
CPO Report to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

by John Chase MCD, Dip Arch, RIBA, MRTPI

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

Date: 9 September 2016

THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
THE ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT 1981
THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF HARTLEPOOL
APPLICATION FOR CONFIRMATION OF
THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF HARTLEPOOL (LONGSCAR BUILDING, THE
FRONT, SEATON CAREW) COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER 2015

Inquiry held on 16 to 18 August 2016
Inspections were carried out on 15 and 16 August 2016.

File Ref: APP/NPCU/CPO/H0724/76272

File Ref: APP/NPCU/CPO/H0724/76272
Longscar Building, The Front, Seaton Carew

- The Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) was made under section 226(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 by the Council of the Borough of Hartlepool on 20 November 2015.
- The purposes of the Order are achieving the regeneration and improvement of The Front and thereby achieving the promotion and improvement of the economic, social and environmental well-being of the area.
- The main grounds of objection are that the Order is not necessary.
- When the inquiry opened there was one remaining objection.

Summary of Recommendation: that the Order be not confirmed

Procedural Matters and Statutory Formalities

1. The Council confirmed its compliance with the Statutory Formalities. There were no submissions on legal or procedural matters, nor any requests to modify the Order.
2. The Inquiry took place over three days between the 16 and 18 August. An unaccompanied site visit took place on the 15 August and an accompanied site visit on the 16 August when the interior of the building was also inspected.
3. The Order Land is variously described in the evidence as the Longscar Building, Longscar Hall and the Longscar Centre. The Longscar Building is used in this report.
4. References in square brackets relate to documents in the schedule at the end of this report; "app" refers to the relevant appendix. References in round brackets in the Inspector's Conclusions section refer to paragraphs earlier in the report.
5. The remaining objection is by the owners of the Order Land, brothers Terrence and Barry Wilkinson, and Longsco Limited, a company set up by their respective sons, Craig and Gary Wilkinson. Longsco Limited has an unregistered 25 year lease on the property and has been set up for the purpose of reinstating the building and bringing it back into use. Statutory declarations [C9 app 1] confirm the brothers' agreement to evidence being given on their behalf by Gary Wilkinson, and to their willingness to support the project.

The Order Land and Surroundings

6. The Order Land is on The Front, which runs parallel with the sea and forms part of the main road serving Seaton Carew, a holiday resort and suburb approximately 3km south of the centre of Hartlepool. The majority of the town is on the landward side, where it forms a built frontage to the road, whilst there is a strip of land on the eastern side, separating The Front from the shore. The northern portion of this strip is largely open recreational space, but towards the centre of the town, where the land widens, there is an area of development including, first, the Order Land, then a terrace of shops with a car park behind, and a bus station. A map of The Front is included at B4.1 page 9.
7. The town developed as a resort in the nineteenth century, and the majority of the buildings in the vicinity of the Order Land date from this period, into the early twentieth century. The predominant style is two and three storey rendered buildings, with shop fronts at ground level, set in terraces along the rear of the

pavement and with a predominantly vertical emphasis [C3 app 5]. In contrast, the Longscar Building on the Order Land is a large, detached, brick and tile structure. It is set back from The Front, and has a distinctly horizontal appearance, formed by an arched colonnade along the road frontage, and stepped, pantiled roofs leading to a two storey portion at the rear. [C3 app 10]

Background

8. The Longscar Building was originally developed by the Council in the 1960s, the structure at that time having a frame and panel appearance, redolent of its era [C3 app 10]. It was bought by the present owners, brothers Barry and Terrence Wilkinson, in 1987, and substantially rebuilt in about 1990 as the brick and tile building now on the site. The main hall area was used for a variety of seaside entertainment activities, with ancillary kiosks and shops, a bar, and a nightclub at first floor level. A dispute between the brothers in 1998 affected their business and led to the closure of the building from about 2006, with the last occupant moving out in 2009. It has been vacant since that time. The interior of the building has been vandalised, with extensive damage to finishes and services, and from damp damage arising from theft of roof lead and disturbance of the tiles. The roof has subsequently been repaired, and later additions at the front of the building removed, but it retains a disused appearance [C9 app 5].

