

## REPORT 2

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	P07/W0031 and P07/W0030/LB
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	FULL and LISTED BUILDING CONSENT
<b>REGISTERED</b>	09.01.2007
<b>PARISH</b>	DORCHESTER
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Mr John Cotton Mr Philip Cross
<b>APPLICANT SITE</b>	Maybourne Properties Limited The Chequers Public House, 20 Bridge End Dorchester-on-Thames
<b>PROPOSAL – P07/W0031</b>	Erection of a pair of semi detached houses & associated garages. Alteration to access.
<b>PROPOSAL – P07/W0030/LB</b>	Demolition of 20 <sup>th</sup> century extensions. Pub use retained and demolition of sectional garage building. Internal alterations to provide new toilets for public house on ground floor new bathrooms at first floor.
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	As amended by drawing nos. 0623-2a and 5b accompanying agent's letter dated 2 February 2007 and 623 -1c accompanying agent's letter dated 26 March 2007 and drawings 623 5a, 01c, 02c accompanying agent's letter dated 26 March and 11 April 2007.
<b>GRID REFERENCE</b>	457856/193932
<b>OFFICER</b>	Mrs S Crawford

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 These applications were deferred from the Planning Committee on 21 February 2007 pending clarification on the use of the Public house and to obtain further information on the viability of the pub. The planning application has been referred to the Committee because the recommendation conflicts with the views of the Parish Council. The application for listed building consent has been referred to committee because it is directly linked to the planning application.

1.2 Since February the applicant has approached Davey and Co who specialise in the valuation and sale of pubs and bars, hotels and inns, restaurants and retail businesses. Davey and Co have assessed the premises with the demolitions proposed and with the development plot taken out of the site. They have confirmed that, in their view there is a market for the use as a Public House and the site is being marketed as such.

Amendments to the listed building application have been submitted to detail

internal alterations to provide new toilets for the public house on the ground floor and new bathrooms at first floor. A new porch on the frontage is also proposed. The plan has been amended so that no parking for customers is shown at the rear.

### 1.3

Amendments to the planning application have been submitted to amend the boundary between the pub and the houses and to clarify the position with regard to the public highway on the frontage. In all other respects the applications are the same.

1.4 The Chequers Public House occupies a prominent corner plot on Bridge End in Dorchester; it has not been used for trading for a number of years and is unoccupied. The pub benefits from a large garden to the rear with a gravelled parking area to the frontage; upon which, stands a double garage constructed in concrete blockwork under a shallow pitched roof. There is a single storey, flat roof extension to the side of the pub that was added in the late 1960's to provide toilets to serve the public house. The property is a grade II listed building and lies opposite the grade II\* church of St Birinus; it is also within the Dorchester Conservation Area. Dorchester lies within the Oxford Green Belt.

1.5 The site is identified on the Ordnance Survey Extract **attached** at Appendix 1.

## 2.0 PROPOSAL

2.1 **Planning application.** The application, as amended, seeks full planning permission for the demolition of the existing detached garage and the construction of two, 3 bed dwellings in a semi- detached pair. Parking spaces for 2 cars per dwelling are proposed to either side of the dwellings. The cottages would be constructed in brick under a plain tile roof and the first floor would be accommodated within the roof space, with bedrooms being lit by dormer windows. The ridge height would be some 6.7 metres above ground level. The amendments have removed garages to either side of the semi, reduced the ridge height, removed the ensuite windows on the front elevation and changed the boundary to the frontage to accurately reflect the highway boundary. An archaeological evaluation and historic building analysis are submitted with the application. Reduced copies of the plans accompanying the application together with the design and access statement are **attached** at Appendix 2.

2.2 **Application for Listed building consent.** This application seeks consent for the demolition of the 20<sup>th</sup> century extensions the public house and the detached garage. Internal alterations to provide new toilets for the public house on the ground floor and new bathrooms at first floor. A new porch on the frontage is also proposed. Consent is also sought for alterations to some windows and doors. Reduced copies of the plans accompanying this application are also **attached** at Appendix 2.

