

Date of Meeting	12 th January 2017
Application Number	16/07192/FUL
Site Address	E V Naish Ltd Crow Lane Wilton Salisbury Wiltshire SP2 0HD
Proposal	Demolition of Existing Buildings to Facilitate the Mixed Use Development of the Site to Provide 61 Residential Units, Two Commercial Units of B1 Use, One Retail Unit, and Associated Car Parking.
Applicant	Mr Geoff Naish
Town/Parish Council	WILTON
Electoral Division	WILTON AND LOWER WYLYE VALLEY – Cllr Peter Edge
Grid Ref	409605 131348
Type of application	Full Planning
Case Officer	Adam Madge

Reason for the application being considered by Committee.

This application accompanies application S/2003/1016 but only considers the demolition of buildings currently on the site.

1. Purpose of Report

The purpose of the report is to assess the merits of the proposal against the policies of the development plan and other material considerations and to consider the recommendation that the application be approved.

2. Report Summary

The main issues to be considered are –

- a) Whether the demolition of buildings on site are acceptable.

3. Site Description

The Naish Felts factory site in Wilton. It lies close to Wilton town centre, outside the settlement framework boundary in the core strategy in the Conservation area. It is a low-lying site alongside river channels (which form part of the River Avon system SSSI and SAC) and is currently occupied by buildings of a variety of ages and styles. None are listed though there is a Victorian two-storey red brick building with stone dressings and a weather vane that is of historic interest. It has cast iron columns internally and is in poor condition. The other buildings are of little interest and are aesthetically poor.

The site is surrounded on its southwest and southeast sides by residential development with the Castle lane playing fields to the north. Across the river to the south is the Wilton Community centre, which is separated from the site by a wall. Access to the site is poor, be it from Crow Lane or Castle Lane. Both are single vehicle width with tight corners at the access and egress. 51 –53 North Street is a two storey building with a large workshop area within that was formerly occupied by Wilton Coachworks. It is an unattractive building with a rendered ground floor and poor quality brick upper floor. It adjoins a listed terrace of Fisherton Grey brick cottages.

4. Planning History

S/1999/0052	PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT SCHEME OF EXISTING BUILDINGS
S/1983/0576	NEW OPENINGS TO FACTORY BUILDINGS FOR GANTRY CRANE
S/1998/0590	VARIOUS SURGERY TO HORNBEAM AND HAZEL
S/1994/0613	C/A CONSENT - DEMOLITION OF REDUNDANT PRODUCTION BUILDING & LINK (PASSAGE) BLOCK
S/1989/1124	ERECTION OF NEW INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS
S/1994/1126	EXTENSION TO FACTORY
S/1989/1193	L/B APPLICATION - DEMOLITION OF SOME OF EXISTING BUILDINGS
S/1989/1231	ERECTION OF NEW INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS - (REVISED APPLICATION)
S/1985/1451	RELOCATION OF EXISTING PREFABRICATED BUILDING
S/1993/1461	CONSTRUCTION OF TOILET BLOCK
S/1989/1757	REPOSITIONING OF EXISTING PORTAKABIN AND ERECTION OF NEW PORTAKABIN

5. The Proposal

The proposal is to demolish all the existing buildings on site and to erect 61 dwellings, mainly in the form of terraces and apartment blocks, to demolish 51 -53 North Street and erect a new building containing a shop, B1 use over and a flat on the upper floor. This building is two storeys with a third storey in the roof. This application only relates to the demolition of the buildings.

6. Local Planning Policy

7.

- a. Adopted development plan – Wiltshire Core strategy

CP58 - Conservation of the historic environment

Saved policies of the Salisbury district local plan

CN9 – Demolition of buildings in a conservation area

Creating places - design guide

b. Neighbourhood Planning

Wilton town council do not have a neighbourhood plan at present.

National Planning Policy context.

Policies and guidance contained within the NPPF and the NPPG

8. Summary of consultation responses

Wilton Town Council

Planning application S/2003/1016

Wilton Town Council objects to this application.

Wilton Town Council has grave concerns about the proposed destruction of Wilton's industrial heritage. Building 4 is of local historical interest within a Conservation Area, and the focus should be on retaining it, and possibly Building 2 as well.

It was noted that although an estimate of £12,000 was given to remove the asbestos from Building 4, no other costs have been given for the removal of asbestos from other buildings, and the Town Council feels that a detailed report needs to be given on this for health & safety as well as financial reasons.

The Town Council disagreed strongly with the Heritage Assessment produced by Elaine Milton Heritage & Planning on behalf of EV Naish Ltd, which asserts that there would not be a substantial impact on the Wilton Conservation Area should the buildings be demolished. It would like a reassessment of the given figures, which councillors feel to be overstated, as they do not take into account the costs that would be incurred anyway (such as asbestos removal), nor any potential grants to retain an historic building. If these were to be taken into consideration, Building 4 may be viable for retention and development.

Historic England –

(16/07192/ful) Having received Savills Report on the 'Retention Versus Replacement of Building 4', November 2016, we wish to raise a number of questions which require clarification before the decision to demolish Building 4 can be taken.

Whilst the case has been put forward stressing the unviability of retaining Building 4, there

has been no assessment or confirmation that the demolition and rebuilding of this element of the wider scheme is in fact a more viable option, taking into account the Environment Agency's flood defence requirements for the new build. We remain unconvinced that the complete rebuilding is the only viable option available. The report states throughout that the later extensions will be removed as insignificant elements of this historic asset, thereby reducing its floor space - can appropriate new additions be made to Building 4 to retain and enhance its usability whilst providing a more attractive floor space offering.

Additionally we question whether the full extent of repair and structural alterations is necessary, as well as the accuracy of the sales values. We recommend that these are verified by a quantity surveyor experienced in dealing with historic structures before the validity of the report is accepted. Only once these issues are fully examined can an accurate planning balance be considered to determine the building's retention.

The Victorian Society –

Thank you for consulting the Victorian Society on this application – I apologize for the slight delay in responding to you. Having looked through the submitted documentation, we wish to register our objection to the proposals. We fully endorse the comments made by Historic England in their submission to you of 5 September 2016 and would also be pleased to be re-consulted when new information is forthcoming.

Wiltshire Council archaeology –

It is recommended that a programme of archaeological works, in the form of an archaeological watching brief, is carried out during any demolition works.

Therefore in line with the NPPF (2012), PPS5 (2010) and the earlier Planning Policy Guidance Note 16: Archaeology and Planning (DoE 1990) the following recommendations are made:

Recommendation: Full condition

No development shall commence within the area indicated (proposed development site) until:

- A written programme of archaeological investigation, which should include on-site work and off-site work such as the analysis, publishing and archiving of the results, has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority; and
- The approved programme of archaeological work has been carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To enable the recording of any matters of archaeological interest.

Further Recommendations: The work should be conducted by a professional recognised archaeological contractor in accordance with the written scheme of investigation agreed by this office and there will be a financial implication for the applicant.

9. Publicity

15 letters of objection raising the following points-

- A) Considers that there are mistakes and inaccuracies in the heritage statement in that the nearest listed building is located next to the former coachworks.
- B) Has the structural integrity of the roads been tested for construction and other traffic?
- C) Has there been any road traffic survey other than the one in 2003 as traffic has increased significantly in that period.
- D) Concerns expressed about blocking out daylight to the neighbouring window from the new commercial buildings on North street also about access to maintain the adjacent property.
- E) There would be the loss of four parking spaces on North Street, considers that the parking provision does not meet the Wiltshire Council guidance.
- F) Questions if there is really any need for more retail units on North Street as existing units are already empty on the street.
- G) Concern about the loss of building 2, considers alternative uses should be considered for building 2 as it is part of the heritage of Wilton.
- H) Consider that emergency vehicles including fire engines and ambulances could not reach the site.
- I) Consider that the proposed apartment building should be no higher than the existing building to be demolished and should only be three storeys in height. The proposed building would have the ability to affect the amenity of the adjacent Moat House.
- J) Dislike of the glass stairway on building 2 which it is considered does not fit with the character of the area. It would also cause light pollution when lit.
- K) Considers that placing a large block of flats in a flood risk area with narrow street access is a health and safety concern.
- L) Considers that the loss of building 4 would do substantial harm to the Wilton Conservation area.
- M) Pointed out that the site River and its tributaries which surround the site are designated as a SSSI.
- N) Concern is expressed by residents about flooding as they are paying a lot more money for their house insurance because their property is in a flood plain.
- O) Concern that traffic will increase as it has with the building of new houses in Wilton Avenue.
- P) Objection to buildings 2, 4, 7 and 9 as these are buildings that are inextricably linked to the industrial heritage of Wilton. Does not consider that the proposals to replace these buildings will enhance the conservation area. Notes that Wilton town council also objected to the loss of these buildings.
- Q) Surveys should be carried out of buildings in the surrounding area to ensure that building works on the site do not damage neighbouring properties.
- R) Costs in relation to the retention of building 2 should also be provided as well as building 4. Grant funding should be explored in relation to the historic buildings on the site.

- S) Considers that there is an error in the red line on land that is included in the public highway and that there is no possibility of increasing the width of the road immediately adjacent 52 and 53 North Street.

CPRE - The proposals include a loss of several buildings that retain Wilton's industrial heritage; this would be detrimental to the conservation area. It would be better for these to be converted sensitively. It is evident that the Heritage statement ignores several listed buildings close too or bordering the site.

Other doubts concern flooding, parking and especially ingress/egress; Crow Lane seems to be too narrow. For all these reasons, the proposal should be revisited.

Salisbury Civic Society –

The Society understands the arguments presented for demolition and accepts there is justification of financial viability presented, but nonetheless regrets the loss of the more prominent historic structures on the site. It is fully recognized that there are public benefits to the site's redevelopment, but the question of ultimate viability must surely be limited only by net worth of the site following redevelopment. We would encourage the Council to consider whether factors such as Section 106 contributions could be negotiated that might allow a compromise situation in this particular instance, to help mitigate the negative impact of costs. Were a suitable proposal for development, retaining one or two of the larger character buildings on this site, be possible for less profit that would ultimately be to the cultural and environmental benefit of the Wilton's Conservation Area and the community, this opportunity should be fully explored.

Wilton and District business Chamber –

Although it could be argued that removing the commercial traffic on the accesses during weekly business hours would alleviate the problem of pedestrian versus, the development of 61 houses would generate more traffic in and out of the site on a 24-hour, seven days a week basis, possibly 100 traffic movements a day, including deliveries and other service vehicles, in both directions on a single-carriageway lane.

This will cause demonstrable harm to the area and to the shoppers and schoolchildren using the lane.

For this reason we object to the development as the site is unavailable for housing development on this scale until a suitable ingress and egress can be agreed that meets modern traffic requirements. Suggests using an access through the C and O tractors site. If permission is granted, a Section 106 Agreement must show benefits to the town, its community, and the area surrounding the site, including the Town Council's interest in the pavilion and playing field, and the natural environment bordering the site, and the Castle Lane access.

13 Planning Considerations

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require that the determination of planning applications

must be made in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Demolition of the buildings

The site lies within the conservation area. Its current character is industrial and this has traditionally been an industrial site. Most of the buildings on the site are unsightly and of poor quality, but there are two of aesthetic value. One is a 1920s red brick warehouse, the other in a 19th century brick former mill building with Bath Stone dressings. This latter building was listed, and then de listed in 1999. Its chimney (from when it was converted to stream) has since been removed and the rear of the building contains extensions which have had a deleterious effect on its main structure. Nevertheless this is an attractive building in the conservation area, which should ideally (in the terms of the NPPF) be converted rather than demolished. It is what is now termed a heritage asset despite it not being listed and therefore must be considered as part of this application.

In 1999 permission was given for demolition in the context of an industrial redevelopment, as the building was not economic to convert for employment purposes. It is in poor condition. The levels on the site means that the grounds floor could not be converted to residential or commercial accommodation because it would be at risk from flooding unless the floor levels were substantially raised, which would be seriously detrimental to its character. Owing to the importance of this building in the context of the CA (and because it contains a bat roost) the applicants were required to demonstrate that it would not be financially viable to convert to residential use with parking on the ground floor.

This they have done. English Heritage (and the councils conservation officer) remain concerned about the loss of this heritage asset and members will see from English Heritage's comments at the top of the report that they maintain they're objection to the proposal to demolish this building.

The applicants have submitted a viability report which officers have seen which explains why the building cannot be converted in economic terms because of the amount of work that would need to be carried out to the building in order to convert it. In addition the floor levels in the building mean that flooding would remain an issue. The applicants have also responded to English Heritages comments above and at the time of writing a further response was awaited from E H.

14 Conclusion

It is therefore with some reluctance, but taking into account the factors that make this building unviable to convert, that officers recommend approval of the application subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION – Grant planning permission

(1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

REASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

(2) No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a Construction Environmental Management Plan, incorporating pollution prevention measures, has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details and agreed timetable.

REASON In the interests of preventing pollution of the river course

(3) Prior to commencement of development a scheme to provide a buffer zone / maintenance strip shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme shall incorporate a detailed site survey and there shall be no development (other than the provision of hard and soft landscaping) within 4 metres of the river channels. This strip shall be provided and maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: In the interests of the water environment and SSSI

(4) Before any demolition is commenced, the river channels shall be protected from materials from the demolition hereby permitted falling into the river in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning authority. The scheme shall incorporate measures for the protection of the water vole habitat and for protection of the river corridor during construction works.

Reason: To protect the river corridor in the interests of protection of the controlled waters.

(5) The demolition of existing buildings, structures and foundations, together with the removal of debris resulting therefrom, shall take place only between the following hours: - 8.00am to 6.30 pm on Mondays to Fridays; 8.00am to 1.00pm on Saturday; and not at all on Sundays and Public Holidays.

Reason: To avoid the risk of disturbance to nearby dwellings / the amenities of the locality during unsocial hours.

(6) No development shall take place within the area of the application site until the applicants, their agents or successors in title have secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to exercise adequate control over any development which would affect the area of archaeological interest.

(7) No site works shall take place within the area of the application site until the applicants, their agents or successors in title have secured the implementation of a programme of building recording in accordance with a written brief and specification which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to exercise adequate control over any development which would affect the area of archaeological interest.

(8) Prior to the commencement of the demolition of the buildings hereby permitted, a scheme for the methodology of demolition shall be submitted to and approved in writing by

the Local Planning Authority and the demolition shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of the locality as the buildings are known to contain asbestos and to prevent pollution of the watercourse on the site.

(9) No development (including any demolition) shall take place until the strengthening works to the watercourse road bridge at the junction of North St/Castle Lane has been completed in accordance with details which shall first have been submitted to and agreed with the local planning authority.

REASON: In the interests of highway safety.

(10) Prior to the commencement of the development a Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The Plan shall include details of arrangements for dealing with the demolition and removal of waste from the site, and the delivery of goods to the site (including local temporary signage for both operations), provision of parking for site operatives, the proposals for keeping local roads free from detritus, and proposals to address matters arising through the provisions of Highways Act s59. The development shall be undertaken in complete accordance with the agreed details.

REASON: In order to ensure that demolition and construction operations do not unacceptably interfere with traffic conditions in Wilton town centre.

(11). Before any development is commenced on the site, including site works of any description, all the existing trees to be retained shall be protected by a fence, of a type and in a position to be approved by the Local Planning Authority, erected around each tree or group of trees. Within the areas so fenced, the existing ground level shall be neither raised nor lowered and no materials, temporary buildings, plant, machinery or surplus soil shall be placed or stored thereon. If any trenches for services are required within the fenced areas, they shall be excavated and backfilled by hand and any tree roots encountered with a diameter of 2 inches (50mm) or more shall be left unsevered (See British Standard BS 5837:1991, entitled 'Trees in relation to Construction').

Reason: In the interests of the amenity and the environment of the development.

(12) There shall be no obstruction to the riverside footpath which shall provide a link through the site from north west to south east.

Reason: To ensure permeability of the site.

(13) No development (including demolition) shall take place until the siting of the site office & compound has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the LPA. The site compound shall then be sited as agreed and hours of working shall be restricted to -8.00am to 6.30 pm on Mondays to Fridays; 8.00am to 1.00pm on Saturday; and not at all on Sundays and Public Holidays.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of nearby residential properties.

(14) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Site location plan dated 25/4/03

Floor area Survey report by Savilles dated Nov 2015

Heritage assessment by Elaine Milton dated June 2016
Viability report by Savilles dated July 2016

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

Appendix A – Applicants agents response to questions brought up by English Heritage

Dear Samuel,

I have been forwarded your response to the E V Naish Ltd applications by Adam Madge, and thought it would be helpful to reply to you directly to clarify some points within your letter; I have copied this to Adam Madge at Wiltshire Council for his information.

I met with your colleague Jacqueline at the start of October on site with my colleague Gavin Hall and we put together the Retention Versus Replacement of Building 4 document following this discussion.

Although the majority of the discussion on site related to the viability of retaining Building 4, as demonstrated in the Report, financial viability is almost a side issue, and the report and planning application itself do not rely on the viability argument as the foundation to this case. The question of planning compliance is of equal if not greater importance as set out in the document. For example, we found that, due to the location of the site outside of the defined Town Centre boundary of Wilton, it would not be policy compliant to have other uses such as a restaurant or retail floorspace within the building.

