

Schedule Of Planning Applications For Consideration

In The following Order:

Part 1) Applications Recommended For Refusal

Part 2) Applications Recommended for Approval

Part 3) Applications For The Observations of the Area Committee

With respect to the undermentioned planning applications responses from bodies consulted thereon and representations received from the public thereon constitute background papers with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985.

ABBREVIATIONS USED THROUGHOUT THE TEXT

AHEV	-	Area of High Ecological Value
AONB	-	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
CA	-	Conservation Area
CLA	-	County Land Agent
EHO	-	Environmental Health Officer
HDS	-	Head of Development Services
HPB	-	Housing Policy Boundary
HRA	-	Housing Restraint Area
LPA	-	Local Planning Authority
LB	-	Listed Building
NFHA	-	New Forest Heritage Area
PC	-	Parish Council
PPG	-	Planning Policy Guidance
SDLP	-	Salisbury District Local Plan
SLA	-	Special Landscape Area
SRA	-	Special Restraint Area
SWSP	-	South Wiltshire Structure Plan
TPO	-	Tree Preservation Order

LIST OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE SUBMITTED BEFORE THE
 FOLLOWING COMMITTEE
CITY AREA COMMITTEE 8th MARCH 2007

Note: This is a précis of the Committee report for use mainly prior to the Committee meeting and does not represent a notice of the decision

Item Page	Application No Officer Site Address Proposal	Parish/Ward Recommendation Ward Councillors
------------------	---	--

1.	S/2007/0057	ST MARTIN & MIL
4-9	Ms Jocelyn Sage	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
	<p>ARUNDELLS 59 THE CLOSE SALISBURY</p> <p>TEMPORARY CHANGE OF USE FOR 5 YEARS FROM PRIVATE DWELLING TO MIXED USE AS A PRIVATE DWELLING AND DWELLING OPEN (IN PART) TO THE PUBLIC. MINOR TEMPORARY ALTERATIONS INCLUDING FIRE DOORS, HANDRAIL AND RAILINGS. ERECTION OF NEW TICKET BOOTH/SHED.</p>	<p>CLLR HOWARTH CLLR TOMES</p>
2.	S/2006/1872	ST MARTIN & MIL
10-14	Mrs B Jones	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
SV	<p>NORTH CANONRY 60 THE CLOSE SALISBURY</p> <p>STONE CLEANING TO THE EAST ELEVATION</p>	<p>CLLR HOWARTH CLLR TOMES</p>
3.	S/2007/0058	ST MARTIN & MIL
15-18	Mrs B Jones	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
	<p>ARUNDELLS 59 THE CLOSE SALISBURY</p> <p>MINOR TEMPORARY ALTERATIONS INCLUDING FIRE DOORS, HANDRAIL AND RAILINGS</p>	<p>CLLR HOWARTH CLLR TOMES</p>

Part 1
Applications recommended for Refusal

No Refusals.

Part 2

Applications recommended for Approval

1

Application Number:	S/2007/0057		
Applicant/ Agent:	MR ANTHONY FORTESCUE, FOWLER FORTESCUE		
Location:	ARUNDELLS 59 THE CLOSE SALISBURY SP1 2EN		
Proposal:	TEMPORARY CHANGE OF USE FOR 5 YEARS FROM PRIVATE DWELLING TO MIXED USE AS A PRIVATE DWELLING AND DWELLING OPEN (IN PART) TO THE PUBLIC. MINOR TEMPORARY ALTERATIONS INCLUDING FIRE DOORS, HANDRAIL AND RAILINGS. ERECTION OF NEW TICKET BOOTH/SHED.		
Parish/ Ward	ST MARTIN & MIL		
Conservation Area:	SALISBURY	LB Grade:	II*
Date Valid:	11 January 2007	Expiry Date	8 March 2007
Case Officer:	Mrs B Jones	Contact Number:	01722 434388

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor Tomes has requested that this item be determined by Committee due to: the controversial nature of the application.

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The site is the Grade II* listed building known as Arundells, 59 The Close, and is well known locally as the former home of Sir. Edward Heath (deceased). The house is set in large grounds, set back from The Close by a long driveway with gates and railings. A small shrub area lies behind the railings at the front of the property. The site lies in a Housing Restraint Area, within the Salisbury Central Area and Conservation Area, in an Area of Special Archaeological Significance.

