

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	12 <sup>th</sup> January 2017
<b>Application Number</b>	14/01990/LBC
<b>Site Address</b>	The White Hart St. John Street Salisbury SP1 2SD
<b>Proposal</b>	Proposed alterations to existing 1970s block including conversion of parking undercroft, stepped four storey extension including an upward extension to form new level, providing function rooms and a new hotel entrance on the ground floor with 28 No new guest bedrooms above. Proposed internal refurbishment and alterations to existing public areas with associated landscaping.
<b>Applicant</b>	White Hart Hotel Salisbury Ltd
<b>Town/Parish Council</b>	SALISBURY CITY
<b>Electoral Division</b>	ST MARTINS AND CATHEDRAL – Cllr Ian Tomes
<b>Grid Ref</b>	414569 129722
<b>Type of application</b>	Listed Building Consent
<b>Case Officer</b>	Tim Pizzey

### 1. REASON FOR THE APPLICATION BEING CONSIDERED BY COMMITTEE

Cllr Ian Tomes wishes the matter to be considered by Committee given the continuing local concerns expressed and the previous history of this project.

### 2. PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to assess the merits of the proposed development against the policies of the development plan and other material considerations. Having reached a balanced conclusion, the report recommends that listed building consent be APPROVED subject to conditions.

### 3. REPORT SUMMARY

The main issues to consider are:

- 1) Scale, Design and Impact on the Listed Building

The application as originally submitted generated 6 letters of objection from local residents, related mainly to amenity issues (noise, overlooking, and loss of light), increased traffic,

parking, scale, design, views and listed building / heritage issues. Concern over noise has been expressed in particular in relation to the proposed new functions rooms, use of the rear service access and intensification of use. Revisions to the proposed scheme and noise mitigation measures have subsequently been submitted following discussions with the Council's Public Protection Team. Some minor revisions to the design have taken place in response to other amenity concerns.

The Civic Society and Ancient Monuments Society have raised concerns, including the introduction of a new reception at the rear of the building. Historic England has raised various concerns to the plans as originally submitted and has been party to discussions on revisions to the scheme. The most appropriate approach and treatment to the 1970s extension has been the subject of considerable discussion. Following the submission of revised proposals, a further 3 letters of objection have been received from local residents. Historic England continues to have an issue with the mansard roof addition but acknowledges the improvements to the scheme and recommends that the application be determined on the basis of the LPA's own expert conservation advice. The Council's Conservation Officer has no objections to the revised proposals, subject to conditions.

With the improvements brought about through revisions to the scheme, it is considered that, on balance, the proposed scale, design and impact on the historic environment is acceptable. The application as originally submitted generated 6 letters of objection from local residents, related mainly to amenity issues (noise, overlooking, and loss of light), increased traffic, parking, scale, design, views and listed building / conservation issues. Concerns have been expressed by the Civic Society and Ancient Monuments Society, including the introduction of a new reception at the rear of the building. Historic England has raised various concerns to the plans as originally submitted and have been party to discussions on revisions to the scheme. The most appropriate approach and treatment to the 1970s extension has been the subject of considerable discussion. Following the submission of revised proposals, a further 3 letters of objection have been received from local residents. Historic England continues to have an issue with the mansard roof addition but acknowledges the improvements to the scheme and recommends that the application be determined on the basis of the LPA's own expert conservation advice. The Council's Conservation Officer has no objections to the revised proposals, subject to conditions.

This application has evolved from previous unsuccessful schemes (including a more contemporary design) over a number of years and has resulted in the current scheme to address previous concerns. In principle, it is considered that the improvement to the hotel accommodation would be beneficial to economic development and tourism in the city. The proposal would result in some reasonably substantial changes and additions to this listed building and it will inevitably have some impact on the environment of the site and on the occupiers of surrounding properties. Having regard to the development plan and other relevant material considerations, it is judged that the balance of considerations weighs in favour of granting listed building consent.

#### **4. MAIN POLICIES**

Wiltshire Core Strategy (adopted January 2015):

Core Policy 22 (Salisbury Skyline)

Core Policy 57: Ensuring high quality design and place shaping

Core Policy 58: Ensuring the conservation of the historic environment

Saved Salisbury District Local Plan policies: D4 (Salisbury Townscape /Chequers)

National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), in particular paragraphs 14 and 17, Section 7 (Requiring Good Design), Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment).

National Planning Policy Guidance, in particular sections with regard to guidance relating to Design, Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment.

Sections 66 Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990  
Section 72 Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Other documents: Salisbury City Conservation Area Appraisal

## 5. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The White Hart Hotel is located at the junction of St John Street and Ivy Street in Salisbury. It is a relatively extensive site within the historic Eastern Chequers area of the city, occupying a significant part of the 'White Hart' Chequer. The main public facing frontage of the hotel building is to St Johns Street (the main entrance) and Ivy Street but it has a vehicular entrance to Brown Street that serves the hotel and car park. The car park extends to St Ann's Street, which forms the southern side of the Chequer. The hotel is a Grade II\* listed building and located within the Salisbury Conservation Area. Although a few commercial uses, there are mainly residential properties which back on to the site in Ivy Street, either side of the access in Brown Street, and St Ann's Street and St John Street on the south side of the site. The Cathedral Close is located within close proximity to the south west on the west side of Exeter Street and St John's Street.

## 6. THE PROPOSAL

The proposal is mainly for an extension and alterations to provide an additional 28 guest bedrooms and new function rooms, with associated works and alterations. The application scheme involves expansion and remodelling of the hotel's 1970s bedroom wing, with an upward third floor extension (mansard roof) to provide an additional accommodation together with the replacement of a collection of single storey buildings, which currently includes back-of-house accommodation, on the north side of this wing, with a new extension, stepped up to three storeys high, with a mansard roof at third floor level which joins that proposed above the 1970s wing at the same height. A new covered refuse storage area is also proposed at the rear. The also seeks to refurbish the public areas within the hotel and re-landscape the car park. The proposal also includes re-facing the 1970's façade to part of St John's Street. The proposals are discussed further below.

This application for listed building consent is being considered concurrently with the associated planning application 14/01986/FUL for the proposed development on the site under that application.

## 7. RECENT PLANNING HISTORY

14/01990/LBC	Proposed alterations to existing 1970s block including conversion of parking undercroft, stepped four storey extension including an upward extension to form new level, providing function rooms and a new hotel entrance on the ground floor with 28 No new guest bedrooms above. Proposed internal refurbishment and alterations to existing public areas with associated landscaping. UNDETERMINED /CONCURRENT.
--------------	---

S/2013/0061	Proposed alterations to existing 1970s block including conversion of parking undercroft, stepped four storey extension including an upward extension to form new level, providing function rooms and a new hotel entrance on the ground floor with 29 No new guest bedrooms above. Proposed internal refurbishment and alterations to existing public areas with associated landscaping. WITHDRAWN 16.01.13.
S/2013/0060	Proposed alterations to existing 1970s block including conversion of parking under-croft, stepped four storey extension including an upward extension to form new level, providing function rooms and a new hotel entrance on the ground floor with 29 No new guest bedrooms above. Proposed internal refurbishment and alterations to existing public areas with associated landscaping. WITHDRAWN 16.01.13
S/2012/0770	Proposed repair works to section of boundary wall. APPROVED 30/05/12.
S/2011/1861	Proposed demolition of existing wall. WITHDRAWN 14/12/11
S/2011/1841	Proposed demolition of existing wall and construction of five dwellings, within the curtilage of a listed building. WITHDRAWN 07/12/11
S/2011/1840	Proposed demolition of existing wall and construction of five dwellings, within the curtilage of a listed building. WITHDRAWN 07/12/11.
S/2009/1313	Internal alterations to existing meeting room to create DDA compliant WC facility. APPROVED 10.09.09.
S/2009/0740	Conversion of staff accommodation for the white hart hotel to provide 4 no individual houses, no's 86, 88, 90 & 92 brown street. APPROVED 28/05/09.
S/2009/0741	Conversion of staff accommodation for the white hart hotel to provide 4no individual houses, no's 86, 88, 90 & 92 brown street. APPROVED 28/05/09.
S/2008/0266	Maintenance to stone portico installation of air conditioning / condense units and bedroom plus corridor decorations. APPROVED 12/02/08.
S/2008/0037	Installation of external air conditioning condenser units and steel work platform. APPROVED 14/01/08.
S/2003/2089	L/B application. Construction of a pair of brick piers to support a damaged concrete beam. APPROVED 23/12/03.
S/2003/2088	Construction of a pair of brick piers to support a concrete beam. APPROVED 28/11/03.
S/2003/0704	L/B application. Extension to existing hotel to include health and fitness centre a further 14 bedrooms to the upper floors and new roof to court yard and associated alterations. REFUSED 07/07/03.
S/2003/0703	Extension to existing hotel to include health and fitness centre a further 14 bedrooms to the upper floors and new roof to court yard and associated alterations. REFUSED 07/07/03.
S/2002/1422	Extension to existing hotel to include health and fitness centre a further 32 / 33 bedrooms to the upper floors and new roof to courtyard. REFUSED 04/09/02.

S/2002/1423	L/B application. Extension to existing hotel to include health and fitness centre a further 32 / 33 bedrooms to the upper floors and new roof to courtyard. REFUSED 04/09/02.
S/2000/2133	Erect external porch. APPROVED 03/01/00.
S/2000/2072	Convert 2 rooms into 1 meeting room and erect external covered area. APPROVED 29/12/00.
S/2000/1827	L/B application. Proposed new entrance door to front elevation with minor internal alterations. APPROVED 12/12/00.
S/2000/1826	Proposed new entrance door to front elevation with minor internal alterations. APPROVED 16/11/00.
S/2000/0525	Infill open area to the front elevation. APPROVED 19/05/00.
S/2000/0526	Infill existing open area to the front elevation. APPROVED 28/06/00.
S/1996/1020	L/B application. Erection of new decorative iron gates and improvements to underside of bedroom block. APPROVED 05/09/96.
S/1996/1019	Erection of new decorative iron gates (St John Street). APPROVED 22/08/96.
S/1995/0882	Reduction in length of existing flagpole from 4.2m long to 3m long. APPROVED 16/08/95.
S/1995/0330	L/B application - relocation of flagpole from roof of portico to portico gable to enable flag to be taken down occasionally for cleaning etc. REFUSED 19/05/95.
S/1992/1553	L/B application - new signage to replace existing and additional signs. APPROVED 08/06/92.
S/1992/1392	L/B application - fit traditional awnings to ground floor windows and door on the St. John street elevation. REFUSED 02/11/92.
S/1989/0537	Re-roofing with non-asbestos slates or alternatively with non-asbestos slates on rear and second-hand slates on front elevation. REFUSED 10/05/89.
S/1988/0403	L/B application - erection of wall and block up doorway. APPROVED 20/04/88.
S/1988/0402	Alterations to lounge etc. APPROVED 20/04/88.
S/1986/1000	L/B application - to erect and paint 15 sets of shutters to ground floor windows along St. John street elevation of hotel. WITHDRAWN.
S/1985/0674	L/B application - re-decoration of sash windows on all elevations and redecoration of brickwork on ivy street. REFUSED 26.06.85.
S/1985/0215	Demolition of existing garage erection of store and formation of conference room. APPROVED 03/04/85.
S/1985/0216	L/B application - demolition of existing garage, erection of store and formation of conference room. APPROVED 03/04/85.
S/1984/1696	L/B application - erection of flagpole atop the balustrade and removal of two in the portico. APPROVED 30/01/85.
S/1983/0779	L/B application - erection of flag pole at top balustrade of hotel. REFUSED 03/08/83.
S/1983/0618	L/B application - erection of a canopy over the door leading to new "wavells" bar. APPROVED 22/06/83.

S/1983/0157	L/B application - (a)to erect 9 hanging basket holders(b)to remove glass from lanterns on portico & replace. APPROVED 11/04/83.
-------------	--

## 8. REPRESENTATIONS

The application was publicised through site notice, neighbour notification and newspaper advertisement.

7 letters of objections from neighbouring properties. Summary of main points raised:

- Concern regarding height
- Massing, overbearing impact
- Don't want upward extension
- Use of access way and right of way at rear of hotel
- Reduction in width of access way
- Parking / obstruction of access way
- Reduction in parking
- Impact of noise from use of functions rooms
- Openable windows / noise breakout
- Noise report needs to address issues to contain noise
- Noise from staff, deliveries and function rooms and use of car park
- No guarantee that management procedures / mitigation will work
- Activities will be concentrated to a much smaller area to the rear
- More likely to cause a statutory nuisance
- Loss of daylight
- Loss of privacy / overlooking from proposed extension
- Increase in size intrudes on privacy
- Upward extension would be an eyesore
- Not in keeping with surrounding medieval buildings which would be overshadowed
- Will necessitate increased traffic into car park
- Insufficient parking on site for size of development
- Increased pressure on on-street parking in Residents Parking Zone E
- Increased traffic congestion and highway danger / safety issues in Brown Street
- Noise and disturbance from users / vehicles in early morning
- Noise and disturbance from construction work
- Previous objections to use of rear entrance as main entrance
- Increase in of traffic using only entrance off Brown Street
- Increase in traffic will exacerbate noise, pollution and fumes in Brown Street
- Air quality assessment inadequate
- For most part, residences opposite access and backing onto hotel affected by increase in traffic.
- Nuisance caused by increase in vehicular and pedestrian traffic, particularly at midnight with alcohol involved – already a problem in Milford Street.
- In a Conservation Area - out of scale with surrounding small scale buildings
- Will overwhelm historic character and intrinsic nature of the area
- Development undesirable / should not be approved.
- Persistent applications of this nature of inconvenience to local residents / property owners
- Insufficient account taken of local need
- Fails to meet Council's adopted policies

- Increase in height / taller – would affect views of Cathedral from outside the site, particularly from the east
- Would partially mask views of Cathedral from Churchill Way
- Impact on listed buildings
- Contrary to Policies CN3, CN5, CN8, CN9, CN11, CN12 (conservation policies) - relating to design, scale, character, setting and views.
- Taking away top floor would only result a reduction of 12 rooms from 28- sold houses in Brown Street that could have accommodated more than 12 rooms.
- Alternative sites for developing 4\* hotel rather than overdeveloping this site
- Hotel has sold off other properties which could have been used for hotel accommodation
- Car parks referred to available for parking e.g. Brown St. likely to be redeveloped, and would not be available for parking.

Following the submission of revised plans, a further 3 letters of objections have been received, two from previous objectors.

(Officer's Note: The above representations also relate to the associated planning application but only those related to matters associated with this listed building consent are relevant to this listed building application:

Salisbury City Council: None received

Salisbury Civic Society:

*"On behalf of the Civic Society, I would like to comment on the above submission. We have been following with interest the evolving applications on this important site. As with previous schemes, we remain somewhat cautious about the effect of significant development within the centre of a Chequer; forming a new entrance to the rear of the hotel turns a quiet, central space into a destination, which is fundamentally out of keeping with the medieval urban layout. When we last wrote on 13th February 2013 with regard to the previous application, we noted our concern that a new formal entrance at the rear of the might make the core of the chequer very busy, especially if the number of guests is increased. We remain concerned that it might become a busy delivery/ pick-up /drop-off point accommodating larger vehicles and groups of people waiting around, as they currently do opposite the front entrance, on St John's Street (although here they are at least a greater distance from the surrounding residential area). New road markings, planting, increased lighting etc. might make this car park and rear entrance much more of a feature than it has been previously.*

*Whilst a new rear access might help to ease congestion on St John's Street, its impact on the character of the listed building might be much more detrimental longer term. The internal spaces of the existing building are rationalised through ones arrival at the St John's Street entrance, directly off the main thoroughfare; the internal layout of the building works to accommodate visitors arriving here, entering at the Hotel Reception. In the proposed plans the current reception and lounge area is now labelled as a 'bistro.' Clearly we must judge the application on the information presented today, but we would be concerned that such a comprehensive reversal of the buildings orientation to now welcome visitors at the rear will very likely raise the need for subsequent internal alterations to the listed building in the future. Sadly, this also leaves the landmark entrance on St John's Street all but redundant in the likelihood it becomes used mainly as the bistro entrance, rather than the main hotel. Much of the joy in staying in these heritage assets in historic towns and cities is taken from the arrival at unusual and interesting landmarks. Unfortunately this will be lost at the White Hart, with a low-key, almost apologetic and very generic entrance being formed at the rear, at the centre of the chequer.*

*Despite our concerns with the plan form and organisation of the new layout, we recognise that this is in the commercial heart of the city centre. As such, we do not feel that the massing of the new proposal is overly large. The plan layouts appear to have been put together carefully so as not to increase any overlooking issues with adjacent properties, although the expansion northwards will have an undeniable impact on the rear of the Ivy Street properties. As with the previous scheme, the main elevational drawings do not fully incorporate the context of the surrounding site. A long section through the whole chequer showing the proposed south elevation would also help reassure us that the massing is acceptable. The proposal's main impact might be from the east where the ground is a bit higher, beyond Brown Street, but there are no drawings which adequately illustrate this. A concise history of the recent planning applications would also help the reader better understand the evolution and reasoning behind the current proposal.*

*Whilst efforts have been made to reduce the massing of the scheme from that submitted in 2013, we do feel that the design intent has unfortunately also been 'watered down.' In this respect, we support the comments made by English Heritage. The elevations are less well considered and it is difficult to see how these are site specific. The new entrance is not articulated as well as the previous scheme and the more monolithic stone façade seems to appear heavier and bulkier as a result. There is a danger that this new development could begin to resemble any other generic out-of-town hotel chain. The current 1970s extension at least dared to be different and of its time!*

*In summary, we feel the application could be substantially improved. Improvements would look to be focused on a design for the new entrance which is currently less good than the previous version. We also reiterate our strong concern that the new reoriented layout is in total conflict with the plan form of the listed building. We also wish to highlight the deficiencies of the application in supplying full contextual information.*

*We are not opposed to redevelopment of this existing extension and we would be glad to see improvements made that also provide a much needed facility to the city centre. However, we are concerned that the current design presents a missed opportunity to do something modern, of its time and site specific. The White Hart Hotel is an unusual and charming historic building; it is a city centre landmark that deserves an architectural response equal to that of the existing building”.*

## **9. CONSULTATIONS**

Historic England: (formerly English Heritage)

Regarding the original plans, Historic England commented as follows:

*“ .....English Heritage has had extensive involvement with this site over several years with both pre-application and formal applications.*

### *Summary*

*We consider the impact of the scale of the new block combined with the imposition of the mansard roof extension on the existing and new build will have less than substantial harm on the setting to the principle heritage asset- The White Hart and adjacent listed buildings within the tight environment of this Chequer within the Salisbury Conservation Area. We believe more efforts should be made to offset this harm with a more integrated and imaginative approach to bring some positive improvements to the car park that is highlighted as a negative space at the rear of the hotel.*

*English Heritage Advice*



*The White Hart is a significant Grade II\* heritage asset that is located on the west side of the chequer nearest to the eastern extent of the Cathedral Close boundary wall. Its presence on this corner of St John's Street and Ivy Street is pivotal in both reinforcing the historic fabric and significance of the city's townscape and, as it covers a large proportion of this chequer, its prominent position is an important landmark. Built in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, but possibly retaining fabric from an earlier structure, it is "remarkably grand for an inn of that date" (Pevsner). Interestingly, Pevsner also highlights the 1970s extension by N Foley that is the subject of this application.*

*Due the extent of time that this proposal has evolved, several different Inspectors from English Heritage have been involved. My understanding of the planning history to date is that various applications have been submitted and either refused or withdrawn. The exception being that LBC has been approved for the demolition of the single storey building behind the principal building. Although this has not yet been implemented, the principle of demolition has already been conceded. It is, however, disappointing that the applicants do not appear to have provided a detailed planning history summary that would assist in this consultation. It is also regrettable that this building has not been integrated into the overall proposal. A more creative solution might have been successful in achieving a sustainable future for this structure.*

*This proposal is primarily concerned with the 1970's block that is linked on the front and forms an L-shaped extension to the hotel. It has a parking undercroft that helps to lighten this otherwise quite heavy extension, when viewed from the car park. The proposal is to infill the undercroft and raise the structure by another storey to allow for further bedroom accommodation. This will also entail the installation of a mansard roof rather than the current flat roofed structure. A further extension of the same height and design finishing in the mansard roof is also proposed to run along the northern side of the hotel providing further accommodation.*

*This scheme presents a more unified structure at the rear than previous iterations and will incorporate the current external stairs that are visually unattractive on the external face of the car park elevation. It also allows for greater separation between the end of the hotel and the rear of the properties on Brown Street. On the street front elevation of this late 20<sup>th</sup> century addition, the proposal includes some cosmetic changes to the façade to create a more visually compatible elevational treatment to the building. Whilst we accept that this may improve the visual qualities of the extension, there is a danger that if badly executed using cheap materials this could result in a poor attempt at pastiche. We, therefore, recommend that this element of the work is subject to strong Conditions.*

*The main issue for us will be the introduction of the mansard roof that is **not** normally an accepted roof form associated with Salisbury. However, we understand that this revision has been as a direct result of discussions with Wiltshire Council. Whilst we do not favour this form of roof addition, we are mindful that it will be relatively well screened from most public views around the Hotel and the Chequer on which it is located. It is most unlikely that there will any views of it from further afield; as the photomontages indicate that this development will have a relatively low impact outside the immediate setting of the Chequer in which the White Hart sits. However, there will be some harm albeit less than substantial, to the immediate heritage assets around and within the Chequer itself by the introduction of the mansard roof combined with the scale of the north elevation. To some extent this should be offset by the landscaping scheme that will help to mitigate the harshness of the car park area that is identified as a negative element in Jane Root's Statement of Significance. However, we do not consider the planting of a few token trees to be adequate enough and would ask that this matter is reassessed. Although, it would also be wrong to over embellish or to make the entrance too conspicuous in the street, something simple might help lift this*

