

17/00139/LBC

Mr Malcolm Guest

Cllr Roger Lees

SWINDON

Greyhound Inn High Street Swindon South Staffordshire

Minor internal alterations to the layout to provide 4no. 2 bedroom apartments and 1no. 1 bedroom apartment; and for external alterations comprising the removal of 2 windows and the rendering of an elevation, the insertion of 2 new windows and three new chimney pots.

1. SITE DESCRIPTION AND PLANNING HISTORY

1.1 Site Description

1.1.1 The application site relates to the former Greyhound public house which is a Grade II listed building in Swindon. The property was previously granted planning permission for its conversion into flats along with the conversion of the barn into two dwellings and the erection of 13 dwellings around its curtilage.

1.2 Relevant Planning History

1.2.1 1980, Demolishing of existing Greyhound Inn and rebuilding of licensed premises including car park, Withdrawn, (80/00866)

1980, New licensed premises, Refused, (80/01393)

1987, Demolition of existing toilets, extensions to form new toilets, Approved, (87/00017/LBC)

1987, Demolition of existing toilets, extensions to form new toilets, Approved, (87/00358)

1988, Extension to car park, Approved, (88/00023/LBC)

1988, Extension to car park, Approved, (88/00550)

1991, Pair of semi-detached dwellings, Approved, (91/00933)

1996, Erection of children's play equipment, Approved, (96/00244)

1997, Timber garden servery, Approved, (97/00439)

1998, Advertisements, Approved, (98/00021/ADV)

1998, Advertisements, Approved, (98/00022/LBC)

2004, Replacement of two windows and recovering of store roof, Refused, (04/00488/LBC)

2004, Re pointing of out-building and re-cover rear elevation of roof, Approved, (04/00489/LBC)

2004, Replacement of timber windows and demolition of lean to store, Approved, (04/01031/LBC)

2004, Demolition of lean to store, Approved, (04/01032/DEM)

2004, Replacement of timber windows and demolition of lean to store, Approved, (04/01033/FUL)

2006, External hut for drinking and dining, Refused, (06/01314/FUL)

2006, External hut for drinking and dining, Refused, (06/01321/LBC)

2007, Smoking Shelter, Approved, (07/00731/LBC)

2011, Retrofit transom bars into the two ground floor front windows, Approved, (11/00040/LBC)

2014, Conversion / change of use of existing public house to six self-contained one- and two-bedroom apartments, change of use of redundant adjacent barn to two semi-detached one-bedroom dwellings and erection of eight three-bedroom dwellings fronting Wombourne Road and six two-bedroom, semi-detached dwellings fronting Winston Road, Approved subject to S106 agreement, (14/00018/FUL)

2014, Conversion / change of use of existing public house to six self-contained one- and two-bedroom apartments, change of use of redundant adjacent barn to two semi-detached one-bedroom dwellings and erection of eight three-bedroom dwellings fronting Wombourne Road and six two-bedroom, semi-detached dwellings fronting Winston Road, Approved, (14/00019/LBC)

2014, Proposed conversion / change of use of existing redundant barn to 2no. semi-detached 2 bedroom dwellings. Proposed 4no. 4 bedroom dwellings and 4no. 3 bedroom dwellings fronting Wombourne Road. Proposed terrace block consisting of 2no. 2 bedroom dwellings and 1no. 3 bedroom dwelling fronting Winston Road and 2no. 2 bedroom bungalows accessed off Winston road, Approved, (14/00694/FUL)

2014, Proposed conversion / change of use of existing redundant barn to 2no. semi-detached 2 bedroom dwellings. Proposed 4no. 4 bedroom dwellings and 4no. 3 bedroom dwellings fronting Wombourne Road. Proposed terrace block consisting of 2no. 2 bedroom dwellings and 1no. 3 bedroom dwelling fronting Winston Road and 2no. 2 bedroom bungalows accessed off Winston Road, Approved, (14/00729/LBC)

2015, Discharge conditions 3, 7, 8, 11, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25 and 27, (14/00694/COND)

2015, Proposed conversion / change of use of existing redundant barn to 2no. semi-detached 2 bedroom dwellings. Proposed 4no. 4 bedroom dwellings and 4no. 3 bedroom dwellings fronting Wombourne Road. Proposed terrace block consisting of 2no. 2 bedroom dwellings and 1no. 3 bedroom dwelling fronting Winston Road and 2no. 2 bedroom bungalows accessed off Winston Road., Approved, (14/00694/AMEND)

