

**Case Officer:** Rebekah Morgan

**Applicant:** Mr & Mrs Parshad

**Proposal:** First floor extension over an existing converted garage (part retrospective).

**Ward:** Kidlington West

**Councillors:** Cllr. Conway, Cllr. McLean and Cllr. Walker

**Reason for Referral:** Called in by Councillor Dorothy Walker for the following reasons: Significant impact on the visual character of the area and on a non-designated heritage asset, conflict with local and national policy, submission of successive retrospective applications for the same proposal.

**Expiry Date:** 19 March 2026

**Committee Date:** 19 March 2026

---

**SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PERMISSION SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS**

**MAIN REPORT**

**1. APPLICATION SITE AND LOCALITY**

- 1.1. The application site comprises a two storey dwellinghouse and small garden located near the centre of Kidlington. The dwellinghouse is sited at one end of a terrace of three cottages, which are understood to have been converted from an historic barn. The row is set some 30m back from the High Street to the south, from which it is separated by gardens and parking areas as well as no.75 High Street, which is located approximately 5m from the southern elevation of no.73 and immediately adjacent to the southern site boundary.
- 1.2. The four dwellinghouses are surrounded by highways on three sides – High Street to the south, Forester’s Way to the west, and Home Close to the east – with Tesco’s car park abutting the northern elevation of nos.73 and 77. A Tesco superstore occupies a large brick building of a functional, commercial character immediately across Forester’s Way from the application site, from which it is approximately 9m distant. Tesco marks the start of the commercial stretch of the High Street, which continues to the west.
- 1.3. The site is surrounded by residential development to the east and south of varied character. Development along the southern side of High Street dates primarily from the inter and post-war periods according to historic mapping, with Home Close developed in the early 1960s. Older development runs along the northern side of High Street to the east of the application site.
- 1.4. The row made up of nos.73, 77, and 79 comprises a linear, gable-ended building with a dual-pitched roof oriented parallel to High Street. It is constructed of rubble stone with a concrete-tiled roof, although the southern elevation of the centre dwellinghouse (no.77) has been covered with white render. The dwellinghouses all have modern windows and the openings to no.73 have red brick surrounds. A number of rooflights have been inserted to both roof slopes of no.79 and a chimney stack constructed rising from the centre of the ridge of no.77. To the rear, there is a central, two storey,

gabled protrusion from no.77, with a largely red brick northern elevation and concrete-tiled roof. A catslide lean-to of rubble stone extends to the east of this, with the subject extension to no.77 adjoining it to the west.

- 1.5. The front elevation of no.73, insofar as this is where the front door is located, is the western gable end, which fronts directly onto Forester's Way. The northern elevation of the building fronts directly onto Tesco car park, which previously comprised the side elevation of a lean-to garage with doors to the western elevation. The works that are the subject of this part retrospective application altered and extended this single-storey lean-to upwards and are detailed in Section 3 of this report.

## **2. CONSTRAINTS**

- 2.1. The application site is within an archaeological alert area related to Kidlington's historic core. It is located approximately 55m west of Kidlington High Street Conservation Area and some 67m west of the Grade II listed no.85 High Street, which is located within the Kidlington High Street Conservation Area. By virtue of its age and historic interest as a surviving – albeit converted – agricultural building associated with the rural history of the settlement, the three-dwelling terrace encompassing the application site is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset.

## **3. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

- 3.1. The application is part retrospective and seeks to retain a first-floor over a previously constructed lean-to garage. The proposal does not alter the footprint of the original extension. The addition of the first floor raises the eaves height to approximately 3.7m in height. The development has a dual pitched roof with a ridge height of approximately 6.9m, creating a north facing gable.
- 3.2. The extension is constructed in limestone to match the host dwelling. The application details the roofing materials as plain tiles. It has three lower floor and three upper floor windows to the northern gable and the garage door to the eastern elevation has been infilled in matching rubble stone with the brick detailing retained. The infilling of the garage door and insertion of ground floor windows facilitates the conversion of the garage to living accommodation, which could be achieved under permitted development rights.
- 3.3. This current application differs from the most recently determined application (24/03350/F) with the eaves height reduced by approximately 0.6m and the ridge height lowered by approximately 0.3m. Two of the windows on the first floor would also be reduced in size.