## 3.0 CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 OCC (Highways) No objection in principle to the proposed dwellings;

<p>comments on original plans. Comments on amendments to be updated verbally. Conservation Officer. comments on original plans.</p>	<p>comments re infringement onto the public highway.  Comments regarding displaced parking of public house and holding objection lodged.  No objection to principle but concern regarding the height and scale of building. Also comments on design of dormers and some window detailing.</p>
<p>Comments on amendments OCC (Archaeology)</p>	<p>The ensuite to the bedroom on the second floor would be better removed. The boundary to the public house still appears contrived.  The pre-determination report has shown that this area has been quarried out previously to a depth of 2 metres circa 17<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> century. The quarrying has removed all traces of earlier occupation and no further archaeological constraints need to be attached to this planning determination.</p>
<p>The Georgian Group Public Amenities Parish Council original and amended plans</p>	<p>No comment on listed building application.  Comments regarding provision of collecting point for bins.  REFUSE. The proposal would adversely affect the setting of the listed building by reducing the area of land historically associated with the pub. It would make it less attractive as a pub and the viability of the pub has not been tested properly.</p>
<p>Neighbour Objectors ( 3)</p>	<p>The neighbouring property is not accurately shown.  The houses will spoil the open character of the area. There is no evidence that conservation and efficient use of energy have played a role in the design.  Concern regarding the impact on south facing balcony at first floor of 18 Bridge End. The balcony serves a first floor living room and the plans do not show extensions to 18 such that the distance between the buildings is not accurately reflected.  Removal of the toilets and a large area of the garden to the public house will compromise its use as a pub.  Overdevelopment of site.  The Chequers is a village pub and should be retained.  The removal of unsympathetic extensions and ancillary buildings is welcome for the listed building but not if they compromise the</p>

viability of the pub.

The location of the car park is impractical

#### **4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 P06/W0116 – Demolition of existing garage and erection of a detached 4 bed house – Withdrawn

P06/W1008 – Demolition of existing garage and erection of a detached 4 bed house – Current

#### **5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE**

##### **5.1 Adopted SOLP Policies**

G2 – Protection of District's resources, G4 – Development in the countryside, G6 – Quality of design and local distinctiveness, GB2 – New buildings within Green Belts, GB4 – Visual amenity in Green Belt, C1 – Landscape character, C8 – Species protection, CON5 – Setting of listed buildings, CON7 – Development within conservation areas, EP6 - Surface water drainage requirements, EP8 – Contaminated land, D1 – Principles of good design, D2 – Parking for vehicles and cycles, D3 – Provision of private amenity areas, D4 – Privacy for new dwellings, D8 – Conservation and efficient design, D9 – Renewable energy, D10 – Management of waste, H4 – New housing within larger villages, H7 – Mix of units, H8 – Density, H9 – Affordable housing, CF1 – Protection of community facilities.

South Oxfordshire Design Guide

PPS1 – Delivering sustainable development

PPS3 – Housing

PPS7 – Sustainable Development In Rural Areas

PPG13 – Transport

PPG15 – Planning and the Historic Environment

PPS22 – Renewable Energy

#### **6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The main issues in this case are;

- Whether the principle of development is acceptable
- H4 Criteria
- Setting of listed building
- Plot coverage, density and provision of gardens

- Affordable housing
- Mix of units
- Sustainable design issues
- Nature conservation issues
- Viability of public house

6.2 **Principle.** Dorchester is one of the smaller villages in the Green Belt where infill development of one or two dwellings or a small terrace of four houses on appropriate sites may be acceptable in terms of Policy H5 subject to the criteria specified in Policy H4. In this case, the site is a small gap in a built up frontage and the principle of development is acceptable.

### 6.3 H4 criteria issues.

- That an important open space of public, environmental or ecological value is not lost;

Whilst part of the site is currently the garden to the Public House and is open, the area to the front of the site presents a gravelled area for parking with a flat roof extension to the listed building, a close boarded fence and a large double garage. The area does not contribute positively to the character of the area and appears neglected. The removal of the flat roof extensions and garage and their replacement with development of an appropriate scale and design would enhance the character of the area and the setting of the listed building.

With regard to environmental value, the site lies within an archaeologically sensitive area. The applicant has provided a pre-determination archaeological evaluation of the site involving trenching, which has revealed that the site has been disturbed to such a degree that there are no deposits of archaeological value and there is no objection to the development proposed.

- Design, height and bulk in keeping with the surroundings;

The plans have been amended to reduce the scale and bulk of the cottages and improve the spacing and setting for the listed building. The amendments have reduced the ridge height of the dwellings so that they are more subservient to the listed building and have removed the garages at the side of either house; this has reduced the width of development across the site and improved the setting of the building considerably. Other alterations to windows and doors have improved the design of the dwellings. Whilst the design of the dormers does not reflect the more traditional arrangement where the dormer is positioned on the wall plate at eaves height, this in itself would not justify a refusal of planning permission. The design of

the proposed dwellings is broadly in line with the Design Guide principles.

iii. That the character of the area is not adversely affected;

The Chequers Public House is a grade II listed building that is located on the junction of Bridge End and Watling Lane in the Dorchester on Thames conservation area. Poorly conceived extensions and inferior quality outbuildings compromise the appearance of the building and its setting at present. There are long views to the building along Bridge End in both directions and across the site.