2015, Discharge of conditions 3 and 7, (14/00729/COND)

2015, Proposed conversion of redundant building into 2no. 2 bedroom apartments and 4 no. 1 bedroom apartments, Approved, (15/00111/FUL)

2015, Proposed conversion of redundant building into 2no. 2 bedroom apartments and 4 no. 1 bedroom apartments, Approved, (15/00112/LBC)

2015, Conversion of coach house into 2No 2 Bedroom dwellings, Approved, (15/00918/LBC)

2016, Conversion of coach house into 2No 2 Bedroom dwellings. Condition no 4 and 5, Approved, (15/00918/COND)

2017, Non-material amendment to planning permission 15/00111/FUL for minor internal alterations to the layout to provide 4no. 2 bedroom apartments and 1no. 1 bedroom apartment; and for external alterations comprising the removal of 2 windows and the rendering of an elevation, the insertion of 2 new windows, and three new chimney pots, Approved, (15/00111/AMEND)

1.3 Pre-application Discussions

1.3.1 None.

2. APPLICATION DETAILS

2.1 The proposal is for listed building consent that was submitted in conjunction with the non-material amendment application 15/00111/AMEND for the reduction in flats from six to five and some external alterations. The non-material application has been approved but listed building consent is also required. The external work relates to the removal of two windows and the rendering of an elevation, the insertion of two new windows and three new chimney pots. This application would also cover other external works such as the re-pointing of the brickwork, doors, windows and rainwater goods.

- 2.1.1 This application follows on from the previous consents 15/00111/FUL and 15/00112/LBC. These were approved subject to pre-commencement conditions that relate to window, doors and rainwater goods details, and also included approval for the structural repairs to the building and a written scheme of archaeological investigation to provide details of the programme of archaeological works to be carried out. The works to the building have been conducted without these conditions being discharged and therefore this application is retrospective.
- 2.1.2 The approval of this application would result in the applicant having two alternative listed building consents and although they can implement either one, the conditions attached to the planning permission 15/00111/FUL would either need to be discharged or varied / removed, because listed building consent is not the same as a planning permission, as they are two separate regimes. The granting of listed building consent does not influence a planning permission.

2.2 Agent Submission

- 2.2.1 Design and Access Statement incorporating Heritage Assessment Engineering Report

3. POLICY CONTEXT

- 3.1 The application property is a Grade II Listed Building within Swindon Village.
- 3.2 Core Strategy Development Plan Document, December 2012:
EQ3 – Conservation, Preservation and Protection of Heritage Assets
- 3.3 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), March 2012

This sets out the national overarching aims for planning with a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Development that is sustainable should be favoured, without delay, and should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.

Para 126-141: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 4.1 Cllr R. Lees (received 06/04/17): called the application into Planning Committee.
- Swindon Parish Council (no comments received: expired 03/03/17)
- Conservation Officer (received 28/02/17):

The proposals are acceptable in principal however, some clarifications are required as to the extent of the internal alterations in particular in relation to the conversion of additional roof space and the ground floor lobby and staircase.

The proposals include the blocking up of 3 small, existing windows - all of which are on the Ground floor - 2 in the west elevation and one in the south elevation.. These should be blocked up with a 15mm recess on either side so the location of the opening can still be seen both internally and externally.

Two additional windows are proposed. The extra window on the ground floor in the north elevation will allow two blocked openings to be re-opened and replace a single opening approved in the centre of this part of the building. The other new opening is on the first floor on the south elevation. This is needed to provide natural light to a bedroom as the proposals now include converting the roof-scape in part of the rear wing. This would result in the loss of a small amount of historic fabric. The window size and proposed design are suitable for this location.

Internally there are some minor internal alterations to the approved scheme, the main one being the conversion of the roof space to enlarge unit 18. There also appears to be the removal of a retained element of wall in the ground floor lobby and the stairs appear to have been remodelled. Further details of these aspects of the scheme need to be submitted to demonstrate that there will be no further loss of historic features.

Additional comments received on the 21/03/17:

During my site visit on March 14th, it was clear that all the works had been completed and it was just the internal fit out that remained to be completed. The staircase has been removed, the additional windows were in place and the additional roof space had already been converted.

