

**Application Site:**

7 The Colony, Colony Road, Sibford Gower OX15 5RY

**Proposals:**

Works to the Main House include: - making good and restoration to the roof, chimneys and gutters / downpipes - making good and restoration to the external pointing, - repairs and changing deteriorated windows and external doors with new double-glazed to match - restoration works to lintels. Works to the Garage include: - incorporating solar thermal panels under slate tiles for solar-thermal power - install new garage doors -changing deteriorated windows with new double-glazed to match the Main House. Works to the Log Store/Garden Room: - demolish the dilapidated Log Store and replace it with a Garden Room. Works to the boundaries: - maintenance work to the existing stone walls - new timber entrance gates to the driveway.

**Understanding the heritage assets affected:**

- Setting of a listed building
- External alterations to a listed building
- Internal alterations to a listed building
- Sibford Ferris, Sibford Gower and Burdrop Conservation Area (Designated January 2008/reviewed April 2012)

**Planning History:**

See the Design and Access Statement (\*I couldn't find some references 97/00571/F, 00/484/F, 02/1468/F)

**Significance:**

Paragraph 189 of the NPPF states *'In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary.'*

The Design and Access Statement includes a 'Heritage and conservation statement' this does assess the evidential, historic, communal and aesthetic values of Bartlett Cottage (7-8 The Colony) within the rural community of Sibford Gower, or analysis the impact on the historic elements proposed to be changed. Guidance can be found in Historic England's Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance: <https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/constructive-conservation/conservation-principles/>

**Background:**

Sibford Gower has always been the largest of the three settlements in the Conservation Area; in the 13th century it was called Great Sibford. The site of the village was probably chosen because of the springs and the near-by ford. It is made up of a long street running from east to west near the crest of a hill; at the west end the farms and cottages are grouped round the pond and a small green, and a minor road branches off southwards, 'Colony Road or Hook Norton Road'. Many two-storied coursed rubble and thatched houses dating from the 17th century survive. Some modernization was carried out in the 18th and early 19th century when the village was expanding. Among the 19th-century additions were the non-conformist chapels. Flint arrow heads have been found near the Colony. See the Victoria County History A History of Oxfordshire Vols II & X (VCH), the Conservation Area Appraisal and [The.sibfords.uk](http://The.sibfords.uk) website. The Colony may have been named after a place for the isolation of people with Smallpox.

**Bartlett Cottage (7 The Colony), Hook Norton Road, Sibford Gower was listed on 20.09.1988 as Grade II:**

*SIBFORD GOWER HOOK NORTON ROAD SP3436-3536 (East Side) 16/175 Bartlett Cottage II House formerly two cottages possibly occupied by small-holders. One build. c.1800. Rendered coursed rubble. Slate roof. Brick ridge and end stacks. The cottages originally of one-unit with a further unit with pitching hole and end outshot. 2 storeys. 4-window range. 2 plank doors and wood lintels. On left a window with honeycomb glazing inserted in the pitching hole. Original pitching hole survives on right. Ground and first floor have 3-light metal casements in wood frames with wood lintels, wrought-iron casement fasteners and lead canes. Interior not inspected. Listing NGR: SP3470337331*

