

<b>Application</b> <b>09/00575/F</b>	<b>No:</b>	<b>Ward: Fringford</b>	<b>Date Valid: 29/4/09</b>
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mr David Markham		
<b>Site Address:</b>	20 Newton Purcell Oxon MK18 4AY		

**Proposal:** Two storey rear extension and removal of concrete garage and construction of new double garage.

## 1. Site Description, Proposal and Relevant Planning History

- 1.1 The property (listed in October 1988) is an 18<sup>th</sup> century vernacular, Grade II listed cottage with later additions, which includes a late 20<sup>th</sup> century side and rear extension at the northern end. The property is strategically located within the village of Newton Purcell opposite the Grade II Listed Church of St Michael, at the southern end of the village before the countryside opens into agricultural fields.
- 1.2 The property is located immediately adjacent to the highway, and almost fills the frontage of its plot. Due to this, it commands a prominent position within the village and street scene. It should be noted that this application is accompanied by an application for listed building consent.
- 1.3 This application (and accompanying listed building application) seeks consent for the erection of a 6 metre long two storey, rear extension, and the replacement of a pre-fabricated concrete garage to the rear of the site with a new, double garage, sited 13 metres further forward towards the site frontage with the road.
- 1.4 The relevant planning history associated with this site is important in the consideration of this application, as it demonstrates how the cottage has evolved and been extended over time:

CHS 81/378 – Two storey extension and alterations (PERMITTED)

08/00906/F – Two storey rear extension (REFUSED)

08/00907/LB – Two storey rear extension. Minor internal alterations. New window openings and door. Part replacement windows. (REFUSED)

08/02331/LB – New window opening and door with replacement windows throughout. (PERMITTED)

## 2. Application Publicity

- 2.1 The application has been advertised by way of site notice, neighbour letter and press notice. The final date for comment is 9 June 2009.
- 2.2 To date, no comments have been received.

## 3. Consultations

- 3.1 Oxfordshire County Council Highway Authority raise no objection to the proposal, subject to a revised plan showing the garage repositioned 5 metres from the face of the cottage, a plan showing provision for at least three off street car parking spaces (condition 4.14AB) and no garage conversion without the LPA's Prior Approval

(condition 6.6AB).

- 3.2 Oxfordshire County Council's Archaeologist raises no objection to the proposal, subject to the imposition of a planning note requiring the applicant to notify the County Archaeologist should any finds be identified during the course of construction.
- 3.3 Cherwell District Council's Assistant Design and Conservation Officer objects to the proposal, on the basis that the alterations are disproportionate to the relatively simple form of the already extended listed building, and will erode its special historic and architectural qualities. Full comments are provided in the appraisal below.
- 3.4 Newton Purcell-Shelswell Parish Council raises no objection to the proposal, and states that the village is very supportive of the sympathetic manner in which Mr Markham has renovated the cottage to date and is supportive of the extension to enable Mr Markham and his family to remain in the village. A minority of the villagers consulted suggested it would be preferable for the garage to be set further back to provide more off street parking.

#### **4. Relevant Planning Policies**

- 4.1 Planning Policy Guidance Note 15: Planning and the Historic Environment, Planning Policy Guidance Note 13: Transport
- 4.2 The South East Plan – Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East - Policies CC6, BE6 and T4
- 4.3 Adopted Cherwell Local Plan 1996 - Saved Policies C28 and C30
- 4.4 Non Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – EN39, EN44 and D6

#### **5. Appraisal**

- 5.1 The key issues to consider are,

- Principle of development
- Impact upon the setting of the Grade II listed building
- Impact upon the character and appearance of the area
- Impact upon neighbouring properties
- Highway safety

Addressing each point in turn:

- 5.2 Principle of the development

##### **Extension**

The thrust of the advice given in PPG 15, Policies BE6 and CC6 of the RSS for the South East, Policy C28 of the Adopted Plan and Policies EN39 and EN44 of the NSCLP is to ensure that development preserves the features and setting of listed buildings and that standards of layout, design and external appearance, including the choice of materials are sympathetic to the character and rural context of the area.

