

**Case Officer:** John Gale

**Recommendation:** Refusal

**Applicant:** Mr Graham Vint

**Proposal:** Single storey kitchen extension

**Expiry Date:** 27 September 2021



**Cherwell Planning Constraints**

Constraints

Public Rights of Way

- Public Footpath
- Public Bridleway
- Restricted Byway
- Byway Open to all Traffic

Listed Buildings (CDC)

- I
- II\*
- II
- DL

Conservation Areas

- 

Application Site

- 



**1. Relevant Features of the Site**

- Hornton Grounds Farm itself constitutes a listed early 19th Century farmhouse, surrounded on one side by the old farmyard – with a separate dwelling for the tenant farmers part of the farmyard. Beyond this to the north are a number of large barns associated with the working parts of the farm.

The farmyard has a farm shop and the applicants operate an existing B&B business out of the farmhouse.

- Listed Building, Grade: II, Name: HORNTON GROUNDS FARMHOUSE, HE Ref: 1216560 - Distance: 0
- Public Right of Way, Route Code: 255/5/10, Status: Bridleway - Distance: 17.09

## 2. Description of Proposed Development

The proposals are for a single storey extension to provide additional kitchen space at the property.

The proposed extension would have a footprint of approximately 22sqm with a flat-roofed design in stone with a parapet. A rooflight is proposed in the ceiling of the extension. The height of parapet would be 3.7m and the roof light would extend to 4m in height. Stone quoins are proposed in the two open corners of the structure. Fenestrations would be in painted timber with sawn stone lintels to match the stone of the quoins.

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

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

<b>Application: 13/01667/LB</b>	Permitted	30 December 2013
---------------------------------	-----------	------------------

Removal of existing rear lean-to porch and replacement with new laundry/boot room.

<b>Application: 13/01666/F</b>	Permitted	30 December 2013
--------------------------------	-----------	------------------

Removal of existing rear lean-to porch and replacement with new laundry/boot room.

<b>Application: 21/02510/LB</b>	TBC	27 September 2021
---------------------------------	-----	-------------------

Single storey kitchen extension

A 2013 application for a replacement porch was approved and has subsequently been built out. The current proposal is for a structure of similar style and proportion.

## 4. Response to Publicity

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.

The final date for comments was **3 September 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.

Hornton Parish Council; No comments received

CDC Building Control: No objections, with the following comments

*A Building Regulations application will be required for the proposal the amount of glazing should reflect the guidance in Approved Document L*

CDC Conservation: Objections with the following comments

*We need full plans of the ground floor and full elevations of the principal west elevation, the north and east, as existing and as proposed. This would allow a full analysis of the proposals. We also need a phasing plan to understand the historic development of the large farmhouse. The 2009 LB application includes unlabelled plans of the ground floor in two parts, I joined these in photoshop to help with my understanding of the full plan but this does not include the 2013 extension. There is a very strong line which runs through, we need to understand the significance of this as the proposals look to remove part of this wall.*

*The significance of the wall that projects northwards from the north elevation of the farmhouse and encloses the farm/livery yard is not understood, the proposed extension does not respect the line of the wall and we should not encourage any extension west of this line. The proposal also straddles two phases of building and does not respect the corner of the pre 1875-87 north wing.*

*The Design and Access Statement includes 'The proposed new extension is designed to reflect the style of the existing building and the boot room built several years ago.' The 2013 boot room (built 2015) replaced a much smaller porch and whilst in a relatively discreet location, it does not enhance the listed building, and should not set a precedent for a further extension on the opposite side of the 3-storey north wing. Recommend a Preapp is submitted alongside the information requested above so that we can work with the Applicant and their Agent to explore how their needs could be accommodated whilst respecting the listed building and its setting.*

## 6. Relevant Policy and Guidance

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

- 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 2031 Part 1 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 including designated heritage assets**

The proposals are for a flat-roofed extension to the side of the existing listed building, in the area adjacent to the former farmyard – which is now converted to a farm shop.

The proposed extension would introduce a structural element outside of the existing northern side elevation of the host building – disrupting the historic pattern of development. The building would also straddle two earlier phases of the building, causing a visual imbalance – muddying both distinct styles with a third phase of construction.

An earlier extension in a similar style to that proposed is in evidence further to the east of the site of the proposed extension. This structure replaced an earlier inappropriate porch and is not considered to be very successful – with windows and a scale that are not considered, upon reflection, to respect the layout and design and by extension the significance of the listed farmhouse. It is considered that by copying this structure the proposals would further harm the significance of the listed building. Together with the placement outside of the historic envelope of the building this would represent a less than substantial harm to the listed building.

The proposed extension would also result in the opening-up of a separating wall internally and the historic plan form of the existing building would be disrupted. Insufficient information on the layout and phasing of the building has been submitted with the proposals to fully assess this impact. In light of the absence of information it is considered that this would also result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the building due to the disruption in the layout.

The proposals are considered to amount to a less than substantial harm to the significance to the designated heritage asset, due to the incongruous design, the proposed location beyond the existing envelope of the built-form and the fact that the proposed structure would straddle two separate earlier phases of construction.

Conclusion: Unacceptable due to the identified harm, which must be outweighed by benefits

### **Residential amenity**

The proposals would not have an impact upon residential amenity given the isolated location of the farmhouse with the nearest neighbouring residential dwelling over 500m away.

Conclusion: Acceptable

### **Highway safety**

The proposals would not add pressure on on-street parking given the modest size of the proposed extension and the existing site having sufficient parking for upwards for 8-10 vehicles.

Conclusion: Acceptable

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

The appraisal above, which is informed by the policy and guidance set out in section 6, identifies a less than substantial harm to the listed building due to the design layout and location in relation to the earlier phases of building. National policy contained within the NPPF requires that any less than substantial harm is identified it must be outweighed by a public benefit.

The proposed structure would house a new kitchen in support of a '*bed and breakfast enterprise*' currently being run from the property. It would purportedly provide a more sizable kitchen space whilst also allowing for the current kitchen space to be converted to storage. No evidence has been provided to show that the existing business would not be able to continue without enlargement and provision of new facilities. There is no study to show that alternative locations, including internal rearrangement of the existing space, have been considered and discounted.

The application does not include a full layout of the existing building in plan form – just an excerpt showing the adjacent areas. It is not clear where the existing kitchen is and what the overall impact on the plan form would be. A heritage statement was submitted with the application, but this document falls short of a full assessment of the impacts and does not justify the proposals.

There would be a minor public benefit in the continued support of the existing bed and breakfast business, however, given the lack of information, business plan, assessment of alternative locations it is not considered that this very minor benefit would come close to outweighing the identified harm from the proposals.

## **9. RECOMMENDATION**

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

1. By virtue of its design, scale and form, the proposed extension would result in a visually incongruous, disruptive and poorly designed form of development that would fail to relate to the existing listed building causing less than substantial harm. The identified harm caused to the listed building is not outweighed by any public benefits. The proposed development therefore runs contrary to Policy ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1, saved Policy C18 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Case Officer: John Gale

DATE: 27.09.21

Checked By: Paul Ihringer

DATE: 27/9/21

---