The demolition of the extensions that were built in the late twentieth century and which do not contribute to the special architectural or historic interest of the building would enhance the character and appearance of the listed building and its setting and also the character of the conservation area. The provision of the cottage style houses in a semi detached pair is acceptable in principle and the removal of the garages to the cottages has improved the spacing between the listed building and the new building; the reduction of the ridge height has made the cottages more subservient in scale and is now acceptable.

iv. Amenity, environmental or highway objections

**Highway issues.** There is no objection in principle to the provision of the new houses in terms of parking provision and access arrangement. The Highways Engineer, has however, expressed some concern regarding the loss of the existing parking area to the public house which would lead to parking on the public highway. Whilst this is a legitimate concern, the public house is within 75 metres of the public car park on Bridge End and a refusal on the displacement of parking facilities for the public house when other parking is available within easy walking distance can not be justified.

**Parking provision.** The proposal provides for 2 on site parking spaces to the side of both dwellings, this provision would meet the Council's standard and is acceptable.

The application for listed building consent originally showed parking facilities to the rear of the pub within the remaining garden. This would not be acceptable in terms of the setting of the listed building, neighbour impact or the impact on an important tree and has now been removed from the proposal.

**Neighbour impact.** The site is surrounded by other residential development numbers 16 and 18 Bridge End and 5 and 6 Samian Way.

16 and 18 Bridge End are unusual in that they are three storey buildings with the main living rooms being at the front of the properties at first floor. 16 has a first floor conservatory at the front and 18 has a first floor balcony leading onto a living room; both are at an oblique angle to Bridge End and 18 is in a backland location to the rear of 16. The new dwellings would sit well forward of 16 Bridge End and would present a flank wall with one small window at first floor level serving a stairwell at a distance of some 11 metres. The impact on 16 would be acceptable in your officer's view.

With regard to 18 Bridge End; the new dwellings would sit well forward at an oblique angle. The neighbours at 18 have expressed concern about overlooking to their first floor living area, particularly from the bedroom window in the rear wing of the nearest dwelling. The neighbours have pointed out the block plan is inaccurate, in that it is based on the Ordnance Survey map base that does not give the accurate location of 18 in relation to the new dwelling. In effect 18 is approximately 2 metres closer to the proposed dwelling than shown. The boundary between the properties is currently marked with a line of deciduous trees that provides an effective screen in the summer. This screening would be kept as part of the current proposal but would not be as effective in winter months. Given the orientation of the buildings, there would not be a direct line of overlooking and having regard to the distance and the screening given by the existing trees this relationship is acceptable in your officer's view.

With regard to 5 and 6 Samian Way, there would be more of a direct back to back relationship but there would be a distance of some 30 metres between the buildings and this is in excess of the Council's minimum standard.

v. Backland development issues

The site provides a frontage onto Bridge End and there is no backland development involved.

- 6.4 **Setting of listed building and impact on conservation area.** There is still some concern about the position of the boundary on the plot and the impact it will have on the setting of the listed building. However, making the plot smaller means it is less likely that the unsympathetic flat roof additions are removed. On balance subject to revisions to the boundary treatment around the parking space to the left hand property the benefits to the setting as a result of the removal of the flat roof elements would outweigh the slightly wider development plot. The same applies to the character of the conservation area.

With regard to the alterations to the listed building. The amended plans have included the provision of toilet facilities within the building and show two rooms

retained for a bar area; the existing cellar and kitchen would be retained. On the first floor the bathroom area is shown to be remodelled involving the provision of new windows on the rear and a new bathroom in a former bedroom. These alterations are acceptable in terms of the impact on the character of the listed building and would involve an improvement to the external appearance at the rear.

- 6.5 **Viability of the public House.** The planning application involves the loss of part of the garden to the public house, the loss of parking facilities and the application for listed building consent involves the relocation of the toilets. Consideration must be given to whether The Chequers could still operate successfully as a public house without these amenities or whether alternative facilities exist that would overcome these concerns. The issue of the displaced parking facilities has already been considered at para 6.3 iv) "highway issues". If parking is not provided in the land to the rear of the pub then there is sufficient land remaining for a garden to serve the public house.

The loss of the toilet facilities is beneficial in terms of the impact on the character of the public house. If the premises were to open again as a public house, these facilities would be essential and the internal arrangement of the building would be required to provide them. This is now shown on the amended plans in a manner that is acceptable for the character of the listed building.

Davey and Co have assessed the premises with the demolitions proposed and with the development plot taken out of the site. They have confirmed that, in their view there is a market for the use as a public house and the site is being marketed as such.

The Chequers Public House has been closed for a number of years and has only recently been actively marketed; before the premises closed it was not open regularly in the way that most public houses operate. The application for listed building consent implies the continued use of the property as a public house and the new owners are marketing the premises as such. In any event planning permission would be required for any change of use of the premises to a dwelling and would need to be accompanied with all the relevant data recommended in the CAMRA guidelines.