THE PROPOSAL

The applicants (Trustees of the Sir Edward Heath Foundation) are seeking to partially change the use of the residential property, to enable access to visiting members of the public to the ground floor of the house and the grounds. Permission is sought for a temporary period of 5 years only, to enable The Trust to gauge likely demand from visitors. Pedestrian access would be from The Close. Essential physical changes required for the public access are:
 a removable access ramp for the front door (not attached to the listed building and to be removed and put inside each day),
 six new fire doors in accordance with the Fire Safety Strategy by CS Todd Associates,
 a pedestrian hand rail and railings for the steps at the terrace to the rear,
 erection of a ticket booth (shed). The booth would be located within the shrubbery in the same location as the original Police Hut from 1985 –1990. No refreshment or wc facilities are proposed.

PLANNING HISTORY

1985/1256 Police Security Hut

Withdrawn

The above hut was proposed in the same location as the current scheme, but the planting did not apparently exist. Documents on file state that the siting was acceptable to the LPA in principle, but the application was withdrawn due to objections from EH and the LPA regarding colour and materials, and the lack of plant screening next to the railings.

CONSULTATIONS

Tourism - Support: Arundells is potentially a very important tourist attraction and opening it up to the public would help to raise the profile of Salisbury and South Wiltshire generally. The Tourism Strategy for South Wiltshire highlights the need to develop enhance and add to visitor attractions in the area, and the Arundells proposal would help to achieve this objective.

WCC Highways - No objection
English Heritage - Amended and additional plans requested. (See below)
Conservation - Amended and additional plans requested. (See below)
Environment Agency - No response received

Salisbury Civic Society No objections to principle of opening to public. Better to avoid return of a shed type structure at the front is possible. More supporting information and justification required for this. Are there alternatives to the use of fire doors?

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	Yes	Expiry 8/2/07
Site Notice displayed	Yes	Expiry 8/2/07
Departure	No	
Neighbour notification	Yes	Expiry 1/2/07
Third Party responses	Yes	16 Letters of objection on the following grounds:

Alteration of character of The Close away from residential to detriment of its unspoilt and peaceful character and setting for Cathedral, limit to the number of visitor attractions that can be sustained – already museums, NT property, offices and schools increased impact on traffic and parking, house is not outstanding and little interest likely to be generated, no toilets, noise, litter, commercial use of house is inappropriate, two year permission only, should display Sir Edward Heath's possessions in one of the museums, alterations required would diminish the house, loss of privacy, drop in demand for attractions, loss of family accommodation.

and **2 letters of support** for temporary use, provided additional parking is prevented in West Walk, and beneficial impact on other attractions in The Close.

Transport 2000 Too many cars in the Close, High Street Gate is of safety concern, publicity for Arundells should not mention car parking in the Close, reduce entrance fees for those arriving by public transport.

Note from HDS. The tourist marketing of the property and entrance fees are not material land use planning considerations for this application.

Salisbury Cathedral No objection in principle, but wish to work together with applicants to resolve issues around parking, toilets, blue badge parking, signage and visitor numbers.

Note from HDS - The agent has responded by letter to the Cathedral's queries. For example, the Cathedral suggests use of Park and Ride or a city car park and shared use of disabled bays, which are both endorsed by the Trust.

MAIN ISSUES

Principle of change of use
Impact on neighbours
Highway and pedestrian safety
Impact on Grade 2* listed building

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted SDLP policies G2, H19, CN8, T1, CN3, CN4, CN5, and the guidance in PPG15

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

1. Principle of change of use

The site is located within the Cathedral Close, which comprises dwellings, and a mixture of other uses including the Cathedral, museums, Mompesson House (National Trust) the Medieval Hall, schools and college. The dwelling would be retained primarily in residential use, but permission is sought to enable visiting members of the public to access the ground floor and grounds. Policy T1 states that the development of new tourist attractions or facilities or the improvement of existing tourist attractions or facilities, will be permitted within the physical limits of settlements. The principle of the change of use to provide public access as a visitor attraction is therefore acceptable under Policy T1, subject to the amenity and conservation policies of the local plan.

2. Impact on neighbouring amenities

Sixteen letters of objection have been received to the proposal. The main objections raised hinge around potential increased disturbance in The Close, loss of quiet enjoyment, and impact on parking/traffic (see highway safety below).