Nevertheless, following the request from Historic England at the site visit, we did assess the viability of retaining Building 4 for a variety of different uses, including residential. The report does, contrary to the assertion in your letter, set out “an assessment or confirmation that the demolition and rebuilding of this element of the wider scheme is in fact a more viable option, taking into account the Environment Agency’s flood defence requirements for the new build”.

Whilst, it was not possible to append the full site wide confidential viability appraisal due to the business sensitive information that is contained within it, a comparison was taken of the retention of Building 4 against the demolition and rebuilding option proposed.

In order to compare the Options set out within the report, the Residual Land Value (RLV) for each option was calculated. Using the proposed replacement of Building 4 as a base point, the report clearly sets out that the retention of Building 4 for retail, office or residential use would result in a significant decrease in RLV of between £204,000 to £318,000. Therefore these options are **less viable** than the proposed demolition and rebuilding/replacement. The *overall* site wide viability is superfluous to this examination of Building 4, as it has clearly been shown that the current proposal to replace the building is more viable than the options for its retention.

It should be noted that the new build option set out and included within the application and the viability assessment includes all necessary works to satisfy the Environment Agency on flood risk grounds; they have no objection to the application. Therefore, the site wide viability has taken account of any flood defence requirements for the new build.

With regard to the extensions it would not be possible, or practical to include new additions to the building to enhance its usability or generate greater value by providing further floorspace. As stated within the report, the current ground floor level of the building falls significantly below the level requested by the Environment Agency to protect the building and its occupants from being at risk of flooding. It would not be acceptable to provide newly built extensions at this ‘at risk’ level, and therefore this would result in any extensions set at a finished floor level at least 880mm above the rest of the ground floor. This would not only result in an extension which would be impractical for future occupiers due to the significant change in levels, but is also unlikely to lead to any significant enhancement in the building’s usability or provision of a more attractive floorspace offering. It would also have the potential to impact the external appearance of the building due to this unusual

arrangement, thereby counteracting the initial purpose of retention. Finally, the addition of new extensions to the building would also be constrained by the proximity of the proposed dwellings to the existing Building 4. Either a smaller extension would be required or another residential unit would need to be lost to provide a greater floorspace. The relative values of residential against any other use speak for themselves in the report, and such a loss of another residential unit would therefore further impact the RLV and viability of the scheme rather than improving it by providing greater floorspace in the retained and extended building.

Moving on to the queries that you raise regarding the necessity of the works required and accuracy of the sales values, the list of repairs provided in the schedule has been prepared by a fully qualified RICS Building Surveyor, based upon the information available to them at their Inspection as is the accepted industry practice for such a stage in the process. Equally, the costs included have been calculated using industry wide accepted standards and practice using SPONS/BCIS pricing books and pricing information gained from other projects that have been competitively tendered, including historic buildings.

Following the inspection, it is the professional view of the qualified Building Surveyor, who is experienced in dealing with historic structures, that all of these works are likely to be necessary to refurbish the building to a condition that meets statutory requirements for its intended use, taking into account their professional knowledge, the age and outward appearance of the building and similar experience elsewhere. Only through a process, as stated in the report, of structural testing and confirmation by production of a detailed specification of works and competitive tender would allow more certainty to be able to be provided. This would obviously be at further expense on an already financially challenging project, and the proposal does not warrant such additional further justification over and above what has already been provided without any evidence being provided to us to the contrary that these works and costs are not justified or supported.

We can also confirm that all of the values provided in our report on Building 4 have been informed by qualified commercial and residential agents who have a proven track record in the marketing, leasing and sale of property in the Salisbury and Wiltshire area, including historic buildings. This information is available in the viability assessment submitted to Wiltshire Council on a confidential basis due to the commercial sensitivity of the information contained therein as noted above. Specifically with regards to the residential conversion we would comment that there is little demand for this type of apartment unit in Wilton. This is evidenced by the lack of apartments sold within Wilton itself and the values achieved nearby at the Ebble Apartments on Redrow's Erskine Park scheme. Given the extent of the viability deficit which all conversion options show, there would need to be a severe increase in achievable values on those which we have reported, before any conversion of Building 4 will even return a nil land value.

As a result the report demonstrates why the proposed option, which is the current application to be determined by the Council, is the preferred option in relation to both viability, practicality and national and local planning policy and guidance. We believe all options and alternatives have been objectively assessed in the course of preparing this application by suitably qualified professionals experienced in their field and the local area and that the necessary level of justification has been provided to the Council in this regard.

Kind regards,

Eleanor Kirton BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Planning