

# Planning Committee

Application Address	St Anns Hospital, 69 Haven Road, Poole, BH13 7LN
Proposal	Listed building application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of a hospital building comprising bedrooms with amenity space, communal, support and staff facilities, generator reconfiguration and associated works
Application Number	APP/23/00168/L
Applicant	NHS Dorset HealthCare University Foundation Trust
Agent	Savills
Ward and Ward Member(s)	Canford Cliffs Cllr Haines Cllr Challinor
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	<b>Grant in accordance with the details set out below for the reasons as set out in the report</b>
Reason for Referral to Planning Committee	Public interest and Part 3 (Responsibility for Functions), Section 2 (Planning Committee) Paragraphs 2.23. d) and f) of the Council's Constitution.
Case Officer	Piotr Kulik
Is the proposal EIA Development?	No

## Description of Proposal

1. This application seeks a listed building consent for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of a hospital building comprising bedrooms with amenity space, communal, support and staff facilities, generator reconfiguration and associated works
2. This application forms part of a wider development of the site where the NHS Trust aim to modernise the hospital site to improve overall conditions and standards expected for both staff and patients. It has been confirmed by the applicant that the existing hospital requires following works through its Capital Development Programme:
  - Transfer all inpatient accommodation out of the 1910 II\* listed building at St Ann's Hospital to meet Care Quality Commission directives;
  - Complete the Phase 2 development at the St Ann's Hospital site through the construction of 'Alternative New Build 2' ('Alternative NB2') facilitating the delivery of 7 bed male Psychiatric Intense Care Unit (PICU), a 6 bed female PICU and a 14 bed female Adult Mental Health Unit (AMH) (separate planning proposal);
  - Refurbish Haven Ward (a 1980s building's ground floor) to provide a minimum of 8 adult mental health beds and Health Based Place of Safety (HBPoS), and Alumhurst ward (1980s building first floor) to convert four dormitory style bedroom into single bedrooms and add three bedrooms to the male side (separate planning proposal).

- The works at St Ann's also include the conversion of a window to door at the Chine Ward to provide active level facilities for staff and crescent car parking reconfiguration works (separate planning proposal)

### **Description of Site and Surroundings**

3. The application site consists of two 2-storey existing buildings Kimmeridge Court and Pine Cottage, and a parking area comprising 24 spaces. It forms part of the St Ann's Hospital site. Kimmeridge Court is a purpose-built hospital building which provides inpatient eating disorders and adult mental illness services, whereas Pine Cottage appears of a residential nature and provides ancillary support space (used as a gym equipment storage).
4. St. Ann's hospital shares a vehicular access with Chaddesley Grange and a residential cul de sac (Chaddesley Pines) on the south side of Haven Road. The hospital site comprises a number of buildings set within a landscaped setting with the land sloping steeply both to the southeast and towards Flag Head Chine. The oldest building on site is a two/three storey Grade II\* listed hospital building to the south (rear) of the site next to a Crescent Parking which sits behind the hospital building. There are a number of other buildings within the site which lie within the curtilage of the listed building, some older whilst others are recent and more contemporary. Apart from a Grade II\* Listed Hospital Building, the other buildings on site are not listed but only sits within a curtilage of a Listed Building.
5. The Grade II\* listed building is to the southeast of the application site (St Anns Hospital Building), and newer buildings separate the listed building from the application site. This includes a Phase 1 building granted in 2011 under planning permission ref. APP/11/00154/FUL. The listing description is as follows:

*POOLE Canford Cliffs HAVEN ROAD (south east side) St Ann's Hospital*

*(Formerly listed as St Anne's Hospital)*

*05/10/88*

*II\* Hospital. 1909-12, with later C20 additions. By R Weir Schultz. Flemish bond brickwork, cross-axial stacks and tiled roof. Free Queen Anne style. Parallel curved ranges with central connecting blocks. Two storeys and attic, single-storey link block; 10:7:10 window range.*

*Entrance front has two storey central range with exterior gable stacks and forward curving single-storey side ranges; central porch with segmental arch and key dated 1910. Keyed flat arches over 6/6-pane sashes. Segmental-arched ridge cupola. Two storey and attic; 7:14:7 window range symmetrical garden front in three sections, the outer ranges set back and angled, and with cross ranges projecting one window deep with ogee gables. Gables have canted bays with pierced balcony parapets, single storey to the end gables and two storeys to the centre and flanking gables, which are linked by similar pierced balconies on square brick piers. 6/6/6-pane ground-floor and keyed 6/9-pane first-floor sashes, wide dormers with triple 4/4-pane sashes across the central section, and four round-gabled half dormers to the outer wings. These have wide carriage arches flanking the centre section with rusticated archivolt beneath first floor oculi. The interior courtyards have two three storey service towers with pyramidal roofs.*

*INTERIOR: panelled link blocks; light wells have decorative friezes, coffered ceilings, moulded beam soffits, and a fireplace in the dining room with shouldered lintel and Ionic column arcade.*

*One of Schultz's best buildings on a prominent cliff-top site, built as the seaside branch of the Holloway Sanatorium, Surrey.*

6. Recent developments from the 1980s are in varied styles though the largest complex including Haven Ward is in a sprawling cottage style with pitched roofs that knit the older cottages facing Haven Road and previously Chattersley Glen road with the cube line block from the millennium period built to house the modern entrance to the complex.
7. Attempts have been made to modernise the 1980s block with the more recent entrance by replacing windows in green frames with dark grey frames though this work is incomplete.

8. The interior of the listed hospital was sensitively renovated in recent years.
9. The site is subject to tree preservation order TPO 43/1999 (November 1999), which was subsequently varied in 2002.

