

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<a href="#">P19/S4665/FUL</a> and <a href="#">P19/S4667/LB</a>
<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	FULL APPLICATION and LISTED BUILDING
<b>REGISTERED</b>	8.1.2020
<b>PARISH</b>	BENSON
<b>WARD MEMBER(S)</b>	Sue Cooper Andrea Powell
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mr Rushworth
<b>SITE</b>	The Three Horseshoes 2 Oxford Road Benson, OX10 6LX
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Removal of existing C20 pergola and roof covering, construction of new single storey extension to side/rear with pitched roof with glazed pitched roof covering between new extension and existing C19 outbuilding. New single storey extension to rear of C19 outbuilding with pitched roof. Internal alterations to remove existing male and female toilets and general refurbishment.
<b>AMENDMENT</b>	Amended by drwgnos 639-(P)-200C, 639-(P)-201E, 639-(P)-202E to reduce rear extension and move further away from site boundary received on 29 July 2020 and amplified by a Flood Risk Assessment, Heritage Statement and noise management measures received on 16 April 2020)
<b>OFFICER</b>	Will Darlison

**1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PROPOSAL**

- 1.1 The planning and listed building consent applications are referred to planning committee in the interest of transparency as the neighbour is a Planning Officer working for South Oxfordshire District Council.
- 1.2 The Three Horseshoes public house is a detached, two-storey, 17<sup>th</sup> Century Grade II listed building with 18<sup>th</sup> 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Century additions. It is located within the built-up limits of the village of Benson. It is served by a rear garden, and parking for the establishment is immediately to the front of the building, accessed from Oxford Road. The application site is within the Benson Conservation Area and fluvial Flood Risk Zone 2.
- 1.3 The public house was registered as an Asset of Community Value in 2014.
- 1.4 The applications seek planning permission and listed building consent for the removal of the existing rear pergola and roof covering element and the erection of a side and rear single storey extension with a glazed pitched roof connecting to the 19<sup>th</sup> Century section. A new single storey rear extension is proposed to the rear of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century element. Internal alterations are proposed to remove the existing male and female toilets along with general refurbishment. A plan identifying the site can be found at **Appendix 1** to this report.
- 1.5 The applications have been amplified over the course of the determination period to respond to requests for additional drainage and heritage information. In addition, amendments have been submitted to address inaccuracies in the depiction of the

northern boundary and the neighbouring property at 4 Oxford Road and to reduce the size and scale of the single storey rear extension.

- 1.6 Reduced copies of the plans accompanying the applications can be found at **Appendix 2** to this report. All the plans and representations can be viewed on the Council's website [www.southoxon.gov.uk](http://www.southoxon.gov.uk) under the planning application reference number

2.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

2.1 **Benson Parish Council – No objections**

- Original plans need to be revised to accurately reflect the north west boundary between the application site and the neighbouring property and reduce the height of the rear extension.
- The originally submitted Transport Assessment was considered by committee members to not accurately reflect the parking availability with the vicinity of the pub. This was to be withdrawn and in its place a statement is to be submitted setting out that parking requirements are not expected to increase significantly.

**County Archaeological Services – No objections**

**Conservation Officer – Initial holding objection**

- Further information was required in the form of a Heritage Appraisal and Impact Assessment to understand the significance and assess the impacts of the works.

The above holding objection was withdrawn upon the submission of additional information in relation to the proposed alterations to the historic fabric. No heritage objection subject to conditions being attached.

**Drainage – Initial holding objection.**

- The site lies entirely within fluvial flood zone 2 and a Flood Risk Assessment is required to address this source of flooding, as well as incorporating IPP measures in accordance with guidance from the EA.
- A feasible surface water drainage proposal incorporating SuDS must be proposed.

No objection following submission of additional information setting out fluvial mitigation and resiliency measures.

**Forestry Officer – No objection subject to a tree protection condition.**

**Countryside Access – No response received.**

**Highways Liaison Officer (Oxfordshire County Council) – No objections**

- The proposal is unlikely to result in any significant intensification of transport activity at the property.
- No change is proposed to the existing access arrangements
- Any obstructive parking can be enforced by Thames Valley Police.

**Env. Protection Team** – Initial holding objection.

- Querying whether the proposed development would be used for any kind of entertainment purpose. If so, then the building would need to be assessed for acoustic insulation to avoid creating a negative impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

No objection following submission of amended plans and clarifying statement.

