Planning Applications Committee: 09 April 2026

Updates to reports

Application no: 25/00714/L for Cotman House, 7 St Martin At Palace Plain
Item no: 4.2
Pages: 27-44

Addition to Paragraph 46:
In accordance with paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework, this harm must therefore be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. As the associated change of use has not been approved, no public benefits arise from the development to justify the harm identified. Consequently, the proposed internal alterations are unjustified and conflict with national policy for the conservation of heritage assets.

Update to / Replacement of Paragraph 55: Planning Balance and Conclusion.
In assessing the proposal, great weight has been given to the conservation of the Grade II* listed building. This statutory and policy duty applies irrespective of whether the level of harm identified amounts to substantial harm, total loss, or less than substantial harm.

The proposed internal works would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset, as identified by the consultation with the Conservation and Design officer. However, NPPF Paragraph 215 states that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset must require clear and convincing justification. In this instance, the internal alterations are directly associated with, and rely upon, the refused change of use of the building to a dwelling. Paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that where a development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, that harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. As the proposed change of use to a dwelling has been refused, no public benefits arise from the scheme.

As such, the proposal would result in unjustified harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, which is not outweighed by public benefits and fails to give appropriate weight to its conservation.

The development is therefore contrary to Section 16 of the NPPF and policy DM9 of the adopted local plan 2014.

Update to the reason for refusal.

Existing (officer's emphasis added):

The proposal fails to comply with local planning policy DM9, which requires the developers to preserve, enhance, or better reveal the significance of designated heritage assets, and **paragraphs 212-213 of the NPPF**, which require significant weight to be given to the conservation of listed buildings, and states that any level of harm must be clearly justified and outweighed by public benefits. As the refusal of full application 25/00713/F prevents any potential public benefit from being provided,

the application fails to meet the statutory duty under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and is also refused.

Updated (officer's emphasis added):

The proposal fails to comply with local planning policy DM9, which requires the developers to preserve, enhance, or better reveal the significance of designated heritage assets, and **paragraphs 212-213 and 215 of the NPPF**, which require significant weight to be given to the conservation of listed buildings, and states that any level of harm must be clearly justified and outweighed by public benefits. As the refusal of full application 25/00713/F prevents any potential public benefit from being provided, the application fails to meet the statutory duty under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and is also therefore refused.