



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 10 November 2020

by S Edwards MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 December 2020

Appeal A Ref: APP/D3125/W/20/3258887

26 Newland Street, Eynsham OX29 4JZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Nicholas Relph against the decision of West Oxfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00669/HHD, dated 24 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey ground floor extension to rear of property.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/D3125/Y/20/3256598

26 Newland Street, Eynsham OX29 4JZ

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Nicholas Relph against the decision of West Oxfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00670/LBC, dated 24 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 May 2020.
 - The works proposed are erection of single storey ground floor extension to rear of property.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The proposal relates to a listed building located within a conservation area, and I shall therefore have special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
4. Both appeals relate to the same site, and I shall consider the Council's decisions to refuse planning permission and listed building consent in a single document, given their similarities, and in the interests of brevity.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposed development and works would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building known as Cherwell Lodge, 26 Newland Street and the character or appearance of the Eynsham Conservation Area, as well as the settings of nearby listed properties.

Reasons

6. The appeal site comprises a two-storey dwellinghouse which, according to the listing description, was constructed circa 1830. Despite some alterations over time, including a large rear extension built around 2002, the property retains much of its Georgian design and detailing, which is characterised by its elegant proportions and a very symmetrical front elevation, with a 3-range window, plain raised architrave to 5-panelled door and prominent gabled chimney stacks.
7. The significance of no 26 Newland Street derives primarily from its restrained yet refined architectural detailing. The special interest of this Grade II listed building includes the rear of the property, which is characterised by its more functional appearance, and shows how the property has evolved over time, notably having regard to the service range constructed alongside the site's western boundary.
8. The appellant's dwelling, together with the Grade II listed properties sited in close proximity, notably at nos 18-20 and nos 22-24 Newland Street, give this historic village a unified character. In that regard, the listing description of the appeal property notes the group value which these properties hold collectively as a well preserved example of an attractive Georgian townscape. As such, they make an important positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Eynsham Conservation Area. From my observations, the special interest of this designated heritage asset primarily focuses on the rich collection of historic buildings characterised by a broadly consistent palette of materials, that make up the core of the village.
9. As noted above, the appeal property has been previously subject to a number of alterations. These include a large two-storey rear extension which, due to its modern approach and materials used, distinctly contrasts with the historic character of the listed building. By concealing its former rear façade, the two-storey addition has somewhat compromised the original form and appearance of the listed property.
10. The appeal scheme would virtually span the entire width of the property and would involve flat and monopitched roof elements. Those would connect the new addition to the single and two-storey historic components of the property and the more recent two-storey extension. The resulting development would appear as a contrived, awkward and overly complicated addition which, by reason of its detailed design and size, would fail to reflect the character and appearance of the listed property, whilst significantly altering its historic plan form.
11. The proposed development and works include large glazed elements, which would allow views into the masonry and windows of the historic rear wing. However, this would only marginally mitigate the overall screening effect of the proposed extension, notably because of its solid roof form and the inevitable paraphernalia which would be associated with the property's residential use.
12. Given the above, the proposed development and works would thus erode further the appreciation and understanding of this designated heritage asset, to the detriment of its significance. As the listed building makes an important positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Eynsham

Conservation Area, it follows that the proposal would also cause harm to this designated heritage asset.

13. The appeal scheme would not be visible within the public realm, but it would nevertheless be noticeable from neighbouring properties. Furthermore, listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest irrespective of whether or not public views of the property can be gained. I therefore afford very limited weight to this consideration.
14. The proposed extension would cause less than substantial harm to the special interest of the Grade II listed building and the Eynsham Conservation Area, to which I ascribe considerable importance and weight. In such circumstances, paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that the identified harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
15. The appellant accepts that the oak which forms part of the two-storey rear extension has not weathered well and proposes to apply a suitable finish or stain. Although this may improve the overall appearance of the rear elevation, this very modest public benefit would not outweigh the identified harm. The proposed development and works would provide additional living accommodation for existing occupiers, but these would constitute private benefits. Any alterations would need to be undertaken in a manner which does not prejudice the significance of this Grade II listed building.
16. For the foregoing reasons, the appeal scheme would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building and the character and appearance of the Eynsham Conservation Area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies OS4, EH9, EH10, EH11 and EH12 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 (LP), Policy ENP2 of the Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2031, the West Oxfordshire Design Guide 2016 and section 16 of the Framework. These notably seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high quality and conserve or enhance buildings and features of historic, architectural and environmental significance. For the purposes of this appeal, I however find no conflict with LP Policy OS2, which sets out the Council's spatial strategy.
17. As noted above, there are a number of listed buildings located within proximity to the appeal site. The Council has raised concerns regarding the effect of the proposed development and works on the setting of no 24 Newland Street in particular. However, by reason of its single storey scale and siting away from the boundary shared with this neighbouring property, I am satisfied that the proposed development would preserve the settings of no 24 Newland Street and other nearby Grade II listed buildings.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons detailed above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that both appeals should be dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR