

APPLICATION NO.	P15/V0179/FUL
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION
REGISTERED	13.2.2015
PARISH	CHILDREY
WARD MEMBER(S)	Yvonne Constance
APPLICANT	Mr Ian Shaw
SITE	Hatchett Inn, Stowhill, Childrey, Wantage, OX12 9UF
PROPOSAL	Erection of three two bedroom cottages and works there to.
AMENDMENTS	None
GRID REFERENCE	436177/187353
OFFICER	Holly Bates

SUMMARY

The application is for the erection of three two bedroom dwellings located on land forming part of the existing garden and parking area for The Hatchet Inn in Childrey.

The application comes to committee because the parish council fully support the application and the officer recommendation is to refuse the application.

Officers are of the opinion that the adverse impacts of proposal, by reason of its detrimental impact on the setting of the adjacent heritage assets and on the long-term viability of the public house, would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal when assessed against the National Planning Policy Framework as a whole.

The main issues to consider are:

- The location of the proposed residential development in Childrey village;
- The impact of the proposal on the setting of the grade II listed buildings surrounding the site, and the character and appearance of the conservation area;
- The impact of the proposal on the long term viability and functionality of the public house;
- Whether there is sufficient off-street parking provision for the public house and new residential development.

The application is recommended for refusal.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Hatchet Inn is located towards the southern end of Childrey, within the main built up area of the village. It is a grade II listed building, and is the only public house within the village. The application site, approximately 0.11 ha in size, forms part of the garden and parking area to the pub and is located to the east of the main pub building. The whole site is located within the Childrey Conservation Area.
- 1.2 The application site is surrounded by grade II listed buildings to three aspects; The Hatchet to the west, Tudor House to the east and Charles House opposite, to the north. To the south lies Threeways garage.
- 1.3 The application site is also washed over by the Lowland Vale local landscape designation, and a section of the existing access point connecting to the highway is

designated as village green. A site plan is **attached** at appendix one.

2.0 **PROPOSAL**

2.1 The application seeks planning permission for the erection of three terraced dwellings on the existing pub garden, accessed via the pub car park. Existing single storey structures to the rear of the pub would be demolished and a smaller replacement pub garden provided. The existing pub garden is 450sq.m in area and the proposed pub garden is 180sq.m in area, a reduction of 60%.

2.2 The proposed dwellings would form a terrace row of traditional design; each providing two bedrooms, rear amenity space and parking provision shared with the pub. The row of dwellings would be 15.8 metres long and 8.7m wide, with an eaves height of 4.5m and a ridge height of 7.7m. They would be constructed from brickwork elevations with tiled roofs, and incorporate design features such as porch canopies, dormer windows and chimneys.

2.3 Vehicular access to the site would be taken from the existing access to the pub car park. Parking provision for the houses and the public house would be shared, with a total of 15 spaces for both the pub and the three two-bed dwellings.

2.4 The application plans are **attached** at appendix two.

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 Below is a summary of the responses received to both the original plans and the amendments. A full copy of all the comments made can be viewed online at www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk.

3.2

<p>Childrey Parish Council</p>	<p>Fully Support. Their concerns may be summarised as follows:</p> <p>The Childrey Parish Council fully supports this application for the following reasons:</p> <p>Childrey Parish Council agree with the comments in the “Design and Access” statement. This resubmission has taken into account the reduction of dwellings from four to three 2 bedroom cottages. It also now shows a provision of pub amenity areas and the retention of the pub garden area. This will safeguard the Public House as a community facility, and also provide new two bedroom housing opportunities for the village.</p>
<p>Neighbours</p>	<p>5 letters of objections from 4 neighbouring properties have been received. The concerns raised can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of car parking provision retained for the pub – would result in on-street parking which is a highway safety risk; • The removal of most of the garden and parking of the pub would likely impact the long term viability of the business; • Light to the garden area of Tudor House would be