Bartlett Cottage is part of a group of isolated properties called The Colony, which were built to the south of the village in 1839-51 as social housing by the Quaker John Enoch or Enock. Each cottage was intended for a farm labourer and included 2 or 1.75 acres of land to support their income. The 1910 district valuation records that all 4 acres were attributable to No 7 rather than divided equally between 7 and 8, although the corresponding map shows a narrow strip directly behind No 8. The cottages are in pairs, 1-2, 3-4, 5-6 and 7-8. Bartlett Cottage (7-8) is now a single dwelling and is the most intact of the pairs, although the other cottages yield clues as to the original form prior to alteration. The original 2-storeyed cottages appear to have consisted of two cells with local brick end stacks (the central ridge stack is wider and shared). The roofline is simple with a slate roof and only one rooflight is shown in the listing photo on the front slope. Each cottage had a 2-storey outer and unlinked cell, most likely for agricultural purposes with a single wide opening on the rear elevation (which looks a little narrow for a cart) and what has been described as a 'pitching hole' to the front. The 'pitching hole' to No 8 retains its wooden shutter but has a leaded light inside, the 'pitching hole' to No 7 appears to have been replaced by a 3-light flush timber casement prior to listing. The list description suggest the lozenge window to No 7 was a 'pitching hole' but this was more likely the door to the cottage, although it is possible the lozenge window may have been relocated and previously sat inside a wooden shutter mirroring No 8. There is a ground floor chimney breast to the north wall of the 2-storey cell south of the cottage that may have contained a bread oven as part of the fireplace in the living accommodation of No 8. A full width single storey lean-to abuts the gable which were likely for storage and may have incorporated an outside WC, the rear elevation has a small opening now glazed with a ledged sill. Whilst the cottages were intended for farm labourers, the Quaker community in Sibford also included clockmakers and it is possible some of the space could have been used as a workshop, No 8 has doors which look to be Victorian and a leaded window in the 'pitching hole', No 7 has a 3-light window and the original doors were replaced in 2002. The build looks to be of one phase although there is evidence for at least three alterations to openings on the frontage and repointing associated with faulty rainwater goods. The roofs of the lean-to ends have been raised slightly during a recent re-roofing. The masonry shows evidence of former lime render. The simplicity of the form is a significant part of its interest, with widely spaced traditional windows and high proportion of solid marlstone wall.



7&8



1&2 doors

This listing photo shows the cut path between the verge to the symmetrical doorways, the lozenge window is where the doorway to No 7 was most likely located. There is a shadow in the centre which suggests a former hedge or doorway, however, the existing wall shows no evidence for a door. The door to No 8 has been replaced with a window (the window from No7 has likely been relocated) and the window to no 7 has been replaced by a new wider door with side lights for the now combined single cottage. Note there are no chimney pots on the list photo, and only one rooflight is shown to No 7. A c2009 porch was added to the south-east elevation of No 7, replacing a lean-to greenhouse conservatory structure.

Between listing in 1988 and 02/00459/LB some works took place including the alteration of windows and doors to the front, and additional rooflights but I can see no LBC in the planning history – do you know if there is anything on file?

The 2002 proposals included opening up part of the wall between the 2-storey and lean-to at No 7, replacement windows to the north elevation of the lean-to, new French doors (of a different design to the current doors) and a 2-light south gable window to No 8 (note that a 3-light window is currently in place).

The rear elevation can still be read as a symmetrical pair of cottages with wider openings in the north and south 2-storey cells. A small single storey extension has been added to the strong linear form of the cottages.

The early OS maps show an entrance way between the lean to and modest outbuilding fronting the lane. The outbuilding at No 8 was divided into three, part of this structure may survive and it may originally have been a pigsty within an orchard. There is a vertical joint in the stone boundary wall which marks the return wall. The current building is of corrugated iron. The land ownership has reduced from the original 2 acres allotted to each cottage. At No 7 an extension to an existing outbuilding was approved which was later replaced with an open shed and storage for 2 cars c2002.

The setting of Bartlett Cottage is a pastoral landscape which Cobham's 1995 Landscape Assessment of the District defines as 'Ironstone Hills and Valleys' with small scale enclosed farmland with rolling farmland.

### **Appraisal:**

#### **The key issues are:**

##### **Making good and restoration to the roof and chimneys:**

There are no notes on the proposed plans but the Design and Access Statement includes 'matching mortar detailing, traditional lead flashing work and matching slate tiles'. This confirms the work is localised rather than the complete replacement of the roof although they should check for the presence of crevice seeking bats or birds prior to undertaking work.

##### **Rooflights:**

We should first be sure that the existing rooflights have listed building consent or were present at the time of listing before we assess their replacement. No 7: 1No to the front shown on the listing photo, one to the rear – is there an LBC? No 8: 1No to the front not shown on the listing photo and 2No to rear - is there an LBC, it would appear the rooflight to the front appeared between the 1988 listing and 2002?

Rooflights are not encouraged on the front elevations of buildings in a conservation area, and even less so on listed buildings. If there is no LBC in place for the rooflight on the front roof slope to No.8. Please note that the 2002 LB allowed for a 2-light window in the gable but a 3-light window has been added and I can see no LB for this amendment, rather than ask for this to be reduced in width to a 2-light window, I would strongly encourage the removal of the rooflight on the front roof slope.

As the rooflight on the front roof slope of No 7 was in place at the date of listing, I would support its replacement with a more traditional top hung conservation rooflight set between the rafters, subject to detail.