*part of the Brown Street. Such enhancement could then be balanced against the harm caused by this inappropriate roof form of development.*

*On this basis, we consider that this development will have a negative impact on the setting to the principle grade II\* listed hotel building, other designated heritage assets within the close vicinity of this site and on the Conservation Area. Currently the proposals should be addressed against Policy 134 of the NPPF. We do not believe enough public benefits have been demonstrated to outweigh this less than substantial harm. We would ask that further investigations are made with the applicants to see if more comprehensive improvements can be forthcoming to the car park and entrance way.*

#### *Recommendation*

*We urge you to address the above issues, and recommend that this application be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your expert conservation advice. It is not necessary for us to be consulted again. If you feel you need further advice, please let us know why.*

*Please re-consult us if there are material changes to the proposals beyond those necessary to address the issues we have raised. We will then consider whether such changes might lead us to object. If they do, and if your authority is minded to grant consent, you should notify the Secretary of State of this application in accordance with Circular 08/2009”.*

Following the submission of revised plans and additional information, Historic England have commented:

*“...The additional information and amended plans provided appear to broadly address the concerns outlined in our earlier advice letter. We continue to have issue with the mansard roof addition but, as previously outlined, are mindful that it will be relatively well screened from most public views. Improvements to the facade treatment and landscaping have improved the visual character of the building and its setting.*

*We therefore recommend that the application is now determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your expert conservation advice.*

*It is not necessary for us to be consulted again. if you feel you need further advice, please let us know why.*

*Please re-consult us if there are material changes to the proposals beyond those necessary to address the issues we have raised. We will then consider whether such changes might lead us to object. If they do, and if your authority is minded to grant consent, you should notify the Secretary of State of this application in accordance with the above Direction...”.*

#### Ancient Monuments Society:

*Thank you for consulting us on this application which was discussed at the Society’s Casework Committee on Tuesday 29 April. The Ancient Monuments Society believes that this application would be damaging to the Grade II\*- listed White Hart Hotel and its setting, as well as to the Salisbury City Centre Conservation Area. While the harm caused would be “less than substantial”, it would not be outweighed by public benefits and has not been justified. The Society agrees with English Heritage that further efforts should be made to a secure a more satisfactory outcome.*

#### *Significance*

*The White Hart Hotel is an important landmark building in Salisbury town centre situated east of the Cathedral Close. It was listed Grade II\* in 1952, and is one of a small number of*

particularly important buildings with “more than special interest”. While the present building dates principally from the 18th century, it is known that an inn of this name existed on the site in 1635. The hotel’s prominent portico was added in the early 19th century as part of a remodelling. The hotel is in the Salisbury City Centre Conservation Area and in the north-west corner of the ‘White Hart Chequer’. Salisbury was built in the 13th century as a ‘new town’ on a grid of five streets from east to west and six from north to south forming ‘chequers’, or squares. The city derives much of its special character from its surviving medieval street pattern. We are grateful to the applicant for providing us with an analysis of the significance of the one-storey building to the rear of the hotel. While the document gives a useful description of the building, it is still not clear to us what its original purpose and age are. It would be useful to have this information to better understand the significance of this section of the White Hart Chequer. The Salisbury City Centre Conservation Area Appraisal states that “There has been little modern intervention within this Chequer and accordingly no archaeological work has been carried out.” Although the building has been much altered in recent years, it has nevertheless survived and is evidence of the Chequer’s past form and uses.

#### *Proposal and AMS position*

The application is for the refurbishment of a 1970s wing to the rear of the hotel and the creation of a new function room and dining room in place of the existing single storey building. Trustees were disappointed to note that the proposed ‘new building’ is in effect a refacing of an existing extension rather than a brand new development. While the preservation of embodied energy is to be applauded, Trustees feel that an opportunity has been missed to improve the relationship of the extension wing with the main hotel and, more importantly, that the constraints of the existing building’s form has made the introduction of an innovative design more difficult to achieve. Trustees were also surprised that the applicant had not taken the opportunity to improve the setting of the White Hart Hotel by removing the 1970s extension and replacing it with a world-class design. In this sense, it could be argued that the recommendations of Section 7 of the NPPF, Requiring Good Design, and in particular Paragraphs 63 and 64, ought to be applied more stringently:

63. In determining applications, great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which help raise the standard of design more generally in the area.

64. Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Trustees cited the Council Office at Bourne Hill as an example of a highly successful design intervention in a sensitive context which has set a useful precedent in Salisbury. As English Heritage has pointed out, there is a danger that a badly executed scheme could result in pastiche. We share the organisation’s concerns that a mansard roof would look incongruous within the context of the Salisbury City Conservation Area. In conclusion, the AMS has no objection to the demolition of the 1970s extension and believes that a well-executed replacement could have an enhancing effect. The Society agrees with English Heritage that the proposed solution is not satisfactory and does not meet the requirements of the NPPF. In addition to this, the AMS has concerns about the demolition of the single-storey building to the rear of the White Hart, whose significance may not yet have been fully established. We therefore object to the scheme as it stands. We would be happy to look at the application again, should further information be made available.

#### WC Urban Design Officer:

“..Policy South Wiltshire Core Strategy saved Salisbury District Local Plan Design Policy D1/D2, Pre submission draft Wiltshire Core Strategy Core Policy 57.

The proposal is a revision of S/2013/0060/FULL & S/2013/0061/LBC which has satisfactorily addressed my comments dated 13.05.2013 on that application, and my subsequent comment on revisions dated 11.10.2013 with the exception of the following queries:

- Downpipes are not shown on the elevations-Is it the intention to run these internally? This should be established and if not, as a significant visual element of the elevational design they should be shown on the proposed plans and elevations. Strategically placed they could particularly contribute a stature and interest to the elevations. For example expressed hopper heads and robust downpipes set in from each corner of the 4 storey element of the brick faced East Elevation to drain the gutter at the mansard parapet level. Rainwater goods should be identified as metal rather than plastics to represent a suitable quality of appearance in this setting with other historic buildings;

- As mentioned in both of my previous comments there is still no indication on the plans or elevations of how the service plant and outlets for the extension will be integrated into the design to establish these will not liberally appear on the roof and facades potentially detrimental to visual quality of the surrounding area and amenity of neighbouring occupiers and not just from the issue of noise.

While there is a note on the 'proposed section c' that 'all extracts, vents, louvres, a/c ducts from the function room will be taken to face the courtyard...' it cannot be assumed from this that externally mounted plant and ducting is not required and will not materialize across the numerous flat roofs which are likely to be clearly visible from neighbouring properties. Associated intake /extract grilles to ventilate the ground floor communal toilets and internal bedroom toilets should also be shown: the location of the hotel bedroom en-suites suggest multiple soil pipe vents and mechanical ventilation/intake extracts may project above and 'pepper' the fourth floor flat roof seen from a distance whereas any protrusions should be shown on the drawings-combined and incorporated in a visually tidy and unobtrusive way into the mansard.

In addition the opening of the windows should also be established and noted on the elevations as centre pivot or top hung windows would look distinctly out of place in this setting.

