

**Sheringham - PF/14/0887 - Partial demolition of hotel and erection of six residential apartments and single-storey rear extension to hotel; Burlington Hotel, The Esplanade, Sheringham, NR26 8LG for McDermott**

**Minor Development**

**- Target Date: 10 October 2014**

Case Officer: Miss J Medler

Full Planning Permission

**CONSTRAINTS**

Conservation Area

Residential Area

**RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

PLA/19901395 PF

Velux rooflight north elevation - window west gable (4th floor)

Approved 22/10/1990

PLA/19970888 PF

Change of use from hotel rooms on second and third floors to eight self-contained residential flats

Approved 02/09/1997

PLA/19741025 PF

Proposed erection of fire escapes

Approved 15/11/1974

PLA/19970134 LE

Demolition of outbuildings

Approved 11/04/1997

**THE APPLICATION**

Is for the demolition of the west wing of the existing hotel to allow for the construction of six residential apartments and single storey rear extension.

The single storey rear extension would allow for the re-siting of the hotel bar and toilet areas at the upper ground floor level.

Car parking would be provided at the lower ground floor level and consist of 12 car parking spaces. There would be an additional six floors above the car parking level containing the six apartments. The extension would be no taller than the ridge height of the existing hotel which is approximately 20m in height. There would be a lift serving each floor.

The vehicular access remains unchanged. The site being served by the private drive to the rear off The Boulevard and The Esplanade.

The external materials to be used on the front and rear of the extension consist of terracotta red and natural stone coloured clay modular panels on the external walls, with contrasting string, head and cill courses. The west facing gable and projecting pier adjacent to the west gable would be constructed in smooth red facing brick, and buff coloured brick for the string, head and cill courses. All external windows and doors are to be grey powder coated metal frames. The roof material would be zinc, with an upstanding seam.

**REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE**

At the request of Councillor Smith having regard to the following planning issue(s):

1. Design
2. Impact upon Conservation Area
3. Retention of local business

## TOWN COUNCIL

Object on the grounds that the extension is unacceptable as it is out of keeping for this iconic building and not sympathetically designed and also there should be better use of the proposed materials.

## REPRESENTATIONS

One letter of objection has been received from a local resident on the grounds of the proposal being inappropriate and out of keeping with the adjacent hotel, unsympathetic cheap design, materials out of keeping with the locally listed building.

Two letters of support received.

In the supporting information submitted with the application the agent has advised that the reasons for considering redevelopment are as follows:

- The current premises, as a hotel, are only used at a maximum of 60% potential for specific time-slot periods of the year.
- The main clientele of the business are an ageing population of coach party type holiday accommodation and occasional wedding type functions.
- With the ongoing demands of clientele requirements for updated facilities and expected standards of comfort, plus the ever increasing demands of regular updates regarding health and safety, environmental health and fire standards, the large premises have an ever-increasing annual drain on financial resources set against a declining market.
- The external fabric of the buildings detailing mixture of red brick and stonework is suffering from the harsh climate of salt laden air and strong northerly winds. Serious finances are required to meet the cost of repair of the decay and erosion of areas of external walls, roof and original timber windows.

The agent's conclusion in respect of addressing the above points is as follows:

- A self-financing exercise is required in order to bring the current property up to the standards required and expected of the current day hotel.
- A smaller hotel accommodation is needed to meet the current declining demands.
- Redevelopment of under-utilised areas of the hotel into self-contained luxury apartments for sale will release capital required for the overhaul needed.

The supporting statement from the Agent is attached at **Appendix ....**

The agent has responded to the original consultation response from the Highway Authority and does not agree with the views expressed. The agent has advised that they would be willing to agree to signage on the site prohibiting the use of a right turn along this private access land when exiting the site.

The agent has submitted an amended plan showing the proposed means of access to the development.

