

From: Jennifer Ballinger

Sent: 08 September 2015 14:15

To: Rebekah Morgan

Subject: Chancel Cottage, Fir Lane Steeple Aston - 15/01328/LB and 15/01327/F

Dear Rebekah

Thank you for passing these applications to me for comment. I previously dealt with applications 14/01552/F and 14/01601/LB which were refused due to their detrimental impact on the special interest of the listed building and character and appearance of the conservation area and setting of the neighbouring grade II* listed building.

The accumulative impact of the proposed alterations were considered to cause substantial harm to the listed building and less than substantial harm to the conservation area and setting of the grade II* listed building.

The new applications have some minor modifications including the alteration of the number and type of roof lights and the change in material from timber boarding to stone for the kitchen extension. These proposed alterations are considered a slight improvement on the previous scheme, but do not fully address the reasons for refusal on the previous application.

The accumulative impact of the proposed alterations are considered to cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building and the public benefits are not considered to outweigh this harm.

The Addendum to the Heritage Statement has been read and I have the following comments to make

- In addition to Policy changes at national level the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 was adopted on 20th July 2015 and the heritage policy is now ESD15: The Character of the Built and Natural Environment. Policy C18 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 remains as a saved policy.
- The designation of Chancel Cottage as a grade II listed building (rather than grade I or II*) does not mean that its plan form is not of significance.

- The harm caused by the opening of a door at first floor level relates to the loss of fabric and the change in function by bringing a former outbuilding / stable into full domestic use. In an acceptable scheme the harm caused could potentially be outweighed by the public benefit of bringing this section of the building into use. This is not an acceptable scheme and therefore there is no public benefit to outweigh the harm.
- The change in material from timber to stone on the proposed kitchen extension is considered to be positive, but the form, scale and massing are still considered to be detrimental to significance of the listed building. The proposal to create an 'additive' nature to the extension is not considered to address this. It is unclear how this alteration to the form is considered to be *'characteristic of how the house (and many other historic houses) has evolved, changing to meet the needs of its occupants and represents the physical evidence of its history'*. The proposed extension is in a modern rather than traditional form and is intended to be built in one construction phase and is not an evolving traditionally constructed building.

The reasons for refusal on the previous applications have not been overcome and it is recommended that these applications should also be refused. The applicants have previously been advised that a modest extension of more traditional proportions may be considered acceptable and justifiable, subject to details.

Regards

Jenny Ballinger