## **4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1. The following planning history is considered relevant to the current proposal:

24/03350/F: RETROSPECTIVE - First floor extension over an existing garage with eaves height increment to accommodate new windows. Appeal dismissed 01.09.2025.

23/03368/F: First floor extension with associated internal and external work (follow-up to 23/01073/F. Refused 19.07.2024.

23/01073/F: Proposed roof extension with associated internal and external works. Permitted 19.06.2023.

- 4.2. With regards to application 24/03350/F, the Planning Inspector concluded '*the appeal scheme results in the unacceptable erosion of the historic fabric of the NDHA. The proximity of modern development and the existence of relatively contemporary additions to the other cottages in the row, does not justify a development which results in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of No 73. The scale of the harm caused by the appeal scheme upon the NDHA is significant and would not be justified*'.

## 5. PRE-APPLICATION DISCUSSIONS

- 5.1. No pre-application discussions have taken place with regard to this proposal.

## 6. RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY

- 6.1. This application has been publicised by way of a site notice displayed near the site, by advertisement in the local newspaper, and by letters sent to all properties immediately adjoining the application site that the Council has been able to identify from its records (amend as appropriate). The final date for comments was **17 February 2026**, although comments received after this date and before finalising this report have also been taken into account.
- 6.2. Three letters of objection, including one from a Ward Councillor, have been received from third parties and are summarised as follows:
- No substantial change to previously refused scheme.
  - Previous appeals and decisions are a material planning consideration.
  - The application does not address the conclusions of the previous appeal decision relating to a similar development (the Inspectors conclusions were summarised in the comments).
  - The Planning Inspector was particularly concerned with the width of the gable end.
  - Proposal remains in conflict with the NPPF, local plan policies, the Kidlington Masterplan (2016) and emerging policy COM14, in as much as they require high-quality design sympathetic to historic assets, including non-designated heritage assets.
  - The property represents an important part of Kidlington's built history.
  - The application property is a non-designated heritage asset.
  - The extension completely obscures the original malthouse. Hiding the original T-shaped building behind a massive second storey extension attacks the strong sense of distinctive architectural style that the Kidlington Masterplan seeks to protect.
  - Colour of the roof tiles (to extension and main roof) of no.73 does not match the remainder of the terrace, eroding the character of the area.
  - The application makes no attempt to make an analysis of context, to explain or justify the principle that have informed the design rationale.
  - Clearly visible from public areas (car park).
  - The proposals do affect parking with a loss of a parking space from the former garage.
  - The current enforcement notice (due to the wording) prevents the permitted development fallback position set out by the previous case officer.

- Conditions on the original consent require adherence to approved plans and should take precedence over permitted development rights.
- My understanding is that permitted development rights only apply to the original building and would not apply to any later additions.
- Work has been constructed without complying with the Party Wall Act.
- There has been a disregard to the correct planning procedure.
- Planning Practice Guidance only allows one opportunity to obtain retrospective planning permission, this development has been given multiple opportunities. There has been no reason for CDC to accept this third application.
- Inaccurate plans have been previously submitted resulting in mis-leading decision makers.
- The current plans (25-KH-3 and 25-KH-5) show boundary with neighbour in the wrong location.
- Application documents do not show the correct owner of the property.
- Existing plans show the sites current state, but this is not lawful development.
- The public have a stake in the planning process and are entitled to understand how decisions are reached.
- Ignoring the views, report and findings of the Planning Inspector would open up the Council to the risk of a legal challenge (judicial review) from the neighbours.

6.3. The comments received can be viewed in full on the Council's website, via the online Planning Register.

## **7. RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION**

7.1. Below is a summary of the consultation responses received at the time of writing this report. Responses are available to view in full on the Council's website, via the online Planning Register.

7.2. KIDLINGTON TOWN COUNCIL: Advised their comments on the previous application should be taken into consideration.

Expressed concern that there appears to be no change in the submitted plans. They found the latest submission to be unclear.

Kidlington Town Council's previous objection raised the following points:

- Overdevelopment and adverse impact on the amenity of the area
- Lack of off-street parking for the property
- Another retrospective application and should be invalid
- Concern that CDC's Conservation Officer was not consulted.

7.3. CDC CONSERVATION OFFICER: Concludes that the development would result in no harm to any heritage asset

"The building that is the subject of this application is not a Listed Building and is not located within Kidlington Conservation Area. The building is now three dwellings, but the historic maps suggest that historically this was part of a larger barn likely associated with the property known as The Laurels, both of which were possibly part of the larger Manor Farm complex. The Main house that appears on historic maps and so potentially associated with Manor Farm (now believed to be 85 High Street) is

late 17th century in origin and the application building has a date stone of 1733, indicating that despite extensive alterations some historic fabric may still remain.

“The building can therefore be considered as a non-designated heritage asset taking into account the National Planning Policy Framework 2024.

“It is noted that this revised application proposes some minor changes to the windows and elevations of the property compared to the previously refused application. However, the same considerations are relevant and therefore these comments do not differ from previous comments in a significant way.

“It is accepted that the building contains some historic fabric, and from historic maps it is indicated that there were possibly other buildings attached to it or it was larger. Regardless of the changes to its plan form (as shown on historic maps) the building has been altered substantially and converted to three dwellings probably in the 1930’s (prior to the 1947 planning Act and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990). This has resulted in much of the character of the building as an agricultural building being diminished.

“In addition to the changes to the building the surroundings have been altered substantially which has resulted in the erosion of the context of the building and its relationship with surrounding properties including the Listed Building (formerly the farmhouse).

“In terms of the extension it is accepted that the two-storey gable extension is larger than the small lean to that previously existed, however there is a previously approved extension which it is argued has the same mass and prominence. The minor changes proposed in the current application are not considered to harmfully change the appearance of the building. The design, siting and materials are considered to be complementary to the building and are not considered to detract from the current character. It has been suggested that historically the building had a T shaped form, although the extension would alter this form, it is considered that existing additions throughout the whole of the building and the previously approved extension have already had an impact, it is considered that the current application will not reduce the legibility of the building further. The extension does not detract from but retains the character of the building as it appears now, which is in the form of three cottages.

“When considering the potential historic fabric that was removed to accommodate the new extension it is considered that this does not constitute a loss of significant fabric and as the building is not a Listed Building there is limited controls on the demolition of a small part of the building. Overall, the works are not considered to be harmful to the non-designated heritage asset.

“Because of the distances involved the application site is not considered to be within the setting of the designated heritage assets in the local area. Therefore, extending this building to the rear does not result in harm to the significance of a Listed Building or conservation area as a result of development within their setting.”

## **8. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE**

- 8.1. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 8.2. The Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 - Part 1 was formally adopted by Cherwell District Council on 20th July 2015 and provides the strategic planning policy framework for the District to 2031. The Local Plan 2011-2031 – Part 1 replaced a number of the

'saved' policies of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 1996 though many of its policies are retained and remain part of the development plan. The relevant planning policies of Cherwell District's statutory Development Plan are set out below:

CHERWELL LOCAL PLAN 2011-2031 PART 1 (CLP 2015)

- PSD1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- ESD15: The Character of the Built and Historic Environment

CHERWELL LOCAL PLAN 1996 SAVED POLICIES (CLP 1996)

- C28: Layout, design and external appearance of new development
- C30: Design Control

8.3. Other Material Planning Considerations

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
- Cherwell Design Guide (2018)
- Cherwell Home Extensions and Alterations Design Guide (2007)
- Kidlington Framework Masterplan (2016)
- Oxfordshire Parking Standards for New Developments (2022)

## 9. APPRAISAL

9.1. The key issues for consideration in this case are:

- Design and impact on heritage assets
- Residential amenity
- Highway impacts
- Other matters

