

Application 09/00576/LB	No:	Ward: Fringford	Date Valid: 29/4/09
Applicant:	Mr David Markham		
Site Address:	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 18th century vernacular, Grade II listed cottage with later additions, which includes a late 20th 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 full planning permission (09/00575/F refers).
- 1.3 This application (and accompanying full 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 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.
- 3.2 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
- 4.2 The South East Plan – Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East - Policy BE6
- 4.3 Adopted Cherwell Local Plan 1996 - Saved Policy C18
- 4.4 Non Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – EN39 and EN44

5. Appraisal

- 5.1 The key issue to consider is,
 - Impact on the setting, character, architectural and historic fabric of the listed building
- 5.2 Impact on the setting, character, architectural and historic fabric of the listed building

The Assistant Design and Conservation Officer has offered the following comments in respect of the building's development:

“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 19th 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.

- 5.3 The original building had a footprint of 82.54m². The Victorian extension, as shown in green on the illustration in Annex A, being 17.15m², represented a 20% increase on this footprint. The 1980s extension, as shown in blue, was 29.25m², 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.
- 5.4 The proposed extension has a footprint of 26.65m², taking the total cumulative extensions to 73.05m², which would equate to an increase of 88.5% over the original house.
- 5.5 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 15.6m², 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 26.65m², 11.05m² (13.5% of the original house) larger than the previously refused application."
- 5.6 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, which would create a building with five bedrooms, and six reception rooms. 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.
- 5.7 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.
- 5.8 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.

- 5.9 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.
- 5.10 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.
- 5.11 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.”
- 5.12 Planning Policy

Paragraph 3.14 of PPG 15 states that ‘*many Grade II buildings are of humble and once common building types and have been listed precisely because they are relatively unaltered example of a particular building type; so they can as readily have their special interest ruined by unsuitable alteration or extension as can Grade I or II* structures.*’ This building is interesting due to the retention of its obviously vernacular origins – the single unit double fronted cottages can still be read as such from each elevation, despite the late rear offshoot constructed in 1981. The large offshoot proposed is an alien form not found in such simple vernacular structures, and can therefore be considered as an unsuitable extension which harms the special interest of the listed building.

- 5.13 PPG15 advises at Annex C that ‘*the plan of a building is one of its most important characteristics. Interior plans and individual features of interest should be respected and left unaltered as far as possible*’, a point noted in the recent appeal decision APP/C3105/E/09/2096158 (8 Calthorpe Road, Banbury). This proposal for a large rear offshoot is a deviation from the original plan of the cottages, which was simple, compact and linear.
- 5.14 Cherwell Adopted Local Plan 1996 Policy C18 states that ‘*the Council will normally only approve internal and external alterations or extensions to a listed building which are minor and sympathetic to the architectural and historic character of the building.*’ The proposal would not be minor due to its dimensions and proportionate

increase in building footprint, nor will it be sympathetic, because it would not be subservient to the original building due to the continuation of the ridge and eave height, and as proposed would be 100mm wider than the original building's depth.

- 5.15 Policy EN39 of the Non Statutory Local Plan (NSCLP) states '*Development should preserve listed buildings, their features and settings... Development that conflicts with these objectives will not be permitted.*' The applicant has failed to demonstrate how this proposal preserves the special interest of the listed building.
- 5.16 Policy EN44 of the NSCLP states '*special care will be taken to ensure that development that is situated within the setting of a listed building respects the architectural and historic character of the building and its setting.*' The applicant has failed to demonstrate how this proposal respects the architectural and historic character of the building and its setting, either in the Justification statement or in the proposal itself. The proposal does not respect the linear humble vernacular form of the original cottage and the detached garage does not respect the frontage and open access of the site.
- 5.17 In summary, the proposed extension and garage are not considered to represent sympathetic, appropriate additions to the property, which would be harmful to the character, appearance, setting and historic fabric of the building, for the reasons rehearsed above.

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, contrary to Central Government guidance PPG 15, Policy BE6 of the South East RSS 2009, Policy C18 of the Adopted Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and Policies EN39 and EN44 of the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011.

CONTACT OFFICER: Laura Bailey

TELEPHONE NO: 01295 221824