The specific facing brickwork and generic reference to the stone panelling and sloping roof finish is shown alongside the coloured proposed elevation drawings and on the sectional details drawing. Samples/specification will need to be provided for each of these for approval together with the brickwork bond /mortar joint details, cills/parapets, profile/colour of the aluminium window frames, and rainwater goods to establish that these are of an appropriately high quality of appearance in this setting. This should include the flat roof finish where a bright and reflective colour and finish (typical of single ply roof membranes) would detract from the roofscape of the Chequers, and visual amenity of neighbouring properties looking down on these. The Michelmersh brick images are shown in Flemish Bond which would be an appropriate bond adding local interest while maintaining the 'contemporary' appearance"

Following the submission of further information in response to the above comments the Urban Design Officer comments:

"Their note suitably clarifies my queries. If they want to run external rainwater pipes on the extension portion they should show these on the elevations but being consistent with the main wing by keeping all pipes internal would be more logical. With the explanation of the approach to appropriately minimising the roof outlets and external plant etc. suggests you could condition this and expect this approach to appear on details then submitted ?"

Conservation Officer:

Based on the latest revised plans, the Conservation Officer comments:

*“...The proposal requires the partial demolition of a single-storeyed range to the rear of the hotel; much more of this is now to be retained than in previous iterations. The extension and additional floor to the 1970s wing would not have an overbearing impact on the setting of the listed building or its listed neighbours. The large flat roof is essentially a reworking of the existing flat roof, although there would be less flat area due to the slate-clad sides; the use of slate is an enhancement over other possible materials (and the existing). The lift/stairwell projection toward the western end of the proposal area may just be visible from St John St, however this would not be a significant intrusion into this important view. The proposal to clad the whole of the rear wing in gault bricks is welcomed, and a pointed sample panel will be essential to ensure that the brick chosen is the most appropriate. I would like to know for sure the materials/design of the dormer windows and new glazing; and also of the ground floor alterations to the St John St elevation, both of which could be provided for agreement by condition.*

*Overall, I think the modest harm created by raising the level of the top floor is outweighed by the visual benefits of the alterations to the rear wing and the southern section on St John St, without getting into the other benefits of increased accommodation etc....”*

#### WC Archaeology:

*“ This site is of archaeological interest as it lies within the medieval White Hart chequer. Archaeological evaluation has taken place in and around the car park in 2003 and 2010. Both demonstrated that remains from the medieval and post-medieval period do survive in the areas investigated. The remains have, in some areas, been affected by the later buildings.*

*The NPPF (and previously the now superseded Planning Policy Statement 5) states that an application should describe the significance of heritage assets affected by an application. NPPF policy 128 states that ‘Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.’*

*In this case, the previous evaluation has provided enough evidence to demonstrate that significant heritage assets with an archaeological interest are present on the site. However, the proposed development appears to have a significant overlap with the existing buildings.*

*The NPPF also says: 141. Local planning authorities should make information about the significance of the historic environment gathered as part of plan-making or development management publicly accessible. They should also require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.*

*As there appears to be a significant overlap between the proposed works and the existing buildings, mitigation work in advance of demolition appears to be problematic. It is therefore recommended that a programme of archaeological works is carried out as part of any development. This should initially take the form of a watching brief during demolition and construction. However, should significant remains be identified it may be necessary to undertake some archaeological excavation as part of the mitigation works. The applicant should be aware that this may have an effect upon their programme of works.*

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

*Further Recommendations: The work should be conducted by a professionally recognised archaeological contractor in accordance with a brief issued by this office and there will be a financial implication for the applicant”*

(Officer Note: a condition requiring a scheme of archaeological investigation is recommended on the associated planning application)

## **10. ASSESSMENT**

### **10.1 Scale, Design and Impact on the Listed Building**

The NPPF requires good design including, inter alia, a strong sense of place responding to the character and history and reflecting the identity of local surroundings and materials.

Core Policy 57 (Ensuring high quality design and place shaping) states that “...A high standard of design is required in all new developments, including extensions, alterations, and changes of use of existing buildings. Development is expected to create a strong sense of place through drawing on the local context and being complimentary to the locality. Applications for new development must be accompanied by appropriate information to demonstrate how the proposal will make a positive contribution to the character of Wiltshire through:

- i. Enhancing local distinctiveness by responding to the value of the natural and historic environment, relating positively to its landscape setting and the exiting pattern of development and responding to local topography by ensuring that important views into, within and out of the site are to be retained and enhanced*
- ii. The retention and enhancement of existing important landscaping and natural features, (for example trees, hedges, banks and watercourses), in order to take opportunities to enhance biodiversity, create wildlife and recreational corridors, effectively integrate the development into its setting and to justify and mitigate against any losses that may occur through the development*
- iii. Responding positively to the existing townscape and landscape features in terms of building layouts, built form, height, mass, scale, building line, plot size, elevational design, materials streetscape and rooflines to effectively integrate the building into its setting*
- iv. Being sympathetic to and conserving historic buildings and historic landscapes*
- v. The maximisation of opportunities for sustainable construction techniques, use of renewable energy sources and ensuring buildings and spaces are orientated to gain maximum benefit from sunlight and passive solar energy, in accordance with Core Policy 41*
- vi. Making efficient use of land whilst taking account of the characteristics of the site and the local context to deliver an appropriate development which*

*relates effectively to the immediate setting and to the wider character of the area*

- vii. Having regard to the compatibility of adjoining buildings and uses, the impact on the amenities of existing occupants, and ensuring that appropriate levels of amenity are achievable within the development itself, including the consideration of privacy, overshadowing; vibration; and pollution (such as light intrusion, noise, smoke, fumes, effluent, waste or litter)*
- viii. Incorporating measures to reduce any actual or perceived opportunities for crime or antisocial behaviour on the site and in the surrounding area through the creation of visually attractive frontages that have windows and doors located to assist in the informal surveillance of public and shared areas by occupants of the site*
- ix. Ensuring that the public realm, including new roads and other rights of way, are designed to create places of character which are legible, safe and accessible; in accordance with Core Policy 66 – Strategic Transport Network*
- x. The sensitive design of advertisements and signage, which are appropriate and sympathetic to their local setting by means of scale, design, lighting and materials*
- xi. Taking account of the needs of potential occupants, through planning for diversity and adaptability, and considering how buildings and space will be used in the immediate and long term future*
- xii. The use of high standards of building materials, finishes and landscaping, including the provision of street furniture and the integration of art and design in the public realm*
- xiii. In the case of major developments, ensuring they are accompanied by a detailed design statement and master plan, which is based on an analysis of the local context and assessment of constraints and opportunities of the site and is informed by a development concept, including clearly stated design principles, which will underpin the character of the new place.*
- xiv. Meet the requirements of Core Policy 61 – Transport and New Development*

Criteria (i), (iii) and (iv) are of particular relevance in a historic environment.

One of the most significant aspects of the development is the upward extension and external treatment to the 1970s wing and the proposed rear extensions. The Planning Statement states that:

*“... the 1970 bedroom wing is prominent and unsympathetic in form and style when viewed from the south or car park side. Many users of the hotel, including resident and function guests and elderly or disabled visitors, currently enter the building from the car park. The 1970 bedroom wing and further twentieth-century extensions adjoining it destroy any sense of arrival at an historic building and block views of it when approaching from this side. Where this range extends onto St John’s Street it forms a continuation of the principal or entrance front of the hotel and is a relatively neutral element in the street scene...”*

Officers agree that, whilst of its time, the 1970s extension is generally considered to be unsympathetic and there is an opportunity to enhance the historic environment of the site and surroundings, whilst permitting the hotel to expand and improve its facilities.