	<p>adversely affected due to the height and close proximity;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overlooking of Tudor Cottage by windows in the development; • The modern development would profoundly alter the character of the area; • The development is not sympathetic to the character of the area; • Three houses is an overdevelopment of the site; • The proposal fails to preserve or enhance the conservation area; • The proposal would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the grade II listed buildings; • Proximity of houses may affect stability of boundary wall (this would be covered by other legislation); • The Hatchet is surrounded by village green which has legal restrictions for access; • Trees have not been plotted correctly.
Conservation Officer – Vale of White Horse	Recommends refusal of the application; full comments are attached at appendix three.
Highways Liaison Officer – Oxfordshire County Council	Concerns raised over level of parking provision for the pub, defer to LPA.
Drainage Engineer – Vale of White Horse	No objections, subject to conditions.
Thames Water Development Control	No objections, recommend informative.
Archaeology Team – Oxfordshire County Council	No objections, subject to conditions
Countryside Access – Oxfordshire County Council	No objections.

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 [P14/V1777/FUL](#) - Withdrawn (13/02/2015)
Erection of 4 x 2 bed dwellings.

[P79/V1173](#) - Approved (10/10/1979)
Construction of a car park extension [site area quarter acre].

[P73/V0559](#) - Approved (05/02/1973)
Erection of a store and garage to replace existing garage which is in a dangerous condition.

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

5.1 **Vale of White Horse District Council Local Plan 2011**

The development plan for this area comprises the adopted Vale of White Horse local plan 2011. The following local plan policies relevant to this application were ‘saved’ by direction on 1 July 2009.

Policy Number	Policy Title
GS3	Developments in Existing Settlements
DC1	Design

DC5	Access
DC6	Landscaping
DC9	The Impact of Development on Neighbouring Uses
H11	Development in the Larger Villages
HE10	Archaeology
NE9	Lowland Vale
HE1	Conservation Areas
HE4	Listed Buildings
CF5	Public Houses

5.2 Emerging Local Plan 2031 – Part 1

The draft local plan part 1 is not currently adopted policy. Paragraph 216 of the NPPF allows for weight to be given to relevant policies in emerging plans, unless other material considerations indicate otherwise, and only subject to the stage of preparation of the plan, the extent of unresolved objections and the degree of consistency of the relevant emerging policies with the NPPF. At present it is officers' opinion that the emerging Local Plan housing policies carry limited weight for decision making. The relevant policies are as follows:-

Policy Number	Policy Title
Core Policy 1	Presumption in favour of sustainable development
Core Policy 3	Settlement hierarchy
Core Policy 4	Meeting our housing needs
Core Policy 20	Spatial strategy for Western Vale Sub-Area
Core Policy 33	Promoting sustainable transport and accessibility
Core Policy 35	Promoting public transport, cycling and walking
Core Policy 37	Design and local distinctiveness
Core Policy 39	The historic environment
Core Policy 44	Landscape

5.3 Supplementary Planning Guidance

- Design Guide – March 2015
The following sections of the Design Guide are particularly relevant to this application:-

Responding to Site and Setting

- *Character Study (DG6) and Site appraisal (DG9)*

Establishing the Framework

- *Existing natural resources, sustainability and heritage (DG10-13, 15, 19)*
- *Landscape and SUDS (DG14, 16-18, 20)*
- *Movement Framework and street hierarchy (DG21-24)*
- *Density (DG26)*
- *Urban Structure (blocks, frontages, nodes etc) DG27-30*

Layout

- *Streets and Spaces (DG31-43)*
- *Parking (DG44-50)*

Built Form

- *Scale, form, massing and position (DG51-54)*
- *Boundary treatments (DG55)*
- *Building Design (DG56-62)*
- *Amenity, privacy and overlooking (DG63-64)*
- *Refuse and services (DG67-68)*

5.4 **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – March 2012**

5.5 **National Planning Practice Guidance 2014 (NPPG)**

5.6 **Neighbourhood Plan**

Paragraph 216 of the NPPF allows for weight to be given to relevant policies in emerging plans, unless other material considerations indicate otherwise, and only subject to the stage of preparation of the plan, the extent of unresolved objections and the degree of consistency of the relevant emerging policies with the NPPF.