### **Relevant Planning History**

10. The site has extensive planning history; with only the following being considered relevant to this proposal.
11. **2011: APP/11/00154/FUL** - Erect two 2-storey (plus plant storey) buildings on site to accommodate a 32 bed long stay ward, 16 bed male treatment ward & 14 bed AAU ward. Provision of a new combined entrance to, & extension of, the existing 1980's building. Demolition of the 1970's block, Pine Cottage & Kimmeridge Court, repair to the west end of the Listed Building, replacement of existing metal staircase & alterations to existing reception counter. Associated car & cycle parking & landscape. Creation of new pedestrian access from Haven Road - Approved
12. **2011: APP/11/00155/L** – Listed Building application for demolition of 1970's block and to repair west end of the building, replacement of existing metal staircase & alterations to existing reception counter and demolition of Pine Cottage – Approved
13. **2016: APP/16/00031/F** - Extend existing 1980's block by adding two external balconies – Approved
14. **2020: APP/20/00088/F** - Demolish Chatterley Cottage and erect a part single and part two storey building comprising 10 care suites, consulting room, laundry, staff rooms and ancillary accommodation - Approved
15. **2021: APP/21/01313/F** - Non-material amendment following approval of APP/20/00088/F for Reduction in area of the entrance canopy, omission of the small canopy to the rear garden, addition of one new window to the first floor office and omission of one window to the first-floor accessible WC. Omission of one rooflight in the common corridor and reduce the size of the rooflight in the Nurse Base Area. Additional louvres to windows and increase in the acoustic louvres enclosure height - Approved
16. **2023: APP/23/00163/F** - Ward refurbishment involving the creation of a new external door in place of a current window opening, removal of courtyard screens, insertion of partitions to central internal corridor, and minor works to modern internal partitions at Grade II\* listed St Anns hospital building – Approved
17. **2023: APP/23/00164/L** - Listed building application for ward refurbishment involving the creation of a new external door in place of a current window opening, removal of courtyard screens, insertion of partitions to central internal corridor, and minor works to modern internal partitions at Grade II\* listed St. Anns Hospital building – Approved
18. **2023: APP/23/00165/F** - Ground floor Infill extension; new windows and doors; replacement windows to the 1980s building – Approved
19. **2023: APP/23/00166/F** - Crescent parking - Laying of hard surfacing, setting out of car parking bays and associated landscaping works for a temporary time period. Currently under consideration.
20. **2023 APP/23/00168/L** - Listed building application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of a hospital building comprising bedrooms with amenity space, communal, support and staff facilities, generator reconfiguration and associated works. Associated application to this scheme also on the September 2023 Planning Committee agenda.

### **Constraints**

21. Following on-site constraints are noted:

- Grade II\* listed building St. Ann's Hospital
- A Locally Listed Building opposite Harbour Court Chaddesley Glen Road

- Pine Cottage - Curtilage listed in association with the Grade II\* listed St Anns Hospital
- Listed building setting

### **Public Sector Equalities Duty**

22. In accordance with section 149 Equality Act 2010, in considering this proposal due regard has been had to the need to:

- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

### **Other relevant duties**

23. In considering whether to grant planning permission or permission in principle for development which affects a listed building special regard shall be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest - section 66 - Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

### **Consultations**

24. Tree Officer – No objection, subject to conditions. This consultee summarised that the scheme is generally positive. It was noted that 8no. trees are proposed for removal (apart from T210, the rest of the trees are generally poor specimens of limited merit) and 13no. new trees are proposed to mitigate their loss, with the benefit of a comprehensive landscape plan.

Comments dated 17/08/2023:

*'Arboricultural information has been prepared in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 to support the development proposal. This has identified the constraints associated with the existing trees on and adjacent to the site. My comments relate to the most recent documents:*

- *Tree survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment, dated July 2023, V3.0*
- *Arboricultural Method Statement, dated July 2023, V5.0*
- *Tree Protection Plan, Ref; TPPPII, dated July 2023, V2.0*

*The submitted Landscape Plan (New Building Planting Plan, STP2-UBU-XX-XX-DR-L-3000) is positive scheme showing 13 new trees to be planted.*

#### **Tree impacts**

*The site contains a number of mixed age/quality trees mainly around the boundary of the proposed development envelope. A row of 3 mature Scots Pines line the Haven Road frontage providing an important feature in the local landscape and add positively to the sylvan character of the area. The revised arboricultural information now shows the retention of all these Scots Pines, which is a positive outcome.*

*The revised arboricultural information shows 8 trees for removal. Five of the trees to be removed (T195, T211, T212, T213 & T214) are low quality poor specimens, that cannot be seen as a constraint to the development. Their loss will not have an impact the amenity and character of the area. Two trees (T202 and T204) already have extant consent (APP/11/00154/F) for removal.*

*Of some stature and visual importance is T210, a mature Monterey Pine which is proposed for removal. T210 sits at the entrance to the proposed development site, in a slightly raised garden bed and is part of a group of low-quality trees, that are shown for removal. Whilst not clearly visible from Haven Road it is a noticeable specimen on entering the hospital and*

*makes a positive contribution to the character of the local area. Justification for the tree's loss is given below by agent.*

*Having reviewed from a construction method and sequence point of view we do not believe it is possible to construct the building without material harm to this group of trees, particularly considering the need to strip 400mm from the existing tarmac level to facilitate a building which works with the existing road and perimeter levels (we believe the tree roots of T210 to be just below top of tarmac level), irrespective of the foundation solution.*

*Given the size of the tree and the poor rooting environment (roadway and parking) outside of the garden bed, roots have spread and caused large areas of displacement to the surrounding tarmac areas. The proposal would require the removal of a large proportion of these surface roots. This root loss to facilitate the development would significantly damage the tree to an extent it's health and stability would be compromised. It is therefore agreed that the tree would not be able to be retained given the current footprint of the hospital and only with a modification of the design, could the retention of this Pine be feasible.*

*Information received from the agent advised that the consequences of retaining T210 would make the hospital unviable.*

*'See RPAs overlaid with proposed building plan, which demonstrate that if we were required to keep the group of trees to the front of the building (including T210) we would lose approximately 100 sq mtr of floor space, including the staff accommodation at first floor and the seclusion suite at ground floor. This equates to 7 bedrooms of space (of the 27-bed unit) which would make the unit unviable.'*

### Conclusion

*Whilst the purpose of the development is favourable to the public benefit, it is not in the Arboricultural Officer's remit to weigh up the planning balance. Therefore, given the important contribution T210 makes to the character of the area, its loss should be resisted, and the proposal re-designed to allow for its successful retention.*