## CONSULTATIONS

County Council Highways (Original comments) - Access is proposed via the existing unmade access tracks to the side and rear of the site, which appear to be outside of the applicants control. These unmade access tracks are generally unsuitable for two way traffic movement due to their limited width, particularly at their intersections with the adopted highway. At the junction with The Boulevard, the access opening measures 4.6m, however, only 3.7m of that width is available for use given the presence of planted borders and a manhole cover, this would be insufficient to allow two way movement, resulting in vehicles potentially waiting or reversing on The Boulevard, to the detriment of the free flow of traffic and therefore highway safety.

A similar situation exists at the access with The Esplanade. The proposed development would be considered to engender an additional 48-60 daily movements associated with the 6 units (TRiCS database details 8-10 daily movements for a single residential property), which would take place over the narrow unmade access routes entering the adopted highway over substandard access points which are outside of the applicant's control. As the application is currently presented, I would recommend refusal on the grounds of intensification of use of substandard accesses and I would

request that this is considered to be a holding objection to allow investigation of the potential for access improvements.

Comments following receipt of amended plan - Thank you for the amended consultation received recently relating to the above development proposal, which now details means of access for the proposed development. With consideration of this revised proposal, together with the correspondence regarding improvements to the access points and internal signage, I am now able to revise my response. Should your Authority be minded to the grant of consent a condition regarding upgrading of the vehicular accesses is required.

Conservation and Design - Have made a number of detailed comments and have raised a number of concerns (see **Appendix ...**).

English Heritage - Object. The Burlington Hotel is an important building in the Sheringham Conservation Area and the proposed development will have a major impact on the Conservation Area. The proposal would result in harm to the historic significance of the Burlington Hotel and the Sheringham Conservation Area through partial demolition of the building and new development in terms of paragraphs 132 and 134 of the NPPF. The Council should also consider if the design could be substantially amended so as to make the new building more appropriate for the conservation area, but as the application stands we would recommend permission is refused. The full and comprehensive response from English Heritage is contained in **Appendix...**

Environmental Health - No objection subject to advisory notes being imposed on any approval regarding asbestos removal and demolition.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

It is considered that the proposed development may raise issues relevant to

Article 8: The Right to respect for private and family life.

Article 1 of the First Protocol: The right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions.

It is considered that refusal of this application as recommended may have an impact on the individual Human Rights of the applicant. However, having considered the likely impact and the general interest of the public, refusal of the application is considered to be justified, proportionate and in accordance with planning law.

#### CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998 - SECTION 17

The application raises no significant crime and disorder issues.

#### POLICIES

North Norfolk Core Strategy (Adopted September 2008):

Policy SS 1: Spatial Strategy for North Norfolk (*specifies the settlement hierarchy and distribution of development in the District*).

Policy SS 3: Housing (*strategic approach to housing issues*).

Policy EN 4: Design (*specifies criteria that proposals should have regard to, including the North Norfolk Design Guide and sustainable construction*).

Policy EN 8: Protecting and enhancing the historic environment (*prevents insensitive development and specifies requirements relating to designated assets and other valuable buildings*).

Policy EN 13: Pollution and hazard prevention and minimisation (*minimises pollution and provides guidance on contaminated land and Major Hazard Zones*).

Policy CT 5: The transport impact on new development (*specifies criteria to ensure reduction of need to travel and promotion of sustainable forms of transport*).

Policy CT 6: Parking provision (*requires compliance with the Council's car parking standards other than in exceptional circumstances*).

#### MAIN ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

1. Principle of development
2. Design
3. Impact upon the Conservation Area
4. Impact upon neighbouring properties

## 5. Highway safety and car parking

### APPRAISAL

The site is located within the Residential Policy Area (Policy SS3) of Sheringham where appropriate residential development is permitted providing the proposal complies with other relevant Development Plan policies.

Officers are mindful of the continual maintenance requirements of a building of this period and scale, and that this is a local business and employer which contributes to the local economy. Such a development as proposed would allow the capital from the sale of the apartments to be used to improve and update facilities and address the condition of the building.

The principle of an extension to the hotel to provide residential accommodation is acceptable in this location, in accordance with Policy SS3 of the Core Strategy.