Planning Context

9. The Hartlepool Local Plan was adopted in 2006. Amongst the identified policies [B1.1], To3 allows commercial and leisure development in the Core Area of Seaton Carew, provided it is sympathetic to the character of the area and its role as a seaside resort. To4 identifies sites in the vicinity of the Order Land for more intensive recreational and commercial facilities, whilst Policy Com6 encourages environmental enhancement in designated Commercial Improvement Areas, including Seaton Carew. Policies HE1, HE2 and HE3 refer to Conservation Areas, including the need to seek their enhancement. A new Local Plan is in the course of preparation, but at an early stage, and the Council do not suggest that its policies should be accorded significant weight.
10. The Seaton Carew Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (the 'Masterplan') [B1.3] was adopted in 2015 following consultation exercises [C1 apps 7 and 8]. It notes that the Longscar Building occupies a highly prominent location, and its size and dereliction have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the area, being identified as a key issue in public consultation. It proposes the acquisition and demolition of the building, using CPO powers if no agreement is reached with the owners, replacing it with a market square and events area as part of the wider regeneration of the seafront. Planning permission [B2.1] has been granted to the Council's development partner, Esh Group, for a detailed scheme based on the Masterplan proposals.
11. The whole of this part of the seafront, except for the Order Land, falls within the Seaton Carew Conservation Area, which was designated in three parts between 1969 and 2002 [Plan at C3 app 1]. The published Visual Assessment [C3 app 7] notes that the Longscar Building is an exception to the low level of vacancy in Seaton Carew, and that its disuse and dereliction have a detrimental effect both on the adjoining Conservation Area and on the local economy. The Management Plan for the Conservation Area [C3 app 8] also refers to the harmful effect of the Longscar Building, which dominates its area. Amongst the Action points, the

Council will use statutory powers to bring buildings back into use and encourage owners to keep them in a good state of repair. The Conservation Area has been on the Historic England 'at risk' register since 2012, with the harmful effect of the Longscar Building being one of three identified risk factors.

12. Listed Buildings in the vicinity include the art deco style Seaton Bus Station and the three storey Marine Hotel.

The Case for the Council [Acquiring Authority]

13. The Council's position is described in the Statement of Case [A10] and summarised in their opening and closing statements [E2 and E4]. They require the Order Land in order to carry out the improvement of the Front as set out in the Masterplan, for the economic, social and environmental well-being of the area, the main aims being a clean, family friendly environment, with enhanced public amenities, and support for the local economy.
14. Three phases of development are proposed [C1 app 8]: the first would be the demolition of the Longscar Building and its replacement with an open events and market space; the second phase would include improved facilities, landscaping and footpaths to the north and south of the Order Land; and the third phase would be the improvement of the Bus Station and its environs. The project would achieve an enhanced public realm with space for festivals, markets and community events, to contribute to the regeneration of Seaton Carew. The replacement of the Longscar Building would restore the openness of this part of the town, removing an obstacle to pedestrian access, and improve views of the adjoining terrace at 70-79 The Front and between the seafront and the commercial area.
15. The Council recognises the harmful effect of the Longscar Building on the adjacent Conservation Area, by its dereliction but also because the scale and appearance of the building bears little resemblance to the surrounding architecture. This position is endorsed by Historic England [C3 app 11] who also note that it creates a visual and physical barrier between the seaside resort and the coast. They advise that a compulsory purchase order would be a tried and tested means of removing an ingrained problem, to benefit the historic environment.
16. The proposed redevelopment scheme is in accordance with the adopted Local Plan: there is no conflict with the terms of Policy To3, and the more intensive use of other land in To4 does not refer to the Order Land. The Masterplan does not create new policy, but provides detail about how development plan policies will be pursued. This is not the forum to challenge the legitimacy of the Masterplan, and the time for legal challenge has passed.
17. Acquisition of the Order Land is essential for the scheme to proceed. No other site offers the same locational advantages, including good pedestrian linkages, and avoiding the loss of existing recreational space. If the Order is confirmed then the Council have the resources to deliver Phases 1 and 2 of the project, with funds available from the sale of development sites, and a commitment to make up any shortfall, should it arise. Phase 3 will be carried out if additional capital becomes available, but the completion of Phases 1 and 2 is not dependent on this.