*Notwithstanding the above, the overall proposal is positive in regard to trees, with a landscaping scheme that will enhance the future visual and environmental benefits and assist in softening the built form.*

*In the event that the Officer decides to approve the proposal it would be recommended that the conditions requiring Implementation of Details of Arboricultural Method Statement; Pre-commencement Meeting; and Implementation of the Landscape scheme are applied'.*

#### 25. Heritage Officer – Objection:

##### Summary:

*'The demolition of Pine Cottage and replacement with a large, new building do not preserve the architectural style and the sylvan character of the streetscene and grounds of St. Ann's and while this development is considered to be less than substantially harmful to the significance and setting of the Grade II\* Listed hospital the NPPF clearly states that great weight should be given to their conservation irrespective of this level of harm. The proposals are, therefore, not supported'.*

#### 26. Urban Design Officer – No objection and the fall-back position was noted by the consultee. However, some concerns were raised regarding the scale and massing of the proposed works.

Comments received on 11/05/2023:

*'This is a sensitive site characterised by mature landscape and the listed St Ann's Hospital. I appreciate the need for additional beds and facilities meeting modern standards. However, it is regrettable that the development would result in parts of the site feeling cramped, a mismatch in architectural styles, the loss of the Pine Cottages and a number of trees.*

### *Layout and massing*

*I understand that the layout and massing was established by planning consent granted for a similar scheme in 2011 which has been partly implemented (APP/11/00154/F).*

*Nevertheless, as mentioned at pre-app stage the scheme would result in a congested form of development. The New Build II would be squeezed rather uncomfortably between Haven Road and the 1980s building with pinch points to both.*

### *Landscape*

*The development would result in the loss of several trees, with a negative impact on the character of the site and Haven Road Street scene.*

*Planting should be abundant and varied to soften the impact of the new building. The tree officer's comments on the trees to be lost and the proposed planting will be important.*

### *Appearance and street scene*

- The site contains buildings of various roof forms and designs in close proximity to one another. This would be exacerbated by the introduction of the modern flat roofed New Build II, beside the pitched roof 1980s building with little breathing space between them.*
- Various sketches of the elevations including the most public elevation to Haven Road include windowless areas of solid brickwork, although this would be somewhat broken up by brick detailing.*
- The building's blocky form would be prominent from Haven Road given its proximity to the boundary and the limited screening provided by remaining trees and planting. This is particularly unfortunate given that there would be no entrance into the building from the street and the boundary would be formed by a tall, closed board fence.*
- If the scheme is approved specification of a good quality brick will be key.*

### *Energy and resources*

*The demolition of Kimmeridge Court and Pine Cottages emphasises the need for the new build to make effective use of resources. I understand that the building is predicted to achieve a BREEAM 'excellent' rating which is positive.*

### *Car and cycle parking*

- Cycle parking is located in various parts of the site. Some cycle stands beside the entrance to New Build II would probably be useful for staff.*

*It is unfortunate that 3 car spaces would be located in front of the building entrance, rather than creating a more open approach.'*

## **27. Historic England – Objection. Summary as following:**

*'Historic England has concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds. We consider that the issues and safeguards outlined in our advice need to be addressed in order for the application to meet the requirements of paragraph 200 of the NPPF.*

*If determining this application you should bear in mind the statutory duty of section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess'.*

## **Representations**

## **28. Letters were sent to neighbouring properties and site notices displayed around the site.**

29. No 9 Letters in support, and 6 letters of objection have been received. All objections are from residents occupying Chaddesley Grange set towards north-east of the application site and the following grounds for objection were raised:

- Design out of keeping
- Scale, sitting and massing of the proposed new building
- Loss of light and privacy
- Overbearing development
- Overshadowing
- Increased traffic and noise
- Neighbours of Chaddesley Grange were not consulted on a 2011 approval ref. APP/11/00154/FUL
  - o Officer's note: The Council's records show that consultation letters were sent by post to residents of APP/11/00154/FUL on 21/02/2011.

30. The Society for Poole:

*'Object to this application that suggests the design lacks practical respect for the neighbourhood and for the provision of adequate parking facilities: the latter being particularly important in circumstances (because of inadequate public transport) where reliance upon cars seems to be a long-term material matter'.*

**Key Issue(s)**

31. The main considerations involved with this application are:

- Principle of the proposed development and site history;
- Design and Impact on the local area character
- Impact on Heritage Assets;

32. These issues will be considered along with other matters relevant to this proposal in the main body of the report below.

**Policy Context**

33. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that planning applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan for an area, except where material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan in this case comprises:

34. Poole Local Plan (Adopted 2018)

PP1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development

PP2 Amount and broad location of development

PP27 Design

PP30 Heritage Assets

35. Supplementary Planning Document

SPD2 Heritage Assets

36. Other material considerations

### **37. The National Planning Policy Framework (2021)**

Paragraph 11 sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Plans and policies should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision taking this means:

- c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or
- d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:
  - i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
  - ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

38. The following chapters of the NPPF are relevant to this proposal:

- Chapter 2 - Achieving sustainable development
- Chapter 8 - Promoting healthy and safe communities
- Chapter 11 – Making effective use of land
- Chapter 12 - Achieving well-designed places
- Chapter 15 - Conserving historic environment

### **Planning Assessment**

#### Principle of the proposed works and site history

39. The proposed development responds to the objectives set out in the NHS 5 Year Forward View implementation plan for mental health and forms part of a wider site reconfiguration under the Trust's Capital Development Programme which seeks to modernise its Estates stock in order to improve the privacy, dignity and security of the service users, to improve working conditions for Trust staff, to adjust the bed configuration in line with the Acute Care Pathway ('ACP'), and to meet the standards expected by service commissioners. The elements of the Capital Development Programme being delivered at St Ann's include:

- Transfer all inpatient accommodation out of the 1910 Grade II\* listed building at St Ann's Hospital to meet Care Quality Commission directives.
- Complete the Phase 2 development of the St Ann's Hospital site (the current application)
- Refurbish Haven ward (1980's Building ground Floor) to provide minimum of 8 adult mental health beds and health based place of safety ('HBPoS') Unit
- Car parking reconfiguration works (separate planning proposal)

40. There is a significant public benefit to the proposed works within the site due to a great demand for mental health services, which continue to rise. A strategic objective of the Poole Local Plan is to enhance and better connect Poole's network of strong, healthy and active communities, including improvements to accessing health care. The principle of the proposed development is in line with the Council's strategic objectives and is therefore supported.