However, the Burlington is an iconic building in the Sheringham Conservation Area, commanding a prominent position over the eastern end of The Esplanade. It is referred to in the Sheringham Conservation Area Appraisal (Draft Summer 2013). Whilst this is only a draft document and not adopted it recognises the Burlington as worthy of being included on the District Council's provisional local list, and worth submitting for national listing. The building has been selected in the Draft Conservation Area Appraisal for local listing due to its positive contribution to the townscape. Notwithstanding that this document is only in draft the Burlington is considered to be an important building in the town. Any alterations to the existing building therefore requires careful consideration in terms of design, scale, massing, materials and relationship to surrounding neighbouring dwellings.

The Committee will note the consultation responses received from the Conservation and Design Officer and English Heritage. The Conservation and Design Officer explains the difficulties and constraints that have come to light in seeking a development proposal that would co-exist comfortably with the existing building. There are significant doubts over whether a successful 'dialogue' would be established between the existing and proposed elements. The Conservation and Design Officer has highlighted that it is rare for them to object to the principle of a contemporary approach. However, there are two main factors of concerns regarding the proposal as follows:

- Alongside the existing building, the proposed roofscape would feature a relatively complicated arrangement of wedge shapes which would surely emphasize the impact of the extension at high level. Particularly with the building being so visible from a number of vantage points, it is difficult to imagine how this grouping of mono-pitched roofslopes would subserviently complement the original building.
- Similarly, with no space available to create a separating link, the new build would have to 'plug' directly into the existing elevations with their strong vertical rhythm and well-defined bays. In practice this becomes extremely difficult as soon as an extra storey is introduced as floor levels and openings no longer correspond or sync. That is very much the case here. Whilst overall the extension would have a vertical emphasis, the rhythm and definition up through the floors and across the main façade appears on the whole to juxtapose uneasily with the host building – certainly it seems to offer much stronger horizontal desire lines principally through the proposed balconies.

There are also concerns that the main focal point of the building would be compromised by the new work. It is not considered that the proposal would be subordinate or respectful of the existing, but would have an assertive presence taking centre stage and working against the original notion of balance. This is a major concern and as a result it is not considered that the proposal would preserve or enhance the appearance and character of the conservation area.

Officers have no doubts over the considerable time and effort that the agent and applicant have put into the submitted proposal. The agent has been undertaking informal discussions with Officers since April 2013. More recent informal discussions took place with the agent prior to the submission of the application this year, when the agent was advised that Officers would be unable to support the proposal primarily on design grounds. Matters regarding the impact of the proposal on the privacy and amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings and car parking were also discussed.

A recent meeting has taken place between Officers, the agent and applicant to discuss Officer concerns. At that meeting possible amendments to the scheme were suggested. These were primarily in relation to simplifying the roof design and continuing the horizontal rhythm of the existing building, along with balancing the front elevation with a bay of proportions to that of the existing building. The agent advised that these suggestions were not practical and did not work in terms of the proposed layout. It was therefore suggested by Officers that it may be the case that too much accommodation is being sought. However, it is recognised that a reduction in the number of units proposed may have an impact in terms of the viability of the scheme as a whole.

Unfortunately, Officers, the agent and applicant have been unable to reach agreement in terms of the acceptability of the design of the scheme, as submitted.

Whilst the principle of the proposal is acceptable the difficulty for Officers and the agent has been how to best achieve such a proposal in design terms which is appropriate for the significance of the building.

The Council has to consider whether the proposal will preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

In terms of considering the design of the proposal the NPPF is also a material consideration and there are relevant paragraphs which have been considered as part of this application, as follows:

Paragraph 58 of the NPPF states that "Planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments:

- will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development and
- respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation; and
- are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping".

Paragraph 61 of the NPPF states that "planning policies and decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment"

It is not considered that the proposal complies with the requirements of the NPPF as above.

Paragraph 64 states that "permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions".

English Heritage are in agreement with the Conservation and Design Officer as you will note from their consultation response contained in **Appendix....** English Heritage consider that the proposal would result in harm to the historic significance of the Burlington Hotel and the Sheringham Conservation Area contrary to the requirements of paragraphs 132 and 134 of NPPF. Furthermore, they do not consider that the information submitted fulfils the requirements of paragraph 128 of the NPPF. Paragraph 128 of the NPPF requires applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected by a development including any contribution made by their setting.

