

<b>Application Number</b>	17/00549/AS
<b>Location</b>	Eastwell Manor Hotel, Ashford, TN25 6HR
<b>Grid Reference</b>	01670/47527
<b>Parish Council</b>	Eastwell
<b>Ward</b>	Boughton Aluph & Eastwell
<b>Application Description</b>	Listed Building Consent for the removal of Mansion Cottage
<b>Applicant</b>	Champneys Eastwell Ltd, Eastwell Manor Hotel, Faversham Road, Boughton Aluph
<b>Agent</b>	Lee Evans Planning, St John's Lane, Canterbury
<b>Site Area</b>	1.73ha

(a) 26/-                      (b) S                      (c) KCC (Heritage) X

## Introduction

1. This application is reported to Planning Committee because it accompanies an application for planning permission which is a major application, which is also reported to Committee under reference 17/00548/AS. In addition to the removal of Mansion Cottage, the planning permission also seeks consent for the erection of a 28 bedroom annexe to provide additional hotel bedroom accommodation, associated provision of additional parking and changes to the parking layout, along with landscaping, a fountain and installation of estate fencing along the driveway.
2. The planning merits of the proposal are dealt with in the report on the planning application. This application is concerned only with the demolition of Mansion Cottage.

## Site and Surroundings

3. The site is located to the north west of Boughton Lees within the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It is accessed off the Faversham Road and the main complex of buildings is located some 650m to the west of the main access, which is in the southern corner of the site. The historic Manor is the focal point of the hotel, and this sits at the high point of the site with the

main buildings overlooking the golf course and formal landscaped gardens. The buildings sit within an undulating parkland setting, with views over Boughton Lees and the Downs.

4. The hotel comprises 23 bedrooms, a restaurant and facilities within the main listed building of Eastwell Manor with a further 39 cottage rooms within the Mews complex (converted stables) to the south east of the main building. Mansion Cottage, which is the subject of this application, is located between the walled garden (adjacent to the Manor) and the Mews, and is used for staff accommodation. Other facilities at the site include a golf course, tennis courts, an outdoor swimming pool and a health centre with spa facilities, a restaurant, an indoor swimming pool, gym and treatment rooms housed in the Pavilion (built in the 1990s), all set within landscaped grounds.
5. Eastwell Manor is listed Grade II, as are the pathways and gates of the landscaped gardens, and the walled gardens to the south west and north east of the Manor. The listing description is appended to the report.

## **Proposal**

6. Listed building consent is sought for the demolition of Mansion Cottage.
7. In support of the application, the following information has been submitted and is summarised below:

### **Heritage Statement**

8. This assesses the impact of the scheme on the as-built heritage (standing buildings) and gardens. It forms an initial stage of investigation of the area of the development and has been carried out in accordance with all the relevant requirements.
9. The statement concludes that the setting of the Manor House started to change when it was converted to a hotel and more significantly when the pavilion spa building was built. The new annexe will ensure the viability of the hotel for the future and the preservation of the heritage asset in a way which is compatible with its historic use, and the upkeep of its gardens and parkland, which are of interest historically. The new building will not be read against the Manor House and therefore, its impact would be less than significant on the setting of the house. The loss of the cottage would be limited.

## **Planning History**

10. The most recent and relevant planning history is listed below:

**17/00548/AS** – Planning permission sought for the removal of Mansion Cottage and the erection of a 28 bedroom annexe to provide additional hotel bedroom accommodation. Associated provision of additional parking and changes to the parking layout, along with landscaping, a fountain and installation of estate fencing along the driveway. This application is the corresponding planning application that accompanies the listed building consent application currently being considered.

**17/00782/AS** – Listed building consent sought for the removal of a partition wall and the relocation of paneling to re-establish the original extent of the room. This application is currently being considered.

**17/00648/AS** - Listed building consent granted for internal alterations to create ground floor toilets.

**13/01437/AS** – Planning permission granted for the erection of a two storey extension to the existing pavilion. This application was the renewal of 10/01241/AS.

**10/01241/AS** – Planning permission granted for the erection of a two storey extension to the existing pavilion. This application was the renewal of 06/02449/AS.

**10/00384/AS** – Planning permission granted for the erection of a hotel annexe.

**07/00698/AS** – Planning permission granted for the erection of a green keeper's store and the construction of an earth bund.

**07/00119/AS** – Planning permission granted for the erection of a hotel annexe.

**06/02449/AS** - Planning permission granted for the erection of a two storey extension to the existing pavilion (including extra treatment rooms, changing facilities and office areas).

**06/02451/AS** – Planning permission refused for the erection of a green keeper's store (for golf course) and construction of an earth bund.

**05/00770/AS** - Listed building consent refused for the erection of a two storey extension including access and toilets (resubmission of 04/01374/AS).

**05/00769/AS** – Planning permission refused for the erection of a two storey extension including access and toilets (resubmission of 04/01373/AS).

**04/01374/AS** – Listed building consent refused for the erection of a two storey extension including access and toilets for the disabled.

**04/01373/AS** – Planning permission refused for the erection of a two storey extension including access and toilets for the disabled.

**04/01468/AS** – Planning permission granted for the creation of a 9 hole golf course (revised scheme)

**04/00485/AS** – Planning application withdrawn by applicant for the creation of a 9 hole golf course.

**99/01303/AS** – Planning permission granted for an additional parking area.

**99/00835/AS** – Planning permission granted for a car park.

**99/00068/AS** – Planning permission granted for the erection of a hotel annexe.

**98/00574/AS** – Planning permission granted for a plant room.

**97/01505/AS** – Planning permission granted for a staff garage block and laundry.

**97/00432/AS** – Listed building consent granted for conversion of building to 6 staff units.

**97/00024/AS** – Planning permission granted for an additional parking area.

**96/01343/AS** – Planning permission granted for the change of use from single dwelling to six bedsits with communal facilities for hotel staff.

## Consultations

**Ward Member:** No written comments have been received from the Ward Member.

**Boughton and Eastwell Parish Council:** The Parish Council welcomes Champneys' investment in Eastwell Manor which secures the future of one of the largest employers in our rural parish and provides a further boost to the visitor economy of Ashford Borough.

Planning application 17/00548/AS proposes a new annexe of 28 additional bedrooms for the hotel. This is close to a 50% increase in hotel room capacity. Combined with the attraction of the Champneys' brand and its increased marketing power we would expect a significant increase in the number of visitors to the hotel and spa plus a corresponding uplift in staff numbers. While we welcome the renaissance of Eastwell Manor as part of the Champneys estate, the expansion of the hotel will impact upon parish residents and, in particular, those living in village of Boughton Lees who can expect to see increased traffic on already busy local roads.

We therefore bring the following issues to the attention of the Planning Committee when considering the application for Eastwell Manor and in setting any conditions for the development.

#### Enhancement of hotel entrance and improved signage

The Parish Council and local residents share the view that the entrance to Eastwell Manor should be enhanced to improve visibility and safe ingress and egress. Existing signage for the hotel is poor. Hotel visitors frequently miss the entrance. Local residents are regularly asked to give directions. This usually necessitates turning around Boughton Lees village green. These changes must be in keeping with its location within the Boughton Lees Conservation Area.

#### Traffic calming measures

Another contributing factor to visitors missing the hotel entrance is traffic speed in both directions on the A251 Faversham Road. Automatic Traffic Count (ATC) recordings by DHA Transport consultants commissioned by the Parish Council in 2014 provided evidence of excessive speeding and that flashing speed indicator signs were routinely ignored. This was corroborated by recent ATC recordings commissioned by a prospective developer close to the entrance to Eastwell Manor. We can provide copies of these reports. Traffic calming measures on Faversham Road would benefit the whole village. Ashford Borough Council officers conducting the recent review of the Conservation Area commented on traffic speed and the absence of safe crossing places. The introduction of traffic islands on Faversham Road was the second highest priority of residents in consultation for the Neighbourhood Plan.

We hope this information is helpful to your discussions. The Parish Council recognise that traffic matters are for Kent County Council Highways Department but respectfully ask whether consideration might be given in the planning process to these improvements which will benefit both the hotel and local residents without a call on the public purse.