- In order to ensure that the extension is only used for patrons and not for regulated entertainment a condition is recommended to ensure that no live or recorded music apart from low level incidental/background music is permitted in the extended area.

**Food Safety** – No objections

**Neighbour Representations** - Neighbour Object x (8)

Original submission

- The drawings are inaccurate in their depiction of our property and the boundary between the two sites.
- The rear extension would restrict the amount of natural light into the property and garden.
- The rear extension would be oppressive by virtue of its depth of some 4.2 metres.
- The rear extension would contravene the 45-degree rule.
- Alternative design solutions should be considered to reduce neighbour impact.
- The proposed extensions would increase levels of noise for surrounding residents.
- Parking for the public house is already problematic, with customers parking in the adjoining White Hart Close private residents car park. The extension of the pub is likely to exacerbate the problem.
- The rear extension brings the wall closer to the flats at White Horse Close.
- The existing parking arrangement on the kerb outside the pub presents a danger to human life as it blocks a clear line of sight for cars joining the B4009.
- The area is already very congested with cars frequently parked on the pavement. School activities can be held in the evening resulting in extra cars and traffic in the area, which with the poor street lighting would be a major problem when combined with the increased parking needed for the extended pub.
- Concerns expressed about the willow in the pub garden. If it were to be removed or altered, it could cause earth displacement and subsidence.
- The size and height of the single storey glass structure.
- Impact and loss of garden to the historic village inn.

Amended submission

- Objections maintained from original submission with regards to traffic impact, noise and impact on character of the historic village inn.

Neighbour No Strong Views x (2)

Amended submission

- The revisions are a more accurate representation of the boundaries and neighbouring property.
- The proposal is acceptable in principle subject to the noise assessment of the external fridge freezer units as well as highway matters.

**3.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

3.1 [P18/S3722/PEO](#) - Other Outcome (09/01/2019)

Proposed single storey side and rear extension at the Three Horseshoes.  
Alterations to improve sanitary and domestic accommodation.

**4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

4.1 N/A

**5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE**

5.1 **National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance**

5.2 **South Oxfordshire Core Strategy 2027 (SOCS) Policies:**

CS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development

CSS1 - The Overall Strategy

CSEM1 - Supporting a successful economy

CSEN3 - Historic environment

CSQ3 - Design

5.3 **South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 (SOLP) Policies:**

C8 - Adverse affect on protected species

C9 - Loss of landscape features

CF1 - Protection of recreational or essential community facilities

CF2 - Provision of additional community facilities

CF3 - Retention of shops

CON2 - Extensions to listed buildings

CON3 - Alteration to listed building

CON6 - Demolition in conservation area

CON7 - Proposals in a conservation area

D1 - Principles of good design

D2 – Safe and secure parking for vehicles and cycles

E5 - Business, industrial, warehousing and storage proposals

EP4 –Impact on water resources

EP6 – Sustainable drainage

G2 - Protect district from adverse development

T1 - Safe, convenient and adequate highway network for all users

T2 - Unloading, turning and parking for all highway users

5.4 **South Oxfordshire Emerging Local Plan 2034 Policies:**

The council is currently progressing the emerging local plan through the examination stage. The plan currently carries limited weight. Relevant policies include;

CF2E - Provision of community facilities and services

DES1E - Delivering high quality development

DES2E - Enhancing local character

DES6E - Residential amenity

EMP10E - Community employment plans

ENV1E - Landscape and countryside  
ENV3E - Biodiversity Non designated sites, habitats and species  
ENV6E - Historic environment  
ENV7E - Listed buildings  
ENV8E - Conservation areas  
ENV9E - Archaeology and scheduled monuments  
EP4E - Flood risk  
STRAT1E - The overall strategy  
TRANS2E - Promoting sustainable transport and accessibility

**5.5 Benson Neighbourhood Plan Policies:**

NP6 – Conservation and Heritage  
NP7 – Design  
NP9 – Parking  
NP13 – Community Facilities  
NP17 – Assets of Community Value  
NP26 – Biodiversity Net Gain  
NP33 – Sustainably Drainage Systems  
NP34 – Flood Risk

**5.6 Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents**

South Oxfordshire Design Guide 2016 (SODG)

**5.7 Other Relevant Legislation**

Human Rights Act 1998

The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into account in the processing of the application and the preparation of this report.

