

APPLICATION NO.	P14/S3055/HH & P14/S3056/LB
APPLICATION TYPE	HOUSEHOLDER & LISTED BUILDING CONSENT
REGISTERED	25.9.2014
PARISH	CROWMARSH GIFFORD
WARD MEMBER(S)	Kristina Crabbe
APPLICANT	Mrs Lynda Barnes
SITE	Church Cottages Church Lane North Stoke, OX10 6BH
PROPOSAL	Remove existing rear extension and replace with new timber framed extension with increased footprint (As amended by drawing 767-2B altering roof material and amplified by Shadowing Report accompanying e-mail from agent received 20 December 2014).
AMENDMENTS	Remove existing rear extension and replace with new timber framed extension with increased footprint(As amended by drawing 767-2B altering roof material).
GRID REFERENCE	Drawing 767-2B 460962/186251
OFFICER	Paul Bowers

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application was deferred at the Planning Committee meeting on 10 December 2014 to allow for members to visit the site. The application has been referred to the Planning Committee by the request of the local ward member Councillor Kristina Crabbe.
- 1.2 Church Cottages comprise a small terrace of Grade II listed properties in North Stoke. The application dwelling (No 1 Church Cottages) is accessed to the front by a shared access with the Old School Rooms. There is a gated alleyway that leads to the rear of the dwelling. The property's front door and internal porch area is shared with and number 2 Church Cottages.
- 1.3 The site is located in a Conservation Area, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and an area of Archaeological Sensitivity.
- 1.4 A plan showing the site can be found at [Appendix 1](#).

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The applications seek both planning permission and listed building consent. It is proposed to remove the existing rear extension and erect a new rear extension that includes a new separate entrance for this dwelling. The original extension measured 1.7 metres in depth, and 3.3 metres wide (at its widest) with a sloping roof. The proposed extension measures 2.7 metres in depth, and is 3.5 metres wide with a mansard style roof.
- 2.2 The applications were amended altering the roofing material to lead.
- 2.3 The plans accompanying the application can be found at [Appendix 2](#) to this report. The

full application, accompanying information and all consultation responses can be viewed on the councils website www.southoxon.gov.uk

- 2.4 Following the deferral of the applications for a committee site visit at the meeting held on the 10 December the applicant has submitted additional information relating to the shadowing impact of the proposed extension. This information has been attached at **Appendix 3**.

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1 **Crowmarsh Parish Council** – Recommend approval

OCC Archaeological Services - This scheme will not affect any known archaeological features. As such there are no archaeological constraints to this application.

Conservation Officer –

- Church Cottages is a terrace of cottages which are Grade II listed within the North Stoke Conservation Area. This application is for a single storey rear extension and some internal ground floor alterations.
- I have no objection to the principle of this extension, although I would require an alteration to the proposed roof and further information regarding the alterations to the floor in the existing downstairs of the main property.
- I consider that this proposal will enhance the rear of this property. The scale of extension is considered to be appropriate and sympathetic to the original structure and would not dominate or overwhelm it. This proposal would not result in the loss of any historic fabric and as such is sympathetic to the original building. Some of the rear timber framing will be obscured but I do not consider that this would diminish the special historic or architectural qualities which make it worthy of inclusion on the statutory list.
- I do not consider that the proposed ply roof material is a traditional roofing finish and as such is not considered to be a sympathetic material here. Therefore, I would recommend that the roof material is revised.
- I am also concerned about the proposals to the ground floor of both the lounge and kitchen. To ensure that the 115mm excavations and insertion of a DPM as well as under floor heating will be appropriate and not result in potential harm to the building, I would require more detail on this aspect of the proposals. I would recommend that further information is submitted relating to the DPM and the installation of the under floor heating which includes a cross-section drawing showing these proposed works.
- I therefore recommend that the extension roof material is revised and that clarification including a cross-section drawing of the DPM and installation of the under floor heating is provided.
- The amended plans address the conservation concerns

Neighbour Objections (4)

