

Report to Planning applications committee

Item

14 February 2019

Report of Head of planning services

Subject Application no 18/01205/F and 18/01206/L – Former Bethel Hospital, Bethel Street

4(i)

Reason for referral Objections

Ward:	Mancroft
Case officer	Katherine Brumpton katherinebrumpton@norwich.gov.uk

Development proposal		
Change of use from office to residential (Class C3) and associated alterations		
Representations (combined from both applications)		
Object	Comment	Support
14 representations received from 9 individuals/addresses	0	0

Main issues	Key considerations
1 Principle	Suitability of the unit as a dwelling
2 Design and Heritage	Impacts from the conversion on the Grade II* property
3 Amenity	Impact upon neighbours, particularly from the courtyard, and suitability of the unit for the future occupiers.
4 Transport	Lack of cycle store or bin store
5 Flood Risk	Use of basement as part of a dwelling
6 Landscaping	Use of landscaping to reduce impact upon neighbours and create a suitable scheme for the heritage asset.
Expiry date	18 February 2019
Recommendation	Approve

Please note that plans are not available at time of publication and will follow as a supplementary agenda

The site and surroundings

1. Bethel Hospital is located on Bethel Street, with Little Bethel Street located to the west and Theatre Street to the south. A former psychiatric hospital, it ceased use as a medical facility in the latter part of the twentieth century and by 1995 it had been sold. It is now in multiple ownerships, with residential use prevailing as the predominant use. Whilst some areas are fully renovated and converted, other areas are in need of renovation/repair.
2. This application seeks permission to convert to residential use a section of the building previously granted approval as an office (known as 45 Bethel Street). The section is located adjacent to Bethel Street and borders what is now known as Little Bethel Court. The property includes a ground floor area, basement and courtyard.
3. The property is currently a partially converted ground floor office with access to a courtyard and a basement.

Constraints

4. Bethel Hospital is Grade II* Listed
5. Conservation Area; Civic Character Area
6. Area of Main Archaeological Interest

Relevant planning history

7. There is an extensive planning history at the hospital, however the below are the applications directly relevant to the site in question.

Ref	Proposal	Decision	Date
04/00690/L	Internal and external alterations to central block to provide 7 residential units, management offices and offices.	Approved	04.01.2007
4/2002/0328	Internal & external alterations (revised proposal)	Approved	30.04.2003
4/2002/0349	Amendment to planning permission 4/1998/0038/F to provide one additional residential unit and managers office (total of seven residential units) - revised proposal.	Approved	14.03.2003

Ref	Proposal	Decision	Date
4/1997/0972	Internal and external alterations to building to facilitate conversion to 20 bedroom hotel, restaurant, offices and 9 residential units with office accommodation including erection of single storey extensions and insertion of additional windows and entrances. Demolition of single storey extensions in courtyard and single storey extension fronting Theatre Street	Approved	14.07.1999
4/1998/0038	Conversion of hospital to 20 bedroom hotel, restaurant, offices and 6 residential units with office accommodation including erection of single storey extensions and insertion of additional windows and entrance	Approved	27.05.1999

The proposal

8. The proposal is to convert 45 Bethel Street into a dwelling. The property would retain its access to a courtyard and a basement, which would both form part of the proposed dwelling. Internally, the proposal would install an alternative tread staircase to access the basement and utilise an existing pedestrian door to access the courtyard. The main access to the dwelling would be via a pedestrian door on to Bethel Street.
9. Following discussions amended plans were received which were re-advertised and reconsulted on. Notably the plans removed the provision of cycle and bike storage, changed the spiral staircase to an alternative tread staircase and included different indicative landscaping in the courtyard.

Summary information

Proposal	Key facts
Scale	
Total no. of dwellings	1
Total floorspace	57m²
No. of storeys	2 (Ground floor plus basement)
Transport matters	
No of car parking	0

spaces	
No of cycle parking spaces	0
Servicing arrangements	This site is considered appropriate to be served by bin bags.

Representations

10. Advertised on site and in the press. Adjacent and neighbouring properties have been notified in writing. 11 letters of representation have been received citing the issues as summarised in the table below. All representations are available to view in full at <http://planning.norwich.gov.uk/online-applications/> by entering the application number.