**5.8 Equality Act 2010**

In determining this planning application the Council has regard to its equalities obligations including its obligations under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

**6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The following considerations relate to the listed building application and the planning application;

- **Impact on the special architectural, historic interest and setting of the listed buildings.**

The following considerations relate solely to the planning application;

- **Principle of development.**
- **Impact on neighbours.**
- **Impact on the character and appearance of the existing building and wider site.**
- **Impact on the character and appearance of the Benson Conservation Area.**
- **Impact on protected trees and species.**
- **Impact on parking and access.**
- **Impact on drainage.**
- **Other issues.**

- 6.2 **Principle of development.** The SOCS in policy CSS1 sets out a strategy to encourage a strong network of settlements across the District and part of that is supporting and enhancing larger villages such as Benson so they fill the role of a local service centre. Part of that is providing for a vibrant and diverse choice of leisure and community activities, a number of which can be centred on or around a successful public house.
- 6.3 Policy CSEM1 of the SOCS continues this aim with a commitment that the Council will work with business partners in order to provide an environment that positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth. This stance is bolstered further in policy CF1 of the SOLP where proposals that would result in the loss of a recreation or essential community facility would not be permitted.
- 6.4 For the proposed development Policy E5 of the SOLP is most relevant. This policy sets out that proposals for businesses will be not be permitted if they:
- (i) conflict with the policies in the plan to protect the Green Belt and the countryside;
  - (ii) conflict with the policies to protect the built environment and to retain recreational uses and essential community facilities and services in accordance with Policies CF1 and CF3;
  - (iii) are of a scale and type of development inappropriate to the proposed site and its surroundings;
  - (iv) are not in keeping with the surrounding area in terms of design, layout and materials;
  - (v) have inadequate access and car and lorry parking and manoeuvring facilities and/or would cause problems on the wider road network in accordance in Policies D2 and T1 to T2;
  - (vi) where appropriate, are in location which are not accessible by public transport in accordance with Policy T2; and/or
  - (vii) cause problems as a result of noise smell, dust, loss of privacy or cause any other environmental problems in accordance with Policies EP1 to EP9.
- 6.5 Therefore, it is my opinion that the above policy establishes the in-principle acceptability of the proposed development, subject to it complying with the above criterion and the other relevant policies contained within the development plan.
- 6.6 Criterion (i) does not apply in terms of the Oxford Green Belt as the application site is situated outside of that area of designations. Furthermore, by virtue of the application site being located entirely within the built-up limits of a settlement I do not consider that there exists a material landscape component to the assessment of the proposals.
- 6.7 Criterion (ii) seeks to ensure, in conjunction with Policies CF1 and CF3 that recreational and essential community facilities are not lost. In my view this application is completely in accordance with this criterion as the proposed development is based on ensuring that the public house remains viable and continues to operate.
- 6.8 The remaining criterion set out within Policy E5 shall be the subject of assessment over the course of this report.
- 6.9 **Impact on neighbours.** Criterion (vii) of policy E5 of the SOLP states that development will not be permitted that cause problems as a result of noise, smell, dust or loss of privacy. Furthermore, SOLP Policy CF2 sets out that for proposals for additional community facilities or services that there should be no overriding amenity objections. The primary receptors of such impacts in this development would be the neighbouring residential properties.

