

<b>Application number(s):</b>	23/02175/LB and 23/02174/F
<b>Application site:</b>	Rosemary Cottage, Somerton Road, North Aston, OX25 6HX
<b>Proposal:</b>	Replacement windows to annexe at Rosemary Cottage; door with glass side panels to be fitted with a new aluminium floor rail, added bottom rail/false bottom rail and security lock/handle.

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

### Policies

#### **Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 (2015)**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Policy ESD15</b> 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
-------------------------------------	---

#### **Cherwell Local Plan 1996 Saved Policies**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>C18</b> 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"/>	<b>C23</b> Presumption in favour of retaining positive features within a Conservation Area.
-------------------------------------	---

<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>C28</b> 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"/>	<b>Paragraph 199.</b> 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.
-------------------------------------	--

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Paragraph 200.</b> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
-------------------------------------	--

**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.

**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.

**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

#### 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 (50 words)

Rosemary Cottage is a grade II listed building situated within the North Aston Conservation Area, for which there is a detailed conservation area character appraisal.

Rosemary Cottage was listed in 1988 and its list description is as follows:

‘Probably C17. Limestone rubble with wooden lintels; concrete plain-tile roof with rebuilt brick stacks. 3-unit plan. 2 storeys. Irregular 4-window front has varied casements, some renewed, plus the entrance between bays one and 2; some openings have chamfered lintels. Steep-pitched roof has stacks to both gables plus a ridge stack aligned with the entrance. Interior not inspected.’

The list description makes reference to some of the windows having been renewed and this has also been referred to within the application, possibly when the building was converted in the 1980s.

#### Appraisal (250 words)

---

The principle of replacing the modern rotten joinery is considered acceptable as they are not of any historic or architectural significance. However, there is currently insufficient information contained within the application to assess the impact of the proposal upon the significance of the heritage assets.

For instance, we require scaled full joinery details which show the existing and proposed joinery, including sections through horizontally and vertically, showing the glazing and glazing bars, cills and how the joinery would sit within the wall. It is noted that elevations have been provided, although these are of the proposed windows and doors and not the existing, so it is not possible to compare the details. Photos could also help.

The details submitted do not give the level of detail required to have a full understanding about what is proposed. It is important to have these full details to ensure that the proposed replacement joinery is an acceptable replacement for the existing rotten windows and doors. It may be that a joiner who is experienced with historic windows and doors would need to provide the scaled drawings.

It is noted that double glazing is proposed, yet it would appear that the existing joinery is single glazed. There would therefore be a change to the appearance. For instance, potentially stuck on/applied glazing bars, spacers, thicker frames, trickle vents, timber fillets, all of which are non-traditional details. Double glazing is usually only ever acceptable when there is a visual benefit to the listed building, for instance an improvement in design/material, and this would not normally be standard double glazing but a slim-lite style double glazing, which can allow for more slender frames and integrated/true, puttied glazing bars. Such benefit to the listed building is not apparent within the application submission.

Any roof lights should have a traditional appearance and be flush fitting, such as a conservation style roof light. The proposal does not appear to be traditionally designed.

**Level of harm**

No Harm

Less than Substantial Harm

Substantial Harm

**Public Benefit (NPPG)**

Yes

No

**Comments**

The public benefits are for the case officer to balance in-line with the NPPF.

**Recommendation**

No objections

Objections

Engage in preapp

**Suggested Conditions**

N/A

**Conservation Officer:** L. Crouch

**Date:** 12<sup>th</sup> September 2023