

Application No(s):	23/01233/OUT
Application site:	OS Parcel 4347 East Of Pipal Cottage, Oxford Road, Kidlington.
Proposal:	Outline application (with all matters except access reserved for future consideration) for the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of up to 800 dwellings (Class C3); a two form entry primary school; a local centre (comprising convenience retailing (not less than 350sqm and up to 500sqm (Class E(a))), business uses (Class E(g)(i)) and/or financial and professional uses (Class E(c)) up to 500sqm, café or restaurant use (Class E(b)) up to 200sqm; community building (Class E and F2); car and cycle parking); associated play areas, allotments, public open green space and landscaping; new vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access points; internal roads, paths and communal parking infrastructure; associated works, infrastructure (including Sustainable Urban Drainage, services and utilities) and ancillary development. Works to the Oxford Road in the vicinity of the site to include, pedestrian and cycle infrastructure, drainage, bus stops, landscaping and ancillary development

<input type="checkbox"/>	Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Setting of a Listed Building
<input type="checkbox"/>	Grade I	<input type="checkbox"/>	Grade II*	<input type="checkbox"/>	Grade II

Policies

Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 (2015)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Policy ESD13 Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Policy ESD15 New development proposals should: Conserve, sustain and enhance designated and non-designated 'heritage assets' including buildings, features, archaeology, conservation areas and their settings, and ensure new development is sensitively sited and integrated, furthermore development should respect the traditional pattern of the form, scale and massing of buildings. Limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation Be compatible with up to date urban design principles, including Building for Life, and achieve Secured by Design accreditation Consider sustainable design and layout at the masterplanning stage of design, where building orientation and the impact of microclimate can be considered within the layout Incorporate energy efficient design and sustainable construction techniques, whilst ensuring that the aesthetic implications of green technology are appropriate to the context (also see Policies ESD 1 - 5 on climate change and renewable energy) Integrate and enhance green infrastructure and incorporate biodiversity enhancement features where possible (see Policy ESD 10: Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment and Policy ESD 17 Green Infrastructure). Well designed landscape schemes should be an integral part of development proposals to support improvements to biodiversity, the micro climate, and air pollution and provide attractive places that improve people's health and sense of vitality Use locally sourced sustainable materials where possible.

Cherwell Local Plan 1996 Saved Policies

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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.

NPPF – Chapter 16

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Paragraph 194. 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. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local
-------------------------------------	--

	planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.
X	Paragraph 199. 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 (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
X	Paragraph 200. 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. Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional; b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly Exceptional.
	Paragraph 201. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply: a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.
X	Paragraph 202. 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.
X	Paragraph 203. The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Other Relevant Policies and guidance

X	<p>Historic England: Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance 2008 Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets Historic England Advice Note 12 The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/caring-for-heritage/rural-heritage/farm-buildings/ https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/national-farmsteads-character-statement/ https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/national-farmstead-assessment-framework/ https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/national-farm-building-types/ https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/caring-for-heritage/rural-heritage/farm-buildings/#Section6Text https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/adapting-traditional-farm-buildings/heag158-adapting-traditional-farm-buildings/</p> <p>Cherwell's Barn Guidance: https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/downloads/file/4125/conversion-of-farm-buildings</p> <p>Cherwell District Council PR6A Land east of Oxford Road Development Brief August 2022</p> <p><i>Philip Masters and Sally Stradling 'Historic Routes In Cherwell District, North Oxfordshire' Oxoniensia 2016</i></p> <p>The archive at Christ Church may hold further detail on the farm at St Frideswide. Picture Oxon lists an 1832 plan of an estate at Cutslow in the City of Oxford Belonging to Christ Church, it is not known if this refers to Cutslow Farm outside the boundary or St Frideswide. https://heritagesearch.oxfordshire.gov.uk/images/POX0082670</p>
---	--

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 16. In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works 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.

Section 72. With respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area

SIGNIFICANCE UNDERSTANDING THE HERITAGE ASSETS AFFECTED

LISTED BUILDINGS AND BUILDINGS PROTECTED BY THE LISTING, COMMONLY KNOWN AS 'CURTILAGE LISTED':

St Frideswide Farmhouse, A34 – Grade II* First Listed: 26-Nov-1951: *“GOSFORD AND WATER EATON A43 SP51SW (East side) Cutteslowe 6/37 St. Frideswides Farmhouse 26/11/51 GV II* Farmhouse, now house. C16, possibly altered C17; extended C20. Limestone rubble with ashlar dressings; Stonesfield-slate roof with brick stacks. 3-unit through-passage plan with rear wing, extended. 2 storeys. Front has, to right of centre, a moulded stone doorway with a 4-centred arch within a rectangular surround; to right is a 5-light stone mullioned-and-transomed window with label; to left a 5-light mullioned window with label, a blocked doorway with heavy wooden lintel, and a 3-light mullioned window with render label. At first floor are 4-light mullioned windows, to left and centre, plus a small window with label above the main door. Right end wall has a second 5-light mullioned-and-transomed window, and has a 4-light window above without its mullions. All have concave chamfers and leaded glazing, including some old diamond quarries. Hipped roof has stacks at the left end and to rear of the right unit rising from a large stone projection with sloping weatherings. Central hipped-roof rear wing, possibly originally containing the stair, has a 3-light ovolo-moulded wood-mullioned window, and is now flanked by a C20 wing and a C17/C18 lean-to extension returning from the right end. Interior: right end contains the through passage and a double-ovolo-moulded wooden doorway with carved vase stops. This leads to a fine room containing C17 oak panelling below a strapwork frieze, plus a large C16 stone 4-centre arched fireplace with recessed spandrels and moulded cornice below a contemporary carved wooden overmantel with 3 arched panels separated by caryatids. The room may originally have incorporated the through passage. The chamber above (now subdivided) has a plainer Tudor-arched fireplace with similar moulded cornice. Ground-floor rooms to left of the passage have lower ceilings with heavy chamfered beams. A heavy studded rear door is now internal. The moulded wooden doorway is similar to 2 at Water Eaton Manorhouse (q.v.) nearby. Occupied in late C16 by Lenthall family. (V.C.H.: Oxfordshire, Vol.12 (to be published)).”*

<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1286525>

Wall approximately 10 metres to northeast of St. Frideswides Farmhouse, A34 – Grade II

First listed: 10-Apr-1987. This list entry was subject to a Minor Amendment on 22 April 2021 to reformat the text to current standards: *“SP51SW 6/38 GOSFORD AND WATER EATON Cutteslowe A43 (east side) Wall approximately 10 metres to northeast of St. Frideswides Farmhouse. GV II Garden wall. C17/C18. Limestone rubble with tiled coping. Wall is approximately 2.5 metres high and extends approximately 60 metres to the east, returning southwards for a few metres. Included for group value.”*

<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1370050>

The range of farmstead outbuildings to St Frideswide are to be treated as being protected by the Grade II* listing of St Frideswide.