- Proposal makes this house out of character with the surroundings
- No foundations
- Will make roof much higher than it is
- Concerns about damage to neighbouring property
- No access for diggers and vibrations could damage property
- Brickwork will be damaged where existing structure is connected to my house
- There could be issues of subsidence
- Out of character
- Drainage problems – the drainage is shared between the houses
- Don't agree with knocking the old part of the listed building

Agenda Item 7

South Oxfordshire District Council – Planning Committee 11 February 2015

- The application does not include a Heritage Assessment, and the LPA does not have enough information to determine the application.
- The false pitch is a poor and wholly inappropriate model for an extension to a listed building.
- Ply roof is not traditional and is unsympathetic to the listed building.
- The false pitch raises the eaves and gives it a taller profile, affecting the sunlight passing across the rear of the neighbours house.
- Concerns that a new door will be facing their property, recommends this part be dropped.
- Headroom is generous and unnecessary.

Neighbour support (2)

- The new structure would complement the property as the existing facilities are unsatisfactory and the aesthetic appearance will be improved.

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 None of relevance.

5.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE

5.1 **The following policies and guidance relate to the listed building application;**

South Oxfordshire Core Strategy 2027 policies

CSEN3 - Historic environment

South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 policies;

CON2 - Extensions to listed buildings

CON3 - Alteration to listed building

South Oxfordshire Design Guide 2008

National Planning Policy Framework

National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance

The following policies and guidance relate to the planning application;

South Oxfordshire Core Strategy 2027 policies

CSEN1 - Landscape protection

CSEN3 - Historic environment

CSQ3 - Design

South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 policies;

CON2 - Extensions to listed buildings

CON3 - Alteration to listed building

CON7 - Proposals in a conservation area

D1 - Principles of good design

G2 - Protect district from adverse development

H13 - Extension to dwelling

South Oxfordshire Design Guide 2008

National Planning Policy Framework

National Planning Policy Framework Planning Practice Guidance

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The following consideration relates to the listed building application and the planning application;

- **Impact on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.**

The following considerations relate solely to the planning application;

- **Impact on the character and appearance of the North Stoke Conservation Area.**
- **Impact on the amenities of the occupants of nearby properties.**
- **Impact on the special landscape of the AONB.**
- **Other issues.**

Impact on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

6.2 Residents have raised concerns that the proposal would harm the historic quality of the listed building. This includes the lack of a Heritage Assessment to determine the application, the use of a false pitch and ply roof material.

6.3 In this instance the Conservation Officer and Planning Officer considered that a heritage statement was not required. The NPPF requires that Heritage Assessments be proportionate to the scheme proposed. The proposal replaces an existing extension, and does not result in the loss of historic fabric, and as such it would be unreasonable to request such report.

6.4 The proposal generally is considered to enhance the rear of the property. The proposed extension is sympathetic to the original building and is subservient in terms of its size. This proposal would not result in the loss of any historic fabric. Some of the rear timber framing will be obscured this would not diminish the special historic or architectural qualities which make the cottage worthy of inclusion on the statutory list. Although the proposed soil pipe arrangement is not ideal it would represent an improvement on the existing situation.

6.5 The ply roof material that concerned the Conservation Officer has been replaced with traditional milled lead and the mansard sides would be covered in plain clay tiles to match existing. The proposed windows are timber casements to match existing.

6.6 Samples of roof and wall materials and detailed window plans are requested by conditions to ensure they respect the historic character of the listed building and the appearance of the conservation area.

6.7 Concerns regarding the ground floor damp proofing and materials have been resolved. The Conservation Officer advises conditions for the specification of the rooflights, glazing thickness and a sample of clay tile. In planning terms it is not reasonable to control the double glazing thickness in this instance because, as indicated in the window section details, such glazing is not likely to be harmful to the cottage's appearance.

6.8 Therefore, as amended, the proposal complies with policies CSEN1, CON2 and CON3.

Impact on the character and appearance of the North Stoke Conservation Area.