English Heritage state that the Council may consider if the new housing provided by the development might deliver a degree of public benefit as noted in paragraph 134 of the NPPF. However, English Heritage does not consider it necessary to deliver such benefit through the design proposed which would result in harm to the heritage asset. English Heritage also refer to the Council considering if the design could be substantially amended to make the new development more appropriate for the Conservation Area.

Whilst this proposal would create 6 new dwellings Officers are in agreement with English Heritage

that the degree of harm that would be caused to the heritage asset would outweigh the benefits of providing new housing in this case. As explained earlier in this report informal discussions had taken place with Officers prior to the submission of this application. Whilst Officers have made suggestions the agent considers that the scheme as submitted is the most appropriate in order to bring the development forward. This is not a view shared by Officers or the consultees. It is not considered that the proposal is acceptable in design terms or in accordance with Policy EN4 of the Core Strategy. It is considered that the proposal would result in harm to the heritage asset of the building and the Conservation Area contrary to Policy EN8 of the Core Strategy.

Furthermore it would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

In terms of impact upon neighbouring dwellings the extension would be six storeys with a ridge height no higher than that of the existing Burlington building. The orientation of the building on the site means the front elevation faces north over The Esplanade and the rear elevation faces south. Whilst there are balconies to the front of the proposed building they are serving bedrooms apart from the upper ground floor which would serve a bedroom and living/dining/kitchen. Whilst the front elevation has the sea views it also has a northerly aspect. Understandably, the agent has designed the apartments so that the main living/dining/kitchen areas to the remainder of the apartments takes advantage of the southerly aspect. However, by doing this the southern facing balconies would significantly increase the potential for overlooking of private garden areas to the surrounding neighbouring dwellings. Whilst the balconies have side walls this is not considered to be sufficient to prevent overlooking from taking place. Whilst it is understood that any extension to the Burlington in this location would require windows on the southern elevation it is the level to which overlooking could occur that is being considered. The neighbouring dwellings which are located directly to the south of the area of the Burlington to be extended are between approximately 25-27m away. In accordance with the Design Guide when considering Amenity Criteria, which is the guidance on acceptable distances between dwellings, an additional 3m should be added to the Amenity Criteria guidance for each additional storey when considering proposals for flats. The guidance would therefore suggest up to 33m between the properties to the south and the Burlington. This means there would be a shortfall of between 6 - 8m in terms of amenity criteria. There are therefore concerns regarding the current scheme in terms of relationship to neighbouring dwellings, but it is not considered insurmountable as it may be possible to reduce the impact by altering internal layouts and external fenestration.

The Committee will note that following the receipt of an amended plan detailing means of access to the proposed development that the Highway Authority now have no objection to the application subject to a condition for the existing vehicular accesses to be upgraded.

In terms of car parking the proposed six units would require 12 car parking spaces as proposed. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Council's car parking standards.

In conclusion, there is no objection in principle to an extension of the building in order for funds to be raised to help maintain this important building in the Conservation Area, and to improve facilities in order to allow the hotel to continue to function as a business and local employer. However, whilst Officers are mindful of this situation consideration also has to be given to the significance of the impact that such a proposal would have on the town's built environment. The public benefits of such a proposal have therefore been carefully considered in accordance with paragraph 134 of the NPPF. However, it is concluded that the proposal as submitted would cause significant harm the heritage asset contrary to the requirements of the Development Plan and NPPF.

In addition, it is considered that the proposal as submitted would be detrimental to the privacy and residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings.

The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Development Plan policies and the requirements of the NPPF.

**RECOMMENDATION: Refuse on the following grounds:**

**The District Council adopted the North Norfolk Core Strategy on 24 September 2008, and subsequently adopted Policy HO9 on 23 February 2011, for all planning purposes. The following policy statements are considered relevant to the proposed development:**

**SS 1 - Spatial Strategy for North Norfolk**

**SS 3 - Housing**

**EN 4 - Design**

**EN 8 - Protecting and enhancing the historic environment**

**It is the opinion of the Local Planning Authority that the proposal would result in an unacceptable and inappropriate form of development in this location.**

**By virtue of the design the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposal would not result in significant harm to the historic significance of the Burlington Hotel and the Sheringham Conservation Area.**

**The applicant has also failed to demonstrate that the proposal would not have a significant detrimental impact upon the privacy and amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings to the south, south west and west of the site.**

**The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the above Development Plan policies and paragraphs 128, 132 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

(143) **SHERINGHAM - PF/14/0887 - Partial demolition of hotel and erection of six residential apartments and single-storey rear extension to hotel; Burlington Hotel, The Esplanade for Mr S McDermott**

The Committee considered item 9 of the Officers' reports.

Public Speakers

Mr L McGinn (Sheringham Town Council)  
Mr B Smith (supporting)

The Senior Planning Officer read to the Committee the comments submitted by Councillors B J Hannah and Councillor R Smith. The local Members supported the need for investment in the hotel but had raised concerns regarding the design of the proposed extension. Councillor Smith had raised additional concerns regarding the impact on the privacy and amenities of surrounding residents.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that Officers had no objection to the principle of the extension and acknowledged that the applicant was attempting to fund improvements to the hotel building. Negotiations had taken place with the applicant's agent but concerns remained in respect of the design and impact on the Conservation area and impact on residential amenities. Officers considered that the proposal, as submitted, would result in significant harm to the heritage asset and recommended refusal of this application.

The Chairman referred to a communication which had been sent to all Members by the agent.

Councillor R Shepherd stated that The Burlington was an icon and the last true seaside hotel. He stated that neighbours and residents had been fairly positive about the proposal, but he took on board the concerns of the Town Council and local Members. He suggested deferral to consider the roof design which was causing the most concern.

Councillor J Perry-Warnes stated that holidaymakers required modern, up-to-date facilities and it was necessary for cater for them. He stated that he was very much in favour of the application and there was nothing wrong with the design. He proposed approval of this application.

Councillor R Reynolds considered that a ridge design would be more appropriate for the roof and that the small windows on the new extension should be similar in design to those at the eastern end of the existing building. He supported deferral of this application to negotiate amendments to the design.

Councillor B Smith stated that he had no objection to the general design of the extension but was concerned at the mixture of roof pitches. He understood the economic issues and did not wish to see the loss of another hotel. He supported deferral to negotiate with regard to the roof.

Councillor Mrs A C Sweeney stated that she liked the design but agreed with Councillor Reynolds' comments. She was concerned with regard to balconies on the



rear and considered that balconies would be better located on the north facing the sea.

Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones considered that The Burlington was the only building of worth on the Esplanade. She was in favour of this application but considered that the roof pitches should be reconsidered. She agreed that there was a need for the extension to bring the hotel back to profitability.

Councillor Mrs A R Green supported the application.

It was proposed by Councillor R Shepherd, seconded by Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones that consideration of this application be deferred.

The Development Manager stated that there was the possibility of an appeal against non-determination if this application were deferred. Officers, the applicant and agent shared the view that there was a need to secure the future of the building. Discussions had previously taken place with regard to the roof and the rhythm of the fenestration, but he considered that it would be acceptable to discuss it further.

The Planning Legal Manager advised the Committee to be specific as to the reasons for deferral.

Mr Smith (architect) stated that he took on board all that had been said. He explained that the design of the roof had been the result of discussions with Officers, including the former Conservation, Design and Landscape Manager. He stated that he was happy to discuss the matter.

Councillor R Reynolds stated that he would like to see the ridge running right through to achieve a balance. He also considered that the windows should be balanced with the existing windows.

Councillor Mrs V Uprichard stated that the hotel and the extension looked like two separate buildings and she considered that effort should be made to unify the frontage. She considered that amendments to the fenestration could help to achieve it.

The Development Manager stated that it appeared that Members wished to see a more harmonised roof in a more traditional form. Also, the windows on the right hand side of the front elevation should have a relationship with the rest of the building. The overarching concern was in relation to the general design in the Conservation Area. Overlooking and loss of privacy were also issues that needed further consideration during any discussions.

It was proposed by Councillor R Shepherd, seconded by Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones and

**RESOLVED** unanimously

**That consideration of this application be deferred for design negotiations in respect of the roof and windows and to address issues of overlooking and loss of privacy, in accordance with the views expressed by Members.**

**Sheringham - PF/14/0887 - Partial demolition of hotel and erection of six residential apartments and single-storey rear extension to hotel; Burlington Hotel, The Esplanade, Sheringham, NR26 8LG for McDermott**

**Minor Development**

**- Target Date: 10 October 2014**

Case Officer: Miss J Medler

Full Planning Permission

*This report is to provide an update to the Committee following the deferral of the above application at the meeting on 27 November 2014.*

**Background**

This application was considered by the Development Committee on 27 November 2014 following a site visit which took place on 20 November 2014. The application was recommended for refusal on design grounds, significant harm to heritage assets and impact upon privacy and amenities of occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. A copy of the full report from the meeting of 27 November 2014 is contained in **Appendix...**

Members resolved to defer determination of the application in order for design negotiations to take place in respect of the roof and windows and to address the issues of overlooking and loss of privacy (see minutes of 27 November 2014 in **Appendix...**).

**Updates**

In terms of report updates amended plans have been received from the agent which alter the roof design of the proposal by following the same profile and ridge height of the existing building, and turning the small square windows on the front elevation to the lobby areas by 45 degrees so that they become square diamond shaped. The agent has also provided further supporting information explaining the amendments in detail and how they have arrived at the amendments proposed in emails dated 7 January 2015 and 14 January 2015 contained in **Appendix...**, along with the supporting information originally submitted.

Re-advertisement and re-consultation has taken place in relation to the amended plans. At the time of writing this report no representations had been received.

Sheringham Town Council accept the roof line improvements but still object to this application on the grounds that the extension is unacceptable, as it is out of keeping for this iconic building and not sympathetically designed and there should be better use of the proposed materials.

Consultation responses have been received from the Conservation, Design and Landscape Team Leader and English Heritage. These responses are contained in **Appendix....** along with their comments in relation to the scheme as originally submitted.

**Appraisal**

A recent site meeting has taken place between Officers, the agent and applicant in order for the agent to explain the amendments made to the proposal. This was a useful exercise. However, despite the significant time and careful consideration that has been given to this proposal by those involved, Officers remain unable to support the proposal for the reasons given in the consultation responses from Conservation and Design and English Heritage.

Whilst it is considered that some improvements have been made to the design by the alterations proposed to the roof, the majority of the comments made on the original design regarding impact and compatibility still apply. Please see consultation responses from Conservation and Design and English Heritage in **Appendix....**

English Heritage are maintaining their objection following the receipt of amended plans and re-iterate that they do not consider that the information submitted fulfills the requirements of paragraph 128 of the NPPF, which requires applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected by a development including any contribution made by their setting.

In addition, in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy you will note from the agents email of 14 January 2015 (see **Appendix...**) that he is satisfied that they have addressed all aspects of potential overlooking. This is not a view shared by Officers. Whilst the agent is correct that no objections have been received from neighbouring properties the distances between properties does not comply with the amenity criteria as set out in the Design Guide. This is explained in the original Committee report, but for clarification the reason why is because an additional 3m should be added to the amenity criteria guidance for each additional storey when considering proposals for flats. There would be a shortfall in the amenity criteria of between 6 – 8m.

Officers continue to maintain support in principle for an extension to the existing building in order for funds to be raised to help maintain this important building in the Conservation Area and to improve facilities in order to allow the hotel to continue to function as a business and local employer.

However, despite some improvement to the roof design as shown on the amended plans it remains the Officer's opinion that the proposal as amended would result in an unacceptable and inappropriate form of development, would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and would have a significant detrimental impact upon the privacy and amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings.

Notwithstanding the amendments made the proposal is considered to be contrary to Development Plan policies and the requirements of the NPPF as explained in the original Committee report of 27 November 2014.

**Recommendation: Refuse on the following grounds:**

**The District Council adopted the North Norfolk Core Strategy on 24 September 2008, and subsequently adopted Policy HO9 on 23 February 2011, for all planning purposes. The following policy statements are considered relevant to the proposed development:**

**SS 1 - Spatial Strategy for North Norfolk**

**SS 3 - Housing**

**EN 4 - Design**

**EN 8 - Protecting and enhancing the historic environment**

**It is the opinion of the Local Planning Authority that the proposal would result in an unacceptable and inappropriate form of development in this location.**

**By virtue of the design the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposal would not result in significant harm to the historic significance of the Burlington Hotel and the Sheringham Conservation Area.**

**The applicant has also failed to demonstrate that the proposal would not have a significant detrimental impact upon the privacy and amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings to the south, south west and west of the site.**

**The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the above Development Plan policies and paragraphs 128, 132 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

(228) **SHERINGHAM - PF/14/0887 - Partial demolition of hotel and erection of six residential apartments and single-storey rear extension to hotel; Burlington Hotel, The Esplanade for Mr S McDermott**

All Members had been lobbied on this application.

The Committee considered item 7 of the Officers' reports.

Public Speakers

Mr L McGinn (Sheringham Town Council)  
Mr B Smith (supporting)

The Development Management Team Leader presented plans and photographs of models produced by the applicant's agent to demonstrate the design amendments since the deferral of this application on 27 November 2014.

The Development Management Team Leader reported that Councillor B J Hannah and Councillor R Smith, the local Members, were unable to attend the meeting but supported the Officer's recommendation to refuse this application. Sheringham Town Council objected to the amended application.

The Development Management Team Leader stated whilst the principle of an extension was acceptable, the current proposal was recommended for refusal.

Councillor R Shepherd considered that the proposals were necessary to preserve the existing building. He did not agree with the objections of English Heritage, and referred to nearby developments which had already blighted the Conservation Area. He considered that no heritage assets would be affected by the proposed development. He considered that the proposal was an entirely acceptable form of development given the parameters of the area. He proposed approval of the application.

Councillor J Perry-Warnes seconded the proposal. He stated that Sheringham needed good accommodation and was very dependent on the holiday industry. He understood the need for the proposal and stated that it was necessary for the proposed apartments to be of good quality. He referred to the location of the building facing the North Sea.

Councillor M J M Baker stated that hotels like the Burlington were a dying breed and needed to diversify and be supported wherever possible. He had no objection to the proposal in principle, however he considered that the design was not in keeping with the existing building.

Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones supported Councillor Shepherd's comments regarding the existing development along the Esplanade. Whilst she had reservations regarding the design of the extension, the hotel was not currently thriving and if refused, the process would have to start again. She supported the proposal.

Councillor R Reynolds stated that the amended design was better than the original, but he still had reservations with regard to the design of the windows in terms of their balance with the existing building.

Councillor P W High considered that the design was as good as could be achieved.

Councillor B Smith considered that hybrid buildings were always controversial, but he considered that the proposal worked, was interesting, and would be unique when completed.

The Development Manager stated that the objections from English Heritage related to the impact the demolition and new building would have on the Conservation Area. He read from the comments of English Heritage and gave advice on weighing the public benefits of the proposal with the harm to the heritage asset. He advised that a link between the development and the improvement or preservation of the existing building would need to be secured by a legal agreement. If the Committee were minded to approve this application he requested delegated authority to deal with this matter.

The Planning Legal Manager considered that Members who had spoken in favour of the application had weighed the issues and advised the Committee with regard to the reasons for approval.

It was proposed by Councillor R Shepherd, seconded by Councillor J Perry-Warnes and

**RESOLVED** by 13 votes to 0 with 1 abstention

**That the Head of Planning be authorised to approve this application subject to the completion of a Section 106 Obligation to link the development to works to secure the preservation of the Burlington Hotel and subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.**

**Reasons: The proposal would ensure the long term survival of the iconic hotel building in the Conservation Area.**