No objections to the replacement of the 3 rear rooflights with a flush conservation rooflight set between the rafters, with a central glazing bar, top hung, subject to detail.

##### **Chimneys and gutters / downpipes:**

The Design and Access Statement includes gutters and fascia boards, the existing eaves and verge have no fascia boards, the gutter is held on traditional rise and fall brackets. Where existing traditional cast iron rainwater goods are beyond refurbishment I would have no objection to the replacement of this and any modern RWGs being replaced in traditional painted cast iron (to match the window colour or black), allowing for an increased profile size to cater for projected increased rainfall. Rainwater goods should be held on traditional rise and fall brackets and not a fascia board as proposed – the detail should match existing.

The elevations show the chimneys are proposed to be lined with chimney pots added. Refer to Historic England guidance: '<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/eehb-open-fires-chimneys-flues/> We need confirmation that there is space for the flue liner to be inserted without damage to the historic fabric.

The proposed buff chimney pots would be acceptable.

##### **Making good and restoration to the external pointing:**

Any stitching should be in austenitic stainless steel, bendable ties may be more suited to a rubble wall. We will need details.

We will need to agree the stone for any piecing in and a sample of the lime mortar pointing. The existing render should be analysed as this looks to be of some age, if it is lime based and breathable it should be consolidated and retained. Please check with Ecology if they require a report on whether the sizeable holes are being used by masonry bees, birds or bats.

**Repairs and Changing of Windows & Lintels:** The windows are earlier than Crittall.

We need a detailed assessment of the existing historic windows - see Appendix A which outlines the recommended process and stages for assessing the significance, condition, repair methods. Only as a final resort would we look at like for like replacements. Please note leaded windows cannot be double glazed whilst retaining a true lead came.

The application form mentions 'repairs and changing deteriorated windows and external doors with new double-glazed to match - restoration works to lintels'. The Design and Access Statement includes 'the proposal is

for the new replacement windows to match the design of the existing metal frame windows and to retain the historic character of the building’.

Appendix A identifies modern windows and we would need to assess the proposed details in light of the window types that exist, do some of the historic windows include t-shaped metal glazing bars or are they all leaded, an existing window survey is needed?

An independent damp and decay specialist may be able to microdrill the lintels to assess their condition, if they are structurally defective, like for like repairs will be considered. We need more details on what is proposed.

#### **Repairs and Changing of Doors & Lintels:** See Appendix B

The Design and Access Statement includes’ the proposal is for the new replacement doors to match the design of the existing doors and are sympathetic to the historic character of the building’. A photo from 2011 shows an original door to No 2 the Colony as a simple vertically boarded door. The existing doors appear to be modern, the doors inserted into the wide opening at No 8 could be slightly earlier but it is difficult to tell from the photographs. I consider these doors with a lower panel to be more sympathetic than the full height glazed doors but we can condition details to show vertical/horizontal plan sections including recess, sills and lintels, together with joinery details for the jamb/head/sill and glazing bars. The vertically boarded door on the south lean to is labelled as panelled but the boarded door as drawn would be encouraged.

An independent damp and decay specialist may be able to microdrill the lintels to assess their condition, if they are structurally defective, like for like repairs will be considered. We need more details on what is proposed.

#### **Air Source Heat Pump:**

Screening to be detailed.

#### **Garage:**

Solar tiles to east elevation – it would be useful to see the type proposed, their reflectivity. There is a natural slate product on the market. We could condition details.

The double doors are not labelled as new so I assume they are being retained on the rear elevation.

New garage doors. This was approved as an open shed/car port. The proposals look to insert glazed panelled doors behind the timber post as an up and over door. The pattern and material is not sympathetic to the setting and would look more like a car showroom (below left). If they are intent on enclosing the bays then traditional painted boarded garage doors which are side hung would be more appropriate. A traditional flush door could accommodate windows at the top. An example is below right (ignore the hinge positions).



The replacement of the window would be supported subject to details informed by a survey of the existing windows on the house.

#### **Log Store demolition:**

Demolition of the log store: The existing masonry walls should be retained.

#### **Replace log store with a garden room with storage space:**

Whilst there are remnants of corrugated iron or tin, the structure is not the original form. Looking at the masonry and the historic plans, it seems likely this was a possible pigsty.

