

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (BUGLE INN, TWYFORD) SUB-COMMITTEE

4 July 2005

Attendance:

Councillors:

Busher (Chairman) (P)

Bennetts (P)
Beveridge (P)
Davies (P)
Johnston (P)

Read (P)
Pearson (P)
Saunders (P)
Sutton (P)

Others in Attendance who Addressed the meeting:

Councillors Bidgood and Wagner

Officers in Attendance:

Mr D Dimon: Acting Planning Team Manager
Mrs J Pinnock: Senior Planning Officer
Ms C Hollis: Assistant Traffic Engineer
Mr N Culhane: Engineer
Mrs H Brushett: Conservation Officer

1. **THE BUGLE INN, PARK LANE, TWYFORD, WINCHESTER – ERECTION OF 2 NO. TWO BEDROOM AND 2 NO. THREE BEDROOM DWELLINGS; ALTERATIONS TO OUTBUILDING, DEMOLITION OF TOILET BLOCK, INTERNAL ALTERATIONS TO PROVIDE TOILETS AND LARGER KITCHEN; ALTERATIONS TO ACCESS – PLANNING REFERENCE W03580/07**
(Report PDC568 refers)

The Sub-Committee met at the Guildhall, Winchester. The Chairman welcomed to the meeting approximately 17 members of the public and Mr Davies and Mr Smith on behalf of the applicant, Intown Pub Company Ltd.

The application sought permission for the erection of 2 no. two bedroom and 2 no. three bedroom dwellings on the car park in front of the Bugle Inn, Twyford. The scheme also proposed internal alterations to the public house (to provide toilets and a larger kitchen) and alterations to the outbuilding, car park and access.

The proposed terraced dwellings

Mr Smith explained that the design and location of the four terraced houses onto High Street, Twyford had followed officer advice. He suggested that the buildings would restore the historical street frontage and make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area.

The style and the materials proposed for the new terraces reflected surrounding buildings, with natural slate and clay tiles. Mr Smith added that the materials and

style of the proposed brick work could be controlled by condition. The dwellings would feature chimneys and dormer windows and had a ridge height of 8.2 metres.

Members discussed the size of the proposed dwellings and Mrs Pinnock explained that the 4 bedrooms were more likely to be used as 3 bedroom properties with a small box room.

Members were concerned that, as the proposed dwellings fronted onto the busy High Street and backed onto a public house car park, the occupiers of the new dwellings would have little opportunity to open their windows without noise nuisance. Mrs Pinnock explained that the applicant had submitted an acoustic report which had been assessed by the Council's Environmental Protection Team, who confirmed that the report met the assessment standard. However they recommended a condition to ensure acoustic glazing be used in accordance with a scheme to be first approved by the Council. Mr Smith added that the dwellings would be designed with a "total refreshment system" to ensure good circulation of air without the need to open windows.

Highways Issues

The Sub-Committee noted that there was difference in opinion between Engineers and Planning Officers regarding the highway issues of the site. Mr Culhane had raised a highways objection to the application which the Planning Officers thought would not be sustainable at an appeal.

Mr Culhane explained that part of his objection to the scheme centred on the applicant's failure to demonstrate the adequacy of the proposed access into the site from Park Lane, which passed through the existing aperture of the Coach House. He added that the tight nature of the car parking area made it particularly difficult for large vehicles to turn on site, and that on leaving, they would therefore be forced to reverse out onto Park Lane.

Members discussed whether a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) along Park Lane would help alleviate parking problems in the area and improve access to the site. In response, Ms Hollis explained that a TRO could not be imposed as part of a planning condition, that the TRO process took on average 6-9 months to implement and that a TRO was likely to generate significant opposition from local residents in Park Lane. Ms Hollis added that a TRO was unlikely to significantly improve the ability of large vehicles to swing into the site through the Coach House, given that Park Lane had only an approximate width of 5.5 metres.

However, in response, Mr Smith stated that there were many public houses operated by the Inntown Pub Company Ltd that had restricted on-site access. He added that most of the suppliers would use small, flat-bed Transit style vehicles that could easily access the site through the Coach House. Members also noted that the applicant was willing to enter into a legal agreement prohibiting the use of larger vehicles servicing the public house.

