

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	12 <sup>th</sup> January 2017
<b>Application Number</b>	14/01986/FUL
<b>Site Address</b>	The White Hart St. John Street Salisbury SP1 2SD
<b>Proposal</b>	Alterations and extensions to existing rear extension/courtyard buildings, to provide function rooms, entrance, and 28 guest bedrooms. Internal changes and refurbishment, with enhancement of existing parking area.
<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>	Full Planning
<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 planning permission be APPROVED subject to conditions.

### 3. REPORT SUMMARY

The main issues to consider are:

1. Principle of the Development
2. Scale and Design
3. Impact on the Historic Environment.
4. Residential Amenity
5. Highway / Transport considerations
6. Drainage / Flood Risk

## 7. CIL

The application as originally submitted generated 7 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 and the harm to the occupiers of adjacent residential properties has been mitigated to a point where it is considered that a refusal of permission would not be justified on the ground of the adverse impact on residential amenity.

Flood risk and drainage has been addressed by the applicant and / or can be controlled through the use of conditions. The hotel is located in an accessible location and would not give rise to harmful traffic / transportation or pollution issues. The Highways Officer has raised no objection on highways safety or to reduced levels of parking, given its location.

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. However, having regard to the development plan and other relevant material considerations, it is judged that the balance of the considerations weighs in favour of granting planning permission.

## 4. MAIN POLICIES

Wiltshire Core Strategy (adopted January 2015):

- Core Policy 1: Settlement strategy
- Core Policy 2: Delivery strategy
- Core Policy 3: Infrastructure requirements
- Core Policy 20: Spatial Strategy: Salisbury Community Area
- Core Policy 22: Salisbury Skyline
- Core Policy 35: Economic regeneration
- Core Policy 38: Retail and leisure
- Core Policy 39: Tourist development

Core Policy 40: Hotels, bed and breakfast, guest houses and conferences  
Core Policy 41: Sustainable construction and low carbon energy  
Core Policy 50: Biodiversity and geodiversity  
Core Policy 55: Air quality  
Core Policy 57: Ensuring high quality design and place shaping  
Core Policy 58: Ensuring the conservation of the historic environment  
Core Policy 60: Sustainable transport  
Core Policy 61: Transport and development  
Core Policy 62: Development impacts on the transport network  
Core Policy 63: Transport strategies  
Core Policy 64: Demand management  
Core Policy 67: Flood risk  
Core Policy 68: Water resources  
Saved Salisbury District Local Plan policies: D4 (Salisbury Townscape /Chequers)

Supplementary Planning Guidance:

Creating Places Design Guide SPG (Adopted April 2006) Creating Places Design Guide SPG (Adopted April 2006).

National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012), in particular paragraphs 14 and 17, Section 1 (Building a Strong Economy), Section 2 (Ensuring the Vitality and Viability of Town Centres), Section 4 (Promoting Sustainable Transport), Section 7 (Requiring Good Design), Section 10 (Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change), Section 12 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment).

National Planning Policy Guidance (March 2014)

Sections 16 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, Tourism Strategy for South Wiltshire

## **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.

A listed building application 14/01990/LBC for associated works has been submitted and is being considered concurrently with this application.



## 7. RECENT PLANNING HISTORY

14/01990/LBC	Proposed alterations to existing 1970s block including conversion of the 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 28 No new guest bedrooms above. Proposed internal refurbishment and alterations to existing public areas with associated landscaping. <b>UNDETERMINED /CONCURRENT.</b>
S/2013/0061	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. <b>WITHDRAWN 16.01.13.</b>
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. <b>WITHDRAWN 16.01.13</b>
S/2012/0770	Proposed repair works to section of boundary wall. <b>APPROVED 30/05/12.</b>
S/2011/1861	Proposed demolition of existing wall. <b>WITHDRAWN</b>

	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.

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”.*

#### Wiltshire and Swindon Biological Records Centre:

Note that otters and bat species have been recorded nearby.

#### Wiltshire Fire & Rescue:

Refer to Building Regulations (B5) and recommendations to improve safety and reduce property loss in the event of fire (domestic sprinkler protection).

*(Officer Note: compliance with Building Regulation is a requirement / procedure. However, an Informative can be added to the decision. Also the applicant should be advised that any subsequent changes to the approved plans to comply Building Regulations may require the further approval of the LPA in terms of the listed building consent and planning permission*

## **9. CONSULTATIONS**

### Historic England:)

Historic England (then English Heritage) commented on the plans as originally submitted 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 has 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 recently 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....”*

#### Economic Development and Tourism:

The Council's Development Officer comments:

*“ I have consulted with VisitWiltshire on the subject application.*

*The Visitor Accommodation Study undertaken for VisitWiltshire by Hotel Solutions confirms that there is potential for additional hotel provision in Salisbury city centre at the 4 star / boutique level, and that incremental growth through the expansion and upgrading of existing hotels, and some new, relatively small boutique hotels is the most appropriate way forward to meeting the requirement for additional supply at this level in the market.*

*This application is aligned with this level of growth, and so VisitWiltshire supports it”.*

#### WC Public Protection:

The Council's Public Protection Officer originally raised queries regarding the submitted with the noise assessment and requested that the issues be addressed at the application stage. With respect to Air Quality the PPO raised no concerns about the air quality assessment submitted with the application and air quality should not deteriorate as a result of the development.

Following the submission of further information the PPO made further comments:

*“The most recent noise report completed in October 2013 (HM:2415/R3) details the measured noise levels at the nearest residential property (86 Brown Street) and refers to BS4142:1997. The assessment indicates the noise level will be 3-4dB above background levels at the property up to midnight. BS4142 states that a difference of around +5Db is of marginal significance. As detailed in the report the predicted noise level is unlikely to be particularly noticeable within buildings, though this is assuming that windows will stay closed and in warmer weather windows are likely to be open for a significant proportion of time. However, based on the responses from this department and the additional information provided, including further mitigation measures internally we will move forward with the previous suggestions made. Therefore, we would expect the applicant to submit further information detailing how entertainment noise from the function rooms will be managed. This should take the form of a noise management strategy. As previously mentioned this strategy should include the following;*

- *Details on how the noise limiter will be set (including how it will control specific frequency ranges)*
- *How the noise limiter will be managed*
- *A statement detailing that all entertainment will be passed through the noise limiter*
- *Implemented procedures to ensure the device/system cannot be tampered/adjusted*

- *Procedures indicating that all entertainers will use the amplification system in the function rooms (therefore be controlled by the noise limiter)*
- *Absolute maximum noise level should be set in the function rooms (including details on how noise levels will be managed to ensure they do not exceed the max noise level)*