Issues raised	Response
<p>Courtyard is inappropriate as a residential garden as it is surrounded by 5 other dwellings, including GF main living areas and a GF bedroom window. One property has 4 windows serving one living room overlooking the courtyard, with the internal floor level higher than the courtyard. It would also;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • create overlooking, • increase noise levels, • create potential issues from anyone smoking in the garden (smell and fire risk), • raise concerns regarding security, • cause damage from any ball games etc played in the garden, and • impact property prices. <p>Privacy of new occupiers would not be sufficient either.</p> <p>Any screening planting would result in reducing the light reaching the adjacent rooms, which is already relatively low, and require maintenance.</p> <p>Conversion of the courtyard would ruin some of the aesthetic and integrity of a historic and very important building.</p> <p>Courtyard should be left as a neutral space with some landscaping, but not available as a garden.</p>	<p>See main issue 2 and 3.</p> <p>Property prices are not a material planning consideration.</p>

Issues raised	Response
<p>Freeholder (also the applicant) has not carried out the repairs required by him by the Repairs Notice served to him in February 2018. He has also not developed other sites in accordance with planning permissions. As such the applicant can't be trusted to carry out the work, if approved, correctly. Condition should be added that requires applicant to finish all works at Bethel Hospital.</p>	<p>This application is just for the part of the hospital within the red-line area on the site plan (45 Bethel Street). It is not appropriate to add conditions regarding the areas of the building that are not affected by the proposals that are subject of the application. To do so would be ultra vires (beyond the scope of planning) and would also fail the tests for a condition set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>In addition, the repairs notice was in draft and does not compel any party to do works at this stage. Notwithstanding this, the applicant is making considerable progress on repairs (both internal and external) to the fabric of other parts of the building in his ownership.</p>
<p>Proposed bin store is unsuitable; area is a kitchen extension and inappropriate for a bin store, it would create a fire and health and safety risk.</p>	<p>This has been removed from the proposal.</p>
<p>Proposed cycle store is unsuitable; block access to no.33</p>	<p>This has been removed from the proposal.</p>
<p>Concerns regarding the noise impact from the building work.</p>	<p>This is largely considered to be outside of the planning remit, with Environmental Protection possessing powers to deal with any noise nuisances. However given the density and number of existing residential neighbours it is considered appropriate to add an informative regarding construction hours amongst other issues. The developer will be advised that works that are audible beyond the site boundary should be limited to between 7.30am and 5.30pm Monday to Friday, 7.30am and 1pm on Saturdays and none on Sundays.</p>
<p>The basement is served by one staircase – this would seem to be a fire risk.</p>	<p>See main issue 5.</p>

Issues raised	Response
Concerns that any development would prevent access to install scaffolding within the courtyard which is needed to undertake repairs etc. to other properties.	The proposal would not impact any existing legal agreements in place. It is understood that a window overlooking the courtyard serving a communal hallway is removable, and provides a means to access the courtyard.

11. In addition Councillor Jo Smith has written in, raising the following points;

- a) The courtyard has several windows directly opening into it serving neighbouring dwellings. Providing access to the courtyard to any future residents would result in a terrible invasion of privacy, regardless of any mitigation. Neighbours could use curtains to maintain some privacy but this would lead to a loss of light.
- b) Noise from use of the courtyard as a garden could impact the neighbours at any point of the day. The courtyard could also be used to smoke in.
- c) Security of the neighbour's windows is of concern.

12. Her letter is included within the total count above.

Consultation responses

13. Consultation responses are summarised below the full responses are available to view at <http://planning.norwich.gov.uk/online-applications/> by entering the application number.

City wide

14. Refuse is collected from existing neighbouring properties via plastic bags. The proposed dwelling can use the same arrangements.

Highways (local)

15. *Original Plans*

16. No objection. The dwelling would not be entitled to on-street parking permits. Bin and cycle storage seem satisfactory in principle, although further details would be needed.

17. *Revised Plans*

18. As a constrained site cycle provision could be omitted from the application at the Planning Officer's discretion. If refuse is collection via plastic bags this is at the discretion of Citywide.

