

APPLICATION NUMBER: WD/D/18/001227

APPLICATION SITE: 9G WEST BAY ROAD, WEST BAY, BRIDPORT, DT6 4EN

PROPOSAL: Repairs to first floor & roof structure

APPLICANT: West Bay (Customs House) Ltd

CASE OFFICER: Jennie Roberts

WARD MEMBER(S): Cllr D Rickard, Cllr F McKenzie, Cllr Mrs S Brown

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY: Grant consent

1. DESCRIPTION OF SITE:

1.1 Norman Goods yard is situated in a central location within West Bay, accessed off West Bay Road. The Grade II* listed warehouse at the most southerly end of the yard, which is the subject of this application, was a former Bonded Stores. There are additional storage buildings along the eastern boundary of the site and a range of retail units with accommodation above at the front of the site, abutting the pavement along West Bay Road. The site is of significant heritage value, and this proposal is sensitive given its impact on the Grade II* listed building. The site also falls within the heart of the Conservation Area, within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and within flood zones 2 and 3.

1.2 The Conservation Area appraisal states; *'The former Bonded Stores (Messrs Norman Good's warehouse) has stone mullioned windows that may signify a 17th century building, since in Dorset, 'Tudor' details appear until quite late. The store may even relate to the first improvement of the Harbour in 1740 and is shown on an Admiralty Chart of 1812'.*

1.3 *The eastern and southern sides of the rectangle are industrial in character. The listed Grade II* former Bonded Stores (now Messrs Norman Good) forms a strong southern arm of 3 storey stonework, with a hipped roof, mullioned windows and loading doors. A vaulted ground floor adds to the importance of this 18th century structure. From within the yard, the building elevations are relatively unspoilt, but the eastern elevation is a mixture of rendered walls and utilitarian sheds of brick and corrugated iron. The adjoining shared garden has stone walls of considerable character and a protective bund to the beach. The west wall follows the line of the Harbour Boundary. The shared garden and Stores are easily seen from East Cliff and the shingle bank of East Beach'.*

1.4 The three-storey listed warehouse has a walled yard to the north and a large walled garden to the south. The industrial buildings within the yard are understood to date from between the late 18th and the late 19th centuries.

1.5 The yard is largely enclosed. A modified late 18th- or early 19th-century house, possibly former accommodation for a site manager adjoins the old bonded stores to the south-west. To the west of the yard is a three storey property, listed in its own right, Clarence House, now subdivided into housing, but may have originated as additional warehousing. A further two storey building is positioned alongside Clarence House, with retail on the ground floor and accommodation above. A footpath runs alongside this building providing pedestrian access into the yard. The retail units to the north and north-west are of modern reconstituted stone under a slate mansard roof, and a modified early 19th-century house stands to the west of the site entrance at the north end of the yard, which has a single storey addition fronting the road containing a shopfront and has accommodation above. The east boundary is bordered by the old bonded stores, together with its associated outbuildings, one of which has been used as a shop, accessed from the east. To the south of the site, beyond the old bonded stores, is the shingle beach of West Bay.

2. DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT:

2.1 This application relates to the refurbishment of the North/South axis wing of the existing building on the eastern side of the curtilage, and seeks listed building consent for repairs to elements of the building which are decayed or unsafe. These works comprise:

- Repair and strengthening of decayed existing first floor joists
- Repair and strengthening of decayed existing roof valley timber

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

Application No.	Application Description	Decision	Date of decision
1/W/80/001091	Erect Extensions To Provide 2 Flats Above Existing Shops Nos 9A 9B 9C 9D	A	16 March 1981
WD/D/17/001237	Replace West access gate to match North access gate. Remove two	UNK	

	raised concrete and blockwork bases. Lay bound 10mm golden gravel over open yard surface.		
WD/D/18/000084	Demolition of existing shop units & industrial building at front of site. Construction of new building for use as retail premises (A1/A3) and 2 no. residential units.	UNK	
WD/D/18/000085	Demolition of existing shop units & industrial building at front of site	UNK	

4 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

4.1 National Planning Policy Framework

As far as this application is concerned the following section(s) of the NPPF are considered to be relevant:

16 – Conserving and enhancing the Historic Environment

Para 38 - Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.

4.2 Adopted West Dorset and Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015)

ENV4 – Heritage Assets

5. OTHER MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

5.1 West Bay Conservation Area Appraisal

6. HUMAN RIGHTS:

6.1 Article 6 - Right to a fair trial.

Article 8 - Right to respect for private and family life and home.

The first protocol of Article 1 Protection of property

This Recommendation is based on adopted Development Plan policies, the application of which does not prejudice the Human Rights of the applicant or any third party.

