

**Case Officer:** Emma Whitley

**Recommendation:** Refuse

**Applicant:** Mrs Mandy Buck

**Proposal:** Extensions & alterations to existing house, including alterations to external appearance

**Expiry Date:** 2 September 2021

---



## 1. Relevant Features of the Site

- Grade II listed Elm Tree House, distance from site: 0m
- Flood Zone 3
- Flood Zone 2
- Situated within the Wendlebury historic core Archaeological Alert Area

## 2. Description of Proposed Development

The applicant seeks planning permission for a single storey rear extension, single storey side extension (to the east), porch extension to the side (west elevation) and front verandah extension. The proposals would be finished in painted horizontal timber weatherboarding with natural welsh slates for the roof.

## 3. Relevant Planning History and Pre-Application Discussions

The following Planning History and Pre-Application discussions are considered relevant to the current proposal.

62/01157/M – Erection of single storey house and garage with access. *Application Permitted 18 October 1962.*

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

## 4. Response to Publicity

This application has been publicised by way of a site notice, advertisement in the local newspaper and letters sent to neighbours situated immediately adjacent to the

application site. The final date for comments was **9 August 2021**, although comments received after this date and before finalising this report have also been taken into account.

No comments have been raised by third parties.

## 5. Response to Consultation

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.

Wendlebury Parish Council: no comments or objections received at the time of drafting the report.

Archaeology (OCC): no objections.

Building Control (CDC): comments – *A Building Regulations application will be required for the proposals.*

Local Highway Authority (OCC): no objections.

Conservation (CDC): comments – *There is a substantial increase in footprint from the existing building, but the building remains single storey and low profile and the proposed development is not considered to have a negative impact on the setting of the listed building.*

*There are, however, concerns with the building being constructed entirely of timber boarding which may look incongruous in relation to the surrounding area and detract from the listed building.*

## 6. Relevant Policy and Guidance

Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 - (CLP 2015)

- ESD15 - The Character of the Built and Historic Environment.  
New development will be expected to complement and enhance the character of its context through sensitive siting, layout and high-quality design. Where development is in the vicinity of the District's distinctive natural or historic assets, delivering high quality design that compliments the asset will be essential. *See page 117 of the CLP 2015 for full details.*

Cherwell Local Plan 1996 (saved policies) – (CLP 1996)

- C28 – Layout, Design and External Appearance of New Development  
New development required to have standards of layout, design and external appearance sympathetic to the character of the urban or rural context of that development. *See page 120 of the CLP 1996 for full details.*
- C30 – Design of New Residential Development  
Development should be compatible to the scale of the existing dwelling, its curtilage and the character of the street scene. Development should also provide acceptable standards of amenity and privacy. *See page 120 of the CLP 1996 for full details.*

Other Material Planning Considerations

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
- Cherwell Residential Design Guide (2018)

- CDC Home Extensions and Alterations Design Guide (2007)

## 7. Appraisal

### **Design and impact on character of the area**

The proposed works would predominantly be focused to the east of the building, which would be within the setting of the Grade II listed Elm Tree House. Further, works are proposed to the front and side elevations, which would be visible within the streetscene of Church Lane.

The rear extension, which protrudes to the east, the east facing side extension and front extension would result in a significant change to the character of the existing dwelling and the immediate streetscene by way of the addition of incongruous features which would appear oppugnant to the simple nature of the existing dwelling. Further, I consider that these additions, particularly given the incongruous construction materials, would present demonstrable harm to the setting of the designated heritage asset.

I note that the predominant construction material of timber cladding is proposed. Whilst this material is in situ on the existing dwelling as a minor detail, the use of the material as the predominant construction material would appear incongruous and out-of-keeping with regards to the character of the existing dwelling and immediate streetscene. Furthermore, the use of timber cladding runs contrary to the Cherwell Residential Design Guide (2018) and is considered to result in some harm to the setting of the adjacent Grade II listed building.

Whilst some attempt has been made to ensure that the rear extension would appear subservient to the main dwelling, this would not overcome the harm identified by the proposals as a whole.

Conclusion: the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area and the significance of heritage assets and is therefore not considered acceptable.

### **Residential amenity**

The proposed additions would be single storey in scale, with the bulk of the extensions behind screened by the retained boundary fencing and established hedgerow vegetation.

The neighbours most likely to be impacted by the proposals are The Old Rectory (to the north), Elm Tree House (to the east) and Red Brick Cottage. The proposals would not front a habitable space with regards to 1 Waterside Cottage and therefore the proposals are not considered to materially impact this neighbour in this regard.

The proposed rear extension would be situated approximately 9m from Red Brick Cottage and would not breach the 45-degree line. Three windows would be added to the side elevation of the rear extension; however, given the existing fenestration in this elevation, I do not consider that the proposals would result in any additional impact to this neighbour as a result of these openings.

One rooflight would be positioned to the rear of the extension facing north and two would be positioned to in the side of the rear extension to face east; however, these would be at single storey level, would thus direct sight upwards and so would not result in a loss of privacy or additional overlooking of neighbouring properties.

Conclusion: on balance, the proposals would not result in demonstrable harm to the amenities of the immediate neighbours.

### **Highway safety**

The proposals before me do not involve any additional bedrooms. The porch may encroach on a small area of the driveway, the retained parking provision is considered commensurate for a dwelling of this size and in this location. Further, no objections were received from the LHA.

Conclusion: acceptable in this regard.

## **8. Planning Balance and Conclusion**

The appraisal above, which is informed by the policy and guidance set out in section 6, demonstrates that the proposed development would fail to accord with the provisions of the relevant Development Plan policies and the proposal is therefore not considered to represent sustainable development. In accordance with Paragraph 11 of the NPPF, it is recommended that planning permission be refused on this occasion.

## **9. RECOMMENDATION**

That permission is refused, for the following reason(s):

1. By virtue of its scale, siting, design and appearance, the proposed development would appear as incongruous additions which would fail to respect the setting of the adjacent Grade II listed building. The identified harm, which is less than substantial, would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any public benefits. Further, by virtue of its design and appearance, in particular the use of timber cladding, the proposals would also result in demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the area. The application therefore fails to accord with Policy ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1, saved Policy C28 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996, the Cherwell Residential Design Guide (2018) and Government guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Case Officer: Emma Whitley

DATE: 01/09/21

Checked By: Nathanael Stock

DATE: 02.09.2021

---