

APPLICATION NO.	P17/S1823/HH & P17/S1824/LB
APPLICATION TYPE	HOUSEHOLDER & LISTED BUILDING CONSENT
REGISTERED	19.5.2017
PARISH	STOKE ROW
WARD MEMBERS	David Nimmo-Smith & Charles Bailey
APPLICANT	Ms M and J Brand-Meyer Hervey
SITE	Clayhill House, Stoke Row, RG9 5PD
PROPOSAL	Revision pursuant of permissions P16/S3080/HH and P16/S3081/LB, and to additionally erect a single storey first floor extension.
OFFICER	Marc Pullen

1.0 **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This application is referred to the Planning Committee following a call-in request made by Councillor Nimmo-Smith.
- 1.2 The application site (which is shown on the OS extract **attached** as Appendix A) contains a grade II listed early C18 house with later additions. The house is situated within the Stoke Row Conservation Area and the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

2.0 **PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 These applications seek planning permission and listed building consent for the erection of a two storey and single storey extension to the rear of the property. A copy of all the current plans accompanying the applications is **attached** as Appendix B. Other documentation associated with the applications can be viewed on the council's website, www.southoxon.gov.uk.
- 2.2 These applications follow on from the grant of planning permission and listed building consent to extend the property with a single storey rear extension. These applications also follow on from applications which were refused earlier this year for an extension identical in form to the current proposals.

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 **Stoke Row Parish Council - No strong views**
Conservation Officer -

- The approved single storey extension is considered to be the full extent that the house can reasonably be extended without eroding the legibility and character of the C17 farmhouse
- Will result in an increase in massing to the building which will result in a dwelling where the footprint of the original farmhouse is considerably overwhelmed by C20 additions
- This proposal constitutes harm to the listed building due to the cumulative impact of C20 additions, eroding the significance of the historic farmhouse
- The special interest of the listed building would not be preserved by this application, contrary to Sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (LB&CA) Act 1990 and would fail the tests of paragraph 134 of the NPPF

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 [P17/S0216/HH](#) & [P17/S0217/LB](#) - Refused (10/05/2017)

Two storey and single storey rear extension, pursuant of permissions P16/S3080/HH and P16/S3081/LB (As amended by plan CHH_P_07 Rev H, received 2017_03_23, to reduce scale of extension).

[P16/S3080/HH](#) & [P16/S3081/LB](#) - Approved (08/11/2016)

Single storey conservatory to rear of property, single storey extension to existing rear section of dwelling and internal alterations.

A copy of the plans associated with these applications are **attached** as Appendix C.

[P10/E0153](#) - Approved (30/04/2010)

Construction of outdoor swimming pool and erection of associated boiler enclosure shed.

[P09/E0513/LB](#) & [P09/E0512](#) - Refused (28/08/2009) – Dismissed at appeal (14/05/2010)

Erection of single and one and a half storey rear extension and internal alterations (As amended by drawings 09 CHH P002 Rev A and 09 CHH P004 Rev B and covering letter received 22 July 2009).

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

5.1 **National Planning Policy Framework & National Planning Practice Guidance**

5.2 **South Oxfordshire Core Strategy, 2012, policies;**

CS1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development
CSEN1 - Landscape protection
CSEN3 - Historic environment
CSQ3 - Design
CSS1 - The Overall Strategy

5.3 **South Oxfordshire Local Plan, 2012, policies;**

CON2 - Extensions to listed buildings
CON3 - Alterations to listed buildings
CON5 - Setting of listed building
CON7 - Proposals in a conservation area
D1 - Principles of good design
G2 - Protect district from adverse development
H13 - Extension to dwelling

5.4 **South Oxfordshire Design Guide, 2016**

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

- 6.1
- Impact on the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area
 - Impact on the architectural and historic interest of the listed building
 - Impact on the amenity of neighbours
 - Other matters

Impact on character and appearance

- 6.2 The South Oxfordshire Design Guide (SODG, 2016) sets out the guidance for householder extensions. It advises that all development to extend properties must respect the character of the property and the local area by using uncomplicated building forms, the use of building materials typical of the local area and attempt to

keep to the established build lines of a street. Extensions must be proportionate to the existing dwelling house and should not overwhelm the original building by ensuring that the original building remains the visually dominant element of the property. The effect of any extension should not overwhelm the house from any given view point.