Policy G2 seeks to ensure that the amenities of neighbouring occupiers are not *unduly* disturbed by new development. There are already a number of visitor attractions in The Close, including the Cathedral itself, which is the main generator of visitor movements in the vicinity. It is logical that visitors to the Cathedral would make linked trips to other attractions in The Close during their visit, including Arundells, but individual small attractions on their own are *unlikely* to become a main generator of visitors. On this basis, it is unlikely that Arundells would, on its own, cause a significant increase in overall visitor numbers to The Close, but would enhance the existing visitor experience for people once they have arrived and have visited the Cathedral.

Arundells is set back within its own grounds, and is a detached building. It is therefore unlikely that adjoining properties would experience undue noise disturbance or overlooking from pedestrian visitors to any greater degree than if this large house were in full and active private residential use by a family (taking into account daytime and evening activities, visitors etc). As refreshments are not being served on the premises, people are unlikely to linger in the grounds to eat or drink.

Some third parties are concerned that the residential character of The Close would be diminished by the change of use, and that the building should remain entirely in residential use. However, this view would run counter to the principle of tourism policies of the SDLP, which seek to develop and improve existing tourist attractions within settlements. Therefore, a change in balance of uses in The Close away from residential could not be supported as a reason for refusal on its own.

Issues surrounding traffic and pedestrian safety are discussed below. Therefore, for the reasons given, officers do not consider that the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in The Close would be sufficiently disturbed by the proposal to warrant refusal under Policy G2.

3. Highway and Pedestrian Safety

The applicants have indicated their willingness to work with the Cathedral to ensure visitors use alternative means of transport other than the private car. Park and Ride and city centre car parks are suggested alternatives, as no visitor parking would be made available within the curtilage of Arundells. The Cathedral has indicated willingness to work with the Trustees to share blue badge spaces for disabled visitors.

For the reasons set out previously, it is considered unlikely that Arundells would become a primary generator of visitor trips to The Close, and is more likely to share visitors who are already visiting the Cathedral. Therefore, it is also unlikely that Arundells would generate significant new demand for parking in The Close. The Highway Authority has raised no objections to the proposals, in accordance with Policy G2.

4. Impact on the Grade 2* Listed Building

Policy CN3 sets out the criteria for development that would affect the character or setting of a listed building, and Policy CN4 sets out the criteria for the change of use of listed buildings in Conservation Areas, which will be permitted if:

- i) It contributes towards the retention of such buildings without adversely affecting their character, setting, or structural integrity and
- ii) It does not give rise to harmful effects on the general environment of the area.

Policy CN5 states that development within or outside the curtilage of a listed building will only be permitted where it does not harm the character or setting of the building concerned.

Criteria (ii) of CN4 has been discussed above. The scheme has been subject to some amendments to and clarification by the applicants, to ensure that the changes proposed are necessary for the change of use and could not be fulfilled in some other way.

English Heritage have offered general comments to date and whilst urging the LPA to address the issues raised, recommend that the application is determined in accordance with national and local policies. And on the basis of advice from the Conservation Officer.

The Conservation Officer has requested amended plans for the proposed handrail on the rear terrace it is felt that the handrail is of a design and materials that would not adversely affect the character of the listed building but the main concern is the potential damage to the steps in installing the balustrade. The applicant has been advised to reduce the number of balusters to reduce this impact.

New fire doors – there are no concerns regarding the replacement of doors FD2-4 as these are existing flush fitting doors. With regards to the new door FD1, it is felt that a flush fitting door here would not respect the historic context, and it has been suggested to the applicant that a simply paneled door would be more suitable. The Conservation officer has concerns regarding the replacement of FD5 (boiler room door), as this is an original plank door of some interest and has requested whether the internal lobby could be reconsidered. She is also concerned about the replacement of FD6 (bottom of main staircase), particularly given its prominent position within the house, and has asked whether in some way the door could be upgraded, e.g. intumescent paint or paper, or else further fire detection measures introduced in this area in order to prevent its removal.

With regard to the ticket booth, whilst further explanation has been provided for the location of the ticket booth, there is still no information about its relative height with the front boundary wall/railings, and therefore its impact on views from the Close cannot be fully understood. A cross section through the wall/railings and ticket booth would help to demonstrate this and has been requested.