18. The Council have sought to purchase the land by agreement over a period of five years, and have made a number of formal offers, but there have been difficulties contacting the owners, and, despite indications of a willingness to sell, negotiations with Longsco Limited have not succeeded because of a wide variation in value expectations.
19. The Objectors have suggested alternative schemes, involving retention of the Longscar Building, but these would not resolve the fundamental shortcomings of its appearance and location, nor provide the economic and social benefits of the Masterplan design. In any event, there is doubt about the likelihood of the scheme proceeding. The nature of the proposals has changed from time to time, and there is no evidence that they would be commercially viable. It is unlikely that it would be possible to provide adequate amenity for residential use of the first floor, and the fall back of a nightclub in this space would not necessarily be compatible with children's play on the ground floor, and would be similar to the mix of uses which has failed in the past. In addition, there are restrictive covenants over the use of the land which may limit the potential to carry out the project. Questions arise about the capacity of Longsco Limited to pursue the scheme. It has no track record, and the claimed sources of finance are not certain.
20. The poor appearance of the building has caused a succession of complaints and problems [C4 Table 2], and consultation on the Masterplan has revealed the extent of public concern, with up to 100% of responses supporting the need to resolve the current situation [C1 section 4].
21. Overall, the Council is satisfied that there is a compelling case for the acquisition of the Order Land. It is necessary for the economic, social and environmental well-being of Seaton Carew, and interference with the owners' rights under the European Convention on Human Rights is proportionate and justified by the wider public benefit.

Submission Supporting the Council

22. Ward Councillor Paul Thompson addressed the Inquiry and the text of his speech is contained at document E9. He supports the Council's action, and notes the very strong local concern about the dilapidated state of the Longscar Building and the negative impact that it has on Seaton Carew. He has received an estimated 900-1000 representations about this in the past six years, being the most commonly raised issue in the town.
23. The Council's scheme offers the potential to attract visitors to the seaside resort, rather than create additional competition for already struggling businesses. Improved facilities and year round events would extend the attraction of the town outside the normal season, and complement the Council's recent sea defence works which have created a 4km long, accessible promenade. Without the removal of the Longscar Building, residents are concerned that the regeneration of Seaton Carew will never occur.

The Case for the Objectors

24. A summary of the Objectors' case is contained in the opening and closing statements [E5 and E8] and in the letter of objection to the Order [B5]. It is their view that the Masterplan, which forms the basis of the Council's scheme,