- 5.3 It is important to consider the extent to which the current building has been extended and altered over the years; Annex A to this report graphically depicts how

the building has been extended in the past, and includes the current proposal (in red). The Assistant Design and Conservation Officer has offered the following comments in respect of the building's development:

- 5.4 "The property has grown from its original single unit 4-bay fronted form via a series of successive extensions. Reading the frontage, at least three doorways can be seen, two now are blocked, and a possible fourth doorway is now a window. The walls are constructed of limestone rubble in an irregular pattern with minimal visible mortar. A later extension, likely to be 19<sup>th</sup> century, is to the north of this original form and replicates the vernacular form. The difference between the two constructions is clearly visible, as the later structure is more regularised and the coursing of the limestone is more prominent, although the use of leaded casement windows and limestone means the two structures are unified well. The ridge line steps down slightly on this later extension showing its subservience to the earlier building. At some point during this history, two small lean-to structures at the rear have been incorporated into the habitable space, creating a study and store. These structures are single storey limestone rubble with slate roofing. The latest addition was constructed in the 1980s (under CHS.81/378) and is clearly different from the remainder of the property due to its larger regular coursed ironstone blocks. The windows are set at different levels to the earlier structure with uniform wooden lintels and window. The front door has been moved to this extension and the property is now entered from the north elevation. The west elevation of this extension has been rendered and contains modern timber top-hung windows. Applications 08/02331/LB and 08/02351/F proposed that these windows be changed to a more sympathetic design but these approved plans have not been implemented.
- 5.5 The original building had a footprint of 82.54m<sup>2</sup>. The Victorian extension, as shown in green on the illustration in Annex A, being 17.15m<sup>2</sup>, represented a 20% increase on this footprint. The 1980s extension, as shown in blue, was 29.25m<sup>2</sup>, a further increase of 35.4%. Together, the Victorian and 1980s extensions already represent an increase of 56.2% over and above the original house.
- 5.6 The proposed extension has a footprint of 26.65m<sup>2</sup>, taking the total cumulative extensions to 73.05m<sup>2</sup>, which would equate to an increase of 88.5% over the original house.
- 5.7 The applicant previously applied for a similar extension in April 2008. This was refused in June 2008 (08/00906/F refers). This proposal was for a family room and one additional bedroom, totalling 15.6m<sup>2</sup>, which would have been a total extension of 75% over the original house. This application was refused on the grounds that it 'did not constitute a minor and sympathetic addition to the building and incompatible with its scale and character. The proposal failed to preserve the character, historic interest and setting of the Listed Building'. In the delegated report, the Planning Officer noted that the extension 'does not respect this original pattern [of four cottages]' and would 'appear very large and dominant'. The current application goes further than this refused application, increasing the number of bedrooms to five rather than four. The current application is, at 26.65m<sup>2</sup>, 11.05m<sup>2</sup> (13.5% of the original house) larger than the previously refused application."
- 5.8 It is clear that the building has been extended fairly significantly in the past, creating a substantial building, consisting of four reception rooms and three bedrooms. This

proposal seeks to add a further 6 metres of two storey development to the rear. The extension, by virtue of its footprint, continuation of the ridge and eaves height (not set down from the existing to create subservience) and cumulative impact is not considered to represent a sympathetic, subservient addition which respects the character, setting or historic fabric of the building. Additionally, the building will be very visible from the public domain (main road along the site frontage) and will be over-dominant when viewed from the north west approach.

#### 5.9 **Garage**

Similarly, the proposed garage is not considered to represent a sympathetic, appropriately designed addition. Whilst the existing garage is of no particular aesthetic merit (the building was constructed under 'Permitted Development' rights, prior to the building's listing), the replacement is not considered to represent an acceptable improvement.

#### 5.10 The Assistant Design and Conservation Officer has stated the following:

"The existing garage is set very far back into the site and therefore has a minimal impact on the listed building, despite being set at a slightly higher level than the front of the plot. The existing structure is pre-fabricated concrete with timber boarding on the east elevation. The single door is white metal and of the up-and-over style.

#### 5.11 The height of the proposed garage will be no higher than the existing garage, although this is set 13 metres back and is raised at least 500mm above the highway. The proposed structure will be timber boarded and set 13 metres further forward on the site, being far more visible from the street. No explanation or justification has been given for this change in position except that it would screen the proposed extension.