Regarding design, the NPPF states at paragraph 58 that:

*“The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people”*

And at paragraph 60, states:

*“...Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness...”*

Whereas a previous application (withdrawn) was for a more contemporary design, the current application reverts to a more traditional approach, with revisions. The third floor extension is now contained within what is described as a ‘mansard’ roof. This is, in fact, more of a modern mansard type roof (as it does not have a traditional full height mansard roof with a central ridge) and has sloping sides with a central flat roof. This reduces the overall height, whilst achieving the accommodation space sought and the height of the third floor extension has been kept below the 12.2m height restriction for development in the central area under Core Policy 22 (Salisbury Skyline). The height is, in fact, just below the height of the existing plant room now on the roof, which would be removed.

The third floor extension is also part of a new side extension on the north side of the 1970s at the rear of the site. This new side / rear extension is in area currently covered by existing ground floor and later additions to the listed building, which will be demolished. The footprint of this element of the extension would be a little greater than the existing ground floor footprint on its east and north sides. The extension in this location also has a ‘mansard type’ roof and is stepped in from the north and east boundaries at first, second and third storey level, leaving a flat roof on these sides over part of the ground floor extension, an element of which is directly adjacent the rear boundary with 2 Trinity Street.

The proposed ground floor contains two new function rooms and breakout area which has an opening out onto the internal courtyard landscaped area. At first, second and third floors the accommodation comprises guest bedrooms. This stepped arrangement reduces the bulk of the extension on its north and east sides. On the north side, an existing pitched roof (over the current plant and conference rooms) will be replaced also by a mansard type roof (slightly lower in height than the ridge of the current pitched roof) which will include additional guest bedroom accommodation linked to the remainder of the proposed extension and 1970s wing. The fenestration is on the south and east elevations and to the west elevation (facing inward towards the courtyard and main listed building. There are some corridor windows proposed on the inner (north) side of the upward mansard extension to 1970s wing, which face over the courtyard but otherwise the walls to the north elevation of the extension (facing the rear of properties in Trinity Street) are blank.

In the north east corner of the site, a new covered bin store is proposed. This is a rectangular single storey brick building with a shallow pitched slate roof, attached to the main extension and directly adjacent the rear boundaries of dwellings in Trinity Street and Brown Street. It also includes space for A/C units. The extension also includes a new enclosed / covered service route between the function rooms and adjacent rear boundaries of 2 and 4



in Trinity Street. The bin store and rear service route is accessed from the rear car park and access off Brown Street, as at present.

Returning to the 1970s wing, it is proposed to enclose the current open under-croft and convert this to a new reception area, with lounge and WCs. A single storey entrance foyer with a glazed roof is proposed on the south side together with a single storey glazed flat roof narrow extension along the south side of the 1970s wing, abutting the existing substantial boundary wall with No.3 St Johns St. It is proposed to enclose the fire escape stair case within the building envelope on the eastern end of the 1970s block on its south side, with a striking vertical glazing to the corner. On a previous scheme, this protruding element was larger and included a lift shaft, which has now been re-positioned elsewhere in the building, enabling its bulk to be reduced.

Regarding the proposed external materials, these comprise facing brick for the new extension and facing of the 1970s wing, natural slates for the slopes of the mansards and a flat roof membrane material to the flat roofs. The sloping sides of the mansard roof will be set back behind a parapet wall with stone coping. The enclosed staircase is proposed to be clad in stone. As a result of discussions, the agent has confirmed that 'natural' stone to match existing is to be used (i.e. not re-constituted). In addition, revisions to the facing brick have been made following discussion with officers (and HE). The main brick work for the facing of the 1970s block and new extension is now proposed to be in a gault / buff coloured brick, a brick colour that also been used on the front elevation of the existing 1970s wing and to elevations to parts of the principal hotel building facing St Johns Street and Ivy Street. This will, it is considered, result in a lighter but more integrated feel and compliment the natural stone faced staircase.

The façade to St Johns Street is proposed to be infilled and to receive some cosmetic treatment. At ground level there will be painted timber framed glazing elements with three separate external doors with access to a sub-station, gas meter room and internal fire escape staircase. Existing concrete posts will be faced with brick slips and infill areas will be in matching brick. The exposed concrete floor slab above ground floor level will receive a stone facing. The existing brickwork and windows will be retained at first and second floor levels with painted heads and stone drip detailing to the window. It is considered that the proposed treatment is sympathetic, will enhance the current rather drab appearance and void at ground level.

Externally, some landscape works are proposed to the car park and rear entrance off Brown Street. The central planting comprises 3 specimen trees (standards) set within a new hedge in the centre of the car park and a number of smaller trees / shrubs in peripheral locations and at the entrance to the car park with associated ground planting. The car park will also be re-surfaced with a buff coloured bonded natural aggregate finish with natural stone setts for edging detail. This will enhance the appearance of the car park, which is currently a fairly bare expanse of tarmac. As a result of comments from Historic England (see above) the applicant has reconsidered the treatment to the entrance area to the car park. The result is that on the north (RHS) entering the car park, some 5 additional car spaces have been removed, which provides an opportunity to provide a strip of soft landscape planting in this location and would enable the remains of the wall / remains of the former historic 'Barracks' building to be better appreciated (an interpretation board is also proposed) and soften the entrance. Other elements of the proposed landscaping include a strip of some soft landscaping at the end (on the east side) of the 1970s block and enclosed staircase and to a new paved area around the new entrance foyer.

Because the finished ground floor level of the extension will be lower than the ground level to the east (the service access) a low retaining wall is proposed to run parallel with its east elevation, leaving a narrow strip between the wall of the extension and retaining wall, which

also provides a pedestrian route to the service access on the north side of the extension. The central courtyard close to the principal historic building (not visible from outside the site) is to receive new hard and soft landscape treatment, whilst retaining a central feature tree.

The Councils Urban Design Officer, having raised some initial queries regarding detailing, has no objection to the general scale and design approach. Further information regarding architectural detailing and materials, which are clearly crucial to securing a high quality development, can be secured through planning conditions. Scale and design is also intrinsically linked to the impact on heritage assets, and is assessed below.

It is considered that whilst the proposals would result in a relatively large addition to the existing building, the mix of traditional and complementary modern design elements, would mitigate the impact of the additional bulk and is generally in less sensitive location (in terms of visual prominence from the surrounding public realm) behind the main street frontages. At the same time, the proposals respond to the site opportunities and, it is considered would result in a positive improvement to views from the rear of the site and through the gap formed by the car park entrance from Brown Street. Conditions can be imposed to approve architectural detailing and materials

Regarding the impact on the historic environment / heritage assets and relevant policy, Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that in considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that in the exercise of any functions, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, under or by virtue of any of the provisions mentioned in this Section, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

The National Planning Policy Framework indicates that:

*“133. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:*

- *the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and*
- *no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and*
- *conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
- *the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.*

*134. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.”*

Notwithstanding the above, policy CP58 of the adopted WCS indicates that:

*“Development should protect, conserve and where possible enhance the historic environment. Designated heritage assets and their settings will be conserved, and where appropriate enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance, including:*

- i. Nationally significant archaeological remains*
- ii. World Heritage Sites within and adjacent to Wiltshire*
- iii. Buildings and structures of special architectural or historic interest*
- iv. The special character or appearance of conservation areas*
- v. Historic parks and gardens*
- vi. Important landscapes, including registered battlefields and townscapes.*