41. A similar layout and massing was established by a planning consent granted for a scheme in 2011, which has been partly implemented (ref. APP/11/00154/F). This particular permission included two 2-storey buildings (Building 1 and Building 2) on site to accommodate a 32-bed long stay ward, 16-bed male treatment ward and 14 -ed Acute Assessment Unit (AAU) ward. This permission also consisted of a provision of a new combined entrance to, and extension of, the existing 1980's building; demolition of the 1970's block, Pine Cottage and Kimmeridge Court; repair to the west end of the Listed Building; replacement of existing metal staircase and alterations to existing reception counter; associated car and cycle parking and landscape; as well as creation of new pedestrian access from Haven Road.
42. Furthermore, a listed building consent ref. APP/11/00155/L was granted for demolition of 1970's block and to repair west end of the building, replacement of existing metal staircase, alterations to existing reception counter and demolition of Pine Cottage. This Listed Building Application comprised in part the same works as were previously permitted by application APP/09/01213/L, approved on 11 December 2009. As in that consent, the creation of a gap between the Grade II\* Hospital listed building and the 1980s building was considered beneficial and sought as an enhancement of the setting of the Listed Building. The consent APP/11/00155/L included demolition of the curtilage building Pine Cottage. No objection was raised to the demolition of Pine Cottage by English Heritage (currently Historic England), nor by the Council's Conservation Officer. A listed building consent ref. APP/11/00155/L was partly implemented (e.g. demolition of 1970s block and alterations to existing reception counter), enacting this consent creating a material planning fall-back position.
43. Phase 1 of APP/11/00154/F permission included the erection of New Build 1 for treatment and AAU thereby similar uses as currently proposed. APP/11/00154/F permission also included changes to the 1980s building to provide a combined entrance and this has been implemented. Phase 2 included 'New Build 2' of a similar scale and massing as this currently proposed, and relates to the current application site boundary with similar works such as the erection of a new hospital building (New Build 2), as well as demolition of both Pine Cottage and Kimmeridge Court.
44. Significant weight should be attached to the extant 2011 permission ref. APP/11/00154/FUL, particularly as regards the location, siting (footprint), mass (floor space) and general design (including roof-scape) of an additional building on the site. The current scheme differences are predominantly dictated by the latest technical and clinical standards as regards the layout and configuration of the internal floor arrangements. However, there are numerous similarities with the partly implemented permission from 2011, such as the following:
- The current application shows a building in the same location for the same use as the consented and implemented scheme in 2011;
  - There would be a very similar footprint (including not materially closer to Chaddesley Grange);
  - The new building would have a similar floor space and roof-scape;
  - The entrance to the building is in a very similar position;
  - The same car parking provision (3 spaces adjacent the entrance to the building);
  - An architectural corner (northwest) tower feature to the design of the building;
  - Both buildings with predominantly the same primary external cladding material (brick); and
  - Windows to the bedrooms being of almost identical configuration (two side-by-side vertical glass panes with horizontally aligned panels above and below).
45. As noted already, a similar scale and massing building in exact same location is subject to a partly implemented planning permission APP/11/00154/FUL, as well as another extant

permission - listed building consent APP/11/00155/L. The proposed design changes are mandated by various standards and constraints of the NHS programme. This is predominantly in terms of the internal configuration of the building, which as a result affect the exterior of the building. Nevertheless, the scale and appearance (e.g. flat roof and number of floors) remains the same as shown within the extant permission.

46. There are essentially two elements that need to be established for a potential fallback to be given weight in the assessment of the planning merits;

(1) the nature and content of the alternative uses or operations; and

(2) the likelihood of the alternative use or operations being carried on or out.

Officers can confirm that the current proposal is for the same uses and operations with the current hospital site. Furthermore, there is no likely acceptable alternative to the proposed sitting of a new building given the site constraints such as the presence of the Grade II\* Listed main building and its direct setting, an effective 'no building zone' between the main building and the coastline, the presence of the other buildings on the site, the presence and location of numerous trees, and the need to retain adequate car parking. Officer's agree that a practical example of these constraints was provided via the refusal of planning permission in 2009 (ref APP/09/01085/F), and reinforced by the local planning authority's response to pre-application enquiries by the Applicant in October 2021 (ref PREA/21/00125) and May 2022 (ref PREA/22/00070).

47. In support of the public benefits of the current scheme, the applicant has provided following information:

*'The public benefits delivered by the proposals at St Ann's come under the banner of improved mental healthcare facilities for Dorset which are part of a modern, sustainable NHS that represent value to the HM Treasury and the UK taxpayer. Specific public benefits include:*

*According to the Office of National Statistics data the suicide rates in Dorset has seen in 2019 41 deaths, 2020 33 deaths and in 2021 45 deaths. Access to the right mental health services at the right time can only help to reduce these numbers.*

*A net increase in Adult Mental Health beds at St Ann's site; supporting BCP located patients being treated close to home, enabling them to be supported by family, carers and local professionals. Patients who are sent out of area have documented longer lengths of stay and overall recovery times, this treatment is also more expensive than delivery locally. There are network effects to recovery. Not only are patients directly impacted, but it is known that this also affects their families and friends, requiring additional service needs in the system.*

*Private and dignified spaces would be created for patients, supporting clinical interventions and conversations;*

*Visits from family and carers would be able to take place in confidence within a space that is comfortable, relaxed and personalised for the patient and supportive of their recovery. Current arrangements are sub-optimal in this respect.*

*New PICUs located within the NB2 would support the treatment of people with serious mental illness as individuals, providing a range of clinically supportive spaces not presently available which would improve clinical outcomes.*

*New facilities, including single rooms, would provide a greater level of care for patients, which would support a shorter length of stay and aid patient recovery. This would reduce costs to the NHS in the long-term. Health Based Place of Safety expansion (Section 136 suite) which allows seriously distressed people to be transferred St Ann's in an environment that provides a greater level of care and supports a shorter length of patient stay. It would also reduce the amount of time that Police Officers are required to spend with patients before they can be treated. This will free up Police Officer time to deal with other matters*

and will represent a cost saving to Dorset Police, that becomes available for other public need.