Design and impact on heritage assets

- 9.2. CLP 2015 Policy ESD15 seeks to secure high quality design that complements and enhances its setting. Amongst other things, it states that "*proposals for development that affect non-designated heritage assets will be considered taking account of the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage assets as set out in the NPPF and NPPG*".
- 9.3. CLP 1996 Policies C28 and C30 exercise design control over new development including residential extensions, seeking to ensure that layout, design and external appearances, including the choice of external materials, are sympathetic to the context of the development, and that proposals for extensions are compatible with the scale of the existing dwelling, its curtilage, and the character of the street scene.
- 9.4. The Kidlington Framework Masterplan supports these aims. Theme 1 of the Framework seeks to 'reveal Kidlington's distinctive identity by, *inter alia*, establishing an attractive townscape character through high quality design of new buildings and public spaces. CLP 2015 Policy ESD15 and the Cherwell District Design Guide are referenced in relation to securing high quality design across all new development.
- 9.5. Section 16 of the NPPF relates to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. Specifically, paragraph 208 requires the LPA to "*identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal...taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise*" and taking this into account in consideration of the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset. Paragraph 216 states that: "*The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated*

*heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset”.*

- 9.6. The Council’s ‘Home and Alterations Design Guide’ advises that “*extensions should normally match the original building in materials, proportions, roof pitch and window detailing. Ideally, the eaves and ridge lines should be lower than those of the main roof to make the extension subservient to the original building*” and “*should be designed to reflect the character of the original building in the design*” (section 5).
- 9.7. The application site is considered not to affect the setting of either Kidlington High Street Conservation Area or any nearby listed buildings by virtue of its degree of separation from these heritage assets and the presence of existing intervening development. It is over 50m from the edge of the Conservation Area, from which it is separated by the twentieth century development along Home Close. Given this, the Kidlington High Street Conservation Area Appraisal is considered not to be of relevance to the assessment of the proposal.
- 9.8. The site context is one of modern development with the twentieth century residential development to the east and south of the site and commercial development to the west and north. The extension is primarily viewed within the context of the large Tesco building located some 9m to the west and the associated car park that abuts the northern elevation of the extension.
- 9.9. Notwithstanding this, the original building (along with the attached neighbouring properties) can be regarded as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) by virtue of its age and historic interest in association with the farming history of the area, although it is noted that it is not identified as a locally listed buildings in the Kidlington Framework Masterplan. The original building appears to have been converted to housing prior to the introduction of The Town and Country Planning Act 1947, which first brought about the planning system in England as we know it today, and subsequent interventions have severely diminished its character and appearance such that it is no longer readily legible as a converted agricultural building. The Planning Inspector (appeal in relation to application 24/03350/F) agreed the building is a NDHA.
- 9.10. The significance of the building lies in its age, agricultural nature and the possibility that it was part of a large farm complex, which has been significantly diminished over the years with the development of Kidlington centre (notably, the substantial supermarket building, shopping centre and surrounding residential development). The original building has been subsequently divided into three properties, alterations have occurred; including the rendering of no. 77, contemporary windows, the addition of rooflights to no. 79 and the construction of a chimney stack in the centre of the building. Residential curtilages have been established with intervening boundary treatment. It is your officer’s opinion that the character, appearance and significance of the building has been severely diminished by the overall alterations to the three properties, that it is no longer readily legible as a converted agricultural building when viewed in the wider context. Whilst the appeal Inspector felt the previously proposal would remove any remaining architectural cues, this appears to focus on the t-shaped plan form of the building and did not acknowledge the lean-to garage, which, whilst not an original element, if it did not pre-date the planning system, is lawful given the passage of time.
- 9.11. The current proposal differs from the previous scheme by reducing the eaves and ridge height of the development. The outermost upper floor windows would be reduced in size so as to remain in proportion to the altered dimensions of the scheme. Whilst upper floor windows, which are of an acceptable design, were not approved as part of the 2023 permission they could, in principle, have been added a later date as

permitted development. Windows allowing, the current proposal is now as close as practicable, in terms of scale and massing to the plans approved by planning permission 23/01073/F. Likewise the works to convert the garage do not require planning permission, and the completed works are considered, in isolation, to constitute permitted development. So, whilst Inspector's decision for the 24/03350/F obviously has a bearing on this case, officers have to be mindful of the 2023 approval in respect of the fallback position as well as the applicant's permitted development rights.

- 9.12. Indeed, with regards to comments relating to the colour of the roof tiles, your officers view remains unchanged insofar that the re-roofing of the main building constitutes permitted development and is outside the control of this application. Given that the tiles used to cover the rear extension match the main roof, it would be unreasonable/undesirable to seek a different roof covering. It should be noted that the other properties that form the barn conversion could replace their roof coverings without the need for planning permission.
- 9.13. This revised scheme aligns as closely as possible in respect of scale and form with planning permission 23/01073/F. Therefore, notwithstanding the appeal decision, officers conclude that there are no substantive grounds to resist the proposal on design grounds given that the current proposal is little different in respect of its dimensions to the extant permission. The extension is therefore considered to comply with the requirements of CLP 2015 Policy ESD15, CLP 1996 Policies C28 and C30, and Section 16 of the NPPF in respect of design.

#### Residential amenity

- 9.14. Amongst other matters, CLP 2015 Policy ESD15 requires that new development should "*consider the amenity of both existing and future development, including matters of privacy, outlook, natural lighting, ventilation, and indoor and outdoor space*". Similarly, CLP 1996 Policy C30 seeks to secure acceptable standards of amenity and privacy in relation to new housing development or proposals for extension.
- 9.15. The extension proposed for retention adjoins the side elevation of an existing gabled protrusion from no.77 High Street; the northern gable ends of both structures forming a continuous building line. By virtue of the siting of the subject development, no.77 is the only nearby residential property whose amenity could be affected. Given the positioning of the development in relation to the existing built form and openings, it would not result in adverse impacts on neighbouring residential amenity having regard to privacy, outlook, natural lighting, ventilation, indoor or outdoor space, or any other material considerations in this regard. It is therefore considered to accord with the relevant requirements of CLP 2015 Policy ESD15, CLP 1996 Policy C30, and Section 12 of the NPPF.

#### Highways impact

- 9.16. CLP 2015 Policy ESD15 seeks to secure high quality design that complements and enhances the character of the area, delivering safe and healthy places to live and work in. Amongst other things, it requires new development to integrate with existing streets and patterns of routes and spaces and promotes permeable, accessible places that are well connected and sustainable.
- 9.17. Section 9 of the NPPF promotes sustainable transport. Paragraph 109 requires transport issues including the potential impacts of development on transport networks and the environmental impacts of traffic to be considered from the earliest stages of development proposals. Paragraph 116 states that "*development should only be*

*prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impacts on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe”.*

- 9.18. The Local Highway Authority raised no objection to an earlier proposal at 73 High Street, 23/03368/F, which would have resulted in the same impacts on parking and highway safety as the current proposal, specifically insofar as both applications result in the loss of the garage for parking. A condition was requested to secure details of secure cycle storage provision, and it is considered reasonable to attach a similar condition to any forthcoming grant of permission. The application site is very close to local amenities, services, and access to public transport links, by virtue of its position adjacent to the town centre, in light of which it is considered suitable for car-free development. The same approach was taken with application 24/03350/F and highway concerns were not raised as a concern in the subsequent appeal decision. Given this, it is considered to accord with the relevant requirements of CLP 2015 Policy ESD15 and Section 9 of the NPPF.

#### Other matters

##### *Applicant's personal circumstances*

- 9.19. The applicant has set out confidential personal circumstances relating to health issues affecting members of the household currently residing at the property. This has been provided in the form of a statutory declaration and supported by letters from relevant professions. The documents set out the need for additional bedrooms at the property to accommodate the applicant's family. Whilst officers are sympathetic to the welfare of the applicant's dependents, little weight can be attributed in the decision making process as there is alternative accommodation, within the area, that would be available to meet their needs.

##### *Party Wall Act and third party rights*

- 9.20. Third party comments have raised concerns relating to a lack of adherence to the Party Wall Act when previous works has been carried out. The Party Wall Act 1996 is a legal framework in England and Wales for managing building work on or near shared boundaries, entirely separate from planning permission. You do not need an agreement in place to secure planning permission and the granting of planning permission does not exempt a property owner from the requirements of the Act.

