

First Objection

To: Wiltshire Council Planning Department

Re: Planning Application PL/2026/01847 — The Angel, Church Street, Westbury

I wish to formally object to the proposed change of use and alterations at The Angel, Westbury.

Loss of hotel accommodation in Westbury

Westbury has no hotel. The Angel has functioned as a hotel within living memory and should be retained as such. The loss of visitor accommodation harms the local economy and contradicts Wiltshire Core Policy 49 which supports tourism infrastructure in market towns. My family housed guests at The Angel Hotel when our own house was full.

Harm to heritage significance

The Angel is Grade II listed and a key historic building on Church Street. The proposal to convert it to a restaurant does not enhance its significance. It removes the historic function and risks trivialising the asset. The National Planning Policy Framework para 202 requires clear and convincing justification for harm to a designated heritage asset. None has been provided.

Unauthorised works and lack of Conservation Officer input

I was informed by the Planning Office that unauthorised works at The Angel had been referred to the Conservation Officer for assessment of potential damage. Despite this, no Conservation Officer report appears on the planning file. We are instead asked to rely solely on the applicant's 'Planning Heritage' report, which is not impartial.

Factual errors in applicant's heritage statement

The Planning Heritage report states the building was a House in Multiple Occupation. As a long-term resident who lived opposite The Angel, I can confirm it operated as The

Angel **Hotel**, not an HMO. This misrepresentation undermines the credibility of the entire document.

Suitability of the applicant

The applicant carried out works without consent and their builders acted evasively and with aggression when questioned by neighbours. This behaviour, combined with the inaccurate heritage statement, gives no confidence that they will 'carefully restore the building' as claimed. Past conduct is a material consideration when assessing custodianship of a listed building.

Conclusion

The application should be refused. It results in the loss of needed hotel provision, causes harm to a listed building without justification, and is supported by inaccurate and partial evidence. I request that a full Conservation Officer assessment is published before any decision is made.

Yours faithfully,

Stephen Pyne

30th April 2026

Second objection

To: Wiltshire Council Planning Department

Re: Planning Application PL/2026/01847 — The Angel, Church Street, Westbury

Subject: Additional Objection — Fire Safety and Means of Escape

I wish to add a further objection regarding fire safety at The Angel.

Proposed restaurant seating on upper floors

The plans show covers located on the first floor. The historic staircase serving this floor is narrow and steep. It is the only staircase shown.

Evidential concern from public use

During a recent organised walking tour of Westbury attended by approx. 40 people, a significant number refused to go upstairs in The Angel due to concern about descending safely. I used the staircase and found it required particular care. This demonstrates the existing means of escape is unsuitable for increased public occupancy.

Heritage vs safety conflict

I would object to removal or harmful alteration of the historic staircase, as it contributes to the listed building's significance. However, retaining it unchanged may not provide adequate means of escape for restaurant use under current fire safety standards.

Request for expert assessment

Given the intensification of use and the constraints of the historic fabric, the application should not be determined without a formal consultation response from the Building Control Body and/or Dorset & Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service. The NPPF para 97 requires planning decisions to ensure safe and accessible places.

The applicant has not demonstrated that a safe means of escape can be achieved without harm to the listed building. I request that a fire officer's report is obtained and published before determination.

Yours faithfully,

Stephen Pyne

30 April 20026