*The refurbishment of the listed building ward to provide dedicated individual and family therapy, and activities of daily living kitchen, treatment and clinic spaces alongside clinical offices would provide the Eating Disorders Outpatients service with the capacity to meet the present and growing needs of the community within a fit for purpose and welcoming environment. Reducing waiting lists and providing reduced referral times and earlier interventions.*

*Staff would have a full range of facilities allowing them to provide the flexibility of care needed in a safe environment, whilst providing them with spaces away from the ward for personal time and wellbeing. This supports staff satisfaction, retention and recruitment and is important to an efficient and reliable NHS mental healthcare in Dorset.*

*The new facilities would ensure staff have space for structured and ad-hoc clinical supervision making the best use of time between therapy sessions to discuss client progress. This provides opportunities for team bonding and cohesion, ensuring community based staff can work alongside their hospital based colleagues, sharing experience and knowledge and enabling care co-ordinators to regularly liaise with their patients in the day programme or on the ward, to provide a joined-up approach between these services. This will improve the overall healthcare service locally.*

*By developing the St Anns site the Trust is able to continue to provide services from a site which has been established within its community for generations, where they will not only have their own therapeutic benefit, but with improved facilities are able to strike a balance between sustainability, modernisation and reverence to the historical context that are really important to the people of Dorset.'*

48. It should be noted that following the 2011 permission, the NPPF has been published and a new Local Plan for Poole was adopted in 2018. However, so far as the relevant heritage and urban design policies are concerned the policy focus and underlying legislative basis e.g. Sections 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservations Areas) Act 1990 remains the same.
49. Finally, some consultees questioned how the current application and a separate application for Car Park Crescent works (APP/23/00166/F) would interact with each other to provide acceptable parking provision on site. Having considered those two applications, it seems to be possible and appropriate to deal with the requirements for additional car parking spaces for the new build application by way of condition attached to that permission subject to the Crescent Parking proposal ref. APP/23/00166/F being granted prior to the committee's decision on APP/23/00167/F.

#### Design and Impact on the character and appearance of the area

50. Paragraph 126 of the NPPF state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and establish or maintain a strong sense of place. The National Design Guide continues that well-designed development should be integrated into their surroundings creating a coherent pattern of development. Policy PP27 relates to design quality and seeks to ensure that all development and spaces are well designed and of a high quality. Development which by its design would be detrimental to the built environment, amenity or character will not be permitted. The design of proposed building, although dictated by the medical requirements of its future uses, would utilise the topography of the site to minimise its impact upon the existing wider setting of the site and street scene.
51. The proposed new building would be located in the north-eastern corner of the hospital site. The area is currently occupied by a car park and two buildings (Kimmeridge Court and Pine Cottage), which will be demolished to facilitate the construction of the new building.

52. The Council's Heritage Office and Historic England raised concerns regarding the proposed design, which in their view has no reference and is stylistically challenging to the curtilage listed Pine Cottage and to the 1980s complex set within a listed curtilage. As such, both consultees concluded that the proposal does not preserve the setting and or make a positive contribution to the asset or better reveal its significance as required in NPPF 197. Proposed external facing materials would be discussed below. However, as already noted in this report the current application very closely follows the extant Planning Permission for Build 2 granted in 2011 (APP/11/00154/F). The Permission was granted for two similar sized contemporary buildings, one attached to the existing building and the other close to but detached.
53. The current proposal appears to match the 2011 approval, which permitted the erection of a building of a similar scale, bulk and massing on a similar footprint. The applicant also responded to the comments received at Pre-App stage. To address those concerns, the building has been reconfigured slightly since the Pre-Application advice by creating an offset in the building footprint on the western flank to increase the separation distance from the 1980s building at one of the pinch-points. The design tries to balance competing requirements of remaining as close as possible to the existing permitted footprint whilst fulfilling the clinical accommodation requirements in compliance with the NHS briefing guidance for the service.
54. The flat roof enables electrical energy generation towards net zero carbon, as well as help to achieve a BREEAM 'excellent' rating through photo voltaic arrays and air source heat pumps which are out of sight from the ground level. These can be safely maintained on a walkable roof and would not be feasible on a pitched roofed building. The extant permission was also granted for a flat roofed building. To achieve the accommodation capacity required, a suggested two storey pitched roof building as suggested by the Council's Heritage Officer would have increased the overall height of the building significantly above the height of the previous permitted scheme.
55. As stated already in this report, the design of the replacement building is dictated by the medical requirements of its future users although the building itself would have a very similar scale, massing and sitting as this shown on the extant permission. The current application follows most recent pre-application advice request ref. PREA/22/00070 where officers noted a fall-back position in form of partially implemented permission from 2011. However, it was noted that *'careful consideration will need to be given to the design of the proposals and a thorough historic assessment will need to be undertaken'*. Following this pre-application advice, the applicant decided to explore a greater use of feature brickwork.
56. Although the scale and massing of the proposed building is fairly similar to that granted in 2011, there are some design differences, which are dictated by internal layout re-arrangement due to the latest medical requirements for its future use. Nevertheless, the Building 2 permitted in 2011 used stone cladding rather than brick and larger units of curtain walling with no direct references to the listed building and its brick detailing. However, the current proposal introduces warm red brick in references to the main hospital building that is listed. The building would feature panels to break up massing. The submitted details indicate 3 types of brick, which have colours of a similar palette used for New Build 1 granted in 2011, New Eating Disorders unit, the Grade II\* Listed Building, as well as the 1980s Building design.
57. There would be 3 types of brick details used as following:
- Brick Type 1 – red brick with light colour mortar, horizontal. It would be used between the windows to highlight the vertical elements of the elevations.
  - Brick Type 2 – red brick with dark colours mortar, vertical. This brick would be recessed by 20-30mm and will be located above windows.
  - Brick Type 3 will feature red brick pattern with dark colour mortar, vertical. It will be used on each side of the window and would continue the vertical pattern above each window.