Historic England

19. *Original Plans*

20. Bethel Hospital is of considerable architectural and historic interest; it was the first purpose built psychiatric hospital in 1713. The original building still survives, with extensive later buildings/extensions added during the 18th and 19th centuries.
21. The area which forms the subject of this application is part of a 19th Century range. The Conservation Management Plan identifies this section as less significant, but it has value as part of the complex as a whole.
22. Note that the application states that the conversion of the site to an office and introduction of an internal spiral staircase to the basement is part of an extant permission. However we understand that Norwich City Council (NCC) questions if this permission is extant; this matter, together with the suitability of the unit as a dwelling, is left to NCC.
23. Historic England (HE) are concerned about the condition of Bethel Hospital, which has been on HE's Heritage at Risk Register for many years. The application site is unoccupied and therefore we are keen to see the building repaired and occupied and in principle would not object to either an office or residential use.
24. Assuming that the spiral staircase is covered by a previous application there are few other alterations. The 1990s stud walls are to remain, which have little value. The internal alterations would not harm the historic significance of the building.
25. However the staircase would be better amended to reduce the impact upon the interior, e.g. replaced with a trap door which would have a smaller footprint. The bench surrounding the sun pipe would be better removed from the scheme.
26. The proposed lining of the basement would potentially mask and exacerbate any problems with dampness and is inappropriate. A breathable finish could be appropriate.
27. The NPPF has the protection and enhancement of the historic environment as an overarching objective. Where developments could result in harm, clear and convincing justification should be made for any such harm and "great weight" should be given to the conservation of listed buildings.
28. Accept the principle of residential in this section of the hospital but consider that the proposal could result in harm to the significance of the listed building due to the installation of the spiral staircase and tanking of the basement.

29. *Revised Plans*

30. Pleased that the revised staircase is more economical.
31. Note that the use of the courtyard could affect the character of the space but are pleased to see the bench design has been simplified; this should be the most minimal feature possible.
32. The basement should not be tanked; a breathable finish could be appropriate but this needs to be established, potentially via a condition.
33. The overall intention of creating residential accommodation in the eastern part of Bethel Hospital is supported; however concerns remain regarding the proposed tanking of the basement. If the Council supports the proposal in principle the sunpipe

housing should be made as minimal as possible and details of how the dampness in the basement could be addressed using a breathable system secured by condition.

Assessment of planning considerations

Relevant development plan policies

34. **Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk adopted March 2011 amendments adopted Jan. 2014 (JCS)**
- JCS1 Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
 - JCS2 Promoting good design
 - JCS3 Energy and water
 - JCS4 Housing delivery
 - JCS9 Strategy for growth in the Norwich policy area
 - JCS11 Norwich city centre
 - JCS12 The remainder of the Norwich urban area including the fringe parishes
35. **Norwich Development Management Policies Local Plan adopted Dec. 2014 (DM Plan)**
- DM1 Achieving and delivering sustainable development
 - DM2 Ensuring satisfactory living and working conditions
 - DM3 Delivering high quality design
 - DM6 Protecting and enhancing the natural environment
 - DM9 Safeguarding Norwich's heritage
 - DM12 Ensuring well-planned housing development
 - DM18 Promoting and supporting centres
 - DM28 Encouraging sustainable travel
 - DM32 Encouraging car free and low car housing

Other material considerations

36. **Relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework July 2018 (NPPF):**
- NPPF2 Achieving sustainable development
 - NPPF4 Decision-making
 - NPPF5 Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
 - NPPF7 Ensuring the vitality of town centres
 - NPPF8 Promoting healthy and safe communities
 - NPPF9 Promoting sustainable transport
 - NPPF11 Making effective use of land
 - NPPF12 Achieving well-designed places
 - NPPF14 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
 - NPPF15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
 - NPPF16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment
37. **Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)**
- Trees, development and landscape SPD adopted 2016

Case Assessment

38. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Relevant development plan policies are detailed above. Material considerations include policies in the National Planning Framework (NPPF), the Councils standing duties, other policy documents and guidance detailed above and any other matters referred to specifically in the assessment below. The following paragraphs provide an assessment of the main planning issues in this case against relevant policies and material considerations.

Main issue 1: Principle of development

39. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs – JCS4, DM12, NPPF paragraphs 11 and 59.
40. DM12 sets out where residential dwellings are considered acceptable in principle. The site is not within an area that would prohibit residential use, and therefore the suitability of the development now needs to be considered under criteria detailed under DM12, in addition to other policies.
41. The proposed is considered against this criteria as follows;
- a) Will not compromise the delivery of wider regeneration proposals – The proposal does not and would serve to bring back into beneficial use a part of a nationally significant listed building that is currently on the ‘At Risk’ register;
 - b) Will not have any detrimental impacts upon the character and amenity of the surrounding area – See Main Issues 2 and 3 below;
 - c) Will contribute to achieving a diverse mix of uses within the locality - The introduction of an additional residential unit into the city centre will help support the areas vibrancy and vitality;
 - d) Will provide for a mix of dwelling sizes - The site is relatively small and would provide one additional dwellings within a primarily residential area. More units could not practically be provided in the red-line area. It would help to diversify the size of units within the Bethel Hospital complex as existing dwellings are larger;
 - e) Proposals should achieve a density in keeping with the character and function of the area - The density responds to the restrictions of the existing building; and
 - f) For all proposals involving the construction of 10 or more dwellings, at least 10% will be built to Lifetime Homes standard - The proposal is for less than 10 dwellings so this point is not applicable.

Main issue 2: Design and Heritage

42. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs – JCS2, DM3, DM9, NPPF paragraphs 124-132 and 184-202.
43. Bethel Hospital was opened in 1713, and since then several extensions have been added. As such the building varies in age and significance, although it falls under the same listing. A comprehensive Bethel Hospital Conservation Management Plan (CMP) was commissioned by Historic England and published in 2016. A copy can be obtained from Norwich City Council’s website;

44. 45 Bethel Street is part of the Boardman range extension along Bethel Street, which was constructed in 1899. The basement is slightly older, dating from 1881-1893. Internally the unit includes one wall which dates from 1881-1893, with the other walls being much newer, dating from 1992 to the present day. The south-eastern wall does however date from earlier, as it also serves the main entrance hall (1757-1830).
45. The proposal would restore the south - eastern wall, which at the moment has a gap in for a door linked to an older permission. The section of wall dating from 1881-1893 would be retained. The 1990 walls would also remain largely unaltered.
46. The significance of this part of Bethel Street is assessed as medium overall, however the principal elevation, fronting Bethel Street, together with the units' south-eastern wall is assessed as being of High Significance.
47. The CMP also reviewed the condition of the building, and 45 Bethel Street has been noted as requiring works within the next 1-3 years. At the time of the site inspection some restoration works were under way. However, the unguarded access to the basement remains, and some works such as plastering and restoring the floors and joinery remain uncompleted.
48. The proposed development would result in the renovation of 45 Bethel Street and the completion of the works identified within the CMP. Other physical alterations include the installation of a staircase to the basement, alterations to the basement to make it suitable for use and landscaping to the courtyard. The original plans included tanking of the basement. Windows and the external door would be retained. The current internal doors are modern additions, and it is understood that any additional doors required will match these.
49. The original plans indicated a large spiral staircase located to the south-east of a staircase. Following concerns raised regarding this proposal an alternative staircase is proposed, which is an alternative tread staircase and therefore much smaller. This would result in the loss of less historic fabric and a reduced impact upon the living area, and is therefore supported as an alternative way to access the basement, which is currently only served by the unguarded access. Although it does not feature within the CMP due to no access being available at the time, the basement appears to suffer from dampness and is therefore in need of works to remedy this. The proposed staircase would provide access to this floor and consequently its repair as part of the development.
50. As part of the renovation of the basement a sunpipe is proposed, which would run into the courtyard. The sunpipe is shown within the indicative landscaping as being boarded by a raised bench seat made from bricks. The sunpipe and seating are considered to be unfortunate, with the seating area especially anticipated to negatively impact the character and usability of the courtyard. This has been raised with the agent, and although the revised plans did not alter this part of the scheme it is understood that the applicant would be amenable to agree the details of the sunpipe and landscaping under a condition. The courtyard housing of the sunpipe should be made as minimal as possible.

51. The NPPF states that clear and convincing justification should be made for any harm caused to the historic environment as a result of development, and that 'great weight' should be given to the conservation of listed buildings irrespective of the level of harm caused (paragraphs 193 and 194). Harm could be caused if the basement was inappropriately tanked, and if an inappropriate housing and seating was installed around the proposed sunpipe. However, following discussions with the applicant the details regarding these aspects are to be agreed via condition and the applicant is happy to amend the proposals accordingly.
52. With suitable conditions the impact upon the historic fabric is considered acceptable. The conditions will include; requesting further details of the basement treatment, details of the sunpipe, submission of a landscaping scheme and submission of a finishing schedule.