There were a number of conditions on the previous approvals not all of which appear to have been discharged. In order to regularise the situation I would suggest that a schedule of works should be submitted including the details required by the conditions and all works over and above what had been approved.

Externally the works appear to have been carried out satisfactorily. The windows are the exception as they are very chunky and the finish and method of opening gives the appearance of a plastic window. However they are not sufficiently inappropriate to warrant further action.

Internally the whole building has been gutted. Concrete floors, dpc's, tanking etc have all been installed. These would not have received permission had it been sought but as they have already been installed their removal would cause further harm.

In terms of the new staircase, this has not yet been installed. No justification has been provided for its removal except to say that it was in a poor condition. In the first instance the staircase should have been retained and repaired. If the staircase as a whole was unsound and not repairable then it should have been replicated on an exact like for like basis. However, a modern, entirely different staircase is proposed. Details need to be submitted.

Further comments received on the 04/04/17:

As I have no objections to works to the windows and the roofspace I would request that either the staircase be removed from the current application or any decision notice make clear that it did not include permission for the works to the stairs.

Photos of the previously existing staircase appear to show a historic staircase in reasonable condition. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary no justification has been provided for its removal either on grounds of condition or grounds of limited architectural and historic interest. The removal of a staircase in a listed building would always require listed building consent and, in my experience, this would rarely be granted unless it was clearly shown that the existing staircase was modern and of no interest and the replacement staircase was therefore an improvement or if it were beyond repair it was replaced on a like for like basis.

Further comments received on the 25/04/17 following the response from Building Control:

While I am still very unhappy about the extent of the internal works that have been carried out at this property, I acknowledge that it was previously in a poor condition and that the new use has ensured the building's long term future. Given that all features of historic or architectural interest have been removed from the interior, with the exception of some roof timbers which remain visible, and had a LBC been received in advance of the removal of the staircase that adequately justified the replacement of it then I would have not objected to the design of the new staircase given the modern finish to the rest of the interior.

Building Control (received 21/04/17):

Further to our conversation I have looked at the photos of the existing stairs and guarding and have reviewed the structural engineers report and can confirm that the existing stairs would not have been acceptable for use in the conversion to apartments. Regulation 8 of the Building Regulations refers to Part K (protection from falling/stairs) as applying to work classed as a material change of use where the health and safety of persons using the building must be of a reasonable standard.

It is my opinion that the existing stairs and guarding would not have been able to achieve this requirement.

County Archaeology (received 03/03/17):

I can confirm that archaeological mitigation in the form of a Level 2 building recording is still relevant. This programme of mitigation should be undertaken by a suitably experienced historic environment specialists and/or archaeologists working to the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists code of conduct, their 'Standards and guidance for the archaeological investigation and recording of standing buildings and structures' (2014). This work would most appropriately be secured via a condition being attached to any permission issued which states:

'Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a written scheme of archaeological investigation ('the Scheme') shall be submitted for the written approval of the Local Planning Authority. The Scheme shall provide details of the programme of archaeological works to be carried out within the site, including post-excavation reporting and appropriate publication. The Scheme shall thereafter be implemented in full in accordance with the approved plans'.

4.2 Representations

4.2.1 None (expired 03/03/17).

4.3 Site notice posted (expired 08/03/17) and newspaper advert published in the Express and Star (expired 14/03/17).

5. APPRAISAL

5.1 The application has been called into Planning Committee by Cllr R. Lees.

5.2 Key Issue

Impact on the listed building

5.3 Impact on the listed building

5.3.1 Policy EQ3 seeks to ensure development that affects a heritage asset or its setting is informed by a proportionate assessment of the significance of the asset.

5.3.2 The pre-commencement conditions imposed on the previous listed building consent 15/00112/LBC had not been adhered to and therefore this application is seeking to formalise the works that have conducted.

5.3.3 An external and internal inspection of the building was conducted by Cllr R. Lees, Planning Enforcement and myself on the 20/04/17. The

external works to the building had largely been completed with the windows, doors (apart from the main front door) and rainwater goods installed and the brickwork re-pointed. Internally the building is going through modernisation with a new stairwell inserted and the only original features identified being the wooden beams in the loft areas.