- 6.3 The site falls within the Chilterns AONB and therefore falls to be considered by Policy CSEN1 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy (SOCS). Policy CSEN1 of the SOCS seeks to protect the district's distinctive landscape character and key features against any inappropriate development. Where development is considered acceptable in principle, measures should be sought to integrate it into the landscape of the area. This policy supports the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) by placing high priority on the conservation and enhancement of the Chilterns AONB.
- 6.4 Policies D1 and G2 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan (SOLP) and CSQ3 of the SOCS seek to ensure that principles of good design are adopted for all development. These policies look to reinforce and to protect local character by ensuring development is of a scale and appearance appropriate to the dwelling, the site and surrounding area. Policy H13 of the SOLP seeks to ensure all extensions are in keeping with the character of the dwelling and the appearance of the surrounding area.
- 6.5 The property lies within the Stoke Row Conservation Area and as such falls to be considered by policy CSEN3 of the SOCS and policy CON7 of the SOLP. These policies seek to ensure that the district's designated heritage assets, including conservation areas, are conserved and enhanced for their historic significance and their important contribution to local distinctiveness, character and sense of place. Permission should not be granted where harm to the character or appearance of a conservation area can be identified.
- 6.6 The proposed additions to the dwelling go beyond those previously granted permission last year ([P16/S3080/HH](#) & [P16/S3081/LB](#)), with the addition of a first floor aspect above the approved single storey extension. The submitted plans for the currently proposed two storey aspect look to emulate the existing two storey addition to the rear which was added in the 1960s in design and height but would be shorter in width. The proposed two storey extension is lower than the ridge height of the 1960s extension. The materials proposed would be to match the existing property.
- 6.7 Whilst these additions could be considered in keeping with the existing form and appearance of the dwelling, officers are mindful of the cumulative impacts that these extensions would have on this property – which has been significantly enlarged already. The cumulative impacts of the previous additions to this dwelling and the additions subject to this current application would, in officer's view, overwhelm the original built form of the dwelling. The overall harm to the building caused by these extensions needs to be considered against the harm caused to the listed building.

Impact on the historic and architectural interests of the listed building

- 6.8 The original building is a small, double-pile farmhouse. It has historically been added to with a linear extension along its street frontage (late 19 Century) and a subsequent extension to the rear much later in the 1960s. The building is situated within the Stoke Row Conservation Area.
- 6.9 In addition to policy CSEN3 of the SOCS, extensions and alterations proposed to listed buildings must be considered by policy CON2 and CON3 of the SOLP. These policies seek to ensure that extensions and alterations to listed buildings are appropriate to the

character of the listed building and sympathetic to the original structure, scale and design of the listed building. Any works that would diminish the special historical or architectural qualities which make it worthy of its inclusion on the statutory list should be resisted. This is in line with the provisions of the NPPF.

Previous schemes to extend the property

- 6.10 Previous applications have been made to extend the property. An appeal made against the refusal of applications [P09/E0513/LB](#) and [P09/E0512](#) was dismissed in 2010 (Details of this scheme **attached** as Appendix D). The refusal reason for this development stated:

The proposed extension, by reason of its size, appearance and inappropriate detailing would be harmful to the special architectural character and historic interest of the listed building. The proposal would therefore be contrary to adopted South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 policies G2, G6, CON2, D1 and H13 and advice in PPG15 (&...South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 policy CON2).

- 6.11 The inspector was of the view that due to the scale and bulk and prominent siting of the extensions and in combination with the twentieth-century additions the scheme would overwhelm the former double-pile farmhouse, which is important to the special architectural interest of the listed building, when viewed from the back garden. It was considered that these additions would seriously undermine the original farmhouse's significance.
- 6.12 The inspector continued; that the complicated plan and roof forms of the proposed extensions at that time and their complex detailing was considered to contrast starkly with the simple pitched-roofed forms and the mainly traditional detailing which are important to the character of the listed building. In addition the substantial areas of glazing in the gable and in the French windows would also be out of keeping with the character of the listed building. For all of these reasons the proposal was considered to fail to preserve the special architectural interest of the listed building, and harm its character.
- 6.13 In addition the inspector considered that the part of the back garden that is edged by the twentieth-century extensions had a clear functional relationship with the kitchen/utility end of the house and the back door and this would have been almost completely filled in by the appeal proposal. This relationship was considered to be important to the use and the character of the single dwelling and because of its functional and visual qualities this external space contributes in a positive way to the setting of the listed building. The appeal proposal would have almost completely filled this space and as such would have harmed the setting of the listed building. On this point alone officers do not share the Inspector's concerns about the relationship between the utility end of the house and the back door. This opinion has been informed by a site visit and consideration of the dismissed appeal plans and the subsequent plans before us. However, on the Inspector's points above about plan and roof forms we do share those concerns with regard to the scheme now being considered.
- 6.14 The previous application for the single storey additions to the rear of the property ([P16/S3080/HH](#) & [P16/S3081/LB](#)) were considered acceptable owing to their simple and single storey form. However it was noted that this previous extension would likely amount to an overall addition to the footprint of the dwelling which would be the full extent that this building can be reasonably extended without eroding the legibility and character of the early C17 double-pile farmhouse which forms the most significant part

of the building.

- 6.15 The footprint of the previously proposed extension would result in an increase of the physical depth of this part of the house over that of the C17 range. However, the previously approved single storey addition was considered acceptable on balance due to its architecturally subservient and simple elevational treatments. This helped to retain the emphasis on the two storey parts of the building, albeit in part this is the less refined 1960s two-storey addition to the rear.
- 6.16 Previous to these current applications, applications [P17/S0216/HH](#) & [P17/S0217/LB](#) sought permission/consent for a similar form of development as currently proposed. These applications were subsequently refused for the following reason:
- 6.17 *Having regard to its scale and massing and when considered cumulatively with other previous extensions, the proposed extension would overwhelm the original building and would erode the significance of the historic building. The proposed extension would therefore fail to comply with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CSQ3 and CSEN3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and saved policies D1, G2, H13, CON2 and CON3 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan.*
- 6.18 These applications have not been appealed.

Current scheme

- 6.19 In contrast to the previously approved single storey scheme, the extensions proposed under the current applications will result in an increase in massing to the building beyond that of the C20 and C21 additions. The council's conservation officer considered that the approved single storey extension would likely be the full extent to which this house can be reasonably added to and that options to carefully provide internal subdivision of existing spaces at ground or first floor should be explored to alter the number of bedrooms desired. The conservation officer objects to the current proposal citing concerns that the development would over-extend the listed building due to the cumulative impact of C20 additions. As such, it is considered that the additions would harm the integrity of the original historic farmhouse.
- 6.20 The most recent of the previous applications were recommended for refusal based on the council's consideration that the extensions as proposed would overwhelm the historic part of the listed building, compromising its significance and failing to overcome the concerns about the impact of increased massing and bulk on the architectural and historic significance of the listed building. The historic farmhouse would be compromised by the level of extension to the building, contrary to good practice, the Planning (Listed Building & Conservation Area) Act 1990, NPPF policies and Local Plan policies. As previously identified, this application proposes the same development as before.
- 6.21 The design of the current proposed extension would depart from that of the scheme dismissed at appeal in 2010. The extension is more in keeping with the traditional dual pitched appearance of this part of the dwelling and the design and external finishes would be proportional and in keeping with the existing property. The height of the two storey extension scheme has also marginally reduced the physical extension from the rear of the previously approved scheme; however it is now two storey.
- 6.22 Having regard to Sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Building & Conservation Area) Act 1990, officers do not consider that the development/works to the listed building would be acceptable having regard to the desirability of preserving the special

historical and architectural interest of the original C17 aspect of the listed building. Indeed the extension, owing to its massing and scale, would erode the historic significance of the original C17 aspect. It is officer's view that the proposed extensions would cause less than substantial harm to the listed building due to the cumulative impact of the C20 additions.

- 6.23 The additions to the building would provide for additional living accommodation for the existing occupants. Having regard to paragraph 134 of the NPPF, officers do not consider the public benefit of this proposal would outweigh the (permanent) harm caused to the listed building.
- 6.24 These additions would result in the loss of the outside/functional aspect to the rear of the dwelling. However it is officer's view that the new glazed conservatory aspect would continue to serve a functional relationship between the dwelling and the rear garden. The new glazed conservatory aspect would, on balance, be acceptable owing to its subservient scale.
- 6.25 The proposal therefore fails to comply with the requirements set out within the NPPF and the relevant policies within the council's development plan. Harm to the listed building can be identified and the public benefit would not outweigh the harm caused to the listed building.

Impact on the amenity of neighbours

- 6.26 Owing to the siting of the proposed additions to the dwelling the harm on the amenity of neighbours is considered to be minimal and not significant.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

- 6.27 The council's CIL charging schedule has recently been adopted and will apply to relevant proposals from 1 April 2016. CIL is a planning charge that local authorities can implement to help deliver infrastructure and to support the development of their area, and is primarily calculated on the increase in footprint created as a result of the development. In this case CIL is not liable for the development as it would not result in a net increase of more than 100 square metres of habitable space to the dwelling.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 7.1 [P17/S0216/HH](#) - Planning permission is refused. Due to its scale and massing and when considered cumulatively with other previous extensions, the proposed extension would overwhelm the original building and would erode the significance of the historic building. As such the proposal does not comply with relevant Development Plan Policies.
- 7.2 [P17/S0217/LB](#) - Listed building consent is refused. Due to its scale and massing and when considered cumulatively with other previous extensions, the proposed extension would overwhelm the original building and would erode the significance of the historic building. As such the proposal does not comply with relevant Development Plan Policies.

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1 [P17/S0216/HH](#) – To refuse planning permission for the following reason:

- 1. Having regard to its scale and massing and when considered cumulatively with other previous extensions, the proposed extension would overwhelm the original building and would erode the significance of the historic building.**

The proposed extension would therefore fail to comply with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CSQ3 and CSEN3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and saved policies D1, G2, H13, CON2 and CON3 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan.

8.2 [P17/S0217/LB](#) – To refuse listed building consent for the following reason:

1. Having regard to its scale and massing and when considered cumulatively with other previous extensions, the proposed extension would overwhelm the original building and would erode the significance of the historic building. The proposed extension would therefore fail to comply with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CSEN3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy and saved policies CON2 and CON3 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan.

Author: Marc Pullen
Contact no: 01235 422600
Email: planning@southoxon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank