

REPORT OUTLINE FOR AREA PLANNING COMMITTEES **Report No.**

Date of Meeting	8 th March 2018
Application Number	17/11681/LBC
Site Address	Little Manor Nursing Home, Manor Farm Road, Milford, Salisbury, SP1 2RS
Proposal	External and internal alterations/refurbishments of the historic part of a 24 bed residential care home. Demolition of the recent extensions to the rear, and construction of a Care Quality Commission (CQC) compliant replacement extension.
Applicant	Wessex Care Ltd
Town/Parish Council	Salisbury City Council
Electoral Division	Salisbury St Martins and Cathedral, Cllr S Hocking
Grid Ref	
Type of application	LBC (and associated 17/11250/FUL)
Case Officer	Mrs. Becky Jones

Reason for the application being considered by Committee:

Cllr. Hocking has called the application to committee to be determined if recommended for refusal by officers, on the following grounds:

- The impact on the listed building.

1. Purpose of Report

To consider the above application and the recommendation of the Area Development Manager that planning permission be refused.

2. Report Summary

The main planning issues to consider are:

1. Impact on the character and setting of the listed building.
2. Conclusion

The application in its original form generated 1 letter of support from Salisbury City Council.

3. Site Description and Proposal

Little Manor is a Grade II listed building. The applicant is proposing to:

- Demolish 2,136sqm of the red brick building erected in 1980 at the rear/west of the site.
- Provide a replacement rear wing extension to the listed building to increase capacity from 24 to 30 beds. Net additional gross internal floorspace of 751 sqm. 3 storeys with flat roof. Contemporary style with contrasting materials to each floor.
- Extension would have external walls finished in red brick at ground level, concrete block (flush joint with Bath stone colour) at first floor and concrete blockwork (raked joint) at second floor level. Painted timber doors and dark grey powder coated metal windows to extension. Directional angled bay windows to 1st and 2nd floor residents' rooms, with smaller of the two panes on each bay obscure glazed for privacy. Cassette type green roof with powder coated metal details.

- New red brick dwarf wall to enclose courtyard to front of period building. Reinstatement of wrought iron gates at pedestrian entry to main entrance
- Galvanised steel escape stairs with mesh enclosure
- Refurbishment works to existing original listed building using matching materials.

Documents submitted:

- Planning Statement – including background to Wessex Care nursing and residential homes
- Design and Access Statement
- Heritage Impact Assessment
- Care Accommodation Assessment
- Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment
- Ecological Appraisal - Bat and Nesting Bird Survey
- Schedule of Works to Listed Building

Planning History (a selection below from full list since 1949):

1949/3894 Change of use from dwellinghouse to guest home for aged people AC

1974/385 Nursing staff quarters Refused 26.6.74. Appeal allowed 29.8.75

76/847 Residential staff quarters AC 15.2.77

S/1987/0909 and 910 1st floor extension and internal alterations AC

S/1991/1496 Change of use from private dwelling (bungalow) to nursing accommodation. AC

S/1996/0607 and 0608 Alterations and extension to ground floor to provide individual bedrooms and bathroom AC

S2004/1359 and 1360 Addition of residential bed unit and ensuite. AC

4. National and Local Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Para 133, 134, 135 and the NPPG

Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS):

Core Policy 58: Ensuring the conservation of the historic environment

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 66: Special considerations affecting planning functions

5. Summary of consultation responses

Conservation: objection

Historic England: no comment

6. Publicity

The application was advertised by site notice, press advert and neighbour consultation.

7. Planning Considerations

Planning permission is required for the development. The applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. (Section 70(2) of the Town and Country planning Act and Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compensation Act 2004). The NPPF is also a significant material consideration and due weight should be given to the relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency of the framework. (Paragraph 215 at Annex 1).

7.1 Impact on the character and setting of the listed building.

The Little Manor is a Grade II listed building and the development would affect its curtilage and setting.

There is a duty placed on the local planning authority under section 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building and its setting.

Paragraphs 129, 132 and 134 of the NPPF state:

Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal

When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting.

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.

Public benefits may include heritage benefits, such as:

- sustaining or enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution of its setting
- reducing or removing risks to a heritage asset
- securing the optimum viable use of a heritage asset in support of its long term conservation

Core Policy 58 aims to ensure that Wiltshire's important monuments, sites and landscapes and areas of historic and built heritage significance are protected and enhanced in order that they continue to make an important contribution to Wiltshire's environment and quality of life. Heritage assets include listed buildings and conservation areas. 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.

The submitted Heritage Impact Assessment concludes:

3.1 Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 confers a strong presumption for development to preserve the setting of listed building, and the courts have reminded that this must be given considerable importance and weight in the planning balance. In exceptional cases, however, the presumption may be overridden in favour of development which is desirable on the grounds of public interest.

3.2 Aside from other potential public benefits that may accrue as a result of the development², there would be heritage benefits through the removal of the unsympathetic additions to the building and the restoration of the building's frontage.

3.3 However, it is acknowledged the proposals would result in some loss of spaciousness within the site that contributes to the setting and in turn the significance of the listed building.

3.4 Overall, however, the proposals would cause 'less than substantial harm' to the listed building under the terms of the NPPF. As such, and in accordance with paragraph 134 of that document, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposals, including rectifying some of the harmful interventions of the past while securing the building in its optimum viable use.

Historic England has made no comment on the proposal. The Conservation officer has stated:

Having now viewed my colleague's comments on the preapp submission, and made my own site visit (external only), I'm afraid that I'm of the opinion that none of the fundamental issues previously raised has been adequately addressed. Without doubt, while there are elements of heritage gain, or at least neutrality, with demolition of the garage and C20 extensions, the sheer scale of extension is much too ambitious for the site and its principal building. The listed building, despite its relatively poor quality extensions, is preeminent on the site and the extensions are very much secondary and partially obscured from view. The same cannot be said of the proposal, with a substantial three-storeyed cranked range occupying a footprint significantly more than double that of its host; even if reduced to two storeys, I consider that the scale of extension would be too great for the listed building. The D&A seems to demonstrate that nothing other than three-storeyed options were considered. The appearance of the extension does nothing to complement the site and seems to have been imposed irrespective of the existing character of the site and its surroundings.

Although there is a detailed 'Schedule of works to listed building', I can find nothing that assesses the heritage impact of the internal works to the historic core of the listed building. For instance, removal of the ensuite partition in room 2 (gd flr) would clearly be a benefit, but removal of masonry walls to the rear of room 3 and the kitchen appear to incur the permanent loss of original historic fabric. Mention is made of replacement windows, I think solely of the existing (presumably unauthorised) upvc windows; this is welcomed but we must see full details of these if consent is to be granted. The replacement dormers are fine (and appear only to replace C20 replacements), and the new steps to the front door entirely appropriate in materials and detail.

I consider that the proposed extension, by virtue of its height and footprint, would cause substantial harm to the character and setting of the listed building, contrary to section 16 and 66 of the Act and para 133 of the NPPF, and the aims of CP58; and that alterations to the

historic core of the listed building would cause 'less than substantial harm' and are inadequately justified in public benefit terms as per NPPF 134.

In conclusion, the proposed scheme is perceived to be very institutional in character and appearance, and although the existing buildings and extensions on the site are somewhat ramshackle in appearance, they have managed to retain the setting of the main building and are relatively unobtrusive within their surroundings and the streetscene. This is probably because they are mainly subservient, and of a simplistic, traditional design approach, with pitched roof details and matching brick and tile materials. This is a sentiment echoed by several third parties.

The proposed extension presents a very strident, contemporary design, which is more institutional in appearance and will create more prominent building than the existing listed building, particularly due to its different, perhaps discordant materials and colours, and its rather uniform scale and design. This would be at odds with the existing modest character of the listed building, to the detriment of its setting. The scale of the proposed building would not seem to reflect the simple, small scale of existing development in the immediate area. The existing outbuildings are simply designed, subservient and they manage to retain the setting of the main building. The proposals would impact on the predominantly modest residential nature of the area, the character of which contributes to the existing informal setting of the listed building.

For these reasons, officers consider that the proposal would therefore be contrary to CP57, CP58, the NPPF para 133 and S16 and 66 of the 1990 Act.

8.0 Conclusion

The proposal seeks to extend an existing nursing home, within the Salisbury settlement boundary and the development is acceptable in policy principle.

The development seeks to remove modern extension and then extend a Grade II listed building and make various internal and external alterations to the original building. The extension would create a 30 bed nursing home facility. Officers consider that the proposals would cause substantial harm to the setting of the listed building and that alterations to the historic core of the listed building would cause 'less than substantial harm' and are inadequately justified in public benefit terms as required by NPPF para 134.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. The development seeks to remove modern extensions and to extend and alter a Grade II listed building comprising a 24 bed nursing home. The proposed extension and alterations would add six new bedrooms and other facilities, to create a modern, 30 bed nursing home facility. The listed building, despite its relatively poor quality extensions, is pre-eminent on the site and the present extensions are very much secondary and partially obscured from view from Manor Farm Road. The proposed extension is a substantial three-storeyed cranked range occupying a footprint that is significantly disproportionate to its host.

Whilst there are some elements of heritage gain within the proposals (such as the proposed stairs to the front door) and neutrality by removing the poor quality modern extensions and refurbishment works to the original building, the alterations to the historic core of the listed building (such as removal of masonry walls to the rear of room 3 and the kitchen) appear to result in the loss of historic fabric and are

inadequately justified in public benefit terms as required by NPPF para 134.

Therefore, the proposed extension, by virtue of its overall design, height and footprint, would cause “substantial” harm to the character and setting of the listed building, contrary to section 16 and 66 of The 1990 Act and paragraph 133 of the NPPF and the aims of Wiltshire Core Strategy Core Policy 58; and alterations to the historic core of the listed building would cause “less than substantial” harm and are inadequately justified in public benefit terms, contrary to NPPF paragraph 134.