

## **The Crown Hotel Observations**

Planning Application - 21/00104/FUL. The Crown, Old Hall Street, Malpas

Whilst the extra trade that may result in the community from an extension of this nature will be positive for the local economy, it is requested that the following observations are considered.

### **Application History:**

It is noted that a previous proposal to build an extension to accommodate a restaurant in the vacant space alongside the Crown was refused; this on the highway grounds.

The decision stated that:

The proposal would not be in the interest of highway safety or the free flow of traffic and in the opinion of the district Planning Authority constitutes over intensive use of the site.

Also that development would be seriously detrimental to the visual amenities of the Malpas conservation area.

Three subsequent planning applications were withdrawn, which suggests further refusals were imminent although reasons are not given, but these suggest that traffic flow and parking mitigation could be crucial material consideration when making a decision to approve or reject the application.

### **Conservation area:**

This application refers to extending a building in the Malpas conservation area. It is also a character building as listed in the Malpas and Overton Neighbourhood Plan.

Paragraph 6.2.1 of the planning statement states that there is no character appraisal of the Malpas Conservation area. This is not correct although somewhat dated there is a March 1981 assessment of the conservation area.

For this reason, it is important should the application be approved, that the design and materials used are sympathetic to existing conservation area and the buildings surroundings.

The proposal is to construct an extension to the building in a gap between the existing hotel and the Dower House residential property. This should be regarded as infill and as such Neighbourhood Plan policies BE3, BE4 and SF1 should apply to this application.

### **Application Issues for consideration:**

There is no south facing illustrated on the proposed elevation drawings.

It is noted that the building appears to have been recently extended. Is a further extension of this surface area permitted under the 30% extension of floor space planning rule?

Although it is mentioned as a note to the potential builder, there is no reference in the planning statement to drainage or sewerage mitigation measures that will be generated by the increase in capacity on the site.

With a building previously being located on the site there is a potential for archaeological deposits to remain. Again there is no mention of an archaeology report or watching brief associated with the application.

Work on the site appears to have started already without permission being granted.

Malpas's biggest town issue as recognised by the Borough and Parish Councils is traffic congestion and parking.

Paragraphs 7.5.2 of the planning statement accepts that there would be some additional parking demand, due to the increase in floor space.

However, there is no mention of the provision of car parking space to support this development to accommodate the increase in customers / tourists that the proposal is indicating an extension to the hotel would bring.

Paragraphs 7.5.3 of the Planning Statement indicates that parking associated with the development is not a problem as customers will be encouraged to use public transport. Malpas has an extremely poor bus service resulting in residents being unable to get a bus in or out of the town after 6:00pm. There is also no existing taxi service in the town, so it is inevitable extra cars will be parking in a location which already restricts the visibility of vehicles accessing the High Street from Church Street.

The application evidences the space required to comply with Covid19 restrictions as a reason for the proposal in a number of instances, however paragraph 7.5.2 of the Planning Statement admits that the number of customers that can be accommodated is likely to remain unchanged. Hence the argument citing Covid19 should be dismissed from any consideration.

The biggest issue is the potential impact of the development on the neighbouring Dower House amenity (visual and light levels). Paragraph 7.4.2 of the Planning Statement refers to the close proximity of the proposal to the Dower House, and a window serving a front living room. The loss of the Dower's house living room light needs to be considered.

**Other:**

Should permission be granted is it possible that with the proposal to add a function room on the second floor, to condition that a sprinkler system be installed for the safety of future patrons?

In addition with the declared climate emergency all applications should be looking towards the provision of green and sustainable types of heating and water recycling being included as part of the development.