#### Grant Permission with Conditions:

- The Gatehouse to the Manor at Boughton Lees

Building work will incur additional heavy vehicle traffic through a narrow, single track entrance. We ask the hotel owner to liaise with the Lodge occupant to mitigate possible disturbance and noise levels whilst building takes place.

- Proposed fencing

We are not aware that the hotel owner owns/leases the land on which the fencing is proposed. If not, we request that the hotel owner must work with/advise the relevant land owner/livestock owner to agree the most suitable type of fencing.

- Sustainability

The Parish Council feels that this should not create a precedent for further development on this site and that any further development should be limited in such a sensitive area.

- The hotel owner should be encouraged to consult with the estate owners of Eastwell Park, estate residents and village residents on this and any further planning applications.

The Council also welcomes and endorses conditions contained within the planning comments of Helen Forster, Biodiversity Officer, forwarded from KCC's Ecological Advice Service, and from Katie Miller, Planning Manager, Kent Downs AONB Unit.

We also strongly support the importance of the benefit to the applicant of pursuing sustainable policies and ecologically-aware practice in the development of the hotel.

**Kent County Council Heritage:** The site of Eastwell Manor lies in an area of wider archaeological potential associated with prehistoric and Anglo-Saxon activity. An ancient routeway crosses the parkland and associated activity, including burials, are known nearby.

Eastwell Manor is considered to have originally been a 16th century country residence with formal gardens, outbuildings and wider parkland. It was re-developed in the mid 19th century and later used as a convalescent home for WWI Canadian soldiers. Remains of the original house are reported to be incorporated into the garden walls but much of the site has been substantially re-landscaped. The main house is Listed Grade II but it does seem that the impact of the golf course has led to the parkland no longer being on the national heritage list. The grounds are still mentioned within the Kent Gardens Compendium in view of the survival of some of the formal gardens, routeways and wider parkland.

Mansion Cottage itself seems to have been a late 19th century construction, identifiable on the 2nd Ed OS map. It appears to be at one end of a shortened enclosure, which is identifiable on the 1st Ed OS map. This enclosure may be part of the 19th century landscaping or horticultural/kitchen garden use. The enclosure seems to have disappeared although it is possibly still visible on the 1940s aerial photographs.

Although the application is supported by a Heritage Statement, there does not seem to be any assessment or statement of significance for the enclosure or building. The Heritage Statement is welcome but it seems to focus on the main house. The Mansion Cottage and the enclosure may be significant heritage assets and will be subject to removal and/or significant harm by the proposed development. As such I recommend the need for an appropriate archaeological assessment of the building and the enclosure and their setting.

The District Conservation Officer may consider Mansion Cottage to be within the curtilage of Eastwell Manor and as such Mansion Cottage may need to be considered as a designated heritage asset. Suitable assessment of this building, including its original function, would be appropriate to ensure an informed decision is made.

The proposed new car parking may have a significant impact on the historic landscape remnants, including veteran trees, post medieval footpaths and routeways, historic views of the house and grounds etc. As such I also recommend the need for a historic landscape assessment, which could include assessment of the rectangular enclosure beside and under Mansion Cottage, as well as the relationship of Mansion Cottage to the views and understanding of Eastwell Manor and therefore its contribution to the significance of Eastwell Manor.

In summary, I recommend the need for a specialist assessment of the significance of Mansion Cottage and its contribution to the significance of Eastwell Manor, and a historic landscape assessment to clarify the significance of the enclosure and surrounding remnants of historic parkland and formal gardens, and their contribution to the significance of Eastwell Manor.

It would be preferable for these specialist assessments to be undertaken prior to determination of this application.

However, if it is decided appropriate to determine this application at this stage, as a less preferred option, I recommend the following conditions are placed on any forthcoming consent:

- i No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of building recording in accordance with a written specification and timetable which has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that historic building features are properly examined and recorded.

- ii No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of

historic landscape assessment in accordance with a written specification and timetable which has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that features of archaeological interest are properly examined and recorded in accordance with NPPF

And

- iii No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a watching brief to be undertaken by an archaeologist approved by the Local Planning Authority so that the excavation is observed and items of interest and finds are recorded. The watching brief shall be in accordance with a written programme and specification which has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that features of archaeological interest are properly examined and recorded.

**Neighbours:** No comments received

## **Planning Policy**

- 11. The Development Plan currently comprises the saved policies in the adopted Ashford Borough Local Plan 2000, the adopted LDF Core Strategy 2008, the adopted Ashford Town Centre Action Area Plan 2010, the Tenterden & Rural Sites DPD 2010, the Urban Sites and Infrastructure DPD 2012, the Chilmington Green AAP 2013, the Wye Neighbourhood Plan 2015-30 and the Pluckley Neighbourhood Plan 2016-30. On 9 June 2016 the Council approved a consultation version of the Local Plan to 2030. Consultation commenced on 15 June 2016 and closed after 8 weeks. Proposed changes to the draft Local Plan were approved for further consultation by the Council on 15 June 2017 and consultation has now commenced. At present the policies in this emerging plan can be accorded little weight.
- 12. The relevant policies from the Development Plan relating to this application are as follows:-

### **Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2008**

CS1 – Guiding Principles

CS9 – Design Quality

CS17 – Tourism



### **Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD 2010**

TRS17 – Landscape Character and Design

### **Ashford Local Plan (2016)**

SP1 – Strategic Objectives

EMP11 - Tourism

ENV13 – Conservation and Enhancement of Heritage Assets

ENV15 - Archaeology

13. The following are also material to the determination of this application:-

### **Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents**

Landscape Character SPD (April 2011)

### **Village Design Statements**

Boughton Aluph and Eastwell Parish Design Statement

### **Government Advice**

### **National Planning Policy Framework 2012**

14. Members should note that the determination must be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. A significant material consideration is the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF says that less weight should be given to the policies above if they are in conflict with the NPPF.
15. The Historic England Good Practice Advice Notes provide information to assist in implementing the policies in the NPPF and the guidance in the PPG.
16. Para. 128 of the NPPF states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage asset affected, including any contribution made by their setting. Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

17. Para 129 requires Local Planning Authorities to identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
18. In determining planning applications, para 131 of the NPPF says that Local Planning Authorities should take account of:
  - The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
  - The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic viability; and
  - The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
19. The general approach to considering applications is set out in para.132 of the NPPF, and states, "When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional."
20. Para. 134 of the NPPF states that "Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use".

## **Assessment**

21. The main issue for consideration is:
  - (a) The impact of the development on the listed building

### **The impact of the development on the listed building**

22. The planning application for this development which is also on the agenda under reference 17/00548/AS, deals with the planning merits of the proposals, which also includes the impact of the development on the listed building. This

application is solely for listed building consent for the demolition of Mansion Cottage.so my report focuses only on this.

23. In accordance with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended), it is the Council's statutory duty and obligation to have regard to the preservation and enhancement of such assets and their setting.
24. Policy ENV13 of the Local Plan 2016 states that proposals which protect, conserve and enhance the heritage assets of the Borough, sustaining and enhancing their significance and the contribution they make to local character and distinctiveness will be supported. Proposals that make sensitive use of heritage assets through regeneration, particularly where these bring redundant or under-used buildings and areas into appropriate and viable use consistent with their conservation, will be encouraged.
25. These criteria are consistent with Government policy set out in the NPPF. The NPPF is supported by the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). The Historic England Good Practice Advice Note provides information to assist in implementing the policies in the NPPF and the guidance in the PPG.
26. The general approach to considering applications is set out in para. 132 of the NPPF, and states *"When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional"*.
27. The building that is proposed to be demolished is in fact a 1920s house that was designed in the style of other estate buildings at Eastwell. It is modest both in terms of its scale and architecture. It is of some significance as a curtilage listed building, but it is clearly subordinate to the Manor which is the main listed building and it has a functional appearance, apart from some half-timbering to the external gable. It has some interest as a demonstration of how estate workers were accommodated, but the proposal to demolish the building will not in my view, provoke substantial harm to Eastwell Manor.
28. Furthermore, the small amount of harm caused to the significance of the Manor can be justified to a degree by the provision of new hotel accommodation which will increase the revenue of the Hotel and which will then improve opportunities for improved maintenance and ongoing care. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal to demolish the Cottage and to replace it in principle with a building which will improve the overall long term future of

the listed building, is therefore in compliance with the NPPF and Local Plan policy.

## Human Rights Issues

29. I have also taken into account the human rights issues relevant to this application. In my view the “Assessment” section above and the Recommendations below represent an appropriate balance between the interests and rights of the applicant (to enjoy his land subject only to reasonable and proportionate controls by a public authority) and the interests and rights of those potentially affected by the proposal (to respect for private life and the home and peaceful enjoyment of their properties).

## Working with the applicant

30. In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the NPPF Ashford Borough Council (ABC) takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. ABC works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner as explained in the note to the applicant included in the recommendation below.

## Conclusion

31. The proposal to demolish the building will not result in substantial harm to Eastwell Manor which is a listed building and furthermore, the harm caused to the significance of the Manor can be justified to a degree by the provision of new hotel accommodation which will increase the revenue of the Hotel and which will then improve opportunities for improved maintenance and ongoing care.

## Recommendation

### Grant Consent

Subject to the following conditions and note:

1. The development to which this consent relates shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this decision.

**Reason:** To comply with the requirements of Section 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of building recording in accordance with a written specification and timetable which has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To ensure that historic building features are properly examined and recorded.

### **Note to Applicant**

#### **1. Working with the applicant**

In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the NPPF Ashford Borough Council (ABC) takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions. ABC works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by;

- offering a pre-application advice service,
- as appropriate updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application
- where possible suggesting solutions to secure a successful outcome,
- informing applicants/agents of any likely recommendation of refusal prior to a decision and,
- by adhering to the requirements of the Development Management Customer Charter.

In this instance:

- the applicant/agent was updated of any issues after the initial site visit,
- was provided with pre-application advice,
- The applicant was provided the opportunity to submit amendments to the scheme/ address issues.
- The application was considered by the Planning Committee where the applicant/agent had the opportunity to speak to the committee and promote the application.

### **Background Papers**

All papers referred to in this report are currently published on the Ashford Borough Council web site ([www.ashford.gov.uk](http://www.ashford.gov.uk)) . Those papers relating specifically to this application may be found on the [View applications on line](#) pages under planning application reference 17/00549/AS.

**Contact Officer:** Sue Head

**Telephone:** (01233) 330387

**Email:** [sue.head@ashford.gov.uk](mailto:sue.head@ashford.gov.uk)

## Annex 1

### Building Details:

Building Name: EASTWELL MANOR AND  
COURTYARD GATEWAYS  
Parish: EASTWELL  
District: ASHFORD  
County: KENT  
Postcode:

### Details:

LBS Number: 181521  
Grade: II  
Date Listed: 27/11/1957  
Date of Last Amendment:  
27/11/1957  
Date Delisted:  
NGR: TR0167247568

### Listing Text:

TR 04 NW EASTWELL

5/14 Eastwell Manor and Courtyard Gateways

27.11.57

II

House. 1843 by William Burn, rebuilt 1926 - 8 by B.C. Deacon. Flint, dressed stone and plain tile roof. An 'E' plan, with extended wings, including remains of C18 house by Joseph Bonomi. Two storeys, numerous irregularly placed stacks, irregular fenestration of mullioned cross-windows, 1 to each floor of left wing, left recess, central gabled porch, right recess and 2 in right wing. Red brick wing to right. The remains of the earlier house now form attached walled gardens left. and right. Subsidiary features: in the courtyards to the rear of the house are 2 C16 gateways (formerly separately listed), a round headed stone archway with flanking columns and cartouche over, and, to north, a 4 centred brick arched gateway, castellated, flanked by buttresses and castellated walls. Interior: the house contains many earlier features brought in from elsewhere in C20, including an oriel window in the kitchen court, panelling from Markyate, Hertfordshire, and a C17 staircase, provenance unknown. Stone balustraded terracing extending some 300 yards in 3 flights south of the house, attached to a raised and paved terrace before the house. Some £500.00 spent on the house in the C19 by the Earls of Winchelsea.

Listing NGR: TR0167247568