*The most recent plans indicate proposals to construct bi-folding doors inside the function rooms to provide additional insulation when the rooms are being used for entertainment purposes. Furthermore to the above we would need additional information from the noise consultant to indicate what the impact of the proposed changes to the structure including the bi-folding doors will have on emitted noise levels at the nearest residential property. As outlined in previous responses we still need to establish what the impact of low frequency noise will be”.*

Following the submission of revised plans and a further revised Noise Report, the PPO's comments and recommendation is:

*“...Following the additional information submitted at the beginning of last year for this application we agreed that we would move forward with the suggestions made by the agent and ask that further information detailing how entertainment noise from the function rooms will be managed. This has been completed, and a noise management strategy has been submitted.*

*The noise management plan includes details on the proposed noise limiting device and how it will be managed by the hotel staff. The information included from the manufacturer, Sentry, states that there is a remote reset key switch which may be added if required. Within the noise limiting management section of the noise management strategy it does not state whether or not this reset key switch will be added to the system, if it is (we would suggest it is) could the applicant/agent please confirm who will operate the switch and have access to the key? And amend their noise management strategy accordingly.*

*Once the noise management strategy has been updated and submitted, we would recommend that a condition to the following effect is attached to any planning permission granted. We would also recommend that a reference is given for the noise management strategy so this can be included in the condition;*

1. *All activities shall be carried out in accordance with the noise management strategy (reference). The noise management strategy shall not be altered without prior written approval from the local planning authority.*

*The layout for the function rooms now includes bi folding doors to cover the windows and fire door during noisy events. The noise assessment recommended acoustics specifications for the windows, fire door in the external wall and an independent acoustic ceiling. These are detailed in both the 2013 and 2016 report (HM:2415/R3). In relation to the mechanical ventilation, it has been identified that noise from the proposed equipment will be below background levels and acoustic louvers will be installed. To ensure all of the recommended mitigation measures are installed we would recommend the following condition is attached;*

2. *The development hereby permitted shall be designed, installed and maintained at all times thereafter in accordance with the acoustic mitigation measures detailed in section 2 and 5 of the submitted Hayes McKenzie Noise Report dated 14<sup>th</sup> October 2013 and 19<sup>th</sup> August 2016 reference HM:2415/R3.*

*At the nearest residential window to the east of the building, the predicted noise level for loud amplified music (96dB LAeq) in the function room is 41dB LAeq, which is 4dB above*

*the lowest assumed background noise level. It has been suggested that the noise level within the function room will be limited using a noise limiter to 90dB LAeq, which should ensure noise levels at the nearest residential window are below background noise levels. It had been agreed that prior to the function rooms becoming operational further measurements will be carried out to ensure a suitable maximum level inside the rooms can be obtained. Therefore, we would recommend a condition to the following effect is also attached to ensure post completion noise measuring is carried out;*

3. *No development shall commence on site until a written scheme for post completion noise measuring has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The written scheme shall include details of the measurement location outside the building (nearest residential window) and the equipment and noise descriptors to be used for the purposes of measuring the residual levels of noise caused by the amplified music inside the function room. Post completion noise measurements made should ensure that the noise limiter is set at a level in which noise levels at the nearest residential window are below background noise levels (LA90) as defined in table 1 of the Environmental Noise Assessment (Reference; HM: 2415/R3, dated 14<sup>th</sup> October 2013 and 19<sup>th</sup> August 2016).*

*To ensure disturbance to residents is minimised during construction and demolition stages we would also recommend that the following conditions are attached to any planning approval granted;*

4. *No construction or demolition work shall take place on Sundays or Public Holidays or outside the hours of 07:30 to 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays.*
5. *No development shall commence on site until a construction management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The plan shall include details of the measures that will be taken to reduce and manage the emission of noise, vibration and dust during the demolition and/or construction phase of the development. It shall include details of the following:*
  - a) *The movement of construction vehicles;*
  - b) *The cutting or other processing of building materials on site;*
  - c) *The transportation and storage of waste and building materials;*
  - d) *The recycling of waste materials (if any)*
  - e) *The loading and unloading of equipment and materials*
  - f) *The location and use of generators and temporary site accommodation*

*The construction/demolition phase of the development will be carried out fully in accordance with the construction management plan at all times.*

6. *No burning of waste or other materials shall take place on the development site during the demolition/construction phase of the development.*

*We would also recommend if there isn't already a condition attached to previous approvals that a condition is attached restricting deliveries/collections to the site;*

7. *No deliveries shall be made to or collections made from the development hereby approved except between the hours of 07.00 and 19.00 Monday to Saturday and 08.00 to 17.00 on Sundays and Public Holidays...”..*

*(Officer's Note: A revision to the Noise Management Strategy has been requested in line with the PPO's requirements)*



### 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 – see conditions below)*

### WC Highways:

The Council's Highways Officer has commented:

*“My highway comments are similar to those on the S/2013/0060 planning application i.e., The hotel is located within the centre of Salisbury and benefits from city centre facilities and public transport opportunities within walking and cycling distances. There is a lack of on-street parking in the vicinity of the hotel, particularly for long stay parking, due to controlled*

parking restrictions and there is a choice of public car parks available for hotel guests if necessary.

*I am of the opinion that the reduction in overall parking provision within the hotel car park is not of particular concern in this central location and there would be no resulting detrimental impact on the highway. I do not wish to raise a highway objection”*

Confirmation is awaited from the Highways Officer regarding the revised plans.

Wessex Water:

*“... Water Supply and Waste Connections*

*If new water supply and waste water connections are required from Wessex water to serve this proposed development, application forms and guidance information is available from the Developer Services web-pages at our website [www.wessexwater.co.uk](http://www.wessexwater.co.uk). Please note that DEFRA intend to implement new regulations that will require the adoption of all new private sewers. All connections subject to these new regulations will require a signed adoption agreement with WessexWater before any drainage works commence. Further information can be obtained from our New Connections Team by telephoning 01225 526222 for Water Supply and 01225 526333 for Waste Water.*

*Separate Sewer Systems*

*Separate systems of drainage will be required to serve the proposed development. No surface water connections will be permitted to the foul sewer system. There should be no significant increase to the Surface water system...”*

Environment Agency:

*“ I note from Weetwood's letter dated 13 February 2014 that the only difference from a previous application that we commented upon (Our Ref: WX/2013/123009/01 and /02) is a slight reduction in proposed footprint.*

*The Flood Map has not changed since our previous comments in relation to the application above. Our advice has therefore not changed and we would recommend planning conditions (relating to finished floor levels and surface water management) as per our previous consultation (see ref above). Please note that we would not seek consultation to discharge a planning condition relating to surface water management. At this scale this would be the responsibility of the Local Drainage Authority.*

*Our previous response is reproduced below for ease of reference:*

*We have **no objection** to the proposed development **subject to the following conditions and informatives** being included in any planning permission granted.*

*(Officer Note: The EA recommends conditions in relation to a scheme of surface water drainage to be approved and water efficiency and Informatives in relation to flood resilience / proofing and water efficiency)*

WC Land Drainage Engineer:

The Council's Land Drainage Engineer's comments on the original submission:

“...