##### *Determination of subsequent planning application*

- 9.21. Third party comments have highlighted planning guidance and questioned why the application was accepted by the local planning authority following the dismissal of the recent planning appeal.
- 9.22. Planning Practice Guidance 'Making an application' states *“An application can be made for a development which has already been refused. However local planning authorities have the power to decline an application for planning permission which is similar to an application that, within the last 2 years, has been dismissed by the Secretary of State on appeal or refused following call-in. A local planning authority may also decline to determine an application for planning permission if it has refused more than one similar application within the last 2 years and there has been no appeal to the Secretary of State. In declining to determine an application, a local planning authority must be of the view that there has been no significant change in the development plan (so far as relevant to the application) and any other material considerations since the similar application was refused, or dismissed on appeal”.*

9.23. In this case it was determined that as the current application, in terms of its form, is now very similar to the previously approved scheme 23/01073/F having been further scaled back from the previously refused schemes. As the applicant has been willing to work with officers to amend the design of the building, it was therefore considered appropriate for the local planning authority to determine the application.

#### *Accuracy of plans*

9.24. Third party comments have raised concerns with the accuracy of the boundary line on drawing numbers 25-KH-3 and 25-KH-5 (which are the existing and proposed elevations). The application site has a small dog leg along the boundary with the neighbouring property, and this is clearly and accurately shown on the site location plan and block plan, and the floor plans accurately reflect this in the layout. The elevation plans have included a red dotted line which appears to show the extent of the detailed drawings; it is unfortunate indicated in red (the colour required to denote the extent of the application site on site and block plans), however, officers have not considered this as indicate the boundary and have relied upon the site location and block plans. The site location and block plans align with land registry documents provided by the applicant.

### **10. PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION**

10.1. This revised scheme aligns as closely as possible with the scale and form of the extension approved under planning permission 23/01073/F. Therefore, notwithstanding the recent appeal decision for a slightly larger extension, officers conclude that given this fallback position, the proposal is acceptable in design, neighbour amenity and highways safety terms and the other material planning matters dealt with above.

10.2. The development as a result complies with CLP 2015 Policy ESD15, CLP 1996 Policies C28 and C30 and government guidance contained within the NPPF. As such, the extension is considered to represent sustainable development in accordance with paragraph 11 of the NPPF and permission should therefore be granted.

### **11. RECOMMENDATION**

**DELEGATE TO THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT TO GRANT PERMISSION, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS SET OUT BELOW (AND ANY AMENDMENTS TO THOSE CONDITIONS AS DEEMED NECESSARY)**

#### CONDITIONS

1. Except where otherwise stipulated by conditions attached to this permission, the development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the form and following approved plans:

- Site Location Plan
- Block Plan
- Drawing number 25-KH-4 – [Proposed Floor Plans]
- Drawing number 25-KH-5 – [Proposed Elevations]

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt, to ensure that the development is carried out only as approved by the Local Planning Authority and comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. Prior to the first use or occupation of the development hereby permitted, access to covered cycle parking facilities shall be provided on the site in accordance with details which shall be firstly submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the covered cycle parking facilities shall be permanently retained and maintained for the parking of cycles in connection with the development

Reason: In the interests of sustainability, to ensure a satisfactory form of development and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. Within 6 months of the date of this decision, the approved replacement first floor windows shall be installed. The windows shall match the other existing windows in this elevation of the property in respect of colour and design.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policy ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1, saved Policy C28 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. The natural stone to be used for the remedial stonework around the window openings shall be of the same type, texture, colour and appearance as the stone on the existing building and shall be laid, dressed, coursed and pointed to match that of the existing building and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policy ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1, saved Policy C28 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### Planning Informative

1. Planning permission only means that in planning terms a proposal is acceptable to the Local Planning Authority. Just because you have obtained planning permission, this does not mean you always have the right to carry out the development. Planning permission gives no additional rights to carry out the work, where that work is on someone else's land, or the work will affect someone else's rights in respect of the land. For example, there may be a leaseholder or tenant, or someone who has a right of way over the land, or another owner. Their rights are still valid, and you are therefore advised that you should seek legal advice before carrying out the planning permission where any other person's rights are involved.

CASE OFFICER: Rebekah Morgan