Members will be updated through late correspondence regarding the updated views of the Conservation Officer, and English Heritage, following receipt of the above information.

CONCLUSION

The proposed change of use of Arundells, which is sited within the Cathedral Close, to enable visiting members of the public to the ground floor and grounds would be in accordance with the tourism policies of the Salisbury District Local Plan, and is unlikely to cause undue disturbance to existing amenities, or create highway safety issues. The impact on the character and setting of the listed building is subject to further consideration following receipt of amended plans, and Members will be updated at the meeting.

RECOMMENDATION:

Subject to receipt of satisfactory amended plans and details, and there being no objection from the Conservation Officer and English Heritage on the grounds of harm to the character or setting of the listed building:

APPROVE

Reasons for approval

The proposal seeks the temporary change of use of Arundells to enable members of the public to visit the ground floor and gardens. The building is sited within The Close, and is a Grade 2* listed building. The proposal would be in accordance with the adopted policy context of the Salisbury District Local Plan, and is unlikely to cause undue disturbance to existing amenities, or create highway safety issues, or harm the character or setting of the listed building.

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. (A07B)

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. AS amended by section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (0004 AMENDED)

2. The change of use hereby permitted shall cease and the building and land shall revert to its former use as a private residential dwelling, and the ticket booth hereby approved shall be removed, on or before 9th March 2012, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority upon submission of a planning application in that behalf. (V13A)

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to maintain control over the development.

3. The change of use hereby permitted shall not commence until Listed Building Consent has been issued for the installation of the pedestrian hand rail and railings, and installation of the internal fire doors.

Reason: In order to define the scope and extent of this planning permission, which does not operate as a grant of Listed Building Consent for the works associated with the change of use hereby approved.

4. Subject to comments from Conservation, further conditions relating to the listed building and ticket booth will be suggested in late correspondence. And in accordance with the following policy/policies of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan:

Policy G2	General Principles for Development
Policy H19	Housing Restraint Area
Policy T1	Tourism
Policy CN3, CN4, CN5	Listed Buildings
Policy CN8	Conservation Areas

and the guidance in PPG15

Part 3

Applications recommended for the Observations of the Area Committee

2

Application Number:	S/2006/1872		
Applicant/ Agent:	S LOCK		
Location:	NORTH CANONRY 60 THE CLOSE SALISBURY SP1 2EN		
Proposal:	STONE CLEANING TO THE EAST ELEVATION OF NORTH CANONRY		
Parish/ Ward	ST MARTIN & MIL		
Conservation Area:	SALISBURY	LB Grade:	II*
Date Valid:	8 September 2006	Expiry Date	3 November 2006
Case Officer:	Ms Jocelyn Sage	Contact Number:	01722 434387

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Contrary to statutory consultee's recommendation (English Heritage)

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The North Canonry is number 60 The Close. It is listed as The North Canonry and Coach House and is a grade II* listed building with a separately listed grade II garden. Originally one house, it is now divided into two residences (numbers 60 and 60a).

It is a flint and Chilmark stone house with thirteenth century origins but was rebuilt in the 16th and 17th centuries and was heavily restored (altered) by Sir Giles Gilbert Scott in the 19th century. It occupies a very prominent position in The Close as it sits hard up to the road (whereas most of the other houses are set back in their plots) and is opposite the west front of the Cathedral. Owing to its siting in relation to neighbouring buildings, and because of the uniqueness of the materials in this location (ie the flint work), this building is not 'read' with its neighbours (Arundells to the left and a modern block of flats to the right).

THE PROPOSAL

This application is for cleaning **areas** of Chilmark stonework on the front façade. The cleaning extends across the whole building ie including the Coach House element (60a - to the left of the entrance door) which is in separate ownership. Two cleaning methods are proposed for different areas of stonework on the front facade.

Firstly the **JOS system** which is essentially a wet, mild jet abrasive cleaning system, made suitable for conservation applications by a controllable low pressure vortex of air, water and granulate. This swirling action cleans away unwanted matter, it is chemical-free and environmentally friendly. The nature of the JOS system means that it can be

employed for use on extremely delicate areas such as intricate carvings and mouldings. This system is unsurpassed in its effectiveness and controllability when used for the removal of black sulphate skin from limestone. It is proposed to use the JOS system on the 'heavily soiled' areas of stonework ie the moulded stonework around the windows and doors.

The second system is a **water wash** under medium pressure with water alone being directed at the stonework. This cleaning is not for the removal of a sulphate skin but is for aesthetic reasons. The intention is to give a light clean to dirty areas of stonework adjacent to areas of cleaned (JOS) areas of stonework and where new stonework has been incorporated. The idea is to 'reduce' the difference between the two areas of stonework and to give a final more harmonious appearance.

The application also includes for the possibility of a sheltercoat. This is the application of a thin surface coating to all the cleaned and repaired stone. This is intended to slow down the effects of weathering on the surviving surfaces by providing a sacrificial layer which may be removed by direct rainfall or disruption by salt crystallisation activity associated with wetting and drying cycles. The shelter coat is a mix of water, fine lime and aggregate mix with casein and formalin.

In essence the applicant is proposing to clean areas of the stonework in the medium-term interests of the health of the stonework. However, because certain areas of stonework are being proposed for cleaning and there is a possibility that these cleaned areas (cleaned with the JOS system) will be visually very obvious, the application therefore includes for a light clean with water and the possible application of shelter coat to reduce the contrast between uncleaned and cleaned stone.

Finally, the application specifies where cleaning may be carried out, and by what system, but it is not prescriptive. For example, if the JOS cleaned stone does not stand out dramatically within the front façade, it may not be necessary to water wash – or only to clean more limited sections. In the same way, the application of a sheltercoat may not be necessary if the cleaned stonework does not look vulnerable enough to require a protective coat or there is no need to 'harmonise' the stonework across the front façade.

The application has been submitted by the architect acting for the owner. However, the specification for the works (submitted with the application) has been written by the two contractors who would undertake the work. This is because the specification is a technical document. The two contractors are a senior conservator at Salisbury Cathedral and a local stonemason and conservator. Both have considerable experience of similar work on high grade listed buildings (including the cathedral – work grant aided by English Heritage). In particular, both are very experienced in undertaking work to Chilmark stone.

PLANNING HISTORY

There have been three previous listed building consent applications in the recent past (ie since the house was purchased by the current owner at the beginning of 2006). The application numbers are S/2006/1165, S/2006/1166 and S/2006/1604. The applications covered various internal alterations to the house. None of these applications is relevant to the current application for stone cleaning. All three applications have been determined.

CONSULTATIONS

English Heritage – letter dated 6 February 2007

Precis of English Heritage's comments

The English Heritage letter accepts the need for some stone conservation but argues that the areas of decayed stone are small and that since the worst decay is on the central projecting bay, that the stone cleaning should be limited to this part of the elevation – and that only one cleaning 'system' should be used (they do not specify which). They do not consider the proposed cleaning of isolated features elsewhere on the elevation is justified on conservation grounds and that the cleaning of this area is likely to be detrimental to the appearance of the elevation as a whole, which is uniformly weathered and has a visual unity.

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement Yes – 12/10/2006
Site Notice displayed Yes – 12/10/2006
Departure No
Neighbour notification Yes – 4/10/2006
Third Party responses No
Parish Council response N/A

MAIN ISSUES

The main issues are whether it is necessary to clean the stonework in the interests of the health of the stonework. And secondly, to consider the visual impact the stone cleaning would potentially have, firstly on the character of the actual building, but also in relation to its setting and the relationship of this building with other buildings (including the cathedral) in The Close, part of the Salisbury Conservation Area.

POLICY CONTEXT

Policy CN3 (listed buildings) and policy CN8 (Conservation Areas).

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Whilst acknowledging English Heritage's views on this matter, the officer considers the approach to be very conservative and underestimates the extent and degree of decayed stonework on the front elevation (the left-hand side). The approach of the English Heritage architect is that only the very worst stonework should be repaired, and that only where there is a **very thick** build-up of sulphate skin should this be removed through cleaning (ie on the projecting bay). In addition, it has also become apparent that the English Heritage architect considers that repairs should be carried out in mortar (cement-based) rather than cutting out stone and replacing with newly carved Chilmark stone.

We believe that the architect underestimates the extent and rate of decay of the Chilmark stone to the left-hand side of the building and the rate of decay of the stonework as a consequence of this build-up of the sulphate skin. Whilst its condition is not as bad as that on the projecting bay, the stonework has suffered and will continue to suffer. There are clearly signs of stonework replacement (not mortar repairs) in the recent past (1960s?) and we take this, together with the existing decayed stonework – to be evidence that the sulphate skin is actively damaging the stonework and will continue to do so, possibly at an accelerated rate. We therefore consider that it is in the interests of the health of the stonework that the moulded stone is cleaned and that very decayed pieces of stone are replaced.

In terms of the visual appearance, we acknowledge that it is technically difficult to clean a building and it not be evident that the building has been cleaned. However, the

application allows for two cleaning techniques to enable the contractor to only use a light-clean where the issue is one of 'blending' with the JOS cleaned stonework rather than removing a sulphate-skin. English Heritage recommends only one clean (the JOS system) on the projecting bay – yet if the very decayed stone on the left-hand return of the bay is cleaned (photograph 17 of the report) but the stone on the lefthand side of the elevation is not, we believe the contrast will be dramatic and visually intrusive. In conclusion, we consider that a light clean (undertaken sensitively by an experienced contractor and closely controlled) will not result in a patchy-appearance but rather that a patchy appearance will result if the English Heritage approach of not cleaning the lefthand side of the building and also undertaking judicious mortar repairs to uncleaned moulded stone is pursued (as evidenced by historic stonework replacement on this part of the elevation).

In terms of mortar repairs versus new stonework, we consider that the replacement of decayed stone with new stone is a more 'honest' repair and is also better in terms of the longevity of the repair. A mortar repair is unlikely to 'survive' as long as a new piece of stonework. We are advised by the contractor (who is used to dealing with Chilmark stone) that, certainly in areas around the windows, it would be very difficult to achieve a long-lasting repair in mortar without removing almost all of the stone (which would negate the purpose of a mortar repair).

Finally, the English Heritage advice does not take into account practical and idiosyncratic issues. In no particular order: the owner has scaffolding erected to undertake repairs and this scaffolding could be used in order to clean the building; the owner is willing to undertake the repairs and cleaning at this point in time and has budgeted accordingly; the owner has the agreement of his neighbour and is willing to pay for the works to the lefthand side of the building (owned by his neighbour) in order to achieve a visually harmonious front elevation; and this building does look dirty (particularly the projecting elevation) when compared with the west front of the cathedral.

CONCLUSION

We consider that the cleaning of small areas of stonework on the main elevation of the building will be in the short and medium-term interests of the health of the stonework and therefore in the overall interests of the historic fabric of the building. It is our view that the proposal to clean only certain areas of stone will ensure that the minimum cleaning is undertaken and, that the employment of two cleaning systems and the option of the application of a sheltercoat, will help to ensure that the end result is a sensitively cleaned building but not one that has been over-cleaned.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Secretary of State be advised that Salisbury District Council is minded to APPROVE the application for the following reason:

The proposed alterations would have no adverse effect upon the character of the listed building or the character of the Salisbury Conservaiton Area,

And subject to the following conditions:

- (1) The development for which permission is hereby granted must be commenced not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission. (Z01B)
- (2) Before any extensive cleaning is undertaken, a sample area of stonework (location and dimensions to be agreed) must be cleaned for the consideration and approval of the local planning authority before the cleaning proceeds on site.

(3) Once the cleaning and stonework repairs have been completed, the applicant should contact the local planning authority to discuss whether a sheltercoat should be applied to areas of stonework. A specification for the application of a sheltercoat should be submitted to the local planning authority for approval prior to its application.

The reasons for the above Conditions are listed below:

- (1) To comply with the provisions of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- (2) To ensure that only the minimum cleaning is undertaken.
- (3) To ensure that a sheltercoat is applied appropriately and that the specification is acceptable.

INFORMATIVE

And in accordance with the following policies of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan:

Policy CN3 Purpose - to protect the historic character and fabric of listed buildings
Policy CN8 Purpose - to preserve or enhance the character of the Salisbury Conservation Area.

Conservation - Amended and additional plans requested. (See below)

Salisbury Civic Society No objections to principle of opening to public. Better to avoid return of a shed type structure at the front is possible. More supporting information and justification required for this. Are there alternatives to the use of fire doors?