The Water Eaton Estate and Middle Farmhouse are not considered to be directly affected by the development, although screening could still help – see the Archaeological and Heritage report for analysis.

NON-DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS:

Within the Site boundary: A milestone, and Pipal Barns, forming a farmstead at Pipal Cottage.

Adjacent to the site boundary: Pipal Cottage, forming a group with Pipal Barns.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL NON-DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS:

The earthwork and buried remains of two Anglo-Saxon round barrows. Possible Roman 'ridgeway'/buried remains of late pre-historic to Romano-British settlement activity. We also have evidence of historic field patterns and historic routeways.

APPRAISAL (250 words)

THE SITE:

This is broadly the PR6A site allocation in the Cherwell Local Plan Review – Oxford’s Unmet Housing Needs, but excludes agricultural land to the south east where the Policy PR6A requires the land to be kept free of buildings. Development proposals need to be assessed against Policy PR6A and the Development Brief.

This is an outline application with all matters reserved but the submission includes an illustrative masterplan (although the dimensions could vary by +/-10m), a building height parameter plan giving heights from finished ground level (although ground levels could vary by +/-10m), access off Oxford Road, and a landscape strategy. The housing numbers have increased by 110, from 690 to 800. :

Response:

I defer to the Case Officer on whether this is justified but add that any increase should not result in higher building height parameters or be closer to the heritage assets than shown in the Development Brief. We also need to check that the +/-10 to the illustrative masterplan and parameters does not stray to the east, closer to St Frideswide farmhouse or farmstead., how and where is this increase being incorporated and justified?

The position of the local centre on the illustrative masterplan roughly accords with the Development Brief adjacent to Pipal Cottage and the historically associated farmstead. The proposed school of up to 11m (from finished ground level) has moved southward, closer to the Grade II* St Frideswide Farmhouse, in place of what would have been allocated as 2-3 storey housing.

Response:

The Land Use and Access Parameter Plan shows the local centre wrapping around Pipal Cottage but the illustrative masterplan shows the local centre west of the proposed school site, and south of Pipal Cottage – please confirm which is correct. See further comments on heights, land use, setting, and buffers under section ‘Layout, density and building height parameters.’

CONSTRAINTS:

The setting of the Grade II* St Frideswide Farmhouse and associated farm buildings protected by the listing often referred to as ‘curtilage listed.’ Several of the farm buildings are in a poor state which needs to be addressed to prevent further loss of historic fabric. Historic maps show further buildings at St Frideswide and it is not known if these have been completely lost – see further comments on Mitigation below. The Environmental Statement par. 11.4.3.9 states “*St Frideswide’s Farmhouse is deemed to be a heritage receptor of high sensitivity.*”

St Frideswide was a moated site, there is an existing farm pond and culvert which form part of the setting (the pond may have fed the moat). The rectangular orchard lies immediately north of the farmhouse, and historic OS maps show it was partly delineated by a ditch or watercourse from what was Water Eaton Copse. The final bullet point in the Archaeology and Heritage Assets Report (Es Appendix 11.1) Par.5.33 recommends the copse is replanted as part of the enhanced screening proposals, even though this lies outside the site boundary.

There is a long walled garden with separately listed wall to the east of the house. The principal elevation faces south across a large lawn, and the farm buildings on the east frame the view across the lawn and filter the south-westerly views. There is also a view between the two nearest stone farm buildings from the lawn, and southward views beyond a ditch to the farmland beyond, spoiled from the recent floodlighting of the sports facilities. The extent of Cutteslowe DMV south of St Frideswide is not known. The retention and strengthening of the existing vegetation around the farmhouse to screen and filter the development is also recommended in Archaeology and Heritage Assets Report (Es Appendix 11.1) Par.5.33 to “*retain the sense of enclosure and isolation to the listed building’s setting*”– see comments on view and height analysis, enhancement and safeguarding below.

Please note there is also potential for the development to affect the listed building physically through changes in ground levels affecting the water table.

Pipal Barns and Pipal Cottage are non-designated heritage assets on the Oxford Road, and there is also a nearby milestone. Pipal Cottage has been excluded from the application site but will be impacted.

Refer to OCC Archaeology for the response on Archaeological items identified on the HER.

SETTING OF HERITAGE ASSETS:

Historic England's The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) 2017 (GPA3) outlines a 5-step process to assess the potential effects of a proposed development on the setting and significance of a heritage asset:

- Identify which heritage assets and their setting are affected
- Assess whether, how and to what degree these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset
- Assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on significance
- Explore the way to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm
- Make and document the decision and monitor outcomes

Historic England and Arups' Increasing Residential Density in Historic Environments, 2018

<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/increasing-residential-density-in-historic-environments/> This is aimed at historic townscapes, but it includes images of contemporary buildings of similar heights proposed on this site. It recommends creating a positive relationship between the new and old elements of a site, and successfully instilling a strong sense of place.

CONTOUR LINES:

A graded coloured topographical plan of the contour lines, would make reading the undulations on the existing site easier. It would also be useful to include the topography outside the site with regard to 'as existing' and 'as proposed' land levels, setting and views. Further contour maps would be useful for the worst case scenario +2m above the finished ground levels on the illustrative plans submitted, and best case scenario in terms of heights of -2m. The implications of reductions to the existing ground levels could impact on archaeological, and general land changes could affect the sensitive water table around the heritage assets.

LAYOUT, DENSITY AND BUILDING HEIGHT PARAMETERS:



Figure 1 Aerial view of the site as seen from Cutteslowe Park. Note the drop in screening west and north of the orchard.

'X' - Analytical drawings to assess the impact of the development on the Heritage Assets in or adjacent to the site :

Our feedback into the draft Development Brief and scoping comments highlighted the need for drawings to help assess what would be appropriate in terms of the building heights and their positions relative to the heritage assets on and near the site (photomontages/wireframe views from key viewpoints, site sections/sectional elevations).

We subsequently met the Agent to walk around the area to agree general views for the LVIA. The Design and Access Statement's Figure 11 Landscape and Visual Appraisal and ES Figure 10.6 Site Visibility Plan, show the photo viewpoints (blue icons) and the wireline locations (green icons), it also identifies the zone of primary visibility, open views, glimpsed views, and where there are no views. See comments below on photoviewpoints, wireframes, and further views in the Archaeological and Heritage Report.

The Planning Statement Par.4.5. *"The Illustrative Masterplan has been informed by the technical assessments conducted and the feedback that has been received from the pre-application consultation and community engagement. Character and placemaking for Water Eaton have been considered throughout the design process and has informed block sizes and street layouts. The Design and Access Statement that accompanies the outline application identifies the overarching strategy that informed the Illustrative Masterplan included with this planning application."*

Site sections/sectional elevations which include the designated heritage assets and the non designated heritage assets 'as existing,' 'as proposed' and with the 'worst case scenario' should be produced. Instead of agreeing height parameters above finished ground levels, which could vary by +/-2m, heights should be in relation to fixed levels such as the ridges and eaves of St Frideswide, her farmstead, Pipal Cottage, and Pipal Barns, so things become more tangible. This would inform the scale of development that is likely to be acceptable in this part of the site, and what mitigation measures are needed. The proposed 14m +/-2m would be too tall, we therefore need to agree appropriate heights adjacent to Pipal Cottage and Pipal Barns.

Key landmark buildings need high quality design, they do not need to be tall; 18m +/-2m from finished ground level, is not considered appropriate or justified.

Water Eaton Manor and farm have been assessed in the Archaeology and Heritage Assets Report, and whilst views westwards will be impacted, the impact of the development proposals would be unlikely to have significant harm. Nevertheless, analytical drawings should be produced (see 'X' above).

Section 6 of the Development Brief included development principles for a mix of 3-5 storeys towards the Park and Ride, and towards Oxford Road – this is comparable with new development in the local centre in Summertown, a dense Victorian suburb of Oxford. Historic houses in Cherwell tend to have quite low ceiling heights, below the standard 2.6m floor to floor. 2-3 storeys are proposed heights of building to the south and south west of St Frideswide – up to 10m, and up to 11.5m where the ground also rises (+/-2m from finished ground levels, not fixed points such as eaves and ridge heights of the heritage assets). We need a further building height parameter to be introduced to ensure heights are dropped near heritage assets.

The Design and Access Statement Section 3.3.9 states: “None of the predicted adverse effects on designated or non-designated archaeology and heritage assets, either during the construction or operational phases of the Proposed Development, are deemed to be of greater than minor significance and, therefore, are not considered to be ‘significant’ in EIA terms.”

Response:

The D&A Statement Section 3.3.9 is made without a full analysis of the impact. The viewpoints appear to have been agreed between EDP and our Landscape Officer. We do not know if the viewpoints show the extents as shown on the illustrative masterplan, or the worst case scenario of +10m in width. No adjustment is made for higher viewpoints from horseback on the bridleway. We have made observations on the submitted views below.

ES Appendix 10.1 Photoviewpoints red line extent of the site.

EDP 2 – shows the farmstead and roof of St Frideswide/EDP6 – the resolution at St Frideswide needs a further detailed view/EDP7 – the Dutch Barn and corrugated roof of one of the St Frideswide barns can be seen but we need enhanced resolution at St Frideswide – are there closer views available from this angle? Please note the Dutch Barn may have been removed according to Google maps./ESD12 this needs to extend westward to include the area just beyond the orchard/ESD13 shows a view westwards to Pipal Cottage and Pipal Barns/ESD17 from a field on rising ground north of the farmstead of St Frideswide looking to the recent floodlighting /ESD18 states the development would be filtered by existing vegetation.

ES Appendix 10.2 Wirelines:

These show ‘as existing’ and ‘as proposed’ wirelines for EDP 5/EDP 6/EDP14/EDP 16. We do not know if the viewpoints show the levels according to finished ground levels on the illustrative plans, or the worst case scenario of +2m in height, and +10m in width. The eye line will be different for pedestrians and riders.

The wirelines are thick and we cannot see how the layering of trees and hedgerows in the foreground would help to screen the development, so we need photo montages to allow us to better assess the impact of the proposed heights. Analysis should clearly show the layering of the site which the wireframes do not provide, photo montages of key views in block form at this stage would help. It would be illuminating to colour code the wirelines for the respective building heights, e.g. the school and housing which is closest to St Frideswide.

The LVIA recognises that the development will be noticeable until landscape buffers are established, planting of buffers should therefore be front ended.

Observations have been made on the submitted wireframes, and where there is a need for wider or additional views to help allay concerns. We need enhanced resolution showing the impact on St Frideswide Farmhouse and the associated farmstead, including closer views from St Frideswide looking towards the site, or views which include St Frideswide: ESD 2 is not shown and we need enhanced resolution at St Frideswide/ESD6 - we need enhanced resolution at St Frideswide/ESD7 is not shown - we need enhanced resolution at St Frideswide/ESD12 is not shown (extended northwards, as requested above) - we need enhanced resolution at St Frideswide/ESD13 is not shown - we need enhanced resolution at St Frideswide. See comments on views in Archaeology and Heritage Assets Report (Es Appendix 11.1)_below.