- Application form indicates use of sustainable drainage and connection to public storm sewers but you appear not to have a consultation response from Wessex Water – this

should be sought in case they require a condition on discharge rates – I am aware that on similar sites they require no increase in discharge rate in relation to storm to storm connections

- The Environment Agency letter dated 2 July 2014 identifies suggested conditions in relation to flood risk with which we agree...”

In discussion with the applicant’s consultant the Council’s Drainage Engineer sought further information regarding percolation tests / infiltration flow rates and details of the surface water system. Following the submission of further information the Council’s Land Drainage Engineer commented:

“... ”

- *Any discharge to public sewers, especially on revised arrangements will need approval of the sewerage undertaker*
- *The FRA talks about storage required if no soakaway and then deals with soakaways*
- *The base of any soakaway is to have at least 1m of unsaturated soil between it and the top level of ground water taking into account seasonal variations – it is extremely unlikely that this required 1m can be achieved – on site testing required – previous email in May 2015 confirmed direct connection to sewer with storage without infiltration due to the high water table...”*

However, subsequent to the latest Addendum to the FRA, the Council’s Land Drainage Engineer has confirmed no objection subject to conditions and recommends support with the following conditions:

*Condition 1 - No development shall commence on site until a scheme for the discharge of foul water from the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the sewerage undertaker*

*REASON: To ensure that the development can be adequately drained*

*Condition 2 - The development shall not be first occupied until foul water drainage has been constructed in accordance with the approved scheme.*

*REASON: To ensure that the development can be adequately drained*

*Condition 3 - No development shall commence on site until a scheme for the discharge of surface water from the site (including surface water from the access / driveway), incorporating sustainable drainage details, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the sewerage undertaker*

*REASON: To ensure that the development can be adequately drained*

*Condition 4 - The development shall not be first occupied until surface water drainage has been constructed in accordance with the approved scheme.*

*REASON: To ensure that the development can be adequately drained*

(Officer Note: the Land Drainage Engineer has subsequently advised that Condition 1 be reworded to clarify discharge rates / limits to the public storm sewer)

## **10. ASSESSMENT**

### **10.1 Principle of the Development**

The NPPF makes it clear that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise (para.11). The proposal is for an extension and alteration to an established hotel in the

centre of Salisbury. The key policy relating to proposals for new hotel facilities is Wiltshire Core Strategy Policy 40, which states:

*“Hotels, bed and breakfasts, guest houses and conference facilities  
Proposals for new hotels, bed and breakfasts, guesthouses or conference facilities, together with the sensitive extension, upgrading and intensification of existing tourism accommodation facilities will be supported within;*

- i. Principal Settlements and Market Towns; or*
- ii. Local Service Centres, and Large and Small Villages where the proposals are of an appropriate scale and character within the context of the immediate surroundings and the settlement as a whole; or.*
- iii. Outside the settlements above, proposals that involve the conservation of buildings that for contextual, architectural or historic reasons should be retained and otherwise would not be.*

*In all cases it must be demonstrated that proposals will:*

- iv. Not have a detrimental impact on the vitality of the town centre; and*
- v. Avoid unacceptable traffic generation.*

*Proposals for the change of use of existing bed spaces provided in hotels or public houses or  
conference facilities to alternative uses will be resisted, unless it can be clearly demonstrated there is no longer a need for such a facility in either its current use, or in any other form of tourism, leisure, arts, entertainment or cultural use”*

The WCS is an up to date document and its policies carry considerable weight. Salisbury is a ‘Principal Settlement’ under WCS Core Policy 1, which states

*“... Wiltshire’s Principal Settlements are strategically important centres and the primary focus for development. This will safeguard and enhance their strategic roles as employment and service centres. They will provide significant levels of jobs and homes, together with supporting community facilities and infrastructure meeting their economic potential in the most sustainable way to support better self containment...”.*

In the WCS Spatial Vision, ‘Objective 1: delivering a thriving economy’ states that the *“ The Core Strategy enables development to take place and encourages economic vitality, providing local jobs for Wiltshire’s population, whilst ensuring that sustainable development objectives have been met...”* and that *“... The potential of tourism should be realised as a major growth sector through capitalising on the quality of the environment and location Wiltshire benefit from...”*. In the ‘Key Outcomes’ a bullet point reference again to tourism states *“...Wiltshire’s tourist sector will have grown in a sustainable way, ensuring the protection and where possible enhancement of Wiltshire’s environmental and heritage assets, including the delivery of new tourist accommodation and where appropriate the safeguarding of existing facilities...”*.

The NPPF defines hotels as a ‘main town centre use’. In principle the proposal to provide additional hotel accommodation and facilities is in line with guidance in the NPPF which supports sequentially preferable sites to ensure the vitality and viability of town centres (para. 24). The town centre first approach is also highlighted in the NPPG. Section 1 (Building a strong, competitive economy) of the NPPF is supportive of sustainable economic growth and advocates that significant weight should be placed on economic growth in the planning system.

The hotel sector has strong links to tourism. WCS Policy 39 (Tourist development) states that *“... Within Principal Settlements and Market Towns, proposals for tourist development of an appropriate scale (including attractions and tourist accommodation) will be supported subject to a sequential assessment. Proposals for large-scale tourist development must be*

*assessed against all the policies of this Core Strategy, including transport implications and how the proposal could assist rural regeneration and the well being of communities...". It is considered that, in principle, the proposal would be in accordance with the Core Policy 39. Sequentially, the site is located in a sequentially preferable location within central and historic core of the city.*

The Spatial Strategy for the Salisbury Community Area in the WCS highlights Salisbury as an international tourist destination that brings significant revenue to the city, whilst the supporting text to Core Policy 40 specifically refers to the lack of both budget and high quality leisure accommodation within part of Wiltshire, particularly the south and states:

*"...For example, Salisbury is less successful in attracting business visitors than other, similar destinations and does not have the conference facilities needed for large events..."*

This relates back to work carried out in connection with 'A Tourism Strategy for South Wiltshire' in connection with the former South Wiltshire Core Strategy and is referred to in the evidence base in connection with the current Wiltshire Core Strategy.

The application is accompanied by a 'Planning Statement and Economic Justification'. Whilst 'need' is not a policy requirement as such under Core Policy 40, the document includes information on the key issues faced by the hotel, which is a material consideration, stating:

"...