*Distinctive elements of Wiltshire's historic environment, including non-designated heritage assets, which contribute to a sense of local character and identity will be conserved, and where possible enhanced. The potential contribution of these heritage assets towards wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits will also be utilised where this can be delivered in a sensitive and appropriate manner in accordance with Core Policy 57....."*

The NPPF requires that the applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution to their setting (Para. 128). A Statement of Significance has been submitted with the application alongside the Design and Access Statement, which assesses the significance of the White Hart Hotel within its setting. The setting of the White Hart includes a high proportion of designated and undesignated heritage assets, and the statement also considers the contribution made by the hotel and its site to the setting of these structures, including the Grade I Listed mediaeval Cathedral Close Wall opposite the entrance front of the hotel. The White hart is a Grade II\* listed building with the following list description:

*ST JOHN'S STREET 1. 1594 (East Side) No 1 (White Hart Hotel) SU 1429 NE 4/130 28.2.52. II\* GV 2. Late C18. 3 storey. White brick on stone plinth with yellow rubbed window arches, moulded stone cornice and blocking course. Slate roof. Projecting central portico, early C19, full height of building with a plain ground floor treatment of 3 stone arches on square piers facing street and one similar arch across pavement at each end, these arches support 4 Ionic stone columns, with 2 responding pilasters on wall face carried up 2 storeys and with moulded stone entablature and pediment crowned with a full size White Hart. The main wall face inside portico is painted stucco, with 3 windows all with moulded architraves and with additional cornices and pediment to central and other 1st floor windows, on ground floor under arcade 2 windows to right hand and 8-panel double doors, egg-and-tongue enrichment to panels, to left hand with architrave surround. 3 windows each side of portico to main block, totalling 9 bays. The portico has enriched and turned wood balustrade, with beautiful side guards of wrought iron scroll work and cypher G.R.; at angles of portico are horn shaped lamp brackets of similar but more delicate wrought iron scroll work. Slightly later extension to right hand of 6 bays, with plain painted front. The portico is an important street feature. Only the windows in side the portico have glazing bars, original, the rest restored. Interior considerably altered. 2 bay modern extension to south in matching style. Nos 1 to 13 (odd) form a very important group.*

In addition, as one would expect, there are a number of listed buildings fronting the 4 streets that enclose the Chequer, fronting Trinity Street, Brown Street, St Ann's Street and St Johns Street. Of these, one is Grade I (No.9 St John's St), some are Grade II\* (Nos. 3-5, 7-7A, 11), and the remaining (2-4 Ivy St, 82-92 Brown St and 1-5 St Ann's St) are Grade II. There is also a significant number of surrounding listed buildings on the opposite road frontages to these streets. In particular, No15 (Malmesbury House) in The Close, St Ann's gate and The Close Wall are Grade I listed buildings. Many other buildings within the conservation area, although not listed, may be regarded as no

designated heritage assets. The Cathedral Close and Cathedral is located a short distance to the south west. Therefore, there are a significant number of designated and no designated heritage assets of significant importance adjacent the site and in the immediate surrounding area. The area is also of potential archaeological significance.

The buildings proposed to be demolished removed are later additions and of no significant historic and architectural interest. The submitted statement of significance states that permission has previously been granted for demolition of these buildings but has not been implemented. As such, no objection has been raised by Historic England or the Conservation Officer in principle to the removal of these elements and their replacement with new building. However, notwithstanding this, as a result of discussions revised plans have been received which retains a larger proportion of a slightly older wall (a part west facing into the internal courtyard) and is now integrated into the ground floor extension, which is welcomed. A condition can be imposed to require a recording of the relevant buildings before their demolition.

Regarding the alterations to the front façade to St Johns Street, no objections are raised by Historic England or the Conservation Officer. These works will not harm the fabric any features of historic or architectural interest and will preserve the setting of the White Hart listed building, adjacent listed buildings and street scene. There are other associated internal alterations, which require listed building consent (the subject of a separate listed building application) but to which the Conservation Officer and Historic England have raised no objection.

Concern has been raised by the Civic Society regarding what appears to be a comprehensive reversal of the buildings orientation to now welcome visitors at the rear and that this would leave the landmark entrance on St John's Street all but redundant in the likelihood it becomes used mainly as the bistro entrance, rather than the main hotel. The Civic Society also raises concern regarding the monolithic design and that it is a missed opportunity to do something modern, of its time and site specific. The AMS also comment that it is surprised that the applicant had not taken the opportunity to improve the setting of the White Hart Hotel by removing the 1970s extension and replacing it with a world-class design, referring to Section 7 of the NPPF and in particular Paragraphs 63 and 64, which it considers ought to be applied more stringently:

*"63. In determining applications, great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which help raise the standard of design more generally in the area.*

*64. Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions".*

Whilst the proposal does not propose the demolition of the 1970s block, the application must be judged on its based on the scheme put forward. A more contemporary approach was taken in the previous application but was withdrawn in view of objections and concerns with such an approach. The current scheme aims to improve on the previous two designs put forward, albeit it similar in terms of the basic approach but articulated differently in detailed design and massing. Regarding the 'entrance' issue, the applicant's submissions identify the difficulties with the drop off point the busy St Johns Street but state:

- *Notwithstanding this, the Portico entrance on St John's Street is the main point of entry for pedestrians including local residents, businesses and visitors using the Hotel facilities (as a meeting point) and for guests during their stay, and historically was the main entrance. It therefore needs to continue to be a strong entry point.*

Local representations also object to the scale and dominance of the of the extensions in relation to the smaller scale surrounding historic buildings and the impact of the upward extension on views across the Conservation Area. HE's comments on the originally submitted plans concluded that there would be some harm, albeit less than substantial, to the immediate heritage assets around and within the Chequer itself by the introduction of the mansard roof combined with the scale of the north elevation but this could to some extent be offset by the landscaping scheme that will help to mitigate the harshness of the car park area that is identified as a negative element in Jane Root's Statement of Significance. HE goes on to say:

*"... we do not consider the planting of a few token trees to be adequate enough and would ask that this matter is reassessed. Although, it would also be wrong to over embellish or to make the entrance too conspicuous in the street, something simple might help lift this part of the Brown Street. Such enhancement could then be balanced against the harm caused by this inappropriate roof form of development..."*

Historic England summarised:

*"...We consider the impact of the scale of the new block combined with the imposition of the mansard roof extension on the existing and new build will have less than substantial harm on the setting to the principle heritage asset- The White Hart and adjacent listed buildings within the tight environment of this Chequer within the Salisbury Conservation Area. We believe more efforts should be made to offset this harm with a more integrated and imaginative approach to bring some positive improvements to the car park that is highlighted as a negative space at the rear of the hotel..."*

Since then, Historic England have continued to be involved in discussion with the applicant and officers, following which revised plans have been received. Historic England has assessed the revised plans for the external works together and treatment of the extensions and re-facing of the 1970s block. They consider that the amended plans appear to broadly address their concerns. Although they confirm that they continue to have issue with the mansard roof addition, they are mindful that it will be relatively well screened from most public views and that the improvements to the facade treatment and landscaping have improved the visual character of the building and its setting. They now recommend that the application is now determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your expert conservation advice.