5.7 Childrey has not submitted a neighbourhood plan.

5.8 **Environmental Impact**

This proposal does not exceed 150 dwellings and the site area is under 5ha. Consequently the proposal is beneath the thresholds set in Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 and this proposal is not EIA development and there is no requirement under the Regulations to provide a screening opinion.

5.9 **Other Relevant Legislation**

- Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990
- Community & Infrastructure Levy Legislation Human Rights Act 1998
- Equality Act 2010
- Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998
- Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006
- The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010
- Localism Act (including New Homes Bonus)

5.10 **Human Rights Act**

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.

5.11 **Equalities**

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 relevant planning considerations in the determination of this application are:

1. Principle of the development
2. Locational credentials
3. Impact on listed buildings and the conservation area
4. Long-term viability of the public house
5. Residential Amenity
6. Traffic, Parking and Highway Safety
7. Flood Risk and Surface/Foul Drainage

6.2 **The Principle of Development**

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Section 70 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides that the local planning authority shall have regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations. The development plan currently

comprises the saved policies of Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011. Paragraph 215 of the NPPF provides that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

- 6.3 Other material planning considerations include national planning guidance within the NPPF and NPPG and the emerging Vale of White Horse Local Plan: Part 1-Strategic Sites and Policies and its supporting evidence base.
- 6.4 Paragraph 47 of the NPPF expects local planning authorities to *"use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area"*... The authority has undertaken this assessment through the April 2014 SHMA which is the most up to date objectively assessed need for housing. In agreeing to submit the emerging Local Plan for examination, the Council has agreed a housing target of at least 20,560 dwellings for the plan period to 2031. Set against this target the Council does not have a five year housing land supply.
- 6.5 Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states *"Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites"*. This means that the relevant housing policies in the adopted Local Plan are not considered up to date and the adverse impacts of a development would need to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits if the proposal is refused. In order to judge whether a development is sustainable it must be assessed against the economic, social and environmental roles.
- 6.6 The relevant housing policies of the adopted and emerging local plan hold very limited material planning weight in light of the lack of a five year housing supply. Consequently the proposal should be assessed under the NPPF where there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Sustainable development is seen as the golden thread running through the decision making process. Having a deliverable five year housing supply is considered sustainable under the three strands.
- 6.7 Paragraph 14 of the NPPF confirms that the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking. For decision-taking, this means where the development plan is absent, silent, or relevant policies are out of date, granting permission unless:
 - Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework when taken as a whole; or
 - Specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted.
- 6.8 The second point is elaborated upon in a footnote, and confirms that policies relating to heritage assets are examples of these aforementioned specific policies.
- 6.9 This means that even with the lack of a five year housing supply, specific policies relating to heritage assets may outweigh the presumption in favour of sustainable development, depending on the specific circumstances.
- 6.10 It is your officer's opinion that the heritage policies in the Framework do overrule the presumption in favour of sustainable development as the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets for which there is no justification or any identified public benefit.