- *The Hotel does not have a dedicated meeting / function / banqueting room and the operator is forced to close the restaurant to accommodate local banquets, weddings and larger meetings.*
- *The Hotel is restricted in terms of its ability to meet the demands of business and tourist visitors by the limited number of bedrooms, and this also affects its ability to service weddings and functions.*
- *There are at least 120 "constrained" nights per year – i.e. nights where there are not enough bedrooms to satisfy the demand.*
- *The location of the Reception, off St John Street, is not the natural point of arrival for guests arriving in their own car or by taxi. Furthermore, there is restricted access for drop off on St John's Street as it is adjacent to a busy traffic junction (and one way system) and no scope to increase the size of the drop off area in that location.*
- *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.*
- *There is not a clear or logical internal route plan within the Hotel for guests and visitors.*

*The application proposals aim to address these operational issues and meet the owner's overall objectives through:*

- *The creation of new high quality and flexible function and banqueting facilities, with a room capacity of approx. 175 persons with associated facilities (toilets / breakout area / bar, etc.).*
- *The provision of 28 additional guest bedrooms, to meet existing demands and to support the conferencing and banqueting facilities.*
- *The enhancement of the existing bistro / bar / lounge area visible from, and leading off, the main portico street entrance from St John's Street, to create a focal / rendezvous point for local business and leisure users.*

- *The creation of a new main entrance and reception area at the car park side of the Hotel to enhance the experience for guests arriving by car and taxi and improve the route through the Hotel.*
  - *The refurbishment of the existing restaurant overlooking a new landscaped courtyard area, giving a central focus / heart to the ground floor of the Hotel*
- ...”

A more recent additional planning statement submitted in support of the application includes information on the economic, social, and public benefits that would result from the proposal, referring to the issues highlighted in the Tourism Topic Paper, and the need for additional hotel accommodation and conference facilities in Salisbury. Some further site specific operational issues mentioned include:

- 2015 records showing the demand for rooms cannot be met because of high occupancy levels.
- The inability to currently meet demand impacts and support Salisbury as a tourist, shopping and business destination.
- The only 4\* hotel without a dedicated meeting / function/ banqueting facilities.
- The 68 rooms is restricted in its ability to meet demands of business and tourist visitors and service wedding and larger functions.
- Will increase the number of 4\* bedrooms and improved conference facilities.
- Visitors are turned away have no other options for this level of hotel accommodation in the city.
- The restricted drop –off point is to a busy traffic junction, part of a one way system and there is no scope to increase its suitability as a drop-off location.
- The construction budget would be a significant investment in Salisbury.
- Would provide additional employment opportunities (8 new full time staff).
- Additional knock on local economic benefits and expenditure.

The applicant considers that the application proposals would be in accordance with the Council’s policy; with the tourism strategy and vision for Salisbury; and with the overarching objectives of the NPPF to promote sustainable economic growth, they will:

“ ...

- *Provide additional hotel bedrooms in an established and accessible town centre hotel location;*
  - *Assist in meeting an identified need for additional hotel accommodation in Salisbury;*
  - *Create purpose built and flexible banqueting and conferencing space, for which there is an acknowledged need;*
  - *Assist in supporting the long term viability of the White Hart Hotel, which is a significant Grade II\* listed building in a prominent location, and enhance its existing 4\* rating;*
  - *More generally, support the tourism economy in Salisbury and the wider south Wiltshire area*
- ...”

The Council’s Economic Development and Tourism officer has referred to the ‘*The Visitor Accommodation Study undertaken for VisitWiltshire by Hotel Solution*’, which confirms that there is potential for additional hotel provision in Salisbury city centre at the 4 star / boutique level, and that incremental growth through the expansion and upgrading of existing hotels, and some new, relatively small boutique hotels is the most appropriate way forward to meeting the requirement for additional supply at this level in the market.

Whilst the development plan and policies have changed since the application was submitted, notably with the adoption of the WCS in January 2015, it is considered that the proposal to extend the hotel in this location would be in line with the general strategy set out in the development plan and guidance in the NPPF and NPPG and would help towards meeting the desired outcomes as set out in the action plan within the Tourism Strategy for South Wiltshire. It is considered that there would be a public benefit in terms of contributing to the local economy and tourism objectives.

Notwithstanding this, however, the proposal must be considered against all relevant policies of the WCS and have regard to any other relevant guidance in the NPPF / NPPG, and other material planning considerations. These matters are set out below.

## 10.2 Scale and Design

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 existing 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*

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.



View 01 - EXISTING



View 01 - PROPOSED

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 Council's 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. A condition can be imposed to ensure the development conforms to the sustainable construction objectives sought under WCS Core Policy 41.

### 10.3 Impact on the Historic Environment

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. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, 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.

#### 10.4 Residential Amenity

Criteria (vii) of Core Policy 57 (Ensuring high quality design and place shaping) states that new development shall have 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)*”. The NPPF states that the planning system should seek to secure a high quality design and good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupiers of land and buildings.

##### Daylight / sunlight

Concern has been expressed by occupiers of neighbouring properties regarding overlooking / loss of privacy and overshadowing / loss of light.

The proposed extension will introduce a new building mass and bulk at the rear of the hotel, which will clearly be visible from the rear of properties in Trinity Street and Brown Street as immediate neighbours on the north and east sides of the hotel. The applicant has sought to reduce the impact on these properties by stepping the proposed extension inward from the east and north elevations of the ground floor footprint at first floor level, leaving a flat roof area around east and north sides of the first floor. A mansard roof on the northern end of the second floor and a mansard on the third floor of the extension (and to the 1970s block) would help to further reduce the impact of the bulk of the proposed extension. The pitched roof to be replaced by a mansard with first floor accommodation adjacent the southern end of the west boundary of No. 2 Trinity Street will increase the bulk of this element to a degree but it is lower in height overall than the existing ridge height of the pitched roof. The rear of the properties in Trinity Street and Brown Street, including those on Brown Street to the south of the rear car park entrance have an existing outlook over the rear of the hotel which occupies a considerable space and height in the Chequer, in particular the 1970s block as a significant feature at the rear. Immediately adjacent to the south of the site is No. 3 St John's Street. This residential property is directly adjacent the hotel on its south side, in particular the 1970s block, which already has a significant impact on the outlook from this property and its rear garden. The single storey addition with glazed roof on the south side of the 1970s block is unlikely to have any undue impact due to the significant boundary wall in this location. The proposed ground floor addition directly adjacent the rear boundaries to properties in Ivy Street (service access route) comprising shallow lean to roof and flat roof



together with the proposed bin store in the north east corner of the site (directly adjacent the rear boundaries to properties in Ivy Street and Brown Street) are low single storey height structures and not considered that these structures would have significant impact in terms of overshadowing / loss of light.

The applicant has submitted a report which has systematically assessed the impact of the proposed development on the levels of daylight and sunlight received by the residential properties that would be most affected by the proposed development in Trinity Street, Brown Street and St John's Street, using BRE guidelines. This is not a development plan policy requirement but aids the assessment of likely impact on the amenity of the occupiers of these properties. The report concludes:

*"...The assessments to the neighbouring properties have demonstrated that a good level of daylight and sunlight will be retained in the proposed condition, in accordance with the BRE guidelines.*

*....The adjoining occupants will not experience noticeable reductions in daylight and sunlight, and in most cases obtain levels in excess of the BRE guidelines...."*

Nos. 2-4 Trinity Street and No. 3 St John Street are likely to most affected. The latter has an upper window facing north at close quarters into the side of the 1970s block at present and the submitted assessment suggest that the level of light to this room is already low and would lose further light by the proposed scheme (the upward extension) below the BRE guidelines. However, the assessment suggest that the current light levels are so low that even the 1% loss of visual sky component would not be noticeable and there is a small window on the rear elevation that should supplement daylight levels to the same room.

The sunlight / daylight assessment report was carried out in connection with the previous scheme / application in 2011. The current scheme has some revisions to the general form, height and massing of the extension. The applicant's consultant has reviewed the revisions to the scheme and comments that "....

- *The east elevation drawings PS-117 shows that in comparison to the old scheme, the overall height of the proposal has reduced, and the stepped facades that reduce in height towards Ivy Street have been mansarded and should have less of an effect on the neighbouring properties.*
- *The proposed stair and lobby area adjacent to the Brown Street properties has now been set back, thus reducing the height of the massing adjacent to the Brown Street properties.*
- *The third floor level has been mansarded, especially adjacent to 3 St John's Street, which equates to a height reduction in comparison to the previous proposal..."*

The applicant's consultant concludes that *"...The revised drawings have been modified to improve the daylight and sunlight effects to the neighbouring residential properties. The 2011 report demonstrated that there would be no noticeable reductions to the neighbouring properties with the taller massing in place. Therefore this revised massing proposal will also ensure that the occupants adjacent to the White Hart Hotel will maintain high levels of daylight and sunlight with the proposed works in place..."*

Officers consider that, on balance, the potential loss of daylight and / or sunlight received to windows in adjacent residential properties is unlikely in itself to result in a harmful loss of amenity to the occupiers of adjacent residential properties. Any overshadowing to rear

gardens is also unlikely to be significant, in comparison with the existing built form. It is concluded that, on balance, any such harm would not be significant enough to warrant refusal of permission on the grounds of the impact on the living conditions for the occupiers of these properties and the current scheme represents a marginal improvement on the previous scheme.

### Outlook and Dominance

Officers would not dispute the findings but the impact on residential amenity is not just restricted to sunlight and daylight analysis. Consideration also has to be had on whether the proposal would represent an over-dominant form of development. In this sense officers consider that the occupiers of these properties are likely to experience a more noticeable change to their outlook, in terms of building mass / bulk and external appearance. However, given the current outlook and dominance of the hotel buildings, in particular the 1970s block, whilst the proposed extensions would result in additional building mass and bulk closer to the residential boundaries, the stepped approach to the upper floors will mitigate the impact on these properties and when set against the existing substantial building mass on the site.

The increase in bulk and height of the 1970s block may result in some partial loss of views over the current flat roof for some properties, although the loss of private views, *per se*, is not a material planning consideration (this is different to public views and associated conservation area issues). Whilst there will be a change in outlook, it is judged that for those most closely affected, the impact is unlikely to be unduly harmful in terms of over dominance or living conditions and, although more subjective, it is considered that there would be some benefits to visual amenity through the design and use of materials, which represents an opportunity to improve the appearance of the hotel from the rear and mitigate the impact of the current appearance of the 1970s block into a more integrated and sympathetic form.

### Overlooking / Loss of Privacy

Objections have also been received on the grounds of overlooking and loss of privacy. The proposed scheme would involve the insertion of a series of 6 additional windows to guest bedrooms in the south elevation of third floor upward extension, set within the slope of the mansard roof and a window to the enclosed fire escape staircase. These windows are spaced regularly and align vertically with the windows below in the first and second floors. Set at right angles, they would overlook No 3 St Johns Street and its garden and properties further south. It is considered that there would be some loss of amenity to the occupiers of these properties as a result of the potential for overlooking. However, there is already significant potential for overlooking from the existing guest bedrooms at first and second floor levels and it is considered that the additional overlooking is unlikely in itself to be so unduly harmful to warrant refusal on the grounds of overlooking / loss of privacy. This is taking into account that it is stated that the window sizes are smaller than those currently at lower levels and that with the over-cladding of the façade the existing windows will be reduced in size from 1275mm high x 1350mm wide to 1100mm high x 1000mm. The third floor windows are also set back within the sloping mansard roof behind a parapet and are at a higher level, such that overlooking to lower adjacent levels would be less than the windows at first and second floor. The windows are also hotel guest bedrooms so that occupancy is unlikely to be throughout the whole day.

There will be additional windows in the east elevation; four in the third floor mansard roof slope, five at second floor level (one in a mansard roof slope), five at first floor level and a large feature window in the enclosed fire escape staircase at ground, first and second floor levels. There are also windows to each of the ground floor function rooms in the east elevation. There are 4 existing windows in the east elevation but there is potential for additional overlooking to the rear of properties in Brown Street. However, the extension is set back at first, second and third floors. There is currently an open service access running adjacent the rear fence / wall boundaries to Nos. 86-102 Brown Street, which is to be

retained providing some separation from the proposed function rooms at ground floor level. An enclosed bin store is proposed in the north east corner of the site at the end of this service access directly adjacent the boundaries to properties I Brown Street and Ivy Street. However no windows are proposed in this building with louvered doors facing into the service access. The structure is single storey height with a shallow sloping roof. There are existing windows in the east elevation of the 1970s block. Revised plans have been received which have reduced two of the larger three light windows in the first and second floor to smaller two light windows. Given this and the separation distance from the main extension to the rear of the nearest residential properties in Brown Street, on balance it is considered that given the existing urban location and relationships between properties, the potential overlooking will not result in unacceptable loss of privacy or impact on living conditions for these properties to warrant refusal of permission on such grounds.

### Noise and disturbance

Objections have been received on the grounds of noise and disturbance resulting from the proposed development. This stems from the direct use of the proposed function rooms and from the intensification of use from the expansion of the hotel and potentially affects

The applicant has submitted a noise report, which focuses around the use of the functions rooms and proposed mitigation measures to reduce potential noise disturbance to existing residential properties adjacent the site, in particular properties in Brown Street and Ivy Street. The Public Protection Officer expressed some concerns about noise levels and proposed mitigation measures. As a result revisions have been made to the function room, which would now include an internal wall to limit noise emissions when amplified music systems are being used. The wall would have bi-folding doors which could be opened during events which do not need amplified acoustic systems. Following the submission of further information, including a Noise Management Strategy (NMS), the PPO has raised no objection, subject to conditions (refer to full response above), including the testing of noise levels / the noise limiting device and an amendment to the NMS in respect of the latter (now submitted). Whilst the concern of residents is acknowledged, taking into account the submitted noise assessment and recommendation of the PPO, it is considered that the potential harmful impact of noise on the living conditions of the occupiers of adjacent residential properties could be adequately mitigated.

