.

The SPD does not categorically exclude the redevelopment of a building listed on the local list, rather it **encourages** the retention of these buildings. The list was prepared and will be reviewed in consultation with the community and the identified buildings add to a sense of place, an important aspect of regeneration. Making better use of historic buildings can also minimise resource consumption, thus contributing to sustainability. The majority of buildings are capable of withstanding conversion and adaptation to provide new uses, should this be required. The value of a restored and reused building often outweighs the value of a new building in terms of character, materials, and even its end monetary value. In addition, the list is not cast in stone, as the second requirement of the policy provides for the review of the local list.

Review of the Local List

It is anticipated that a decision to review the Local List will be taken three years from the formal adoption date of the SPD with the actual review taking place over a period of time specified at the 'decision to review' meeting.

It may also be prudent to allow for a review of the SPD content, wording and application after it has been in operation for a period of time. If a decision was taken that the SPD needed changing and / or enhancing to ensure its effectiveness and fairness further rounds of public consultation would be required.