The upward extension will be visible from some close public views from Brown Street and St Anns' Street at ground level, noticeably through the vehicular access of Brown Street. It may also be visible at higher levels from surrounding buildings. It is likely to be visible in the roof scape in the line of public views to the Cathedral, for example from higher ground to the east. The upward extension would be lower than the current plant building but clearly larger in terms of its massing. However, the overall height, design and use of slates to the mansard roof slopes will mitigate its impact on views and, in terms of longer distance views towards the Cathedral and its spire, it is not likely to appear as an unduly prominent, obtrusive or discordant element in the varied roofscape and it is judged that it would harm the city's skyline important public view points of the Cathedral. It would also not exceed the 12.2m height restriction under Core Policy 22. The upward extension has also been considered on how it might affect the historic street scene in St Johns Street and the setting of adjacent and nearby heritage assets, not least the White Hart Hotel itself. It is judged that due to the set back of the extension and roof slope from the St John's Street frontage, it is unlikely it would be either visible or unduly prominent (where it might be partly seen) from street level and is likely to have a neutral impact on the street scene and setting of heritage assets from this direction. The roof will, of course, no doubt be visible from upper building storeys in

surrounding buildings in the context of the surrounding roof scape. It is concluded, however, that views into and out of the Conservation Area would be adequately safeguarded / preserved. The Council's Conservation Officer (see comments above) concludes that the "... overall the modest harm created by raising the level of the top floor is outweighed by the visual benefits of the alterations to the rear wing and the southern section on St John St , without getting into the other benefits of increased accommodation etc...."

Regarding underground heritage assets, the Council's Archaeologist has advised that the site is of archaeological interest as it lies within the medieval White Hart chequer and that previous evaluation that took place in and around the car park in 2003 and 2010 demonstrated that remains from the medieval and post-medieval period do survive in the areas investigated, although the remains have, in some areas, been affected by the later buildings. Therefore a planning condition is recommended to require and approve a written scheme of archaeological investigation, which will require a watching brief should significant remains be identified it may be necessary to undertake some archaeological excavation as part of the mitigation works.

Having regard to the NPPF, in particular paragraphs 131 to 134, the advice from English Heritage and the specialist advice from the Council's Conservation and Archaeology Officers, it is judged that overall, taking into account the positive enhancements resulting from the proposed development, the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the historic environment generally not any specific designated or non-designated heritage asset. Notwithstanding this, if it is considered that the upward mansard additions would have some negative impact on heritage assets as a result of its design and bulk, it is judged that this would be less than substantial harm and would be outweighed by the public benefits in terms of the contribution to the local economy and tourism objectives together with the enhancement of public views into the site from the rear and setting of the principle listed building.

## **10. CONCLUSION**

It is considered that having regard to the development plan, national planning policy guidance and other relevant material considerations, it is judged that listed building consent can be granted for the works associated with the proposed development on this site, subject to planning permission being granted under planning application 14/01986/FUL.

## **11. RECOMMENDATION**

**Provided planning permission is granted in respect of the associated planning application Ref.14/01986/FUL,**

**Then APPROVE,**

**Subject to the following conditions:**

1) The works for which Listed Building Consent is hereby granted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this consent.

REASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2)The development hereby permitted shall be implemented in accordance with the submitted plans and documents listed below. No variation from the approved plans should be made

without the prior approval of the local planning authority. Amendments may require the submission of a further application.

- Location plan 5296/PS-100
- Proposed Layout 5296/PS-106 REV B
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan 5296/PS-107 REV B
- Proposed First Floor Plan 5296/PS-108 REV A
- Proposed Second Floor Plan 5296/PS-109 REV A
- Proposed Third Floor Plan 5296/PS-110 REV B
- Proposed Roof Plan 5296/PS-111 REV A
- Proposed Demolition Plan 5296/PS-112 REV A
- Existing and Proposed North Elevation 5296/PS-113 REV A
- Existing and Proposed East Elevation 5296/PS-114 REV A
- Existing and Proposed South Elevation 5296/PS-115 REV A
- Existing and Proposed West Elevation 5296/PS-116 REV B
- Proposed Elevations (north and east) 5296/PS-117 REV B
- Proposed Elevations (south and west) 5296/PS-118 REV C
- Existing and Proposed St John's Street Elevation 5296/PS-119 REV A
- Section Details 5296/PS-123, REV B
- Existing and Proposed Section A-A 5296/PS-124 REV A
- Existing and Proposed Section B-B 5296/PS-125 REV A

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

3) No development shall commence on site until the exact details and samples of the materials to be used for the external walls and roofs have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: The application contained insufficient information to enable this matter to be considered prior to granting planning permission and the matter is required to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority before development commences in order that the development is undertaken in an acceptable manner, in the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area, and preserving the character and appearance of the listed building and its setting.

4) No walls shall be constructed on site, until a sample wall panel of the proposed brickwork, not less than 1 metre square, has been constructed on site, inspected and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The panel shall then be left in position for comparison whilst the development is carried out. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved sample.

REASON: The application contained insufficient information to enable this matter to be considered prior to granting planning permission and the matter is required to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority before development commences in order that the development is undertaken in an acceptable manner, in the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area, and preserving the character and appearance of the listed building and its setting.

5) No external stonework shall be constructed on site until full details have been submitted (including a sample panel of stonework to be constructed on site and inspected) and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any panel required shall then be left in position for comparison whilst the development is carried out. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved sample.

REASON: The application contained insufficient information to enable this matter to be considered prior to granting planning permission and the matter is required to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority before development commences in order that the development is undertaken in an acceptable manner, in the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area, and preserving the character and appearance of the listed building and its setting.

6) No development shall commence on site until details of all eaves, verges, windows (including head, sill and window reveal details), doors, rainwater goods, chimneys, dormers and canopies have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: The application contained insufficient information to enable this matter to be considered prior to granting planning permission and the matter is required to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority before development commences in order that the development is undertaken in an acceptable manner, in the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area, and preserving the character and appearance of the listed building and its setting.

7) The works hereby granted consent shall be carried out in such a manner as to ensure that the existing buildings are preserved and not structurally or superficially altered in any way whatsoever, save in accordance with the approved plans and the said building(s) shall be structurally supported and weatherproofed at all times during the construction period in accordance with established building practice.

REASON: To preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

8) No works shall commence on site until an appropriate programme of building recording (including architectural/historical analysis) has been carried out in respect of the part of the building to be demolished. This record shall be carried out by an archaeologist/building recorder or an organisation with acknowledged experience in the recording of standing buildings which is acceptable to the Local Planning Authority. The recording shall be carried out in accordance with a written specification, and presented in a form and to a timetable, which has first been agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: The application contained insufficient information to enable this matter to be considered prior to granting planning permission and the matter is required to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority before development commences in order that the development is undertaken in an acceptable manner, to secure the proper recording of the listed building.

## **INFORMATIVES**

INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT: Any alterations to the approved plans, brought about by compliance with Building Regulations or any other reason must first be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority before commencement of work.

INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT: The applicant is requested to note that this permission does not affect any private property rights and therefore does not authorise the carrying out of any work on land outside their control. If such works are required it will be necessary for the applicant to obtain the landowners consent before such works commence.



If you intend carrying out works in the vicinity of the site boundary, you are also advised that it may be expedient to seek your own advice with regard to the requirements of the Party Wall Act 1996.

**INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT:** Please note that Council offices do not have the facility to receive material samples. Please deliver material samples to site and inform the Planning Officer where they are to be found.