The PPO has raised no general objection to any activity which may be generated as a result of any intensification of use of the hotel outside of the building (e.g. in the car park) as a result of the arrivals and departures. It is considered that the hotel is an established business with a function rooms / conference facilities. The number of parking spaces in the car park is to be reduced, thereby reducing the number of cars able to park. Not all the patrons for hotel accommodation or functions will arrive and leave via the car park and the front portico entrance will still be used. The use of the service access route at the rear of the site will remain as existing and it is not anticipated that the proposal should result in any increase in noise and disturbance over the existing arrangement. The enclosed bin store is an improvement and the proposed A/C units are now to be enclosed within this building. The PPO has requested some conditions regarding construction activities, which although temporary, is considered reasonable in this case, in the interests of residential amenity, due to the proximity of adjacent residential properties in relation to the scale of the proposed development.

### 10.5 Air Quality

The site is located in an Air Quality Management Area. An Air Quality Assessment has been submitted which assesses the air quality impacts as a result of the proposed development during construction and at the operational stage. The report states that since the development will reduce the number of parking spaces it is likely to result in a small

reduction in traffic but it is recognised that this will be offset by the potential for increased traffic due to the increase in the number of bedrooms. However, the small number of rooms to be added is highly unlikely to significantly increase local traffic flows even if no allowance is made for the reduction due to removal of parking spaces. Taking into account Council guidance / criteria for the requirement of assessments, overall it is concluded that the development will not have any significant impact on local air quality conditions and a quantitative assessment is not required. During construction there is a risk of dust emissions but that mitigation should be straightforward, as most of the necessary measures are routinely employed as 'good practice' on construction sites. A Construction Method Statement is, however, recommended. The Council's Public Protection Team has raised no concerns regarding air quality. Given the scale, nature, characteristics and likely air quality impact, it is considered that the proposal would not conflict with WCS Core Policy 55.

#### 10.6 Highway / transport impact

The applicant has submitted a parking statement. The statement confirms that the White Hart Hotel currently has 68 bedrooms. This application proposes an additional 28 bedrooms, providing 96 bedrooms in total. Additional function space is also proposed as part of the application. There are currently 76 car parking spaces available to serve the Hotel. As a result of the proposals (including the additional 5 spaces lost through revisions to the external landscape works) this would result in 53 spaces to serve the extended 87 bedroom hotel. None of the staff have allocated parking space and use of the car park by staff is at the Hotel Manager's discretion. No more than eight employees are able to park at the Hotel on a regular basis, but only if there is capacity. It is indicated that up to 50% of overnight guests use the car park. The Statement provides information which shows that the car park operates within capacity. The statement includes the results of a survey undertaken shows that the existing level of car parking provision is more than adequate to meet demand at the site and whilst the survey is now a few years old (2011), the Hotel Manager has confirmed that the results remain valid and that it is only in rare and extreme circumstances that the car park is ever close to full capacity.

The car park is currently managed by the Hotel, with a barrier system and tickets dispensed to Hotel visitors on their arrival and they are charged according to their length of stay. The Statement acknowledges that the improved and extended function space proposed as part of the separate application will add to the Hotel's attraction as a venue for conferences and weddings. However, the hotel does not expect that all guests would arrive by car. Given the current level of spare capacity in the car park, the applicant considers that the number of additional trips to the Hotel generated by the additional 28 bedrooms and improved function space could be accommodated into the remaining car parking spaces and that the reduced number of spaces would be sufficient to meet operational requirements. It is pointed out that on the rare occasions when the car park is full, there are a number of car parks within a short walk of the Hotel, which guests and visitors can be directed. The nearest of these are Brown Street East and West car parks (which are available overnight) and the Culver Street car park. Ultimately the management of the car park is a matter for the Hotel. The Statement points out that there is the option to cancel existing parking permit arrangements and restrict the ability for staff and non-guest members of the public to park at the Hotel.

Notwithstanding that the proposal is likely to result in a greater use of the hotel and its facilities and reduction in the number of parking spaces, the hotel is well located a central location and highly accessible by modes of transport other than the private car, with good pedestrian and public transport links. The Council's Highways Officer has raised no objection in respect of level of parking provision nor raised any concerns regarding operational aspects. The submitted parking statement is based on the plans as originally submitted and refers to the loss of 17 car spaces. Since the original submission, the external landscape works scheme has resulted in the number of parking spaces being reduced by a further 5

spaces. However, the Council's Highways Officer has confirmed that he has no objections to the latest revised plans.

Local concerns have been raised about traffic generation, congestion in Brown Street and air pollution. Brown Street is likely to experience traffic queuing at peak periods as it is one of the main through / circulation routes (one way) in the city centre. However, the Council's Highways Officer has not raised any concerns regarding highways safety in relation to Brown Street nor the use of the hotel's vehicular access. The Council's Highway Officer has also raised no concerns regarding congestion or air pollution resulting from the proposed development.

It is considered the development would be in accordance with WCS Core Policies CP61 in respect of transport and new development and in line with guidance in the NPPF (Section 4) which seeks to support a pattern of development which facilitates the use of sustainable transport.

#### 10.7 Drainage and flood risk

A Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted with the application. The site is located within Flood Zone 2. The FRA concludes that

*"...Based on existing ground levels and modelled flood levels the majority of the area proposed for the hotel extension is located outside the 1,000 year flood outline. Some depths of inundation (of up to 220mm) of only the lower areas of the area proposed for the hotel extension may be expected in the 1,000 year event. It is important to note, however, that flood waters in the 1,000 year event would be very unlikely to reach this area of the site due to the existing built development to the west of the site obstructing the inundation of flood flows. Flood risk from surface water flooding is considered low, however any residual risk will be mitigated through the measures proposed for the management of surface water runoff following redevelopment. Flood risk from both groundwater flooding and highway flooding are also considered to be low. Proposals include an extension to an existing building, as well as converting the existing ground floor undercroft car parking area into a lounge area. A structural engineering report has confirmed that the existing ground level of the undercroft car park would need to be reduced by 500mm to allow sufficient head height in this area. As such, the FFL of the hotel extension would need to be reduced to 45.60mAOD. Ground levels surrounding the hotel extension are however situated above the 100 year plus climate change event and therefore no flood waters would be expected to reach the extension. To further mitigate against the effects of an extreme event it is proposed that flood resilient techniques will be incorporated into the construction, in line with guidance provided in the Communities and Local Government Document, "Improving the Flood Performance of New Buildings: Flood Resilient Construction..."*