5.3.4 The Conservation Officer (refer to para 4.1) is satisfied with the external works conducted. However, concerns have been raised over the removal of the original stairwell and that it should have been retained or replaced on a like-for-like basis.

5.3.5 Even though the original stairwell has been removed, I did find photos of it and presented them to our Building Control team (refer to para 4.1) who concluded:

"...and have reviewed the structural engineers report and can confirm that the existing stairs would not have been acceptable for use in the conversion to apartments.

...the existing stairs and guarding would not have been able to achieve this requirement."

5.3.6 The existing stairwell would have needed to be removed in order to satisfy building regulations and a like-for-like replacement would not have been acceptable either. Further comments were received from the Conservation Officer after viewing the comments from the Building Control team and stated:

"While I am still very unhappy about the extent of the internal works that have been carried out at this property, I acknowledge that it was previously in a poor condition and that the new use has ensured the building's long term future. Given that all features of historic or architectural interest have been removed from the interior, with the exception of some roof timbers which remain visible, and had a LBC been received in advance of the removal of the staircase that adequately justified the replacement of it then I would have no objected to the design of the new staircase given the modern finish to the rest of the interior."

5.3.7 Concerns have also been raised by Councillor Lees over the basement, that it has been filled in and is no-longer accessible. The NPPF states that where a development leads to a 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. The entry details of the property on the Historic England website is as follows:

SWINDON C.P. HIGH STREET (west side) SO 89 SE The Greyhound (formerly 5/119 listed as Greyhound Public 5.8.80 House) GV II House now inn. Early C18. Red brick; plain tile roof; brick external end stacks. 2 parallel ranges with extension to rear. 3 storeys, reduced proportions to second

floor, dentilled eaves band. 2 windows, 3-light glazing bar casements, those to ground and first floors have segmental heads. Central door with segmental head. To the rear a 2-storey extension with large side stack, possibly a former brewhouse.

Interior: chamfered and stopped beams.

- 5.3.8 The primary features for the listing entry of the building relate to its external fabric and the works conducted has been considered satisfactory by our Conservation Officer. The internal features solely relate to the chamfered and stopped beams with no reference made to the significance of the stairwell or basement.
- 5.3.9 From our site visit on the 20/04/17, the external works do appear to have been conducted to a good standard and the beams have been retained in the loft areas. Therefore, there appears to be no direct conflict with the Historic England listing and thus a less than substantial harm to the heritage asset.
- 5.3.10 Although it is unfortunate that the works have been conducted prior to relevant conditions being discharged as part of the previous consents, particularly that a written scheme of archaeological investigation was not conducted for the interior of the building; in this instance considering that the external fabric of the building has not been detrimentally altered but made good and that the beams in the loft areas have been retained, the internal works conducted are enduring.
- 5.3.11 Details have been provided for the main front door which matches the other doors around the building and is considered acceptable. The new stairwell is modern in appearance and is also considered acceptable as the internal décor of the building will be modernised and has been designed to comply with building regulations.
- 5.3.12 Therefore, on balance, even though it is unfortunate that the stairwell has been removed prior to formal consultation with the Planning team, it probably would have been allowed anyway in order to bring the building back into viable use as a residential development and to secure the long-term future of this historic building. The works conducted have not caused significant harm to the heritage asset or its setting and public benefits would be gained that outweigh any residual harm upon the listed building by fact that it will be brought back into use securing its long-term future; complying with policy EQ3.

5.4 Representations

- 5.4.1 None.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 This is a retrospective application for works being conducted to the Grade II listed building. The external works conducted is considered acceptable and when considering that the works to the interior do not conflict with the listing details as stipulated on the Historic England website it is considered that a less than substantial harm has been caused. When weighing up the residual harm upon the building against its long-term future being secured, on balance, the development complies with policy EQ13 of the adopted Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework, and is recommended for approval.

7. RECOMMENDATION APPROVE

Subject to the following condition(s):

1. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans:

0200
500 M
600 D
Front Entrance Doorset

Reasons

1. In order to define the permission and to avoid doubt.
2. Pro-active Statement

In dealing with the planning application the Local Planning Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner in accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

INFORMATIVE

The granting of this listed building consent does not imply the discharge of condition(s) attached to any previous planning permission(s). Any condition(s) requiring discharging as part of a planning permission(s) must be dealt with separately.



Greyhound Inn, High Street, Swindon, South Staffordshire