- 6.10 The proposed development includes a single storey extension that would wrap around the side and rear of the existing building comprising of a brick and tile element to the side and a fully closed glazed element to the rear aspect replacing an existing canopy feature. This would put additional built form in close proximity to the southern side boundary shared with White Hart Close, which is a development of 18 flats. The boundary is delineated by a wall separating the proposed side extension from an area to the front of the neighbouring site that is partially used for parking and partially an area of grass and trees. This spatial relationship with this neighbouring site, combined with the single storey scale of the extension would in my opinion ensure that the proposed built form is not overbearing or oppressive. It would also mean that, in conjunction with being sited to the north of these neighbours that the proposed side and rear extension would not be a cause of loss of direct sunlight or ambient daylight.
- 6.11 The proposed rear extension which would be located to the rear aspect of the existing 19<sup>th</sup> century element of the building was in its originally submitted form of a greater depth along the shared north boundary of the application site. This was considered to be materially harmful to the amenities of 4 Oxford Road, the immediate neighbouring property. The situation was not aided as the originally submitted plans did not accurately depict the configuration of the boundary between the two sites or the design of the neighbouring dwelling.
- 6.12 Amended plans were submitted over the course of the determination period which resulted in a plans that were considered both sufficiently accurate and of an amended size, scale and massing that would be acceptable in terms of the impact of the rear extension on this neighbouring property. This has taken the form of a substantial reduction in the depth of rear projection for the rear extension. This combined with its single storey scale and some 1.1 metre separation from the shared boundary would result in an acceptable degree of impact upon the light, outlook and privacy.
- 6.13 The proposed development, specifically the increased space afforded the premises by the glazed element of the rear extension, has raised concerns with local residents in terms of the impact of additional noise. This has been reviewed by our Environmental Protection team. They had requested information on the types of entertainment that would take place within this space and associated acoustic reports to justify it. Furthermore, as part of the amendments to the other rear extension along the northern boundary a fenced area was to contain external fridge freezer units, and the Environmental Protection team requested that these also be the subject of acoustic assessment.
- 6.14 In response to the above mentioned requests from the Environmental Protection team the applicant has confirmed that no live music or other forms of regulated entertainment would take place within the extension and that the use of the garden area for use by patrons would not go beyond 10:30 pm. In addition, the externally located fridge freezer units along the northern boundary of the application site were removed and sited within the built form of the rear extension itself. These changes were assessed by the Environmental Health Officer who raised no objection on the basis of noise impact. This however, was on the basis that a condition being attached to any forthcoming planning permission that would ensure that the proposed extension is only for the use of patrons and not for regulated entertainment and that this would include no live or recorded music, with the exception of low level/incidental/background music. This is deemed to be reasonable and necessary given the nature of the proposed space and its potential for additional acoustic impact by virtue of its glazed construction.

- 6.15 It is however not proposed to impose a condition for the use of the garden to cease by 10:30 pm as the garden and its use is not the subject of these applications. Noise nuisance is subject to separate legislation and it is not the role of the planning system to duplicate efforts in this respect. Any unneighbourly noise issues from the use of the garden should be reported to the Environmental Protection team so that they can be investigated and resolved through the Environmental Protection Act 1990.
- 6.16 In light of the above, and in conjunction with the existing lawful status of the site as a public house with an established garden I do not consider that the proposed development would be harmful in terms of neighbouring impact. I consider that the development would be in compliancy with criterion (vii) of Policy E5 as well as the other relevant policies in the SOLP referred to in paragraph 6.8 of this report.
- 6.17 **Impact on the character and appearance of the existing building and wider site.** Criteria (iii) and (iv) of Policy E5 set out the need for development to be of a scale and type appropriate to the proposed site and its surroundings and be in keeping with the surrounding area in terms of design, layout and materials. This is bolstered with other design orientated development plan policies such as: D1 and G2 of the SOLP and NP7 of the Benson Neighbour Plan.
- 6.18 The proposed side and rear extension would employ a design comprised of two distinct elements; the more traditional side projecting element and the predominantly glazed rear element. I am of the view that both sections would be clearly legible as a later additions to the building with appropriate degrees of subservience to the host building demonstrated through their single storey scale, subordinate width in terms of the side projecting element and their position to the side and rear aspects. It would employ a variety of roof ridge configurations, which would be beneficial in breaking up the massing of the extension.
- 6.19 The glazed rear element would be useful in further breaking up the massing of the proposal in visual terms by providing a lighter, more visually permeable character to the rear elevation and in keeping with the nature of the garden space of the pub as one to be used and enjoyed in combination with the host building.
- 6.20 The proposed rear extension to the 19<sup>th</sup> Century element of the building would, in its amended form be of a modest scale with a sympathetically uncomplicated design. This would be in the form of a rectangular/square footprint under a pitch roof presenting a gable end to the rear garden. This would be a natural progress of this section of the main building continuing a legible series of ridge lines stepping down as it extends out to the rear.
- 6.21 I therefore consider that the proposed extensions would be acceptable additions to the building and the site as a whole in design terms.
- 6.22 **Impact on the special architectural, historic interest and setting of the listed buildings.** Policy CON3 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 requires that any alterations to a listed building must respect the buildings established character and should not diminish the special historical or architectural qualities. This is bolstered in the Benson Neighbourhood Plan Policies NP6, which sets out a commitment to conserving and enhancing the significant special architectural and historic interest of listed buildings, and their settings.
- 6.23 The consultation response from the Conservation Officer set out that they had no objections to the principle of the proposed extension and refurbishment of the premises, which includes a suite of internal alterations as depicted on the proposed



floor plan. However, the level of information originally submitted did not sufficiently set out the significance of and impact on the historic fabric of the building, which prevented them assessing the development adequately.

- 6.24 Over the course of the determination period additional information in response to the above request has been submitted. The Conservation Officer has reviewed this information and commented that they are satisfied that with regards to the internal works to the plan form would be adequately demonstrated in these locations and that the works should be carried out in accordance with the details provided within the supplementary heritage statement as well as conditions requiring the submission of sample materials, joinery and glazing details and that any making good to historic fabric be carried out in materials and finishes to match.
- 6.25 **Impact on the character and appearance of the Benson Conservation Area.** Policy CON7 of the SOLP sets out that planning permission will not be granted for development that would harm the character and appearance of a conservation area. When considering proposed development within conservation areas the design and scale of new work will be required to be sympathetic with the areas established character and traditional materials used whenever appropriate. Policy NP6 of the Benson Neighbourhood Plan echoes the SOLP in this respect with a requirement for developments to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of the two conservation areas in the village.
- 6.26 The proposed side and rear extension would be visible from outside the site, this is by virtue of the side projecting element being located in an existing area of side access to the garden of the pub. Therefore, it is important that the design of this part of the proposal be sympathetic and assimilate well into the established character of the area. This would be achieved through the use of a variety of roof types to break up the massing of the side extension. The front most section would draw links back to the host building with the roof slope facing forward presenting a gable to the side, behind which are a staggered set of roof lines aligned perpendicular to the first. This in my view would provide an important level of visual distinction for the extension giving it an appearance that would be evocative of a building that has been added to over time as opposed to one addition. This is particularly important as the length of the extension is over 17 metres and excessive uniformity in appearance would be incongruous on this length of structure.
- 6.27 The above combined with a palette of matching materials comprising painted brickwork and roof tiles to match those used on the existing would, in my view help to ensure that the proposed extension would be in keeping with the traditional coaching inn appearance of the building, which is the predominate character that the site contributes to the conservation area.
- 6.28 The glazed rear aspect of the proposed side and rear extension as well as the entirely rear extension to the rear of the 19<sup>th</sup> century element would not have a perceptible impact on the character and appearance of the Benson Conservation Area. This is based on being positioned exclusively to the rear of the building with either the neighbouring properties to the northern aspect or the proposed side extension providing visual screening from public vantage points.
- 6.29 For these reasons I am of the view that proposals would not pose harm to the character and appearance of the Benson Conservation Area.
- 6.30 **Impact on protected trees and species.** The application site is located within the Benson Conservation Area and as such the trees that are located within the site are of

a protected status. The application was therefore the subject of a consultation with the Forestry team. They have reviewed the submitted information, original and amended, and commented to confirm that they have no objection to the proposed development. They have stated that the proposed works could be carried out without the loss of trees on the site, however they did set out that a tree protection condition should be attached to any planning permission. This is on the basis to protect trees on the wider site, which whilst not directly impacted upon through the size and position of the extensions would need protection during the construction phase of development to avoid harm. This is deemed reasonable and necessary as trees within the garden of the pub provide an amenity benefit to not only patrons but the occupants of residential properties in the vicinity and this amenity should be maintained.

- 6.31 **Impact on parking and access.** Criterion (v) of Policy E5 sets out that proposed development would need to comply with SOLP Policies D2, T1 and T2, and Benson Neighbourhood Plan Policy NP9 in order to provide for adequate, safe and secure parking and access at the premises.
- 6.32 The site visit undertaken as well as the representations received from local residents have highlighted the pressures on parking in and around the site, which lies in close proximity to the Benson C of E Primary School. The existing parking arrangement at the site is limited to a few spaces immediately to the front elevation of the building where there is no clear delineation between it and the pavement whether it be in terms of levels or fencing as the space in question is of a size and configuration that precludes these features. High levels of on street parking is in evidence in the immediate vicinity.
- 6.33 This is an existing situation and the level of on-site parking provision is considered to be less than what would be required if, for example, a new public house was being applied for. However, The Three Horseshoes is an established premises and is an important community facility, exemplified in its status as an asset of community value. There exists an opportunity to help the premises become more of a viable business through the proposed development securing the public house for the benefit of the village and it is this that must be weighed against the parking, access and associated highway safety matters.
- 6.34 The Highway Authority at Oxford County Council were therefore an essential consultee as they possess the specific technical knowledge to assess whether the proposals would represent an unacceptable risk to highway safety beyond that which exists at the site currently. The consultation response received from the Highways Liaison Officer was as follows;