The proposal is not sensitive in scale or material. The land is lower at this point as the road falls to the south. The proposed eaves are considerably higher than the existing eaves and higher still than the earlier structure. I would not support this increase in scale as a building in this position should be modest and not detract from the simplicity of the pair of Quaker’s cottages. A modest replacement single storey structure would be supported, the proposal is too high and the glazed gable could dominate the setting. The taller part of the wall has been extended, as seen by the vertical joint, I would not object to this continuing to meet the lower stone boundary wall. A waney-edged timber cladding could be built on top of the lower masonry walls. Alternatively the masonry walls could be increased in height to a low single storey, it may be possible to include a discreet clerestory between the eaves and the top of the wall to avoid raising the height of the stone boundary wall or cross wall (see Fig 23 in <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/adapting-traditional-farm-buildings/heag158-adapting-traditional-farm-buildings/>). Whilst there may be scope for the rear elevation to have glazing, this should be mindful of the possible impact on the surrounding countryside and light spill, the gable could be very visible from the bridleway to the south. The impact of any glazing could be reduced by

projecting the roof beyond the glazing, or timber louvred screens could be added. The existing roof itself is of low pitch and this might lend itself to a traditional corrugated roof that one might see on a farm outbuilding, these roofs are also good for rain harvesting. Alternatively we would not object to a natural slate roof to match the house.



**Boundaries:**

Works to the boundaries: - maintenance work to the existing stone walls - new timber entrance gates to the driveway. We would need to agree the matching stone and ask for a sample for the repairs. We would need details for the new entrance gates.

**Level of harm**

Elements of the proposals would cause significant but less than substantial harm to the listed pair of cottages but there is no public benefit in terms of the NPPG and NPPF to outweigh this harm.

There are repairs and the replacement of modern windows/doors which would be welcomed subject to details.

**Policies:**

**Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended):**

states that *'in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority...shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses'*. Likewise **Section 72** of the same Act states that in considering proposals for development in a Conservation Area, *'special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area'*.

**Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031: Adopted Document (July 2015) (As amended) Policy ESD15:**

*'Conserve, sustain or enhance designated 'heritage assets' (as defined in the NPPF) including buildings, features, archaeology, conservation areas and their settings, and ensure new development is sensitively sited and integrated in accordance with advice in the NPPF', and 'Respect the traditional pattern of routes, spaces, blocks, plots, enclosures and the form, scale and massing of buildings.'*

**Cherwell Local Plan 1996:**

*C18 Works to a listed building should preserve the building, its setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest. Alterations or extensions to a listed building should be minor and sympathetic.*

*C23 Presumption in favour of retaining positive features within a Conservation Area. – See C33.*

*C28 The layout, design and materials proposed within a new development should respect the existing local character. 'control will be exercised over all new development to ensure that standards of layout, design and external appearance are sympathetic to the character of the urban or rural context of that development.'*

**National Planning Policy Guidance NPPG:**

Plan Making: the Historic Environment.

Describes public benefits as *'anything that delivers economic, social or environmental progress.'*

## **NPPF: 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment:**

NPPF 192. In determining applications the LPA should take account of *'the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.'*

NPPF 193. *'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation... This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.'* and

NPPF 194: *'Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.'*

NPPF 196. *'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'*

### **Historic England's guidance on The Setting of Heritage Assets, GPA3.**

#### **Recommend:**

The application should cover any unauthorised work carried out post listing.

There is no public benefit to the more controversial aspects of this proposal to outweigh the perceived harm, namely the proposed garden room, and the proposed garage doors.

We need more detail on the windows as discussed in the Appraisal section and Appendix A prior to agreeing their repair or replacement.

We need more details of the proposed solar roof.

The repairs to the masonry, roof, rainwater goods, gates and doors can be conditioned but I have highlighted that we may need some input from Ecology\*.

#### **Conditions:**

As suggested in the appraisal:

Sample panels for masonry repairs/lime mortar pointing/render repairs. The voids need to be checked for birds/bats/masonry bees that may be protected\*

Stitching details: austenitic grade stainless steel ties.

Cast iron RWG on traditional rise and fall brackets, and any added felt trays suggested in the Design and Access statement – details of RWGs and eaves.

Slate sample for making up any shortfall/extent of repairs. Traditional eaves/verge

Joinery Details.

#### **Officer / Date**

Joyce Christie/23.04.2021