The Archaeological and Heritage Report (Es Appendix 11.1) includes further views (Image EDPs):

In addition to views ESD7/12/13, we need further views analysis from the St Frideswide site: from the farmhouse lawn extending westward where housing is proposed, and from St Frideswide Farmhouse looking north/west/south as a panoramic view. This information will help to show if the heights are appropriate, and to assess whether mitigation factors are likely to remove concerns. We are also missing views of St Frideswide within the site 'as existing' and 'as proposed' with the housing proposed to the south which runs close to the farmstead of St Frideswide. Any screening and strengthening of existing buffers between the development site and St Frideswide and Water Eaton Estate should not adversely affect key views or setting. See comments below and Mitigation comments:

Image EDP 2: *"View of the principal southern façade of St Frideswide's Farm House, Grade II* listed building. The associated Grade II listed garden wall lies to the right of frame and this image illustrates the immediate and enclosed garden setting of the farmhouse."*

Response:

There is a gap between the south-west corner of the farm house and the tall trees towards the north-west. If the viewpoint was slightly to the east looking north-north-west, the school site may be visible to the right of the taller tree to the left of the photo.

Image EDP4: *"General view of the dense woodland planting at the main western approach to St Frideswide's Farm House, looking west. This image demonstrates the lack of intervisibility with the site in this direction."*

Response:

This image shows farmland through the trees which means there is intervisibility between St Frideswide and the site. See further CDC photos below.

Image EDP 5: *"General view east toward St Frideswide's Farm from within the site, looking along the main access track. Note the listed farm house and walls are entirely screened by dense woodland (even in winter), with only the wider farmstead buildings visible, of which these are in varying states of disrepair and age."*

Response:

There are other viewpoints from within the site, the screening from the northwest towards St Frideswide is much thinner. See further CDC photos below.

Image EDP6: *"General view south from within St Frideswide's garden. Note outward views in this direction are curtailed by the rising ground, such that there is minimal experience of the wider landscape (including the site)"* and **Image ESD3** *"General view west from within the front (southern) garden of St Frideswide's Farm House. This image further demonstrates the enclosed and well-vegetated nature of the garden, particularly to the west (i.e. in the direction of the greater part of the site)."*

Response:

Image EDP6 does not extend the view to the south-west where the proposed 2-3 housing is proposed beyond the farmstead. Image EDP 3 looks in a south-westerly direction but the view is taken directly under the canopy of a Yew tree which blocks views, this should be replaced by a view nearer to the farmhouse, in front or below the canopy of the Yew.

Image EDP7: *"View north towards St Frideswide's Farm House from within the southern part of the site. Note only the roofline and upper storey is visible, however, the architectural interest of the building cannot be appreciated at such distance."*

Response:

The image shows the deep roof, chimneys, and hooded stone mullioned windows which tells the viewer this is a house of some status when seen in the context of the variety of trees. This is a significant view and we need to see a photo montage of the worst case scenario +2m on the ground levels on the illustrative maps plus 11m for the proposed school, the housing, and any 'key buildings'. This may require a wider view.

Image EDP8: *"View north-east towards St Frideswide's Farm House from within the south-eastern part of the site. Although the later outbuildings are clearly visible, just the roofline and a small part of the St Frideswide's Farm House are visible. However the architectural interest of the building cannot be appreciated at such distance."*

Response:

This shows the deep roof, chimneys, and hooded stone mullioned windows of a farmhouse of some status seen in the context of the barns and variety of trees. This is a significant view and we need to see a photo montage of the worst case scenario +2m on the ground levels on the illustrative maps plus 11m for the proposed school, the housing, and any 'key buildings'. This may require a wider view.

Generally:

The Environmental Statement Par. 10.6.17 *“Residents at St Frideswide’s Farm...would experience a change as a result of the development. This would constitute a high change which would result in major/moderate adverse effects, which is significant in EIA terms. However, as the proposed landscape strategy on the eastern edge of the site matures and screens the development, the level of effect would reduce over time. Photoviewpoint EDP 17 – as requested by the Council - represents an illustrative view from St Frideswide’s Farm, which would be experienced by workers at the farm, who would experience moderate adverse effect as a result of the scheme.”*

Paras 11.4.23 acknowledges that St Frideswide farmhouse, the listed wall and its gardens are well enclosed and sheltered by trees and vegetation and by the natural topography of the land: *“This sheltered setting makes a positive contribution to these assets, as it serves to enclose them well from the wider landscape. Consequently, it is from the immediate private garden surroundings that the heritage significance of the buildings is best ‘experienced,’ there being limited opportunities to appreciate it from the wider landscape.”*

Paras 11.4.24 and 11.4.25 describe the density of the vegetation to the north and west of the farmhouse, including the historic orchard, and *“The southern aspect of the farm house’s garden is more open, and a shallow, curving ditch affords outward views southwards across a pasture field, comprising the purported moat and Deserted Medieval village (DMV) site”, “However, these views are significantly curtailed by the rising topography, nonetheless, the intervisibility with this pasture field makes a positive contribution to the farm house’s heritage significance, as there is a visual link with the site of the deserted medieval settlement, with which the farmstead (or an earlier version of) likely formed a focus.”*

Although the windows are modest, this is reflective of the period in which it was built. The farmhouse would have enjoyed the southerly open views and the garden, the associated daylight but also need to be secure.

The Environmental Statement Paragraphs for St Frideswide are 11.4.14-11.4.39 *“...the Assessment and the site visit established that the site does play a role in the setting or ‘experience’ of the listed buildings in an agricultural landscape when experienced in the approach to the farmstead from the lower-lying landscape to the east, where the eastern extents of the site south of the farm house provide an undeveloped backcloth of fields in these views. Such views to and from the farm house across this agricultural landscape have been experienced since the late Medieval period, notwithstanding the modern outbuildings of the surrounding farm complex and the presence of modern infrastructure and built form in the wider landscape.... the loss of part of the associated agricultural land within the asset’s wider setting (i.e. the land within the site) and the encroachment of built form onto historically agricultural open land within the immediate environs of the listed farm house has the potential to affect the heritage significance of the listed buildings at St Frideswide’s Farm through change to their settings.”, and “The Grade II* St Frideswide’s Farm house is deemed to be a heritage receptor of high sensitivity and the Grade II Garden Wall a heritage receptor of medium sensitivity based on the criteria set out in Table 11.1”*

Response:

See comments on the photoviewpoints and wireframes above, where we consider the status of the farmhouse can be appreciated, and additional comments below.