- 6.6 **Plot Coverage, density and provision of gardens.** Minimum standards for new residential development are recommended in the South Oxfordshire Design Guide and in policies D3, H7 and H8 of the Local Plan. These standards seek to ensure that sites are not overdeveloped.

- **Provision of garden areas.** The proposed dwellings would have gardens well in excess of the Council's minimum standards and the proposal is acceptable in this respect.
- **Plot coverage.** The plot coverage is under 20% which is well below the maximum standard specified in the Design Guide of 40% for semi-detached housing.
- **Density.** PPS3 seeks to ensure that proposals for housing are provided at a density of 30 dwellings or more per hectare (dph) within villages and this is reflected in Policy H8 of the local plan. The density is below 30 dph but a higher density would not be appropriate in terms of neighbour impact and



setting of the listed building.

- 6.7 **Provision for affordable housing.** Policy H9 of the adopted Local Plan seeks to achieve a provision of affordable housing on sites capable of accommodating more than 5 dwellings in settlements where the population is less than 3000. In this case, the number of units is below the threshold but your officers have considered whether the site is capable of providing more units. There are constraints on the width of the site, the relationship with other surrounding houses and the setting of the listed building that would prohibit further development. There is no requirement to provide affordable housing in this case.
- 6.8 **Mix of units.** Policy H7 of the adopted Local Plan 2011 requires an acceptable housing mix to ensure a steady provision of small two bedroom properties. On all sites that are capable of accommodating two or more dwellings, 45% of the development shall be two bedroom units unless this provision for small dwellings would adversely affect the character of the area. In this case, the proposal provides for 2 X 3 bedroom units, where the bedrooms themselves are small and provided within the roof space. The third bedroom in particular is only 2.4m X 2.4 m. Strictly speaking one of the dwellings should be provided as a 2 bed unit but in this case this may compromise the symmetry of the pair or provide a large two bed unit and a small 3 bed unit. In this case, the proposal provides two small dwellings and is an acceptable mix for this site.
- 6.9 **Sustainable design issues.** Policy D8 of the adopted Local Plan seeks to encourage the use of sustainable materials and forms of buildings that incorporate design solutions to increase water and energy efficiency. Whilst none are specifically mentioned the proposal will need to meet the standards specified in Part L of the Building Regulations regarding the conservation of fuel and power. The proposal does provide chimneys to both houses which have internal stacks and are more efficient
- 6.10 **Nature conservation issues.** Policy H4 of the adopted Local Plan seeks to ensure that sites of ecological value are not lost. Policy C8 also aims to ensure that protected species and their habitats are not adversely affected by new development. The Countryside Officer has been consulted on the proposal and does not think that the proposal involves works to a bat habitat. He has recommended that a condition be added to any planning permission to set an appropriate course of action if bats are found during construction works.

## 7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The provision of two small, cottage style dwellings would positively enhance the character of the conservation area, the setting of the listed building, would not be unneighbourly or cause highway problems. The loss of the large area of the garden of the Public House or the removal of the toilets (that could be provided elsewhere within the existing building), would not in itself undermine the long term viability of the public House and would be acceptable in my view.

## 8.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 8.1 **That Planning Permission be granted subject to the following conditions and written confirmation that the second floor ensuite facility will be removed:**

1. **Commencement 3 years**

**2. Samples of all materials**

**3. Slab levels**

**4. Prior to the occupation of the proposed dwellings the parking and turning areas for the dwellings and the garages shall be provided and shall be constructed, laid out, surfaced (bound material), drained and completed, and shall be retained unobstructed except for the parking and turning of vehicles at all times.**

**5. Exclude Permitted Development - extensions alterations and new windows**

**6. Details of surface water drainage works to be approved**

**7. Windows, external doors and rainwater goods to specification**

**8. Species protection**

**9. Windows in flank walls to be obscure glazed.**

**10. Tree protection**

**11. Landscaping scheme to agree position of boundary and treatment of frontages**

**8.2 That Listed Building Consent be granted subject to the following conditions and written confirmation that the second floor ensuite facility will be removed**

**1. Commencement listed building consent 3 years**

**2. Measures to secure safety and stability of building during demolition**

**3. Approval of brick samples and detail of the construction of the new ground floor rear wall and its junction with existing fabric**

**4. Approval of joinery details for the new and replacement window and doors**

**5. Approval of details of new window openings and any new vents**

**Author** Sharon Crawford

**Contact No.** 01491 823739

**Email Add.** [planning.west@southoxon.gov.uk](mailto:planning.west@southoxon.gov.uk)

