



**City Services & Development  
Directorate  
Planning, Transport & Highways**

Development Management  
Civic Centre 4  
Much Park Street  
Coventry  
CV1 2PY

[www.coventry.gov.uk/](http://www.coventry.gov.uk/)

Please contact Nigel Smith  
Direct Line 024 7683 1246  
[planning@coventry.gov.uk](mailto:planning@coventry.gov.uk)

Mr Adrian Hill  
AAH Planning Consultants  
27 Old Gloucester Street  
LONDON  
WC1N 3AX

Reference FUL/2011/1587  
06/10/2011

Dear Sir,

**TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**

Application Ref: **FUL/2011/1587**  
Proposal: **Alteration, extension and part demolition of existing buildings to provide hotel accommodation including banqueting and spa facilities and associated car parking and landscaping**  
Site Address: **Old Hall, Tamworth Road**

Following consideration of the above application, I am writing to express the following concerns:

I have read the planning statement, but have come to the conclusion that the proposed development constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt. This is because extensions to commercial buildings are not listed as potentially being appropriate in paragraph 3.4 of PPG2. Therefore, very special circumstances to clearly outweigh the harm are required.

Aside from the economic / job creation benefits of the scheme, the main benefit (very special circumstance) being put forward would appear to be that the scheme would preserve the listed building. With this in mind, Policy HE11.1 of PPS5 is relevant, as is the guidance on 'Enabling Development' produced by English Heritage. The Policy gives criteria against which any proposal for enabling development should be assessed and the guidance gives very detailed instruction as to the type and breadth of financial and other information required. Whilst I see little point in regurgitating all of the guidance I think it worthwhile to highlight that it is necessary to demonstrate that the level of development is the minimum necessary to secure the future conservation of the listed building and to explore whether there is a source of funding that might support the heritage asset without the need for enabling development. As the requirement for any 'enabling development' (let

alone the amount proposed) has not been established I am afraid that it cannot be given significant weight in any decision.

Furthermore, due to the scale of the proposal and the fact that the end use would be a hotel, sequential and impact assessments are required in accordance with Policies EC14.3 and EC14.4 of PPS4. Also, a tree constraints plan has not been submitted with the application.

Therefore, as it stands, the application will be recommended for refusal. If you would like to undertake further work to address the above issues please do so by 24<sup>th</sup> October 2011. The reason for this date is to meet the deadline for Committee reports for the meeting to be held on 10<sup>th</sup> November. If you would like to speak about the application, please call me on the above number.

Yours faithfully

Nigel Smith  
Senior Planning/Policy Officer