The screening to the north-north west is not considered to be dense vegetation, and there are also views through the vegetation to the west and south west. We need closer montage views of the farmhouse in its setting to establish if the development will be seen, and to judge the effectiveness of the screening. These drawings should also include regular timescales to show how the proposed buffer planting is projected to mature and mitigate against any harm to the setting, privacy, and tranquillity of the heritage assets:



Listing Photos showing the north elevation of St Frideswide Farmhouse and the separately listed wall looking west towards the farmhouse and the PR6A site beyond.

CDC photos:



Views from inside the farmhouse looking towards the site show there is little screening north of the tall trees shown above the west chimney in the photos above.



The screening of the south-westerly views beside the farmhouse and westward and north-westerly from the orchard and north of the farmhouse would also need strengthening.



View of the barns from the principal frontage of the farmhouse looking south-west with the pond in the foreground. The Dutch Barn looks to have recently been removed which may open up south-westerly views from the farmhouse garden – see the latest Google map: <https://www.google.com/maps/@51.7971618,-1.2658988,301m/data=!3m1!1e3?entry=ttu>



Left image - a further view looking north from the farmstead to the pond, west of the farmhouse, with the gate pier marking the direct access between the farmstead and the farmhouse. The threshing /cart barn on the left and the possible stable/cowshed on the right.

MITIGATION AND SAFEGUARDING:

BUILDING HEIGHTS – IMPACT ON VIEWS AND SETTING OF LISTED BUILDINGS:

The Grade II* listed St Frideswide currently nestles quietly in its rural landscape. The listed garden wall, orchard, associated remains of a moat, the pond, lawn, farmstead, and views to the land that supported the living are all important factors which contribute to the significance of the Heritage Asset. The farm is also away from streetlighting and enjoys the tranquillity of a country setting.

Planning Statement: *Archaeology and Heritage*

7.62. Two designated heritage assets, the Grade II listed St Frideswide's Farmhouse and Grade II listed associated wall, are located immediately east of the site at St Frideswide's Farm. While the development of the site will inevitably result in the loss of farmland historically associated with these listed buildings, mitigation is proposed in the design of the scheme to reduce the impact on the setting of these assets and minimise any resultant harm to the significance of the listed buildings. As a result, the proposed change to the setting of the Grade II* St Frideswide's Farmhouse and Grade II Listed wall is in each case expected to each equate to 'less than substantial harm,' at the low end of this scale of harm*

We do not feel this statement of at the low end of the scale of less than substantial harm has been fully qualified in the submission. There are concerns about the proposed 'up to 11m' height of the school from 'finished ground level' to the north-west of St Frideswide and the proposed heights of building to the south and south west of St Frideswide – up to 10m, and up to 11.5m where the ground also rises. In order to assess the efficacy of the proposed mitigation we need a comprehensive analysis as discussed above. There are concerns over the potential building heights, and we need a better understanding of proposals in terms of relationships, topography, views and setting as described above ('X'), and height parameters should be based on existing fixed eaves levels and ridge heights on the heritage assets to avoid the +/- tolerances described above.

We support the recommendations in the Archaeology and Heritage Assets Report (Es Appendix 11.1)

Par.5.33:

"However, the following considerations and principles could be implemented within the design of future development in order to remove or reduce adverse effects on the significance of the Grade II listed St Frideswide's Farm House:*

- Retention of the eastern edge of the site as open space to allow the continuation of the appreciation of the farmhouse in an open, undeveloped setting;*
- Retention and enhancement of the area of orchard in the north-east corner of the site, in order to preserve and enhance the part of the site that retains a high degree of historic integrity and allows the historical function and setting of the listed building to be appreciated and understood;*
- Retention of the site's south-eastern field as open space, in order to avoid introducing new built form in to the views south from the listed building;*
- Retention and strengthening of extant field boundaries, where they follow historic alignments, in order to retain historic landscape fabric;*
- Retention of the existing trackway to the farmhouse across the site, as well as the bridleway to the north and public footpath to the south-east, which together form either the historical approaches to the farmstead or routes within its wider setting that retain a degree of historic integrity;*
- Retention and strengthening of existing well-vegetated boundaries around the farmhouse curtilage to screen/filter development within the site and retain the sense of enclosure and isolation to the listed building's setting;*
- Restriction of building heights to two storeys where development encroaches closest to the farmhouse, in order to respect its vernacular scale and the appreciation of its role as an historical focal point in the surrounding landscape; and*
- Reinstatement of woodland or orchard to the north of the farmhouse, in the general location of historical copse (Water Eaton Copse)."*

Response:

The OUT application needs to include these recommendations as part of the mitigation for the development and safeguarding of St Frideswide.

The Archaeology and Heritage Assets Report (Es Appendix 11.1) 6.3 confirms: *"the masterplan should seek to retain an appropriate offset to the aforementioned features (garden setting and DMV site), and the listed complex [St Frideswide's Farmhouse], in order to respect its currently isolated and enclosed setting."*

Our Policy Team's comments include: *"The 8-hectare green infrastructure corridor along the eastern edge of the site is expected to perform a green and active travel function but importantly it is also expected to: minimise the visual and landscape impact of the proposal, ensure development responds appropriately to the setting of the listed St Frideswide Farmhouse and wall and Cherwell Valley beyond, and create a clear distinction between the site and the Green Belt."*; and *"It is understood that in siting the primary school and local centre in a more central location, safe and easily accessible to both PR6a and PR6b sites and incorporating the archaeological features also in the central area of the site may constrain the width of the Green Infrastructure corridor in the vicinity of St Frideswide Farm."*

The pathway will be at a higher level than St Frideswide, and we need to retain avoid overlooking of St Frideswide, whilst also protecting views of and from St Frideswide. The proposed 'green infrastructure corridor,' or 'green buffer' which responds to the agricultural setting, between the development and St Frideswide needs strengthening, with the north/south pathway moved to the west to allow denser planting to the east. The footprint of the school, and main north south street will need to ensure the green buffer to St Frideswide is not compromised, especially with the +/- 10m tolerance. We need analytical drawings as outlined ('X').