*'The proposal seeks to make alterations to the existing public house.*

*The proposal is unlikely to result in any significant intensification of transport activity at the property. No change is proposed to the existing access arrangements. The proposal is unlikely to have a significant adverse impact on the highway network.*

*It is worth noting that any obstructive parking can be enforced by Thames Valley Police.*

*After reviewing the supplied plans and documentation, the Highway Authority has No Objection to the proposal on the basis of Highway Safety'*

- 6.35 I therefore view that there is a very high value to be placed upon the ability to retain the public house as a viable business as it provides a valuable role in the community of the village and that with no objection from the High Authority that a pragmatic approach should be adopted. On balance I am of the opinion that the benefits of the retention of

this asset of community valuable outweigh the additional impacts on parking and access matters at the site and in the vicinity, particularly in light of the Highway Authority's view that it is unlikely that these will be significantly intensified. It is also worth noting that the proposed development would not involve the reduction in the available parking at the front of the site, notwithstanding the less than ideal nature of the area in question.

- 6.36 **Impact on drainage.** The site is located with fluvial Flood Risk Zone 2 and as such it is a requirement of paragraph 163 of the NPPD to reduce the risk of flooding on-site and elsewhere. Therefore, when consulted our Drainage Engineers initially lodged a holding objection as there was not a supporting Flood Risk Statement to address the source of flooding and incorporate individual property protection design features.
- 6.37 It was also requested that a surface water management scheme be submitted. This is required to be in compliance with Policy EP6, which sets out that developers will be required to demonstrate that the surface water management system would accord with sustainable drainage principles.
- 6.38 A Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage scheme document was subsequently submitted by the agent. This was reviewed by our Drainage Engineers and found to be acceptable. Therefore, it is proposed to attach a suitably worded condition to the planning permission to ensure that the proposed development would be carried in accordance with these approved measures.
- 6.39 **Other issues.** The Council's CIL charging schedule has been adopted and will apply to relevant proposals from 1 April 2016. CIL is a planning charge that local authorities can implement to help deliver infrastructure and to support the development of their area and is primarily calculated on the increase in footprint created as a result of the development. In this case the proposed development would not be a liable form of development as defined on the CIL charging schedule.

## 7.0 **CONCLUSION**

- 7.1 Officers recommend that planning permission is granted because the proposed development would be of an acceptable design and appearance. It would demonstrate sufficient sympathetic links to the existing building and the Benson Conservation Area with benefits that would outweigh the level of impact identified to the significance of the listed building affected. It would not pose a risk to highway safety or an unacceptable intensification of the number of vehicle movements to the site and, in conjunction with the attached conditions, the proposal accords with development plan policies.
- 7.2 Officers recommend that listed building consent is granted because the proposed works would demonstrate sufficient benefits that would outweigh the level of harm identified to the significance of the listed buildings affected. In conjunction with the attached conditions the proposal accords with development plan policies.

## 8.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

- 8.1 **Grant Planning Permission subject to the following conditions;**

- 1 : Commencement three years - Full Planning Permission**
- 2 : Approved plans**
- 3 : Sample materials required (all)**
- 4 : Joinery/Glazing Details required**
- 5 : Works to match existing**
- 6 : Entertainment Restriction**
- 7 : Tree Protection (General)**

**8 : FRA – Implementation as approved**

**8.2 Grant Listed Building Consent subject to the following conditions;**

- 1 : Commencement three years – Listed Building**
- 2 : Approved plans**
- 3 : Sample materials required (all)**
- 4 : Joinery/Glazing Details required**
- 5 : Works to match existing**

**Author:** Will Darlison  
**Contact No:** 01235 422600  
**Email:** [planning@southoxon.gov.uk](mailto:planning@southoxon.gov.uk)