- 6.9 Residents raised concerns that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 6.10 The proposed extension would be an improvement on the existing rear extension and would better complement the historic character of the listed building. The garden space is small and is currently cluttered with outbuildings. These are to be removed and replaced with a single timber shed in order to facilitate the proposed extension and would result in the garden area appearing less cramped. The shed could typically be erected under permitted development rights. In addition its timber construction and position would not harm the character of the area or result in any harm to neighbours' amenities.
- 6.11 Extensions are part of the character of a residential area and given that the proposal would not harm the setting of the listed building and would not appear cramped within its plot, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 6.12 As confirmed by the County Archaeologist this scheme will not affect any known archaeological features

Impact on the amenities of the occupants of nearby properties.

- 6.13 Concerns have been raised by the owners of number 2 Church Cottages that the proposal would result in a loss of daylight and sunlight to one of their habitable rooms. There are windows located on their rear projection facing towards the application site. The proposal is 1 metre longer in depth than the existing extension but it includes a mansard rather than a sloping roof. Given the relative position of the neighbour's windows to the extension and the scale of the extension, there would not be a significant loss of daylight and sunlight to this window. The proposal may result in some additional shadowing but not to the extent that it would justify the refusal of planning permission based on the impact on the habitable windows at number 2 Church Cottages.
- 6.14 Concerns have been raised about the provision of the new rear entrance door to the property on the western elevation facing number 2 Church Cottages. The door would face a side window of number 2 Church Cottages. This side window is located adjacent to the existing entrance of both properties. Your officers consider that the new rear door would not materially change the level of privacy between the two dwellings. It is an existing situation that residents of both properties need to pass in front of this window to enter the building. The position of the new rear access also means that the residents of number 1 would need to pass this window. The angle of views would be different, but either entrance would result in views into this window.
- 6.15 The proposed extension would extend beyond the rear wall of the adjacent dwelling, Glebe Cottage, by one metre. There is a front window close to the boundary of the properties. The scale and massing of the proposal is not considered to result in an adverse level of shadowing and much of the extension would be obscured by the existing fence.

- 6.16 Therefore, the proposal would not result in harm to residential amenity, in accordance with policy D4 and H13 of the SOLP.

Impact on the special landscape of the AONB.

- 6.17 The modest scale of the proposal in conjunction with its position in an area of surrounded by buildings ensures that the wider impact on the special landscape of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is extremely limited.

Other issues

- 6.18 A number of other concerns have been reported by neighbouring residents.
- 6.19 A resident has raised concerns that the proposal would result in damage to her property by way of demolition of the existing extension, the digging of foundations, and issues of subsidence. These aspects are not protected by the planning system. If works are required around a party wall, then the applicant will need to abide by the Party Wall Act 1996. With regard to damages to the adjoining listed buildings, it is a criminal offence to damage a listed building and any such works should be reported to the Council's Planning Enforcement Team. The works would require Building Regulation approval and they will examine proposal to ensure that it does not result in subsidence and assess the suitability of foundations etc.
- 6.20 The proposal would not materially affect the sewerage system as it is replacing a bathroom. In your officer's opinion it would be unreasonable to require works to the sewerage system as part of this proposal as that would be disproportionate to the impact and demands of the scheme.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The proposal would not harm the special historic character that makes it worthy of inclusion on the statutory list. Officers consider that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and this part of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. There would not be any significant harm to amenity of adjoining properties. Subject to the recommended conditions, the proposal accords with the relevant development plan policies.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 8.1 **That planning permission is granted subject to the following conditions;**

- 1 : Commencement 3 yrs - Full Planning Permission**
- 2 : Approved plans**
- 3 : Submission of details**
- 4 : Submission of sample materials**

- 8.2 **That listed building consent is granted subject to the following conditions;**

- 8.3 **1 : Commencement 3 yrs – Listed Building Consent**
2 : Approved plans
3 : Submission of details
4 : Submission of sample materials

Author: Paul Bowers
Contact No: 01491 823278
e-mail: paul.bowers@southandvale.gov.uk