AMBIENCE ASSOCIATED WITH SETTING AND THE EXPERIENCE OF THE HERITAGE ASSET:

Historic England's GPA3 Setting Assessment Step 2: 'Assess the degree to which these settings and views make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s) or allow significance to be appreciated' includes consideration of 'the contribution made by noises, smells, etc to significance'. The tranquillity of St Frideswide is a sensory part of the heritage value, just as rushing water through a water mill is a valuable sensory experience. The D&A statement Figure 16 Noise Map, is a base level on the site and include St Frideswide at less than 45dB(A).

The nearby development, and in particular the noise from the nearby school playground could have a harmful effect on the current peacefulness at St Frideswide. It may be possible to address sound attenuation with potential issues of unwanted surveillance of the school yard from the pathway. It is assumed the school will be made secure by a barrier. A 'living willow wall' could provide a green physical barrier which would block views from the pathway westward into the school playground. This 'living willow wall' could be sinusoidal rather than linear. To the school side of the 'living willow wall' there could then be a small strip of trees within the playground to allow safe woodland experience (Steeple Aston School uses an adjacent wood as part of their learning experience to give physical exercise and help with science lessons), there are allotments shown on the illustrative masterplan but this does not include an area within the school. The design of a 'living willow wall' incorporates an acoustic core which could soften noise levels at the Grade II* listed St Frideswide Farmhouse.

A change in artificial light levels can also affect sensory perceptions and the setting of St Frideswide, who are already affected by the floodlighting at Oxford Hawkes to the south of the farm. If any floodlighting of the playground is proposed, this should take into account of the setting and views of St Frideswide, as should the general lighting in the development.

ACCESS TO ST FRIDESWIDE AND THE FARMSTEAD – RETENTION OF THE LANE BUT CLOSING THIS TO FARM TRAFFIC ASSOCIATED WITH THE FARMHOUSE AND FARMSTEAD:

There are concerns regarding a new route for farm vehicles and its impact on both the setting of the heritage assets, and the Cutteslowe DMV site. This should not be left as a reserved matter.

SAFEGUARDING ST FRIDESWIDE FROM FLOODING (HERITAGE BENEFIT TO BALANCE AGAINST THE HARM TO THE SETTING AND LOSS OF FARMLAND):

Our initial comments on the PR6A site the development and its drainage needs very careful design. The water table around the moated site of St Frideswide is already sensitive, and we are aware that there may be rare trees in the orchard. Changing the water table on a traditional listed building would be highly damaging to the fabric. The illustrative masterplan shows drainage attenuation basins and ponds are located along points are proposed along the north - south pedestrian/wheelchair/cycle route, parts of which is at a higher level than St Frideswide and the development site.

Planning Statement Par 4.27. *"The Illustrative Masterplan considers and preserves overland flow paths and existing drainage routes through the site where appropriate. This will ensure that there is no flood risk to the development and no increase to flood risk off-site as a result of the development. A sustainable drainage system is proposed to serve the development which follows the drainage hierarchy alongside guidance and*

policy on sustainable drainage design. The introduction of a positive drainage system will result in improvements to the surface water flood risk situation within the site and in the surrounding area, and include features which will provide amenity, water quality and biodiversity benefits for the lifetime of the development, as well as resilience against the future effects of climate change on rainfall intensities.”

Planning Statement Par “7.53. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been prepared by Glanville and is submitted with this application. The FRA outlines the existing situation with regards to flood risk and drainage, and outlines the proposals for flood risk protection and resilience, and surface water drainage disposal. This report concludes that the development site is not at risk of flooding from fluvial sources, and that any other flood risk sources can be adequately mitigated within the development proposals.”

Planning Statement Figure 7 Water Eaton Flood Zones/Figure 8 Water Eaton Surface Water Flood Map and the Design and Access Statement section 3.3.8 includes “Existing flow routes can be maintained and improved where feasible,” and “The surface water drainage strategy will be designed to allow for the future effects of climate change.”

We would like to see a more detailed study around St Frideswide farmhouse for reassurance that the development will not adversely impact on St Frideswide. This would ideally include positive enhancement to outweigh the inevitable harm that the development will bring to the setting and access to the heritage asset.

As with many low lying historic properties, opposing back and front doors were opened to allow water to pass through quickly, ground floors were solid, and good furniture was moved into upper floors at times of flood. Historic England’s website includes webinars and guidance of flooding: <https://historicengland.org.uk/services-skills/training-skills/training/webinars/recordings/flood-resilience-of-traditional-buildings-learning-from-practice/>. We need to protect the listed building from the risk of flooding, please note the pond immediately adjacent to the house and culvert. Figure 8 shows the watercourse running beside St Frideswide in dark blue. We also need to understand how the watercourse stretching e/w is to be treated within the development.

REPAIR OUTBUILDINGS TO ST FRIDESWIDE (HERITAGE BENEFIT TO BALANCE AGAINST THE HARM TO THE SETTING AND LOSS OF FARMLAND):

The Planning Statement Figure 6 Archaeology and Heritage does not specifically mention the barns/ outbuildings at St Frideswide, however they are discussed in Paras 11.4.26—36 of the Archaeological and Heritage Statement (Es Appendix 11.1).

The outbuildings consist of several stone and brick barns which comprise the farmstead to St Frideswide, and includes a stone threshing barn. The lawn to the north of the principal façade of St Frideswide runs up to the stone barns. The dilapidated barns at St Frideswide have been added to Cherwell’s Heritage at Risk register, and there should be a heritage benefit from the development of the farmland land at PR6A. This would also avoid any unsightly or dangerous structures adjacent to the proposed housing and north/south pathway to the east of the site.

BUILDING HEIGHTS – IMPACT ON VIEWS AND SETTING OF NON-DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS ON AND ADJACENT TO THE SITE:

The Design and Access Statement at Section 3.2.9, lists four NDHA’s within the site boundary as recorded by the HER:

- The ploughed remains of two Anglo Saxon round barrows – to be preserved in-situ.
- Possible Roman Ridgeway - The D&A Statement does not state what is proposed.
- Pipal Cottage and associated farm building complex – where possible these buildings will be retained in the masterplan. The development options for the Pipal Barns include their conversion and reuse within the scheme or, subsequent to a suitable record being made, their replacement with new buildings*.