Main issue 3: Amenity

53. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs – DM2, DM11, NPPF paragraphs 8 and 127.
54. *Future Occupiers*
55. The proposed dwelling is relatively small, however the size is limited by the size of the unit, and there is no clear way to extend. As discussed above a significant part of Bethel Hospital is already in residential use and so an additional residential use is considered to be acceptable in principle.
56. A 1 bedroom 2 storey dwelling under the nationally described space standards should include 58m² of floor space. In total the unit would provide 57m², broken down into 29.35m² at ground floor and 27.65m² in the basement. DM2 advises that these standards should be met in the majority of cases, however where there are exceptional conservation or regeneration benefits there may be some scope to relax them. Whilst the basement is shown as storage, with the proposed sunpipe installed and appropriate treatment given to the walls and floor, the southern section especially would be suitable for use as additional living accommodation, such as a snug/additional living room.
57. It is acknowledged that the size of the proposed unit is relatively small; however there is no practicable way of enlarging it. Weight is also given to the benefits that would occur from the scheme in terms of conserving and regenerating this part of the hospital.
58. *Neighbours*
59. As above the use is considered acceptable in principle, and the immediate neighbours are all residential. The impact upon neighbours from the use of the internal space is anticipated to be acceptable. There will be some additional noise generated from this unit being occupied, but this isn't anticipated to be significant and would be in keeping with a building that is primarily in residential use. Some overlooking would occur from the window facing into the courtyard, especially to windows directly opposite. However the windows opposite serve a hallway, and already experience some overlooking from other windows overlooking the courtyard.
60. The use of the courtyard as an amenity area will have a greater impact upon neighbours. However, although currently unoccupied, the current use of the unit is

considered to be an office, and it has access to the courtyard already. The application unit includes the only door into the courtyard. As such the unit could be completed as an office and occupied without further permissions, and this would be likely to result in a more active use of the courtyard by office workers. The courtyard is currently unused because this unit is currently unused, although previous consents have been implemented.

61. Historically the courtyard was a service yard, accessed by the door within 45 Bethel Street. With part of the hospital already converted, this courtyard is now looked onto by several neighbouring residents over 3 floors. On the ground floor on the south-western elevation there are 3 windows facing into the courtyard; all of these serve a hallway belonging to 43 Bethel Street. On the north-western elevation there are 4 windows facing into the courtyard; all of these serve a living/dining area belonging to 9 Little Bethel Court. To the north-east there are the applicants own window and door, and a door serving a communal hallway. The north-eastern elevation is blank.
62. The windows on upper floors are likely to be impacted to some extent from the use of the courtyard as an amenity space. However this impact is anticipated to be acceptable; residents already experience noise from other neighbours. The change from a courtyard serving an office to a courtyard serving a small, one-bed residential unit is not considered to increase this impact significantly enough to make it unacceptable.
63. The impact upon 43 Bethel Street would not be to a part of the property used as a main living area. The concerns regarding overlooking could be mitigated against using blinds and/or frosted window films and this is not considered to be unreasonable within a conversion of this type.
64. 9 Bethel Street will be impacted more significantly, given that the affected windows are the only windows serving the main living area. Following discussions with the agent, amended plans include indicative landscaping of the courtyard that shows some plant screening stepped away from these windows. Screening stepped away would serve to create a visual barrier that would reduce any overlooking, and still enable a view from these windows. It is worth noting that the owners of the site could plant tall vegetation right up against neighbouring windows without any permission.
65. With a clever landscaping scheme the impact upon the neighbours, and particularly 9 Little Bethel Court, could be reduced sufficiently to enable the proposal to be considered acceptable.
66. Concerns regarding security are arguably already relevant as this courtyard is part of 45 Bethel Street and the neighbours do not have control over who goes into the courtyard.
67. An appropriate landscaping scheme would serve to provide some screening, especially for 9 Little Bethel Court. Reducing the access to all the ground floor windows would also be beneficial, and help to address the neighbours concern regarding security.

Main issue 4: Transport

68. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs – JCS6, DM28, DM30, DM31, NPPF paragraphs 8, 102-111.
69. The original plans included cycle and bike storage some distance from the proposed dwelling, in the south-eastern part of Bethel Hospital. There were concerns regarding this proposal relating to the distance, the bin store's capacity (the store is also linked to dwellings proposed under another application yet to be determined), the visual impact, and the impact upon neighbours.
70. Although not ideal, following discussions with Citywide Services regarding refuse collection and Highways regarding cycle storage, in this instance the removal of both elements from the scheme is considered desirable. The site is restricted by both its size and its heritage value and as such this is considered an exceptional circumstance where provision can be waived.
71. The amended plans therefore have removed both storages from the plan. There are several public cycle stores in the immediate vicinity which any future occupier can use, and refuse can be collected in sacks, as it currently is from neighbouring dwellings.
72. No car parking is provided, and this complies with the above DM policies in such a sustainable central location. There are ample public transport opportunities available nearby.