7. PUBLIC SECTOR EQUALITIES DUTY:

7.1 As set out in the Equalities Act 2010, all public bodies, in discharging their functions must have "due regard" to this duty. There are 3 main aims:-

- Removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristics
- Taking steps to meet the needs of people with certain protected characteristics where these are different from the needs of other people
- Encouraging people with certain protected characteristics to participate in public life or in other activities where participation is disproportionately low.

Whilst there is no absolute requirement to fully remove any disadvantage the Duty is to have "regard to" and remove OR minimise disadvantage and in considering the merits of this planning application the planning authority has taken into consideration the requirements of the PSED

8. CONSULTATIONS:

8.1 *Historic England* - No objection to the application on heritage grounds. Following comments from the DCP conservation officer, HE was again reconsulted, and confirmed that they do not object to the repair works proposed, as they do not involve the loss of historic fabric and are relatively minor in nature.

8.2 *Bridport Town Council* - "Objection on the grounds that:

- the application address is incorrect, misleading and confusing to the public and undermines effective consultation;*
- a comprehensive structural assessment of the building as a whole is required in order to determine the application. Furthermore, a more justified approach to the repair options chosen should be provided or ideally, a more traditional and sensitive approach to repair adopted. As a minimum in response to concerns about the piecemeal approach to this site, a masterplan for the site is required. Section 16 (Paras 184, 185, 189, 194 and 196) of the NPPF, Sections 66 and 72 of the 1990 Act and Env 4 policies of the Local Plan refer; and*
- This is an 'at risk' building, and minimal repairs using modern materials are insufficient."*

8.3 DCP Conservation officer - *"I have recently responded to a sister application for the removal of external staircase and installation of a new internal staircase. As part of these comments I have raised the need for a comprehensive structural appraisal for this large, vulnerable building which should be prepared in conjunction with a repairs schedule. The proposals provided here are acceptable in principle, although the use of more traditional repairs without the use of steel and concrete padstones would be far preferable. I would argue that these works do not even touch the scope of repairs that the building actually needs and a holistic plan for the whole site is what is crucial. I would wholly support and reiterate the comments of Historic England, provided in response to this application. These should be given great weight when determining this application.*

I do not recommend that the application is determined until we have a far more comprehensive structural assessment of the building as a whole. Furthermore, a more justified approach to the repair options chosen should be provided or ideally, a more traditional and sensitive approach to repair adopted. As a minimum in response to concerns about the piecemeal approach to this site, we need an update as to what the future Masterplan for this important site actually is."

9. REPRESENTATIONS:

9.1 Two people have objected to this application for the following reasons:

- considers that the piecemeal approach to the repair of this important Grade II* listed building is unacceptable, and considers that a Masterplan needs to be produced
- the use of different application addresses is confusing and misleading

10. PLANNING ISSUES:

- Impact on listed building

11. PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

11.1 Impact on listed building

The conservation officer, town council and members of the public have all opposed the application on the grounds that a site-wide masterplan is needed to deal with this 'at risk' building. Whilst Historic England would also like to see such a plan, they have stated that they have no objections to the repairs proposed on heritage grounds.

The applicant has responded to the concerns of those objecting as follows:

"I appreciate the concern that is being expressed regarding a full survey, however, the application is made to address an urgently needed repair in order to prevent further damage to [the] building.."

Following on from receipt of the objections from the conservation officer, Town Council and members of the public, the Assistant Inspector of Historic Buildings from Historic England was again consulted. She reiterated that, whilst it would be desirable for there to be a masterplan, she does not object to the proposed repairs as submitted, as they do not involve the loss of historic fabric and are relatively minor in nature.

12. CONCLUSION/SUMMARY:

12.1 A masterplan for the site as a whole has been requested previously and the numerous piecemeal applications have been of concern. However, although a master plan would still be desirable, there is no justification to insist on this, and as a relatively minor proposal for the repair and strengthening of the roof joists and roof valley timber only, this application for Listed Building Consent can be supported.

The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable and compliant with Policy ENV4 of the adopted local plan.

13. RECOMMENDATION:

Grant consent, subject to conditions:

- 1 PLAN The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Location Plan & Block Plan - Drawing Number 15/061/100 received on 07/06/2018

Floor Plans - location of proposed repairs - Drawing Number 15/061/SK02 received on 07/06/2018

Engineering drawing - Ref S10643/l, drawing no. 3 received on 07/06/2018

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 2 K40A The work to which it relates must be begun no later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which the consent is granted.

REASON: This condition is required to be imposed by reason of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).