The Planning Statement Figure 6 Archaeology and Heritage identifies Pipal Cottage as a NDHA but it does not specifically mention the stone and timber barns. The barns belong to Christ Church, the farm court is sub-divided into garden for the cottage and the remainder is untended, making access to the barns/open sheds difficult. It is understood there is a pedestrian throughway east to west. Openings to the outside of the courtyard are limited, which is typical of this layout, and adds to the character of the barns. There are open sheds which face southward into the courtyard and towards Pipal Cottage.

Although the D&A Statement suggests the barns could be retained, the submitted illustrative masterplan shows the barns being demolished. We strongly encourage their retention, and consider these could be converted to housing or another compatible use. The farmstead is a recognisable tie to the agricultural land and an integral layer of the site's history which should not be swept away. The barns together with Pipal Cottage form an important and recognisable local landmark on Oxford Road.

The Environmental Statement: Pipal Cottage Par. 10.6.18 *"Due to their location on the boundary of the site, residents would have uninterrupted views of the proposed scheme. Vegetation clearance and road improvement works along Oxford Road would be noticeable. Overall this would result in a high magnitude of change which would result in major/moderate adverse effects. Over time the enhanced Oxford Road Frontage and landscape strategy within the site would mature and embed the scheme into the local area, which would lessen the effects."*

Planning Statement: Archaeology and Heritage:

7.65. *Pipal Cottage and its associated farm outbuildings including the Pipal Barns are non-designated heritage assets and buildings of local interest that lie along the western boundary of the site. The loss of the Pipal Barns through the construction of the scheme will be mitigated by a programme of building recording in advance of demolition, to ensure a permanent record of their heritage interest is produced and made publicly available. Pipal Cottage is located outside the site and will therefore remain in situ, albeit the setting of this building of local interest would be changed by the scheme."*

The issue of building heights needs to be addressed in a revised building heights parameter plan. Pipal Cottage is a modest farmhouse vernacular farmhouse shown on the 1st edition OS Map. The streetscene would be incongruous if building heights were allowed to step up to 14m immediately adjacent to the vernacular Pipal Cottage. Heights need to gradually increase as they move away from the NDHA. The linear stone barns/open sheds are identified as NDHAs, and provide a buffer to Pipal Cottage. These should be retained and integrated into the development, as a layer of the site's historical development. A preapp would be helpful to investigate options to convert these buildings. There are examples of converted outbuildings including the North Wall which may be relevant to the Pipal Barns, in helping the transition from the diminutive Pipal Cottage gradual increase in building height. Church Street and the High Street in Kidlington is a nearby example of a street that has successfully incorporated farmhouses and barns, there are more examples throughout Cherwell District and Oxfordshire.

ACCESS TO PIPAL COTTAGE, PIPAL COTTAGE LIES OUTSIDE OF THE SITE BOUNDARY BUT THE DRIVEWAY LIES INSIDE THE BOUNDARY:

There is a note on the Access Strategy drawing which states: "Existing access to Pipal Cottage – opportunity for access via site to be considered at reserved matters stage." *I defer to the Planning Case Officer on the issue of changing the access to Pipal Cottage which is excluded from the development area.

The proposed segregated cycle path and pavement are proposed to split, with the cycleway to the west of the cottage, crossing the existing discreet driveway off Oxford Road (with restrictive views due to the adjacent hedgerow which forms part of the setting and delineates the agricultural land to the east). The pavement circles around the back of Pipal Barns and Pipal Cottage, isolating them as a small 'traffic island.' This does not feel as if the NDHAs are to be an integral part of the development.

The stone boundary wall and west gable of later extensions to Pipal Cottage prevents the continuation of parallel segregated pedestrian and cycle routes (See Image EDP 16 in the Archaeological and Heritage Report). Is it realistic to assume pedestrians on a direct north/south route will walk around the rear of the barns beside Pipal Cottage? Passive surveillance of pedestrians adds to their sense of security, and passing between the retained hedgerow/trees and bushes fronting Oxford Road shown on the green infrastructure plan could be an area of concern. The longer route around the barns and cottage could be offered in addition to a shared section of pavement and cycle route in front of Pipal Cottage and Pipal Barns, similar to the existing shared use of the footway/cycleway on the west of Oxford Road.

At Present, Pipal Cottage benefits from direct access onto Oxford Road. There are concerns about leaving the Pipal Cottage access as a reserved matter. However, there is an existing field gate to the east of the driveway to Pipal Cottage where cars are parked. This route led north-eastward to Middle Farm, but is now much overgrown. A 1944-50 OS Air photo perhaps illustrates the route best, the existing sinusoidal hedgerow to the south and east of Pipal Cottage lines the south of the routeway:

<https://maps.nls.uk/geo/explore/side-by-side/#zoom=17.4&lat=51.79972&lon=->

[1.27314&layers=9&right=ESRIWorld](https://www.esri.com/arcgis/storymaps/1.27314?layers=9&right=ESRIWorld) This hedge is considered to have some significance in terms of a surviving route marker but under the masterplan does not look to be retained. There is a rectangle south of the hedge on historic maps, this may have been a walled garden to Pipal Cottage as there looks to have been a perimeter path. The garden amenity of the south of Pipal Cottage could be improved if cars did not need to pass directly in front of the porch to the cottage.



Images EDP 15-17 in the Archaeological and Heritage Report.

The comment on Image EDP 15 “Long-distance view of the site to the north-east taken from the bridleway towards Pipal Cottage and farmyard. The buildings are largely obscured by high hedgerows and trees which obscures most of the main windows from the site” Photoviewpoint ESD13 in the ES Appendix 10.1 shows there are views into the site through breaks in the hedgerow which lines the south of the historic lane shown on the aerial photo from 1940-55, and historic OS maps <https://maps.nls.uk/geo/explore/side-by-side/#zoom=15.1&lat=51.79927&lon=-1.26821&layers=9&right=10>



Photoviewpoint EDP 13 – detail, it is not clear if the proposed pedestrian route would remove the historic hedgerow. Historic OS map showing the lane south of Pipal Cottage.