- 6.11 Officers have also identified that the adverse impacts of the development, in relation to the harm to the designated heritage assets, long-term viability of an important community facility and on highway safety significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits if the proposal.
- 6.12 These issues will be discussed in detail within this report.
- 6.13 **Locational Credentials**
The NPPF requires the need to travel to be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes to be maximised (paragraph 34).
- 6.14 The site is located within the main built up area of Childrey and is well linked to existing development and its services. Childrey is allocated as a smaller village in the Town and Village Facilities Study (Update February 2014) which is part of the evidence base for the Emerging Local Plan 2031 Part One. It contains, amongst other facilities, a primary school, local shop, church, village hall and the public house immediately adjacent to the application site.
- 6.15 The application site is within walking distance of many of these facilities; approximately 350m to the primary school and 70m from the local shop. The application site is also within approximately 50m of a bus stop which is served by local bus service 38 which connects Childrey with Wantage, and by service 67 which also connects to Wantage, and Faringdon. The approximate distances provided are from the site access.
- 6.16 The site is therefore considered to be a sustainable location in terms of the social and economic aspects of sustainability, providing good access to a range of services and facilities and public transport allowing connections to larger towns within the Vale district.
- 6.17 **Impact on the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings**
There are two important statutory duties for the local planning authority with regard to a listed building and a conservation area. Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires a local planning authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that special attention should be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.
- 6.18 In the NPPF a listed building and a conservation area are both defined as a “designated heritage asset”. Paragraph 132 of the NPPF confirms that “*When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be*”. Paragraph 134 of the NPPF explains that “less than substantial harm” to the significance of the heritage asset should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
- 6.19 Policy HE4 of the adopted local plan seeks to protect the setting of listed buildings while policy HE1 seeks to protect the character and appearance of a conservation areas. Policy DC1 seeks to ensure good quality design. In March 2015 the council adopted its design guide, which aims to raise the standard of design across the district.
- 6.20 The proposed dwellings would be adjacent to three listed buildings; The Hatchet Inn to the west, Tudor House to the east and Charles House to the north. While the impact of the proposal on the context of the area would affect the setting of Charles Cottage, this

dwelling is approximately 37m away from the proposed dwellings. Therefore the main impacts to consider are on the immediately adjacent Tudor House, and The Hatchet itself.

- 6.21 The setting of the grade II listed thatched Tudor House would be harmed by the siting of the proposed dwellings in such close proximity to the west gable of the cottage. The proposed dwellings would be noticeably higher (by approximately 1.7m) due to the higher ground level of the application site. They would overly dominate the lower vernacularly scaled timber framed cottage.
- 6.22 The setting of The Hatchet includes the current open pub garden and car park. These provide a space from which the listed building is appreciated. The proposal would significantly erode this space, thereby harming the setting. Therefore the proposal would detract from the significance of both designated assets.
- 6.23 It is also considered that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. This part of the conservation area, within the village's historic core, has an open, low density character. The space around the pub is an important element in this character. From along the High Street, and Stowhill this space, along with the open grassed areas at junctions and along Stowhill, provides views across to the vernacular Tudor House which contribute significantly to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Officers consider the proposed dwellings would appear overly prominent in views from High Street and Stowhill and harm the conservation area.
- 6.24 The harm to designated assets that has been identified is less than substantial. It is possible for this level of harm to be outweighed by a parallel public benefit. The parish council considers that the proposal will be of benefit to the viability of the pub. Officers have far less confidence in this, as will now be explained.
- 6.25 **Long-term viability of the public house**
The NPPF at paragraph 28 stated that: "To promote a strong rural economy, local and neighbourhood plans should promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship."
- 6.26 In addition, paragraph 70 confirms that "planning policies and decisions should guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services..." and "...ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernise in a way that is sustainable, and retained for the benefit of the community..."
- 6.27 The submitted design and access statement makes a brief reference to the intention to build the proposed dwellings to safeguard the pub. However, no information or evidence has been submitted to explain how the dwellings would help to safeguard the pub's long term future. For example there is no mechanism to ensure that the profit made from selling the dwellings will be directed to the pub.
- 6.28 In fact officers consider there is a strong likelihood that the proposal will jeopardise the long term viability of the pub. The relatively rapid decline in the number of pubs over recent years has been well documented. Officers' experience is that, to survive, village pubs have to become "destinations" that can attract patrons from a wider area. This is generally associated with the ability to provide restaurant space and outdoor space.
- 6.29 The existing pub is relatively small, with a floor space of approximately 145 sq.m. To maximise the ability of the pub to survive in the longer term, when an expanded

restaurant and outdoor space is likely to be required, officers consider that it is prudent to protect the curtilage of the pub. This will provide space for a potential restaurant extension and for additional car parking.