Overall, the rhythm of the windows and shadows created by recessed elements of the elevation would add interest to each elevation.

58. The proposed works would give St Anns Hospital a new public presence on Haven Road. The visual impact of the scheme on Haven Road street scene is noted as at the moment, only a minimal glimpses of the cottage roof can be afforded and the main vista is one of a sylvan and verdant setting. The proposed building would noticeably change to this part of the Haven Road street scene although not materially to this granted under 2011 permission. When comparing to the 2011 extant consent, the proposed building would be approximately 1.3 metre taller due to clinical ceiling height standards and services requirements. The plant is also taller but is offset from the building perimeter where possible to reduce its visual impact. There is proposed a prominent corner of the building facing Haven Road with the intention to accentuate the verticality of windows pairing. There is a clear reference in the façade design to the proportions of the pierced balconies on square brick piers in the centre of the Grade II\* hospital building. This was achieved by reproducing the proportions of the square brick piers between the windows and adding the feature brickwork on each side of then with similar proportions of the pierced balconies and parapets.
59. For the above reasons, the proposed works would comply with Policies PP27 and PP30 which seeks to promote that all development and spaces are well designed and of a high quality, as well as require protection of heritage assets.

#### Impact on Heritage Assets

60. As stated already in this report, this site is constrained by various heritage assets, including those on site – Grade II\* listed building St. Ann's Hospital and Grade II Listed Pine Cottage. The NPPF places 'great weight' on the conservation of heritage assets. Where less than substantial harm is identified the NPPF at Paragraph 202 requires this harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. As stated already in this report, the application site is constrained by various Heritage Assets.
61. The application is objected to by both the Council's Heritage Officer, as well as Historic England. The concerns raised are around the proposed demolition of the Pine Cottage, the design and scale of the proposed building, as well as concerns regarding the proposed arrangement for car parking across the site and travel plan. The Conservation officer notes that the loss of Pine Cottage is 'detrimental' to the Listed Building's setting and the removal of trees along Haven Road makes a bland site elevation. What amounts to "substantial harm" or "less than substantial harm" in a particular case will always depend on the circumstances. Whether there will be such "harm", and, if so, whether it will be "substantial", are matters of fact and planning judgment.
62. Any planning application for development which will affect a listed building or its setting must be assessed in accordance with the requirements of section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. This requires a local planning authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any feature of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
63. The term preserving, used in both section 66, has been defined as doing no harm. This does not mean that there are no circumstances where development may be permitted where it is agreed that some harm will be caused. A further guidance on this is given in section 16 of the NPPF and also in the Historic Environment chapter of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Paragraph 199 of the NPPF emphasises that when considering the impact of proposed development on what the PPG calls "heritage assets", great weight should be given to the conservation (or preservation) of those assets. and the more important an asset (i.e. the higher its listing grade) then the greater the weight that should be attached to its conservation.
64. Paragraph 200 states that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset whether from its alteration, destruction or from development within its setting, should require clear and convincing justification. The NPPF identifies two levels of harm: substantial harm

and less than substantial harm. The courts have made it clear that there is no spectrum of degree of harm within the less than substantial harm category but, as explained above, the more important a heritage asset is, the greater the weight to be attached to its preservation or the preservation of its setting, irrespective of whether the harm caused is substantial or less than substantial.

65. The NPPF gives separate guidance on the approach that should be taken when determining an application where the harm is assessed as substantial and where it is assessed as less than substantial. In this case, the degree of harm to the setting of the Grade II\* St Ann's Hospital Building has been assessed as less than substantial. Paragraph 202 of the NPPF applies where the harm is assessed as less than substantial. This requires that in determining the planning application the less than substantial harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
66. The NPPF itself does not define what public benefits are for this purpose. Further guidance is given in the Historic Environment Chapter of the PPG. This refers to anything which delivers the economic, social or environmental objectives of sustainable development described in paragraph 8 of the NPPF. Those objectives are defined in paragraph 8 of the NPPF as follows:-

- (a) Economic - to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy
- (b) Social - to support, vibrant and healthy communities
- (c) Environmental - to contribute to protecting and enhancing the natural, built and historic environment.

The PPG makes clear that the public benefits must flow from the development and must be of a nature or scale that would benefit the public at large but these benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public or to all sections of the public to be genuine public benefits.

The Balancing Exercise Between Harm and Public Benefit.

The courts have held that the duty imposed by section 66, referred to above, is complied with if the harm caused to the listed buildings or their setting is assessed as being not as significant as the benefits which the proposed development will bring. This is the balancing exercise which paragraph 202 of the NPPF requires is carried out when deciding whether or not planning permission should be granted.

67. Trees and planting (no objection by the Council's Arboriculturist) will be discussed later in this report (the proposed development will now retain the third pine on this elevation T206 as per the updated tree removals plan). The landscaping to the centre of the site has been adapted to remove the majority of the car parking and to respond to how the setting of the original building would have been laid out to take advantage of spaces and landscape as part of the design concept.
68. The Applicant has vacated Pine Cottage, and the building is now empty (saved for some gym equipment). Under the scope of the extant 2011 permission (namely, Listed Building Consent APP/11/00155/L) Pine Cottage could be demolished. The listed building consent is a free-standing permission and has previously been lawfully implemented. In planning terms, there is nothing to stop the applicant from demolishing the existing Pine Cottage on site. The implemented extant permission is considered to be a material fallback position and this carries significant weight in the planning balance.
69. The Council's Heritage Officers also commented that the applicant has failed to follow the 5 Step Guidance of The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Noted 3 (Second Edition) publicised by Historic England. This particular Guidance suggests following steps to be taken while assessing developments within proximity to the heritage assets:

- Step 1: Identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected.