Mitigation of the harm to the NDHAs of Pipal Cottage and Pipal Barns:

The development needs to provide further mitigation to become acceptable adjacent to the NDHAs. The starting point would be to retain the barns and use convert these to a use compatible with the character and form of barns which also respects the privacy of Pipal Cottage. See barn guidance from Historic England and Cherwell. The building height parameters need further refinement to ensure the scale is appropriate adjacent to the farmstead at Pipal Cottage, the landscaping should also be enhanced. The Illustrative Landscape Strategy Plan does not specifically mention Pipal Cottage or Pipal Barns, and the site boundary does not exclude Pipal Cottage.

NEW ACCESS IS PROPOSED SOUTH OF PIPAL COTTAGE, AND NORTH OF THE LANE TO WATER EATON MANOR AS THE MAIN ACCESS TO THE DEVELOPMENT:

The junction looks complicated and it is hoped that a muted colour palette and subtle landscaping details will be prepared to soften the engineered scheme.

ACCESS TO WATER EATON LANE - BRIDLEPATH:

Water Eaton Lodge, marked the access lane to the Water Eaton Estate on the Oxford Road. The pair of lodges were last shown on the 1921 OS Map. There is mention of a lodge, but it is not clear if this relates to this lodge <https://heritagesearch.oxfordshire.gov.uk/images/POX0021786>. See comments on access elsewhere. The historic route could be celebrated in a similar way by incorporating lodges either side of the entrance, not affecting visibility, but adding to the sense of place. Please note that horses are sensitive creatures, if the intention is to provide a crossing which links to the PR6B, is a controlled crossing proposed?

OTHER OBSERVATIONS:

The north/south pedestrian, wheelchair*, all weather cycle route:

As there is a noticeable rise in levels west of St Frideswide, is level wheelchair access feasible without major excavations? I note the EIA and the Archaeology and Heritage Assets Report identified both Water Eaton and St Frideswide as deserted mediaeval villages, and the site has known archaeology, in addition to evidence of ridge and furrow.

Level of harm

<input type="checkbox"/>	No Harm	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Less than Substantial Harm to St Frideswide but still significant requiring mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Substantial Harm
--------------------------	---------	-------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	------------------

Public Benefit (NPPG)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes in terms of housing supply and the potential for archaeological interpretation of the site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No public heritage benefit as proposed – see recommended Mitigation. The development is likely to harm NDHAs.
-------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	---

Comments

Outline planning applications are used to gain an understanding as to whether the nature of a development is acceptable, this can help to ensure viability up front. Specific details known as 'reserved matters' can then be confirmed later. Allowing for planning permission to be granted subject to the condition that reserved matters are approved before development begins.

Please see comments above including the need for further visual studies to assess the impact of development on the designated and non designated heritage assets, and efficacy of the proposed screening.

We need maximum height parameters for building relative to existing eaves and ridge heights at St Frideswide Farmhouse and her farmstead, rather than for maximum 10m height above finished ground levels that can vary by +/-2m. The 2-3 storey housing adjacent to St Frideswide Farmhouse and farmstead need to be further zoned as a 2 storey edge to the east. This is also the case for the proposed school which is up to 11m, above a finished ground level of +/- 2m.

The height parameters around Pipal Cottage and Pipal Barns, require grading to protect the setting and streetscape. 14m is not appropriate adjacent to this non designated heritage asset.

18m high key building height parameters are excessive and well above heights in the Development brief. Good design should make the key buildings stand out, rather than additional height.

We have also included comments on the changes to existing access points along the Oxford Road where these relate to designated and non designated heritage assets.

We would also hope to see heritage benefit to outweigh the harm of the loss of the agricultural setting to the west of St Frideswide. This could be in the form of repairs to the farmstead which is in close proximity to the proposed 2-3 storey housing proposed in the south of the site, and improving the drainage to reduce flash floods and safeguard St Frideswide, being mindful of Historic England's guidance.

There is a demolition plan proposed for the barns north and east of Pipal Cottage, and the illustrative masterplan, show these replaced with several small footprints indicative of dwellings. We do not support the demolition of Pipal Barns.

Any access changes relating to St Frideswide, Water Eaton Manor, Middle Farm, and Pipal Cottage should not be reserved matters due to the potential impact on the setting of the heritage assets.

We defer to OCC Archaeology on archaeology.

There is a crossover with our Ecology colleagues for the conversion of barns and farm buildings in terms of materials and details.

Design:

We acknowledge that the site has been allocated to help meet Oxford’s outstanding housing need. The development needs to be dense to address this, whilst also responding sensitively to the heritage assets and agricultural setting, and the character of Oxford, as this is in effect a northward extension of the city.

There are examples of terraced housing in Oxford, from the Classical proportions in Parktown of 3 storeys, 4 storeys with semi basement in Keble Road, tall Victorian houses of 2-3 storeys above a basement storey or with attic accommodation, set back behind walls and railings, and screened with mature trees are typical on parts of Banbury Road and Woodstock Road. We also see modest terraces with vernacular building heights. There are examples of modern development at the Oxford Colleges both for student housing and teaching facilities. There is also modern development in the local centre on the Banbury Road of 4 storeys with a 5th storey set back, and 4 storey buildings at St Anne’s and Wolfson College for example, all within existing built up areas. Whilst we don’t expect slavish copies of our historic building stock, we can learn from the storey heights of vernacular cottages and buildings which may have had a higher status, reflected in taller ceilings. Studying the proportions of solid wall to void, the proportion and rhythm of elevations, and the hierarchy of our existing townscape will help to arrive at what might be suitable for the PR6A site in tandem with the recommendations in the Development Brief. The traditional materials palette is oolitic limestone, the suburbs are predominantly brick, and there is also some render. North Oxford Victorian Suburb of Summertown,

(https://www.oxford.gov.uk/downloads/file/4120/north_oxford_conservation_area_appraisal).

Allotments: There are pleasant modern allotment precedents which are well-designed, allotment rules will be key to maintaining a neat and well designed framework in which to plant.

Recommendation

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No objections to some aspects pending further visual analysis.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Objections to the demolition of Pipal Barns/ objections to some aspects pending further visual analysis.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Recommend preapp
-------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	------------------

Suggested Conditions –

Not applicable at present.

Conservation Officer: Joyce Christie

Date: 02.10.2023