- 6.30 The current proposal will significantly reduce the size of the pub garden and the car parking space available for the pub. The garden space would be reduced by 60% to approximately 180sq metres. The pub has a relatively large area of tarmac for parking, containing 13 spaces. The proposed dwellings would share this space and a total of 15 parking spaces would be provided. In this location, two parking spaces per dwelling would be advisable and additional space for visitors to minimise the risk of overspill to the public highway. At the most, and not counting any potential visitor spaces for the dwellings, this leaves only nine spaces for the pub
- 6.31 Officers consider that the proposed reductions in garden area and parking will severely compromise the potential for the pub to expand in the future. As a direct comparison, officers would point to the General Elliot in South Hinksey. Here the future viability of the pub has only been secured through a recent planning permission for an extension to provide more floor area and letting rooms, and for a larger car park. Without a site that gives sufficient flexibility for such proposals it is reasonable to conclude that the long term viability of the pub is doubtful. As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to the aims of local plan policy CF5, and contrary to the NPPF and NPPG.
- 6.32 Consequently, officers consider that there is no public benefit arising from the proposal that would outweigh the harm to the designated assets. The proposed housing has to be considered within the context of the current deficit in the five year supply of housing land, and of paragraph 14 of the NPPF. However, officers consider the harm identified contravenes specific policies in the NPPF concerning the protection of heritage assets. Thus the presumption in favour of granting permission is outweighed.
- 6.33 **Residential amenity**
Adopted local plan policy DC9 seeks to prevent development that would result in a loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight for neighbouring properties or that would cause dominance or visual intrusion for neighbouring properties and the wider environment. Protecting amenity is a core principle of the NPPF. Design principles DG63-64 of the Design Guide pertain to amenity, privacy and overlooking.
- 6.34 The main dwelling which would be affected by the proposal is Tudor House, the grade II listed dwelling to the east of the site. The proposed dwellings would broadly align with Tudor House, and would not project beyond the front elevation of Tudor Cottage. Similarly, the rear elevations of the proposed dwellings, while at an angle, would not significantly project beyond the rear elevation of Tudor House. There are no windows contained within the west elevation gable to Tudor House.
- 6.35 Therefore, despite the significant visual dominance of the cottage by the proposed dwellings, their position and layout means that there would be no loss of light or outlook to any windows or amenity areas of Tudor House.
- 6.36 Upper floor windows are contained within the front and rear elevations of the proposed dwellings, which face north-west (over the car park) and south-east (over the rear amenity areas for the dwellings). While there may be some angled views from the nearest upper floor bedroom window within the proposed unit 3, these would not be significant and are no more than the mutual overlooking that would reasonably be expected to occur between rear windows for adjacent neighbouring dwellings. Therefore, no harmful overlooking would occur as a result of the proposal.

6.37 As such, the proposal is considered to comply with Local Plan Policy DC9, the Design Guide 2015 and the NPPF and NPPG in this regard.

6.38 Traffic, Parking and Highway Safety

Adopted local plan policy DC5 requires safe access for developments and that the road network can accommodate the traffic arising from the development safely. The NPPF, as paragraph 32 states: "Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe."

6.39 The proposed dwellings would be served by the existing vehicular access to the pub, which leads to the existing parking area. The access is considered to be acceptable, and the highways liaison officer has raised no objections to the application on this basis.

6.40 The county highways liaison officer also raised concern over the amount of parking left for the pub following the development; his comments are as follows:

"I have no objection in principle to the proposal and my only concern is whether or not there will be adequate parking to serve the pub when the houses are built. Providing you are satisfied that there is sufficient parking available for both the pub and residential use then I have no objection and recommend the following condition for inclusion in any consent you may grant..."

6.41 The local planning authority have reviewed the parking provision, and as indicated in previous sections of this report, do raise concern regarding the level of parking provision remaining for the pub in terms of the very limited provision restricting any further expansion of the pub in the future which may be required to secure its long-term viability.

6.42 In addition, no evidence has been submitted to indicate that the proposed reduced level of parking would be suitable for the public house uses and needs. Without this, there is a risk that any overflow car parking would migrate to the adjacent Stowhill vicinity with a risk of obstructing traffic, to the detriment of highway safety.

