

Dear Sir/Madam,

On behalf of Little Rissington Parish Council I would like to request a submission of an email comment relating to Planning Application 20/02390/FUL Full application for a change of use to land, keeping/grazing horses and erection of a stables complex at Church Farm Little Rissington, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, which is to be considered at the Planning and Licencing Committee on 9th December 2020.

The comment the Parish Council would like to submit is as follows;

'Having further discussed Planning Application **20/02390/FUL Change of use of land to keeping/grazing of horses and erection of a stable complex at Church Farm** at the Parish Council Meeting on 16th November 2020 Little Rissington Parish Council see no change in circumstances relating to this application and uphold their previously submitted decision. To reiterate the response remains:

Cllrs discussed the need for eight stables for personal use, particularly as existing nearby stables have been converted to accommodation as they were no longer required as stables. The potential for these to become livery stables is high. This raises the issue of increased traffic from cars, horseboxes, delivery vehicles with animal supplies in addition to the farm traffic already using the access lane. Cllrs also discussed the apparent inadequate parking facilities which appears to be directly in front of the stable's access and raised these questions. Where would people park when they exercise their horses? Is there room for vehicles and horses in the stable yard?

The Parish Council objects to this application on grounds of highways access and parking. The lane to the proposed site is already oversubscribed with farm and domestic traffic. With further developments already underway way on this very narrow track it is unsustainable. It is not possible to pass other vehicles without using private resident's driveways as passing places. A passing place would be required outside the entrance to allow vehicles space to pass. The potential increase of traffic from cars, horse boxes and horse care delivery vehicles would make this a dangerous place for drivers and pedestrians alike. The added issue of these larger and longer vehicles trying to turn into the lane from the main road are a serious concern on a severe bend with a narrow access/exit. Parish Council would like to also object to the inadequate parking to serve these eight stables. The area for parking is directly in front of the stables, presumably making it a very difficult process to take a horse in and out.

Thank you for considering this comment.'

With kind regards

Suzanne Davidson
Clerk to Little Rissington Parish Council

Planning Committee - 9th December 2020

Applicant Statement - 20/02994/FUL 1 The Old Manor

Since moving to The Old Manor in 2015, our family has grown and so too has our connection to the community and building we live in. Around a year ago, we started to explore the possibility of extending our home to create some valuable additional ground floor space as well as a further bedroom.

We are fully aware of our role as custodians of this building and the guarding of its historical importance has been at the forefront of our minds throughout this process. As our Historic Building Consultant has identified, throughout its lifetime, owners of this building have made numerous additions to the original, with varying degrees of sensitivity and quality. Whilst we are now seeking to continue this custom of adaptation, it has been of vital importance to us from the outset that we do this in a way which is worthy of the building, and not just for the sake of more space as others have seemingly done in the past. Working closely with our Architect, we have strived to create a high quality scheme which does justice to the existing building ensuring it enhances its architectural merit, rather than detracts from it.

Keen to minimise the impact of any proposal on our immediate neighbours, we have adapted the design to ensure that we have a scheme which they are supportive of - evidenced by the fact that several have contacted the Council in writing. We have not had any objections.

We were pleased that the Conservation Officer found the contemporary and architecturally interesting nature of our proposal broadly acceptable, however we would seek to address some of the concerns raised. We have endeavoured to keep the ridge height to an absolute minimum by reducing both floor and ceiling heights significantly. You will note that the proposed ridge height is only nominally higher than that of our neighbour's extension to the same elevation. Furthermore, at no point is the depth of the proposal any greater either.

Putting the majority of the structure to the left hand end of the South Westerly elevation ensures that this is on the part of the building with least historical merit. By way of balancing any impact, we are reducing the mass and height of the existing kitchen extension, thereby exposing more of the historic stone which is currently obscured.

Whilst the two storey element of the proposal will inevitably cover up some of the existing exterior stone wall, we intend to leave this exposed internally therefore creating a very low level of permanence. The only change to the existing building is to enlarge the opening at first floor which as our Heritage Building Consultant notes, was likely a doorway previously anyway.

I am Richard Morriss, a historic buildings consultant professionally involved in heritage and planning for over 35 years; there is a potted CV in my heritage impact assessment.

All buildings change; change is inevitable as aspirations change. Conservation is the careful management of change, relying on understanding what makes a building significant, and how change will or won't impact on that significance.

From the conservation advisor's comments, there seems to be no dispute with our interpretation of the listed building's development and we certainly agree on two key points raised:

Firstly, *'The demolition of the current, modern kitchen extension is uncontentious, and the principle of a replacement structure is reasonable, subject to scale and design'*.

Secondly, *'The proposed extension is, in and of itself, an interesting and not unattractive contemporary design that would form a visually striking structure'*.

Where we disagree is on the impact of the proposals on the listed building, in terms of its plan form and material palette.

Regarding the 'L-shaped' plan, that is only appreciated in the key front elevation. It is difficult to see from the rear, given the sub-division of the grounds and recent extensions.

The original 'foot' of the 'L' was short but then more than doubled in length by the utilitarian extension that makes up most of No.1; originally single storey and then raised, this is not of the same architectural quality as the original building and has been much altered. The elevation hidden by the proposed extension is of no great architectural quality.

The fact that the much longer tall single-storey extension to the east butts against a gable end is, in my view, an argument in favour of the location of the proposed extension rather than against it. Gables were usually intended to be fully exposed compositions, not obscured by accretions and this a more common addition at right-angles.

As regards the suggested use of stone for any proposed extension, I would say two things. Firstly, using stone does not mean that original character is respected; of the extensions on this side one is of rubblestone that is too crude and the other of crisp ashlar contrasting with the original's historic patina.

The material palette of the proposed extension is better suited to its contemporary design and means that it does not pretend to be older than it is; it is thus honest. As agreed by the conservation advisor: *'Using a more contemporary design approach, albeit sensitively and subtly handled, is again reasonable in principle'*.

The conservation of a heritage asset is recognised as a 'public benefit' in the NPPF. These proposals are well-designed and proportionate and will preserve and enhance the significance of the building and ensure its long-term future.