Main issue 5: Flood risk

73. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs – JCS1, DM5, NPPF paragraphs 155-165.
74. The site is not at risk from any type of flooding and is not within a critical drainage area. It is noted though that basements are inherently at a higher risk from flooding than other floors within dwellings, simply due to their nature. However a properly maintained basement and associated drainage system should prevent this from happening. The basement will need to be renovated as part of this development, as discussed above. Building regulations cover areas such as fire escape routes, ventilation, ceiling height, damp proofing, electrical wiring and water supplies. Therefore any issues regarding flooding and safety are considered to be covered under Building Regulations.

Main issue 6: Landscaping

75. Key policies and NPPF paragraphs – JCS2, DM3, NPPF paragraphs 8, 91, 96-101, 127.
76. As discussed above the proposal includes a courtyard. This was a service courtyard when the hospital was in its original use and as such is overlooked by several windows, although there is only one access door (from 45 Bethel Street).
77. Any hard landscaping here around the sunpipe should be as minimal as possible. The indicative landscaping shows a brick seat, however a more minimal arrangement would be considered more suitable. A Landscaping Scheme condition which requested these details is considered an acceptable way to achieve a more suitable design.

78. Discussions have been had with the agent regarding implementing a landscaping scheme which could help to alleviate the concerns of neighbours. This could include restricting access immediately adjacent to windows and providing some screening, especially to the north-west end in front of 9 Little Bethel Court. An indicative scheme was submitted as part of the amended plans. Although this goes some way to addressing the concerns more work would be needed to achieve an acceptable scheme. Again, this can be achieved via a Landscaping Scheme condition.

Compliance with other relevant development plan policies

79. A number of development plan policies include key targets for matters such as parking provision and energy efficiency. The table below indicates the outcome of the officer assessment in relation to these matters.

Requirement	Relevant policy	Compliance
Cycle storage	DM31	No
Car parking provision	DM31	Yes – none required
Refuse Storage/servicing	DM31	Yes – collection is considered acceptable here via plastic bags rather than bins
Water efficiency	JCS 1 & 3	Yes subject to condition
Sustainable urban drainage	DM3/5	Surface water is to be disposed of via existing pipes to the foul drainage. Whilst not ideal there is no reasonable prospect of installing any SuDs given the site constraints and location of a basement directly under the courtyard.

Equalities and diversity issues

80. There are no significant equality or diversity issues.

Local finance considerations

81. Under Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 the council is required when determining planning applications to have regard to any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application. Local finance considerations are defined as a government grant or the Community Infrastructure Levy.

82. Whether or not a local finance consideration is material to a particular decision will depend on whether it could help to make the development acceptable in planning terms. It would not be appropriate to make a decision on the potential for the development to raise money for a local authority.

83. In this case local finance considerations are not considered to be material to the case.

Conclusion

84. The proposal is considered acceptable in principle and would lead to the renovation of part of a nationally important Grade II* Listed Building that is currently on the 'Buildings at Risk' register. Any harm caused to the significance of the Listed Building can be mitigated by the use of appropriate conditions to secure details of the sun-pipe housing, damp treatment to the basement and landscaping of the courtyard.
85. There are some anticipated impacts upon neighbour's residential amenity however these can be mitigated against sufficiently to make the proposal acceptable. The development is therefore in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Development Plan, and it has been concluded that there are no material considerations that indicate it should be determined otherwise.

Recommendation

To approve application numbers 18/01205/F and 18/01206/L and grant planning permission and listed building consent subject to the following conditions:

18/01205/F

1. Standard time limit;
2. In accordance with plans;
3. Details of Landscape Scheme and management thereof;
4. Water efficiency;
5. Construction working hours;

18/01206/L

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans;
3. Details to be submitted (to include:- basement treatment, sun-pipe housing, details of infilling of doorway between G26 and G30; details of infilling of existing access to basement; new stair; cable runs and utilities installations)
4. Listed Building – making good

Article 35(2) Statement:

The local planning authority in making its decision has had due regard to paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the development plan, national planning policy and other material considerations. Following negotiations with the applicant and subsequent amendments the application is recommended for approval subject to appropriate conditions and for the reasons outlined in the officer report.