6.43 As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Local Plan Policy DC5, the NPPF and the NPPG.

6.44 Village Green

The strip of land across the vehicular access as it meets the highway is designated as village green. This has been confirmed with Oxfordshire county council definitive map and commons team. There are legal ramifications for granting new access across village greens, which the applicant would have to address separately. However, this is not a material planning consideration to be addressed here, as it is dealt with under separate legislation.

6.45 Flood Risk and Surface/Foul Drainage

The NPPF provides that development should not increase flood risk elsewhere and should be appropriately flood resilient and resistant (paragraph 103). It states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by, amongst other things, preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution (Paragraph 109).

6.46 The site is not located within an identified flood zone. The council's drainage engineer and Thames Water have not raised any objections to the proposal, subject to

conditions.

7.0 CONCLUSION

7.1 In view of the council's housing land supply shortfall, the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies and permission should be granted unless "any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole" or "specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted." (NPPF paragraph 14). Paragraph 7 of NPPF identifies three mutually dependant dimensions to sustainable development; it should fulfil an economic role, a social role and an environmental role.

7.2 The proposed development would perform an economic role, at least in the short term, in that it would provide employment during the construction phase. It would also create investment in the local and wider economy through the construction stage and new residents and their spending.

7.3 The scheme would have a social role as it will provide in general additional housing that the District needs, and smaller housing units for this village location. The dwellings would also be located to existing services and facilities within Childrey.

7.4 However, officers consider that the proposal has a very reasonable likelihood of jeopardising the long-term viability of the public house by reducing its garden and parking areas thereby restricting potential visitor numbers. This would have a substantially harmful impact on the social sustainability of Childrey by reducing the number of community facilities available, and losing the only public house in the village.

7.5 Harm has been identified in terms of less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area and grade II listed buildings directly adjacent to the site. Considerable importance and weight is given to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the conservation area and conservation of listed buildings and their setting.

7.6 In this case, the harm is less than substantial but no public benefits to the proposal have been identified, as required by paragraph 134 of the NPPF. Concern is also raised that the substantial reduction in garden and parking space for the existing pub could harm its long-term viability and the optimum viable use of the listed building, thereby directly conflicting with paragraph 134 of the NPPF.

7.7 Therefore, while the proposal may have some economic and social benefits, the adverse environmental and social aspects of the proposal significantly and demonstrable adverse outweigh the benefits. Specific policies within the NPPF also indicate development should be restricted where they would lead to harm to designated heritage assets.

7.8 Consequently, the application is recommended for refusal.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

8.1 **That planning permission is refused for the following reasons:**

- 1. In the opinion of the local planning authority, the proposal by reason of its scale, extent, layout and proximity would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the Grade II listed buildings The Hatchet and Tudor House and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Childrey Conservation Area. The less than substantial harm identified is not outweighed by any evidence of any public benefit resulting from the**

proposal. As such, the proposal is contrary to adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan policies DC1, HE1 and HE5, the adopted Vale of White Horse Design Guide 2015, the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Policy Guidance.

2. In the opinion of the local planning authority, the proposal by reason of its significant reduction in garden amenity space and parking provision for use by the existing public house, The Hatchet Inn, would compromise the long term viability and functionality of the public house due to the restriction in available ancillary facilities. This would result in the loss of an important community facility, to the detriment of the social and economic sustainability of Childrey. As such, the proposal is contrary to adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan policy CF5, the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Policy Guidance.
3. In the opinion of the local planning authority, the proposal has not provided evidence to demonstrate that the reduced level of parking would be adequate for the pub's requirements. Without this evidence there is a risk of increased on-street parking to Stowhill and the surrounding area which would pose a risk to obstructing traffic, to the detriment of highway safety. As such, the proposal is contrary to adopted Vale of White Horse Local Plan policy DC5, the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Policy Guidance.

Author: Holly Bates
Contact No: 01235 540546
Email: holly.bates@southandvale.gov.uk