- does not apply the provisions of the Local Plan, but rather creates new policy, contrary to Regulation 8 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. Local Plan Policies To3 and To4 do not refer to the demolition of the Longscar Building and its replacement with open space, but rather To4 seeks the more intensive use of this part of the Front. As such, the Masterplan, and the planning permission based on it, do not provide the development plan framework for compulsory purchase required by Government Guidance. Paras 5 to 21 of the Objectors' Closing Submissions [E8] set out the legal framework, with reference to relevant case law, in support of their contention that the Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is not soundly based.
25. Nor is it accepted that there is a compelling case on heritage grounds. The original building pre-dated the first part of the Conservation Area, and was the context within which it was designated. Subsequent planning permission for the rebuilding in its present form was granted after the Conservation Area had been extended close to the Order Land, and in taking its decision, the planning authority would have been bound to consider the impact on the Area. The suggestion that the building should now be demolished and replaced by open land because of its effect on the setting of the Conservation Area is extraordinary and not one for which the Council's heritage witness could provide a precedent. The building presently provides a sense of containment, whereas its demolition would reveal the poor appearance of the rear of the shops at 70-79 The Front. In addition, the Council's Conservation Area Management Plan [C3 app 8] indicates that the Council will use statutory powers to bring buildings back into use, not force their demolition.
26. It is recognised that the disused state of the Order Land is detrimental to the area, but not that the solution is the demolition of the building. The Objectors have prepared alternative proposals for its refurbishment and re-use, which would offer advantages over the Council scheme. They would stimulate vitality and commercial activity, along with increased employment, by providing additional visitor attractions, as well as a place for shelter in bad weather, and a link between the town's attractions. Unlike the Council's scheme, the Objectors' proposals accord with the Local Plan. The Objectors have found the Council committed to their own scheme and reluctant to discuss the refurbishment plans.
27. Some work has been carried out to the building, including repairing the roof and demolishing extensions, but the issue of the Order has led to the suspension of further operations. However, the Objectors would be in a position to make an early planning application and commence the project, with the expectation that the building would be trading within 16 months. Mr Gary Wilkinson's statement [C9] includes photographs of previous projects carried out by the directors of Longsco Limited, and details of the availability of finance, along with expressions of interest from prospective operators in the new facility. The project is financially viable: the Council's estimates of the cost of refurbishment far exceed those of the Objectors, but, nonetheless, do not indicate a negative outcome.
28. The Objectors contend that the Order is not necessary and does not comply with the development plan. The Guidance requires compelling reasons to outweigh the human rights of the land owner, and such reasons do not exist.

Inspector's Conclusions

29. The CPO seeks to acquire rights and ownership of land shown on the Order Map for the purpose of facilitating the carrying out of re-development and improvement of land in and around The Front, Seaton Carew. It is made under Section 226(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004). The power granted is intended to assist a local authority to fulfil its duties of promoting the economic, social and environmental well-being of its area. Government advice on its application is contained in the 2015 publication *Guidance on Compulsory Purchase Process* ('the Guidance'), paragraph 76 of which sets out the factors which will be taken into account by the Secretary of State when deciding whether to confirm an Order, and which will be discussed further below.
30. The Council's case has several strands. There is a concern about the longstanding dereliction and disuse of the building, and its effect on the economic, social and environmental quality of the area. But there is also the more fundamental point that the building is inappropriate for its location, because it is an impediment to the proper redevelopment of the seafront as set out in the Masterplan, and because of the effect on the Conservation Area, which surrounds the Order Land. It is this latter aspect which will be dealt with first.

Impact on Heritage

31. The significance of this part of the Conservation Area appears to lie in the evidence of its development from a fishing village to a seaside resort, in the setting it provides to the listed buildings within it, and in the architectural form of the buildings, which are of varied design, but unified by their restricted scale and range of materials. The Longscar Building is of an entirely different design, size and materials, which does not complement the surrounding architecture, and which divides part of the older town from the seafront. It is not in the near vicinity of any Listed Buildings but, to the extent that their setting is formed by the Conservation Area, any harmful effect has some impact. (7, 11, 15)
32. However, discordant buildings affect many heritage items, and it would be unusual to seek their removal, and replacement with open space, in any but the most compelling circumstances. It is doubtful that such circumstances exist here, where there are a number of mitigating factors. Whilst of entirely different design from its neighbours, there are indications of a considered architectural composition in the building, which may have been undermined by later accretions, but these have now largely been removed. There are other buildings with a horizontal emphasis within the Conservation Area, including the frontages of amusement arcades opposite the Order Land, and the art deco Bus Station, further to the south. In addition, any increase in open space to improve the linkage between the town and sea would be of incremental, rather than decisive, benefit as there would remain development south of the Order Land to block views and access.
33. There is merit in the Objectors' argument that the removal of the building would expose the relatively poor aspect of the car park and rear of shops at 70-79 The Front, which landscaping proposals would be unlikely to wholly conceal. They also point out that a building existed on this site prior to the designation of any part of the Conservation Area, and that, if the present design had been so wholly unsuitable, then it would not have received planning permission at a time when

the Conservation Area, although not immediately adjacent to the Order Land, was sufficiently close to be heavily influenced by its development. (25)