In particular, it is noted in the FRA that *"... it is proposed to construct a water proofed wall, up to at least the 46.10mAOD level, around the edge of the proposed reception area and lounge. This will be part of the construction details of the new boundary walls and windows, and would protect the site to the current level of natural protection. It is therefore considered unlikely that the area proposed for the hotel extension would receive any floodwaters in the 1,000 year event, even if FFLs are set at 45.60mAOD..."*

In terms of means of emergency measures and means of escape the report notes that *"... The site is included in the EA flood warning area. Owners of the hotel may register with the EA to receive flood warning information. Dry access and egress is available from the site along Brown Street in a northerly direction, in up to a 100 year plus climate change event..."*

Regarding surface water disposal / drainage, the records show that this drains to the public sewerage system. Because of the high ground water levels, infiltration devices are difficult. The FRA has been revised with an Addendum covering to cover the proposed surface water disposal arrangements. It is noted that the amount of impermeable surfacing as a result of the proposed development will be little different to that existing. The Environment Agency have been consulted and have raised no objection subject to conditions, including details of the surface water disposal but point out that this aspect is the responsibility of the Council's own drainage engineers. It would appear that the current arrangement, where private drainage system discharges surface water under the undercroft and into the public surface water sewer in St Johns Street and this will have to be changed, as it is under the proposed extension (which will be filled in) and would not be able to be accessed in the event of a blockage. Therefore an alternative route will be required. The strategy in the FRA is:

- There will be no increase in existing flow rates discharged to the public sewer
- The use of SUDS as the preferred method of dealing with surface water
- The run-off up to the 1 in 100 year annual probability + climate change will be dealt with without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

The use of SUDS to mimic natural drainage can be achieved in a number of ways, including underground storage tanks. However, the calculations in the FRA show that the minimal storage required can be achieved within the proposed pipe network. The Council's Land Drainage Team has raised no objection subject to conditions to agree the full details of the design of the surface water discharge. The applicant will be required to consult Wessex Water at the detailed stage to agree discharge rates. Wessex Water has raised no objection but indicate that no surface water connections will be permitted to the foul sewer system and that there should be no significant increase to the surface water system. If new water supply and foul / waste water connections are required, this would also require consent from Wessex Water. It is recommended that an appropriate Informative is added to any planning permission.

Subject to no objections / comments from Wessex Water and the Council's Land Drainage Team in respect of the revised FRA and appropriate conditions, it is considered that the proposed drainage arrangements would be satisfactory.

#### 10.8 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

The CIL is a charge that local authorities can place on new development in their area. The money generated through CIL will contribute to the funding of infrastructure to support growth. Wiltshire Council adopted it's CIL in early 2015. The developer (or whoever has assumed liability for the development) is liable to make payment to Wiltshire Council for this type of development. An Informative will be placed on planning permission to inform applicant that the development may represent chargeable development under the CIL Regulations and Wiltshire's CIL Charging Schedule.

### **11. CONCLUSION**

Having regard to the development plan, national planning policy guidance, other material considerations and matters raised, it is judged that the balance of the considerations weighs in favour of granting planning permission.

### **12. RECOMMENDATION**

**Subject to the following:**

**1) Confirmation from Wessex Water regarding the revised drainage proposals.**

**Then APPROVE,**

**Subject to the following conditions:**

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) 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 5 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) Notwithstanding the approved plans, 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 if required 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) 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.

8) No development shall commence until:

- a) 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



b) 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.

9) No development shall commence on site until a scheme of hard and soft landscaping has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the details of which shall include:

- location and current canopy spread of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land;
- full details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of development;
- a detailed planting specification showing all plant species, supply and planting sizes and planting densities;
- finished levels and contours;
- means of enclosure;
- car park layouts;
- other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas;
- all hard and soft surfacing materials;
- minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse and other storage units, signs, lighting etc.);
- Proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications, cables, pipelines etc. indicating lines, manholes, supports etc.);
- retained historic landscape features and proposed restoration, where relevant.
- Trees of a size and species and in a location to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, shall be planted in accordance with BS3936 (Parts 1 and 4), BS4043 and BS4428

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 ensure a satisfactory landscaped setting for the development and the protection of existing important landscape features.

10) All soft landscaping comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the first occupation of the building(s) or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner; All shrubs, trees and hedge planting shall be maintained free from weeds and shall be protected from damage by vermin and stock. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years, die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. All hard landscaping shall also be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory landscaped setting for the development and the protection of existing important landscape features.

11) No demolition, site clearance or development shall commence on site, and; no equipment, machinery or materials shall be brought on to site for the purpose of development, until a Tree Protection Plan showing the exact position of each tree/s and their protective fencing in accordance with British Standard 5837: 2012: "Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction -Recommendations"; has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and;

The protective fencing shall be erected in accordance with the approved details. The protective fencing shall remain in place for the entire development phase and until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Such fencing shall not be removed or breached during construction operations.

No retained tree/s shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree/s be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars. Any topping or lopping approval shall be carried out in accordance British Standard 3998: 2010 "Tree Work – Recommendations" or arboriculture techniques where it can be demonstrated to be in the interest of good arboriculture practise.

If any retained tree is removed, uprooted, destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place, at a size and species and planted at such time, that must be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

No fires shall be lit within 15 metres of the furthest extent of the canopy of any retained trees or hedgerows or adjoining land and no concrete, oil, cement, bitumen or other chemicals shall be mixed or stored within 10 metres of the trunk of any tree or group of trees to be retained on the site or adjoining land.

[In this condition "retained tree" means an existing tree which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars; and paragraphs above shall have effect until the expiration of five years from the first occupation or the completion of the development, whichever is the later].

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 enable the Local Planning Authority to ensure the retention of trees on the site in the interests of visual amenity.

12) No development shall commence on site (including any works of demolition), until a Construction Method Statement, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The plan shall include details of the measures that will be taken to reduce and manage the emission of noise, vibration and dust during the demolition and/or construction phase of the development. It shall include details of the following:

- a) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- b) the movement of construction vehicles;
- c) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- d) The transportation and storage of plant and waste and building materials
- e) The recycling of waste materials (if any)
- f) The loading and unloading of equipment and materials
- g) The location and use of generators and temporary site accommodation
- h) The cutting or other processing of building materials on site;
- i) The erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
- j) Wheel washing facilities;
- k) Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
- l) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works; and
- m) Measures for the protection of the natural environment.
- n) Hours of construction, including deliveries;

Has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The approved Statement shall be complied with in full throughout the construction period. The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the approved construction method statement.

REASON: The application contained insufficient information to enable this matter to be considered prior to granting planning permission and 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 minimise detrimental effects to the neighbouring amenities, the amenities of the area in general, detriment to the natural environment through the risks of pollution and dangers to highway safety, during the construction phase.

13) All activities shall be carried out in accordance with the noise management strategy (Appendix A of the Hayes McKenzie Noise Report dated 19<sup>th</sup> August 2016 ref MH: 2415/R3). The noise management strategy shall not be altered without prior written approval from the local planning authority.

REASON: To ensure the creation/retention of an environment free from intrusive levels of noise and activity in the interests of the amenity of the area.

14) The development hereby permitted shall be designed, installed and maintained at all times thereafter in accordance with the acoustic mitigation measures detailed in section 2 and 5 of the submitted Hayes McKenzie Noise Report dated (INSET DATE / REFERENCE)

REASON: To ensure the creation/retention of an environment free from intrusive levels of noise and activity in the interests of the amenity of the area.

15) No development shall commence on site until a written scheme for post completion noise measuring has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The written scheme shall include details of the measurement location outside the building (nearest residential window) and the equipment and noise descriptors to be used for the purposes of measuring the residual levels of noise caused by the amplified music inside the function room. Post completion noise measurements made should ensure that the noise limiter is set at a level in which noise levels at the nearest residential window are below background noise levels (LA90) as defined in table 1 of the Environmental Noise Assessment (Reference; HM: 2415/R3, dated 14<sup>th</sup> October 2013 and 19<sup>th</sup> August 2016).

REASON: To ensure the creation/retention of an environment free from intrusive levels of noise and activity in the interests of the amenity of the area.

16) No construction or demolition work shall take place on Sundays or Public Holidays or outside the hours of 07:30 to 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays.

REASON: To ensure the creation/retention of an environment free from intrusive levels of noise and activity in the interests of the amenity of the area

17) No burning of waste or other materials shall take place on the development site during the demolition/construction phase of the development.

REASON: In order to minimise detrimental effects to the neighbouring amenities.

18) No deliveries shall be made to or collections made from the development hereby approved except between the hours of 07.00 and 19.00 Monday to Saturday and 08.00 to 17.00 on Sundays and Public Holidays.

REASON: To ensure the creation/retention of an environment free from intrusive levels of noise and activity in the interests of the amenity of the area.

19) No development shall take place until evidence that the development is registered with a BREEAM certification body and a pre-assessment report (or design stage certificate with

interim rating if available) has been submitted indicating that the development can achieve the “very good” BREEAM standard (or any such equivalent national measure of sustainable building which replaces that scheme). No part of the new building shall be occupied until a final Certificate has been issued certifying that the “very good” BREEAM standard (or any such equivalent national measure of sustainable building which replaces that scheme) has been achieved for the development.

REASON: To ensure that the objectives of sustainable development set out in policy CP41 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy are achieved.

20) 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.

21) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting or amending that Order with or without modification), no windows, doors, or other form of openings other than those shown on the approved plans, shall be inserted in the elevations of the development hereby permitted.

REASON: In the interests of residential amenity and privacy.

22) No development shall commence on site until a scheme of water and energy efficiency measures to reduce the water and energy consumption of the development hereby approved has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Before any of the dwellings are occupied, the approved measures shall be implemented and brought into operation in accordance with the approved scheme and thereafter retained.

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 the conservation of water and energy resources.

23) The flood risk mitigation measures (flood proofing, flood resilience, etc.) detailed in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) shall be carried out in full prior to the first bringing into use of the development.

REASON: In the interests of flood prevention.

24) No part of the development hereby approved shall be brought into use until the parking shown on the approved plans has been laid out in accordance with the approved details. This area shall be maintained and remain available for this use at all times thereafter.

REASON: To ensure that adequate provision is made for parking within the site in the interests of highway safety.

25) No development shall commence on site until a scheme for the discharge of foul water from the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the sewerage undertaker

REASON: To ensure that the development can be adequately drained

26) The development shall not be first occupied until foul water drainage has been constructed in accordance with the approved scheme.

REASON: To ensure that the development can be adequately drained

27) No development shall commence on site until a scheme for the discharge of surface water from the site (including surface water from the access / driveway), which proves existing and hence limiting discharge to the public storm sewer to current rate with control device and appropriate storage volume arrangements, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the sewage undertaker.

REASON: To ensure that the development can be adequately drained

28) The development shall not be first occupied until surface water drainage has been constructed in accordance with the approved scheme.

REASON: To ensure that the development can be adequately drained

### **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.

INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT: The applicant's attention is drawn the advice of from Wiltshire Fire & Rescue Service in their letter dated 9<sup>th</sup> May 2014 received in relation to the matter of requirements identified under B5 of Approved Document B relating to The Building Regulations 2010 and recommendations to improve safety and reduce property loss in the event of fire.

INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT: The applicant is reminded of the need to obtain separate listed building in addition to this planning permission.

INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT: With respect to the archaeological investigations required by the conditions above, the work should be conducted by a professional archaeological contractor in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation and mitigation agreed by this office. The applicant should note that the costs of carrying out a programme of building recording and archaeological investigation will fall to the applicant or their successors in title. The Local Planning Authority cannot be held responsible for any costs incurred.

INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT: The Environment Agency recommends that flood resistance and resilience measures are incorporated into the design of the development. These include removable barriers on building apertures (e.g. doors and air bricks), elevated electrics, and using waterproof materials and techniques (e.g. no plasterboard, solid tiled floors). The following link offers further assistance [http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/uploads/br/flood\\_performance.pdf](http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/uploads/br/flood_performance.pdf) .

INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT: The development should include water efficient systems and fittings. These should include dual-flush toilets, water-saving taps, showers and baths, and appliances with the highest water efficiency rating (as a minimum). Greywater recycling and rainwater harvesting should be considered. An appropriate submitted scheme to discharge the condition will include a water usage calculator showing how the development will not exceed a usage level of 105 litres per person per day.

INFORMATIVE: The applicant's attention is drawn to Condition 27, which requires details of surface / storm water to be agreed with the local planning authority, prior to commencement of development and will require consultation with Wessex Water. The applicant is advised to contact the Council's Land Drainage Engineer (Peter Weston, tel. 01249 706505) prior to submitting details pursuant to this condition and Condition 28 and 25(foul drainage).

INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT: If new water supply and waste water connections are required from Wessex water to serve this proposed development, application forms and guidance information is available from the Developer Services web-pages at our website [www.wessexwater.co.uk](http://www.wessexwater.co.uk). Please note that DEFRA intend to implement new regulations that will require the adoption of all new private sewers. All connections subject to these new regulations will require a signed adoption agreement with Wessex Water before any drainage works commence. Further information can be obtained from our New Connections Team by telephoning 01225 526222 for Water Supply and 01225 526333 for Waste Water.