- Step 2: Access the degree to which these settings and views make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s) or allow significance to be appreciated.
- Step 3: Assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful on the significance or on ability to appreciate it.
- Step 4: Explore ways to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm.
- Step 5: Make and document the decision and monitor outcomes.

70. The statutory consultee especially raised concerns regarding Step 4. In response to that, it should be noted that following a recent pre-application advice response, the applicant introduced an offset in the building footprint on the western flank to increase the separation distance from the 1980s building at one of the pinch-points. Also, the third pine tree (T206) as per update tree removals plan ref. STP2-UBU-XX-XX-DR-L-1003-P5 would be retained. Additionally, the proposed building will be built of warm red brickwork with references to the main Grade II\* Hospital Building, as well as feature panels will be introduced to break up the overall massing of the building. Finally, it should be noted that the proposed building has a very similar footprint and sitting as the permitted footprint under the 2011 approval that is considered as a material fallback position. Furthermore, the proposed new building would be set approximately 80 metres away from the Grade II\* listed Hospital Building and effectively screened from it by the 1980s block, which was recently redeveloped.
71. The applicant confirmed that the Guidance would not result in a substantially different scheme that would meet the needs of the NHS Trust and their patients, nor the applicable current technical and clinical standards as already noted in this report. There is no reasonable likelihood of any alternate development scheme emerging due to existing site constraints. A practical example of these constraints was provided via the refusal of planning permission in 2009 (ref APP/09/01085/F) and reinforced by the local planning authority's response to pre-application enquiries by the Applicant in October 2021 (PREA/21/00125) and May 2022 (PREA/22/00070).
72. Furthermore, comments from English on the 2011 planning application (APP/11/00154/FUL) are noted, as summarised in the case officer's report at the time:
- "In the previous advice English Heritage stated that they would prefer to have the new buildings located closer to the properties in Haven Road than in the car parking area..."* and *"The siting of the new facility in the proposed location is seen as preferable to other options within the site, which were judged to detract from the setting of the principal Listed Building. In terms of mass, scale and bulk they consider the new building to be appropriate. The quality of the final design of any new building is recognised as being very dependent on the materials used, particularly the choice of brick and the skill in construction."* Additionally, English Heritage did not object the loss of Pine Cottage in 2011 contrary to the current advice from Historic England.
73. The harm identified by both the Council's Heritage Officer and Historic England would be 'less than substantial'; however; there is a clear public benefit to the proposal, as well as the proposed building would be set away from the main hospital building, Grade II\*. It is considered that the proposed new building, which fronts Haven Road, would have little impact on the setting of the Listed Building since it is effectively screened from it by the 1980s block.
74. There was a duty to consult with Historic England on this application because the proposed development had the potential to affect the setting of the Grade II\* listed hospital building. However, although its assessment of the effect of the proposed development and the degree of harm caused is important (and in this case it also assessed the harm as less than substantial), the final decision whether listed building consent should be granted is for the Local Planning Authority in exercising its planning judgement in respect of the merits of the scheme as a whole
75. It is your Officer's view that the level of harm of 'less than substantial harm' raised by the Heritage Officer will not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits provided through the provision of a new facility where there is in high demand for such mental health service with a new facility. Although there is identified conflict with Policy PP30, assessed

against paragraph 202 of the NPPF, it is officer's view that identified public benefit of a new health care unit in support and viable use of the site would outweigh the harm. Also, the existing fall-back position in form of 2011 permissions (full planning and listed building) is noted.

### **Planning Balance**

76. In accordance with paragraph 38 of the revised NPPF the Council, as Local Planning Authority, takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. The Council works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by offering a pre-application advice service, and as appropriate updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application and where possible suggesting solutions. In this instance the applicant discussed development option through pre-application advice discussions and was advised of issues identified following submission and provided a revised scheme which was considered acceptable.
77. The application would extend an existing health care provision site which would help facilitate improvements in patient care and will provide much needed inpatient care for adults. The proposed unit would complement the existing use of the site and is considered the most viable option for already established healthcare facilities on site. Provision of improved healthcare facilities weighs heavily in favour of the application as a public benefit in the form of helping people to recover from mental health crisis faster and closer to the home. Paragraph 92 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which, in part, enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would help address identified local health and wellbeing needs.
78. The design of proposed building is dictated by the medical requirements of its future uses and although the scale of the proposed works would result in some level of harm in wider views, a strong public benefit and extant 2011 planning and listed building consent permissions are recognised. It is considered that the positive changes secured as a part of the planning process, the imposition of conditions in respect of the detailing and materials will add further visual interest.
79. The balancing exercise under the policies in paragraphs 201 and 202 of the NPPF is not the whole decision-making process on an application for planning permission, only part of it. The whole process must be carried out within the parameters set by the statutory scheme, including those under section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 ("the 2004 Act") and section 70(2) of the 1990 Act, as well as the duty under section 66(1) of the Listed Buildings Act. Every element of harm and benefit must be given due weight by the decision-maker as material considerations and the decision made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Within that statutory process, and under NPPF policy, the decision-maker must adopt a sensible approach to assessing likely harm to a listed building and weighing that harm against benefits, in this case public benefits as a result of a new mental health facility.
80. The NPPF places 'great weight' on the conservation of heritage assets. The Heritage Officer has identified that in their opinion there would less than substantial harm arising from proposals. Where less than substantial harm is identified the NPPF at Paragraph 202 requires this harm to be weighed against the public benefits that would occur from the development. Paragraph 202 requires a balanced judgment to be applied for applications that impact on designated heritage assets. In this case, the merits of the scheme found within the improved healthcare provision in a sustainable location, along with the social and economic benefits are considered sufficient mitigators to outweigh the less than substantial harm to the setting of the Grade II\* hospital building on site and the loss of the curtilage listed Pine Cottage.
81. The NPPF does not direct the decision-maker to adopt any specific approach to identifying "harm" or gauging its extent. It distinguishes the approach required in cases of "substantial harm ... (or total loss of significance ...)" (paragraph 201) from that required in cases of "less than substantial harm" (paragraph 202). But the decision maker is not told how to assess what the "harm" to the heritage asset will be, or what should be taken into account in

that exercise or excluded. The policy is in general terms. There is no one approach, suitable for every proposal affecting a “designated heritage asset” or its setting.