34. The National Planning Policy Framework places great weight on the need to conserve a heritage asset, and account is taken of Historic England's support for the Council's approach. However, the evidence falls short of proving that any harm caused by the building is so great as to justify its removal, as compared to renovation, in order to achieve the enhancement sought by Local Plan Policy HE2, or to meet statutory obligations regarding the preservation of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and setting of listed buildings.

Masterplan Proposals

35. The need to improve the appearance of The Front, and to widen the tourist offer, is central to the Masterplan proposals. Mr Spencer's evidence [C2] emphasises the requirement for seaside resorts to adapt to changing demand and the role of public investment in achieving this. The market square is intended to widen the public appeal by enabling a different range of cultural and commercial activities from those already in the town, providing a space for events to take place, to attract visitors to the town, including outside the summer season. (10, 13, 14)
36. In terms of the criteria in para 76 of the Guidance, there seems no doubt that the Council's proposals are intended to contribute to the economic, social and environmental well-being of the area. However, this paragraph also refers to establishing whether those purposes could be achieved by any other means.
37. There is no indication of an investigation of alternative schemes which would not require the acquisition of the Order Land; rather the demolition of the Longscar Building appears to have been central to the plan preparation¹. This may be a reasonable approach if there is an overwhelming need to remove the building for environmental and heritage reasons, but in the absence of such justification, the failure to look at alternative approaches is a defect in the process. As it is, the explanation for excluding other sites [C1 para 7.20] lacks substance. It may be that the location of the Order Land would be the best position for the market and events space, but there is no compelling case that any alternative location would be so inferior as to prevent the Council's objectives being realised. For instance, other potential sites are not so remote from the footpath system as to be inaccessible, and the proposed events space would be an open use in itself, rather than supplanting open space. (14, 17)
38. Para 76 of the Guidance also refers to an investigation of whether the purpose for which the land is being acquired fits in with the adopted Local Plan. It is a key part of the Objectors' case that this is not so, and that the Masterplan SPD creates new policy. There is some force to this argument. In particular, Local Plan Policy To4 identifies land adjoining the Longscar Building as being suitable for more intensive use. The Order Land is not included in this schedule, being already developed, but it would be illogical to assume that the Local Plan anticipated open space on the Order Land when other sites around it were earmarked for more intensive use. (16, 24)

¹ See for instance page 8 of the Council's Development and Marketing Brief, 2011 [B4.1]

39. Whether or not the Masterplan conflicts with policies in the Local Plan, the Council point out that this is not an appropriate forum for deciding its legitimacy, and the time for any legal challenge has passed. It is recognised that the Masterplan has been through an extensive programme of public consultation and, whilst not entitled to the weight accorded to the Local Plan, remains a significant material consideration. Nonetheless, the Guidance makes clear that there must be a compelling case to support a Compulsory Purchase Order, and the Masterplan, and attendant planning permission, are not, of themselves, conclusive evidence of the need to acquire the land. It is also necessary to look at the wider merits of the case and, as discussed, these provide a less than compelling justification. (16)

Building Use and Condition

40. Whilst the Council's redevelopment proposals may not provide adequate support for the compulsory acquisition of the Order Land, there is reason to consider that such action would be appropriate to resolve the harmful effect of the poor condition of the property. It is a large site in a prominent location in the centre of the resort, and public responses to the Masterplan reinforce the view that it has had a seriously depressive effect on the town. The combination of disuse and partial dereliction would have undermined any attempt to improve the local environment and promote the town as an attractive tourist venue. (8, 20, 22)
41. The Objectors claim that the Longscar Building had been a successful going concern, and the closure was only occasioned by a dispute between the owners. Even if this is the case, it does not indicate responsible property ownership, and there is little justification for leaving the building substantially vacant and neglected for a decade. Having regard to the sensitivity of this location, and evidence of the fragile state of the seaside economy, there is a case for public intervention to address the problem. (8)
42. The question now arises as to whether the Objectors' current proposals to refurbish and re-use the property are realistic, and sufficiently likely to come to fruition as to render the compulsory purchase unnecessary. There is scope for some scepticism about the capacity of Longsco Limited to undertake the work. The company has no track record, and any indications of financial support appear to rely on cooperation within the Wilkinson family, which, as demonstrated, has been subject to internal disputes. There are also doubts about whether the proffered expressions of interest in the refurbished premises would be likely to result in firm tenancies. The Council point out that no planning applications have been made for the renovated building, and there are concerns about whether any residential accommodation proposed would be capable of providing satisfactory amenity, or would overcome restrictive covenants on the title. Above all, there is no clear reason why, if there were a realistic means of resolving the problems posed by the building, effective action has not been taken at an earlier date. (19)
43. There is substance to these concerns. However, there is also evidence that the directors of Longsco Limited have experience of building projects and running leisure businesses, and that the recent repair of the roof and removal of unsightly outbuildings is an indication of some financial commitment to the project. It is understandable that the issue of the Order would have led to the cessation of any further work. Nor do the Council wholly exclude the possibility of a residential

element, nor prove that this would be contrary to planning policy. The restrictive covenants are within the control of the Council. (19,27)

44. Questions are raised about the financial viability of the refurbishment scheme. Whilst the Council's evidence [C5] does not indicate a negative outcome, Mr King, for the Council, warned that his estimate was 'generous' to the Objectors, and his appraisal [C5 app 1] indicates a relatively marginal positive land value. The estimated construction cost, at £825,722, compares unfavourably with the Objectors' valuation of £349,747 [C8 app 2] for the same work. Mr King also questioned whether the level of demand in Seaton Carew would support a substantial increase in leisure and retail space, a point echoed by Cllr Thompson. (19, 23)
45. However, limited weight can be given to either of the building cost estimates in the absence of a detailed survey and design. Mr Daley, on behalf of the Objectors, acknowledged omissions from his estimate, whilst Mr King was not able to support individual elements, which had been prepared by another party, and it was likely that direct management of the building works would reduce costs below those estimated. Relatively small differences of assessed rent and yield for the completed building led to wide variations in capital value. The Council's appraisal included a 20% developer's profit on cost, although it may be that the owner of a building would not require the same profit incentive as an uncommitted third party. Overall, whilst there remained uncertainty about the outcome, the Council did not prove that a positive financial return would be so unlikely as to prevent the project from proceeding. Nor were concerns about the capacity of the town to support additional leisure space fully supported; the Longscar Building operated alongside existing outlets before closure, and a seaside resort catering for visitors serves a wide potential market. (19, 26)
46. There is reason to consider that the refurbishment and occupation of the building in the form proposed by the objectors would eliminate the harm arising out of its present poor and disused condition. It is credible that the Council have been committed to the Masterplan project and have been reluctant to enter positive discussions to deliver a refurbished building. (26)
47. Whilst doubts remain about the future of the building, especially in light of the hiatus which has occurred since it was vacated, the Council's evidence does not conclusively prove that the Objectors would be unable to carry out a refurbishment, nor that it would be financially unviable. The matter is finely balanced, but the forced sale of an individual's property is a draconian measure, and it is reasonable that the benefit of the doubt should lie with the Objectors.