During discussion, Mr Davies confirmed that the developer had proposed to install electronic bollards to protect residents' parking bays and Mr Culhane advised that the parking standard for the public house included staff parking.

Mr Davies explained that the applicant had considered increasing the aperture of the Coach House but during discussion, Mrs Brushett stated that views of this building

would remain from Park Lane and that there would still be highways objections to the proposals even if this building was altered.

The Sub-Committee also discussed the 1 in 20 gradient of part of the site and although it was confirmed that the access through the Coach House would be flat, Members requested further detailed information in this regard.

Members questioned the proposed location of the disabled parking bay in the scheme and Mrs Pinnock stated that its position had been selected as it was nearest to the public house. At the invitation of the Chairman a member of the public stated that, primarily because of its slope, the disabled car parking space did not comply with the Disability Discrimination Act.

The Bugle Inn

The Sub-Committee discussed the internal changes to the public house. In summary, it was proposed to bring the toilet facilities inside the public house and that the kitchen would be enlarged by taking some space from the restaurant area. The refurbishments were necessary to comply with the Disability Discrimination Act.

Some Members were concerned that the public house had no garden and would therefore have limited opportunities to provide children's facilities.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a representative of the Save The Bugle Inn Action Group spoke against the application. He raised concerns regarding the future viability of the public house since the proposed terrace of housing to the front would partially obscure the Inn from potential passing trade. He added that as a large number of the Inn's patrons came from surrounding villages the reduction in the number of car parking spaces would further damage its viability.

In response to these concerns, Mr Davies reported that following its refurbishment, a new tenant would be managing the public house from September 2005. Mrs Pinnock highlighted to Members the officers' recommendation to require the applicant to enter into a legal agreement to ensure that none of the new dwellings should be occupied until the public house had been refurbished and opened to the public.

Other Issues

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Bidgood (as a Ward Member) commented on the application. Members noted that, as the property was not listed, the applicant could make internal alterations to the public house without requiring planning consent.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Wagner (as a Ward Member) commented on the site's gradient and that the proposed terrace of housing would obscure views of the public house. He added that the poor access to the site was made worse by drivers' inability to see if all the car parking spaces were full without first turning into the site.

Mrs Pinnock explained that officers did not consider that the public house would be obscured from public view, and that cars would access the car park and if full, turn within the car park and exit the site in a forward gear.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a number of the members of public present spoke in opposition to the scheme, including representatives of Twyford Parish Council and

the Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) and it was noted that more than 700 letters of objection had been submitted to the planning authority. During discussion, many local people did not consider the car park in front of the public house to be an “unattractive gap” as stated in the report and instead commented that the proposals would not enhance the character of the area. In summary, several of those who spoke recommended that the application be amended to reduce the number of proposed dwellings to two, which would allow access from the High Street without use of the Coach House.

Other concerns raised included the possibility of increased parking congestion along Park Lane as many of the existing properties had no off-street parking. Members also noted that Park Lane had no pavement and yet was frequently used by people visiting the nearby Hunters Park. In addition to its patrons, the Bugle Inn car park was also used by customers of the nearby shops, as Twyford had no public car park.

At the invitation of the Chairman, a member of the public (Mr Barlow) illustrated a photograph of the Bugle Inn taken during the First World War which showed the open space in front of the public house. However, in response Mrs Brushett showed Members the historic maps dating from 1843 which demonstrated that there had been a development frontage to the site.

Conclusion

At the conclusion of the meeting, the Chairman summarised the concerns of the Members which principally related to the highways issues, the location of the disabled parking and the site’s gradient.

No formal recommendation was made, although the majority of Members made it clear that they would recommend refusal on the application as it stood. The Sub-Committee asked the applicant to submit further information on highway issues, including the swept path, levels and cross sections through the site which would be considered at the next Planning Development Control Committee.

However, whilst some Members raised no objection to the principle of developing a frontage onto the High Street, the Sub-Committee was unanimous in voicing its support that the public house should remain open to the public.

RECOMMENDED:

That the application be deferred for further information as outlined above.

The meeting commenced at 11.00am and concluded at 1.15pm.

Chairman