#### 5.12 There is a lack of clarification of the materials proposed – 'manmade slates' is a very ambiguous phrase and could mean anything from hand cut Welsh slate to reconstituted (concrete) tiles. Front opening doors are indicated on the plan, although these are not shown on the elevation and no materials have been proposed. The proposed timber boarding for the walls is not traditional to the village or existing property. In addition to this, the more traditional form of subsidiary agricultural building would not be entered from the gable, but from the elevation.

#### 5.13 A more suitable structure would replicate a traditional agricultural outbuilding or cart shed, which would be open timber-framed and turned through 90° with the plan elevation to the street. By replacing the existing structure on the same site, this would have less of an impact on the listed building and no more impact on the street scene than the current structure."

#### 5.14 It is therefore considered that the principle of the proposed extension and garage cannot be supported, as they do not represent subservient, appropriately designed developments. The latter sections go into further detail in respect of the impact of the proposed development on the setting, character of the area, neighbour amenity and highway safety, respectively.

5.15 Impact upon the setting of the Grade II listed building

The extension is not considered to represent a sympathetic, subservient addition to the existing listed building. The extension does not respect the linear, humble, vernacular form of the original cottage, and the detached garage does not respect the frontage and open nature of the site, by pushing development closer to the existing building and highway edge.

5.16 Impact on the character and appearance of the area

The materials of the proposal are proposed to match those of the existing 1980s kitchen extension: squared limestone in deep regular courses, contrary to the irregular limestone rubble courses of the earlier original humble cottage. The continuation of the use of inappropriately used materials would not improve the property visually nor would it be historically accurate.

5.17 The proposal continues the ridge and eaves line from the 1980s extension. This means that it is not subservient to the original building or its later extensions. Traditionally, a rear 'service wing' would be lesser in scale and significance, often being built of different materials, for example the lean-to slate-roofed store of the original building. This different form of construction shows a building's development and history, and is a key element to a building's character, as indicated by PPG15 para 3.13 '*...cumulative changes reflecting the history of use and ownership are themselves an aspect of the special interest of some buildings*'. This proposal would not be subservient, and would in fact be dominant when viewed from the northwest approach.

5.18 The proposed fenestration on the north elevation of the extension is larger than that of the original building, raising the height of the eyebrow dormers. The windows are even larger on the south elevation and include French doors with additional glazing either side. This is an inappropriate style of glazing, alien to the vernacular form of the building and not following the original simplicity of this listed building.

5.19 The applicant states in the Justification Statement that '*the extension is well hidden at the rear and is screened by the new garage*'. The plan in Annex A shows that the extension will be clearly visible from the highway due to the open access. This means that the inappropriate fenestration and materials and lack of subservience will have a detrimental effect on the street scene and character and appearance of the area.

5.20 Impact on neighbour amenity

The nearest neighbouring property is no. 22, to the north of the application site, and is approximately 16 metres from the side of the proposed extension. Due to land level differences, the large (approx. 4 metres high) conifer hedge on the northern boundary with the site and neighbouring property and the distances involved, the extension will not cause harm to neighbour amenity by way of overlooking, overbearing or loss of light.

5.21 Similarly, the garage, although being sited further forward, will not cause harm to neighbour amenity, given the large conifer screen and the land level differences.

## 5.22 Impact on highway safety

The Local Highway Authority has recommended the submission of an amended plan re-positioning the garage 5 metres from the face of the existing cottage to provide additional parking, in the interests of highway safety. They have also recommended two conditions; one requiring the submission of a plan showing provision for a least three off street car parking spaces, and the other restricting the conversion of the garage.

Subject to the receipt of these details, it is not considered that the proposal would cause detrimental harm to highway safety.

## **6. Recommendation**

**It is therefore recommended that the application as submitted be refused for the following reason:**

**The proposed development, by virtue of its scale, materials and siting does not constitute a minor, proportionate or sympathetic addition to the building, and is incompatible with the scale and form of the listed building. The proposal fails to preserve the features, fabric and setting of the building. The extension and garage would also constitute disproportionate, over-dominant additions within the street scene, detrimental to the visual amenities of the locality, contrary to Central Government guidance contained in PPG 15, Policies CC6 and BE6 of the South East RSS 2009, Policy C28 of the Adopted Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and Policies EN39, EN44 and D6 of the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011.**

**CONTACT OFFICER: Laura Bailey**

**TELEPHONE NO: 01295 221824**

**Annex A: - Illustration of cottage's evolution**