Conclusion

48. The various strands of the Council's case, whether taken individually or together, do not demonstrate that the acquisition is essential to achieve the economic, social and environmental well-being of the area, nor that the public interest outweighs the infringement of the Objectors' rights under Article 1 of the first protocol of the European Convention on Human Rights.

Recommendation

49. I recommend that the Council of the Borough of Hartlepool (Longscar Building, The Front, Seaton Carew) Compulsory Purchase Order 2015 be not confirmed.

John Chase

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE COUNCIL:

Mr M Carter	of Counsel
He called	
Mr R Smith BA, Cert. Regeneration	Principal Regeneration Officer, Hartlepool Borough Council (HBC)
Mr R Spencer MBA, BSc, MRTPI	PartnershipGLu
Ms S Scarr BSc, DipTP, MRTPI	Heritage and Countryside Manager, HBC
Mr M Steele BA, MRTPI	Senior Planning Officer, HBC
Mr M King FRICS	Bilfinger GVA
Mr D Clarke BSc, MRICS	Estates and Regeneration Manager, HBC

FOR THE OBJECTORS:

Mr G Grant	of Counsel
He called	
Mr S Cavey BA, MSc, MRICS	Greig Cavey Commercial Ltd
Mr M Daley FRICS	Maurice Daley Partnership
Mr G Wilkinson	Longsco Limited on behalf of Terence and Barry Wilkinson
Mr D Stovell BSc, MRTPI	Stovell and Millwater Ltd

INTERESTED PERSON:

Cllr P Thompson	Ward Councillor, HBC
-----------------	----------------------

DOCUMENTS

A Compliance Documents

- A1 Order
- A2 Order Map
- A3 Notice of making (advertisement)
- A4 Advertisement
- A5 Notice of making (qualifying persons)
- A6 Covering letter
- A7 General Certificate
- A8 Protected Assets Certificate
- A9 Statement of reasons
- A10 Statement of case
- A11 Relevant date letter
- A12 Notice of inquiry date letter
- A13 Change of venue
- A14 Public notice of inquiry
- A15 Advertisement of notice of inquiry
- A16 Certificate of billposting
- A17 Photo of notice on site
- A18 Photos of notice on site

B Core Documents

- B1.1 Local Plan Policies To3, To4, Rec9, HE1, HE2, HE3, Com6, GN3
- B1.2 Saved Policies, Framework Justification
- B1.3 Seaton Carew Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
- B1.4 SPD Consultation Document
- B2.1 Planning Permission Ref H/2015/0396 and associated documents
- B2.2 Letters of objection to above planning application
- B3 Council committee reports
- B4.1 Seaton Carew Development and Marketing Brief
- B4.2 Hartlepool Vision
- B4.3 Commercial lease agreement for the Longscar Building
- B4.4 Conveyance of the Longscar Building dated 1987
- B5 Objection on behalf of the Owners

C Witness Statements

For the Council:-

- C1 Mr Smith with appendices (in 2 separate folders)
- C2 Mr Spencer with appendices (separately bound)
- C3 Ms Scarr with appendices (separately bound)
- C4 Mr Steele
- C5 Mr King with appendices
- C6 Mr Clarke with appendices (in a separate folder)

For the Objectors:-

- C7 Mr Cavey with appendix
- C8 Mr Daley with appendices
- C9 Mr Wilkinson with appendices
- C10 Mr Stovell with appendices

E Documents presented at Inquiry

By the Council:-

- E1 Schedule of appearances
- E2 Opening statement
- E3 Coastal Communities Fund Guidance Notes
- E4 Closing submissions

By the Objectors:-

- E5 Opening statement
- E6 RWE v Milton Keynes BC [2013] EWHC 751 (Admin)
- E7 Wakil v LB of Hammersmith and Fulham [2012] EWHC 1411 (OB)
- E8 Closing submissions

By a third party:-

- E9 Text of presentation by Cllr P Thompson