

Q&A — Demolition & Redevelopment

Version 1.0.0 · 2026-10-23

Editors of the Great House Farm Legal Wiki

Table of Contents

1

Release notes

1

1.1

This release (version 1.0.0).

1

1.2

Older versions

1

2

Record

1

2.1

Q&A — Demolition & Redevelopment

1

Page 516 of the Great House Farm Legal Wiki, carried over from the version last modified on 2026-10-21. The same page is published at research.bucklerfamily.estate, and this version is also a [PDF](#) in the wayback archive.

1 Release notes

1.1 This release (version 1.0.0)

- **2026-Oct-23** - Carried over to the docs library from Legal Wiki page 516 (last modified 2026-10-21 19:10:07 UTC). The page text, dates and references are as on the wiki. Links to wiki pages lead to the same page on research.bucklerfamily.estate; images are links to their files on the wiki.

1.2 Older versions

None yet.

2 Record

Page ID: 516 · **Title:** Q&A — Demolition & Redevelopment · **Evidence status:** Not yet labelled — see the Editing Protocol · **Version:** 1.0.0 · [Editing Protocol](#)

2.1 Q&A — Demolition & Redevelopment

When was the farmhouse demolished?

The site’s chronology records demolition during the night of **5–6 December 1988**, following the final stages of the possession dispute and the heritage-listing issue.

What happened immediately before demolition?

The record includes the December 1988 eviction proceedings, press coverage, and the final possession dispute. The detailed sequence is set out on the [1988: Possession and Demolition](#) page.

Was there a planning application after the demolition?

Yes. The site records outline planning application **89/01396/OUT**, granted on 13 March 1990, followed by reserved matters application **92/00671/RES**. The surviving planning record is still being reconstructed.

What does the redevelopment tell us about the land?

Why does Church View Close matter?

What planning records are still missing?

Was there a section 52 or other planning agreement?

No such instrument has been located in the material reviewed to date. Because outline permission was granted on 13 March 1990, the historic search should include any agreement under section 52 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1971, as well as deeds, undertakings and local-land-charge entries. The absence of an identified agreement is not proof that none existed. [?]

Why is the retention of the farmhouse now a planning question?

The 1989 officer’s report records that East Vale Local Plan Policy H.2 supported residential development but that the policy’s supporting information said the buildings on the site should be retained. The same report records that the buildings had already been demolished. The surviving planning record does not yet show how the Council reconciled those facts.

Why are Appendices B–E important?

The officer’s report says Appendix B contained further GGAT comments received after discussions with the Trust; C and D were representations, including one from a local County Councillor described as a GGAT member; and E was the applicants’ agents’ response to GGAT. These annexes are absent from the planning file disclosed in 2026.

Why does the 1992–1993 applicant sequence matter?

The record identifies Ideal Homes Wales as the 1992 reserved-matters applicant and separately records BP’s transfer to Ideal Homes on 3 December 1993. The documentary question is what legal or contractual interest or arrangement explained the earlier application. It is not, by itself, evidence that the application was invalid.

Was environmental assessment considered?

The 1988 environmental-assessment regulations were in force when the outline application was made. The site was about 3.4 acres, while case-law discussing those regulations identifies a 0.5-hectare threshold for the Schedule 2 urban-development category. The Council’s screening/determination record has not yet been located.

2.1.1 Open demolition and redevelopment questions

- What complete set of documents was before the planning authority in 1989?
- What were the full terms of archaeological conditions 16 and 18 and how were they discharged?
- What happened to the missing planning appendices identified in the current records chronology? [?]
- Which plans show the former farmhouse / House Plot most clearly before and after redevelopment?
- What archaeological and heritage material was considered at the reserved-matters stage in 1992?

2.1.2 Page version & change log

Current version: 1.0.0

Version	Date (UTC)	Editor (human or agent name)	Change	Source / evidence
1.0.0	2026-10-18T15:17Z	Sion’s Tab agent	Footer standardised; no content change	Editing Protocol, 18 Oct 2026

Agents and editors: follow the [Editing Protocol](#).