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	Yes	Expiry 8/2/07
Site Notice displayed	Yes	Expiry 8/2/07
Departure	No	
Neighbour notification	Yes	Expiry 1/2/07
Third Party responses	Yes	16 letters of objection and 2 of support to the change of use application. Points raised of relevance to this listed building application include:

Alterations required would diminish the house.

MAIN ISSUES

Impact on Grade 2* listed building

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted SDLP policies CN3, CN4, CN5 and the guidance in PPG15

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

1. Impact on the Grade 2* Listed Building

Policy CN3 sets out the criteria for development that would affect the character or setting of a listed building, and Policy CN4 sets out the criteria for the change of use of listed buildings in Conservation Areas, which will be permitted if:

- i) It contributes towards the retention of such buildings without adversely affecting their character, setting, or structural integrity and
- ii) It does not give rise to harmful effects on the general environment of the area.

Policy CN5 states that development within or outside the curtilage of a listed building will only be permitted where it does not harm the character or setting of the building concerned.

Criteria (ii) of CN4 has been discussed above. The scheme has been subject to some amendments to and clarification by the applicants, to ensure that the changes proposed are necessary for the change of use and could not be fulfilled in some other way.

English Heritage have offered general comments to date and whilst urging the LPA to address the issues raised, recommend that the application is determined in accordance with national and local policies. And on the basis of advice from the Conservation Officer.

The Conservation Officer has requested amended plans for the proposed handrail on the rear terrace it is felt that the handrail is of a design and materials that would not adversely affect the character of the listed building but the main concern is the potential damage to the steps in installing the balustrade. The applicant has been advised to reduce the number of balusters to reduce this impact.

New fire doors – there are no concerns regarding the replacement of doors FD2-4 as these are existing flush fitting doors. With regards to the new door FD1, it is felt that a flush fitting door here would not respect the historic context, and it has been suggested to the applicant that a simply paneled door would be more suitable. The Conservation officer has concerns regarding the replacement of FD5 (boiler room door), as this is an original plank door of some interest and has requested whether the internal lobby could be reconsidered. She is also concerned about the replacement of FD6 (bottom of main staircase), particularly given its prominent position within the house, and has asked whether in some way the door could be upgraded, e.g. intumescent paint or paper, or else further fire detection measures introduced in this area in order to prevent its removal.

With regard to the ticket booth, whilst further explanation has been provided for the location of the ticket booth, there is still no information about its relative height with the front boundary wall/railings, and therefore its impact on views from the Close cannot be fully understood. A cross section through the wall/railings and ticket booth would help to demonstrate this and has been requested.

Members will be updated through late correspondence regarding the updated views of the Conservation Officer, and English Heritage, following receipt of the above information.

CONCLUSION

The proposal seeks to make certain physical alterations to Arundells to enable members of the public to visit the ground floor and gardens. The changes include installation of a handrail and railings, and fire doors. The building is a Grade 2* listed building. The impact on the character and setting of the listed building is subject to further consideration following receipt of amended plans, and Members will be updated at the meeting.

The application must be referred to the Secretary of State (GOSW) as the building is Grade 2* listed.

RECOMMENDATION:

That subject to receipt of satisfactory amended plans and details, and there being no objection from the Conservation Officer and English Heritage on the grounds of harm to the character or setting of the listed building, the application is referred to the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of State is informed that the District Council is minded to APPROVE the application, for the following reasons:

The proposal seeks to make certain physical alterations to Arundells to enable members of the public to visit the ground floor and gardens. The changes include installation of a handrail and railings, and fire doors. The building is a Grade 2* listed building. The proposal would be in accordance with the adopted policy context of the Salisbury District Local Plan, and is unlikely to harm the character or setting of the listed building.

And subject to the following conditions:

1. The development for which permission is hereby granted must be commenced not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission. (Z01B)

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 (4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. .0006 AMENDED

2. The building shall revert back to its former condition, the firedoors hereby permitted shall be removed and the original doors shall be reinstated, and the handrail and railings shall all be removed on or before 9th March 2012, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority upon submission of a listed building application in that behalf. (V13A)

Reason: In the interests of the character of the listed building, as the changes are approved on a temporary basis only.

3. Subject to comments from Conservation, further conditions relating to the listed building will be suggested in late correspondence.

And in accordance with the following policy/policies of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan:

Policy CN3, CN4, CN5 Listed Buildings
and the guidance in PPG15