82. Identifying and assessing any “benefits” to weigh against harm to a heritage asset are also matters for the decision-maker. Paragraph 201 refers to the concept of “substantial public benefits” outweighing “substantial harm” or “total loss of significance”; paragraph 202 refers to “less than substantial harm” being weighed against “the public benefits of the proposal”. What amounts to a relevant “public benefit” in a particular case is, again, a matter for the decision-maker. So is the weight to be given to such benefits as material considerations.
83. The proposal would not fully comply with policy PP30, however the public benefits identified are considered to be a significant material consideration in the identification of the exceptional circumstances required by this policy. Therefore, having considered the appropriate development plan policy and other material considerations, including the NPPF, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions attached to this permission, the development would be in general accordance with the Development Plan, would not materially harm the character or appearance of the area or the amenities of neighbouring and proposed occupiers and would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and convenience. The public benefits identified consider to be sufficient to outweigh the less than substantial harm to heritage assets arising from proposals.
84. The proposed new development has been justified in the Design and Access and Heritage Statements, and the proposals are the result of extensive pre-application discussions. A significant weight needs to be given to a partly implemented permission APP/11/00154/FUL granted in 2011 where a similar scale and mass of building was approved in an almost exact same location. There is also existing listed building consent ref. APP/11/00155/L for demolition of the curtilage listed Pine Cottage. It is considered that the loss of trees is adequately mitigated by the proposed landscaping strategy. No objection is raised to the parking provision and the scheme demonstrates energy efficiency benefits of the proposal. The extent and quality of these proposals is wholly appropriate to this sensitive site and the scheme demonstrates improvements to the sustainability of the hospital use on the site.

### **Recommendation**

85. Grant listed building consent subject to:

(a) the following conditions (with the power delegated to the Head of Planning or other relevant officer to make any necessary amendments as long as they don't go to the heart of the decision):

## **CONDITIONS**

### **Condition 1: Time Conditions**

The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

### **Condition 2: Approved Plans**

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- STP2-MAA-V1-XX-PL-A-9009-P1 - Planning - Location Plan
- STP2-MAA-V1-XX-PL-A-9002-P2 - Planning - Existing Site Plan
- STP2-MAA-V1-XX-PL-A-9003-P2 - Planning - Demolition Plan
- STP2-MAA-V1-XX-PL-A-9004-P2 - Planning - Proposed Site Plan
- STP2-MAA-V1-XX-PL-A-9007-P2 - Planning - Site Access - Vehicles and Pedestrians
- STP2-MAA-V1-XX-PL-A-9005-P2 - Planning - Parking Plan

- STP2-MAA-V1-XX-PL-A-9006-P2 - Planning - Fire Strategy Site Plan
- STP2-UBU-XX-XX-DR-L-1000-P9 – Planning - New Building Landscape General Arrangement Layout
- STP2-UBU-XX-XX-DR-L-1002-P1 - Landscape General Layout Plan Podium Courtyard and Planting Proposal
- STP2-UBU-XX-XX-DR-L-1003-P5 - Tree Removal and Proposals Plan
- STP2-UBU-XX-XX-DR-L-3000 – Planting Plan
- STP2-UBU-XX-XX-DR-L-3005 – Planting Plan – Additional Tree Planting to Boundary
- STP2-MAA-V1-00-PL-A-0101-P3 - Planning - Proposed General Arrangement Plan - Ground Floor
- STP2-MAA-V1-01-PL-A-0102-P3 - Proposed General Arrangement Plan - First Plan
- STP2-MAA-V1-02-PL-A-0103-P3 - Planning - Proposed General Arrangement Plan – Roof
- STP2-MAA-V1-XX-PL-A-0202-P3 - Planning - Proposed General Arrangement Elevation
- STP2-MAA-V1-XX-PL-A-0302-P3 - Planning - Proposed General Arrangement Section
- Tree Constrains Plan ref. TCPPII
- STP2-MAA-V1-XX-PL-A-0301-P3 – Planning – Existing GA Sections
- STP2-MAA-V1-XX-PL-A-0201-P3 - Planning – Existing GA Elevation

Reason – For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

### **Condition 3: Sample of Materials**

Details and samples of all external facing and roofing materials to be used shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of superstructure works. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason - To ensure that the external appearance of the building(s) is satisfactory and in accordance with Policies PP27 and PP30 of the Poole Local Plan (November 2018).

### **Condition 4: Screen Fencing / Walling**

No part of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed above damp course level unless details as to the position(s), design(s), material(s) and type(s) of boundary treatment to be provided in respect of the development including the amount of screening it will provide, together with a timetable for its delivery, have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No part of the development shall be used unless the boundary treatment has been fully provided in accordance with the approved details and the approved boundary treatment shall at all times thereafter be retained, and also maintained in a manner that ensures that the boundary treatment continues to provide the same level of screening.

Reason - In the interests of amenity and privacy and in accordance with Policy PP27 the Poole Local Plan (November 2018).

### **Condition 4: Architectural Details**

Prior to the commencement of superstructure works, detailed drawings at a scale of 1:50 showing sections through the new build elevations showing details of fenestration in reveal shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.

Reason - To enable a record to be made of this building of historic and/or architectural interest and in accordance with Policy PP30 of the Poole Local Plan (November 2018).

### **Informatives**

## **1.Working with the Applicant**

In accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 38 of the NPPF the Local Planning Authority (LPA) takes a positive and creative approach to development proposals focused on solutions. The LPA work with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by;

- offering a pre-application advice service, and
- advising applicants of any issues that may arise during the consideration of their application and, where possible, suggesting solutions.
- in this case the application was acceptable as submitted and no modification or further assistance was required.

## **2.Bats**

If bats are found during demolition that all work to cease and if possible, part of structure that was removed and exposed bats put back into place. A bat ecologist employed to address situation and Natural England contacted.

## **Background Documents:**

Case Officer Report Completed  
Officer: Piotr Kulik  
Date: 21/09/2023

Agreed by:  
Date:  
Comment: