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1. Introduction and Planning Policy Context

1.1 This document is the first appraisal and review of the Hampton Poyle Conservation Area, which was first designated in May 1991 (see Figure 1).

1.2 Hampton Poyle is a small agricultural settlement which grew up near a strategic crossing over the River Cherwell. Kidlington lies across the river to the south as does Oxford, to the north-west lies Hampton Gay, to the north Bletchingdon, to the north-east lies Bicester and Weston on the Green, to the south-east Islip.

The original manor has been lost along with the mills that took advantage of the river. The conservation area centres on the farms which loosely line Church Lane which branches off the main route through the village between the Oxford to Bicester highway and Bletchingdon.

1.3 Conservation area status is awarded to places that are considered to be of ‘special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance’.

1.4 The first conservation areas were designated under the Civic Amenities Act of 1967 and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (Section 69) placed a duty upon local planning authorities to identify areas of special architectural or historic interest through an appraisal process. Local planning authorities also have a duty under the Act to consider boundary revisions to their conservation areas ‘from time to time’.

1.5 Protection for the built heritage is conferred under primary legislation. This document should be read in conjunction with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), retained saved policies from the Adopted Cherwell Local Plan 1996, the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 Adopted 20 July 2015, and the Design and Conservation Strategy 2012-2015 (currently under review). Policies are listed in Appendix 1 of this appraisal.

1.6 Since 1967 almost 10,000 Conservation Areas have been designated in England, including 60 in Cherwell District.

1.7 The intention of designating a conservation area is not to prevent change or development but to try to manage change in order to protect or enhance the special character and appearance of an area. Change can be both positive and negative.

1.8 In 2015, Historic England identified over 6% of conservation areas as being at risk from negative change through inappropriate development, neglect or deliberate damage. Inappropriate highway treatment can have a major effect on a conservation area as can the loss of fabric which makes a positive contribution to the street scene.

‘In the countryside, picturesque villages and landscapes continue to be affected by changes in farming practices. These can cause buildings and other structures to be neglected, and conservation areas to become at risk.’


1.9 The preservation and enhancement of the conservation area will be driven by the positive management of the village by homeowners, landowners, the parish council and neighbouring parish councils, the district council, the county council highways department and service providers.

1.10 The setting of the Hampton Poyle Conservation Area benefits from being located in the Oxford Green Belt which has planning policies in place to protect the setting and views of Oxford which in turn should protect the setting of villages which
lie within or adjacent to the greenbelt. In addition, there are local policies in the Cherwell District Council Local Plan which supplement national planning guidance.

1.11 The purpose of this Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan is:

• to provide a clear definition of the area’s special architectural and/or historic interest;

• to identify ways in which the unique characteristics can be preserved and enhanced;

• to strengthen justification for designation of the conservation area;

• to review the boundary of the conservation area;

• to create a clear context for future development in accordance with conservation area policies in the Local Plan;

• and to provide a vehicle for engagement and awareness raising.

1.12 This assessment and management plan aims to identify the significant attributes of the Hampton Poyle Conservation Area and promote and support developments that help to preserve and/or enhance the character of Hampton Poyle Conservation Area. It is not an attempt to stifle change. There is a duty to conserve the historic environment for future generations and this needs to be given due consideration when assessing the demands for progress and growth in the District. This document examines the reasons for designation, and defines the qualities that make up its special interest, character and appearance. The omission of any reference to a particular building, feature or space should not be taken to imply that it is of no interest.

1.13 The significant heritage assets in Hampton Poyle are shown in Figure 1; and include the current Designated Heritage Assets (listed buildings), the designated conservation area boundary for the village and the archaeological constraint area. The location of trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders are shown in Figure 126.

1.14 The council has a duty under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to identify locally significant historic buildings, structures, objects or places that have historical importance or contribute to the built heritage, character or appearance of the area. Buildings and structures which make a positive contribution to the conservation area are identified in Appendix 3 and will be considered in line with the council’s criteria for inclusion on the district-wide 'Register of Local Heritage Assets' (Non-Designated Heritage Assets).

1.15 The draft appraisal was subject to public consultation between 31 March and 13 May 2016 – See appendix 5.
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Figure 2. 2014/15 Aerial photograph
2. Location

2.1 The village of Hampton Poyle lies approximately 9.5km (6 miles) north of Oxford and about 1.6km (1 mile) north-east of Kidlington’s historic core. The small parish lies on the east of the River Cherwell which forms the boundary between the parishes. The A34 lies to the south east, and is the main route which links the M40 with the A40, A44 and A420. The hamlet of Hampton Poyle is reached from the north from the Bletchingdon Road and from the south via the Oxford Road that branches northwards from the link road between Gosford and the A34.

There is a bus service that runs to Oxford. The Water Eaton Park and Ride and the Oxford Parkway Station are only 3 miles to the south giving access to London Marylebone, Bicester and Oxford. (See Figure 3).

2.2 The spine of the Hampton Poyle Conservation Area is Church Lane, which is crossed just east of the churchyard by a historic routeway running north/south between Kidlington and Bletchingdon. The south of the parish is crossed by the Oxford-Bicester highway.

2.3 Church Lane, Bletchingdon Road and Oxford Road are the main vehicular routes through the conservation area, other routes having been either historically down-graded (and are now public rights of way) or terminated by the Oxford Canal or the railway, both of which run north-south along the Cherwell Valley. The lane is now laid in tarmac as far as the entrance to Manor Farm but the road links with a number of historic footpaths to Kidlington, Bletchingdon and Hampton Gay, the latter is fondly called ‘Godley’s Track’ after AD Godley, an Oxford Don. The route from Kidlington to Wight Bridge over the River Cherwell is also known as the Causeway.

2.4 The 1991 conservation area boundary included much of the historic development within the settlement but excluded housing along the Bletchingdon and Oxford Roads that was built after 1950. The new conservation area boundary also includes buildings with some historical interest, such as The Bell and the nearby hovel/village wash house which are discussed in Sections 9 and 10 of this appraisal.
Figure 3. Current OS map showing location of Hampton Poyle
3. Geology and Topography

3.1 At Hampton Poyle the River Cherwell runs through a wide, flat flood-plain of its lower course. The majority of the parish is floored by fine alluvium whereas the majority of villages along the Cherwell sit on gravel. Hampton Poyle follows a rough east-west fault line through the Great Oolite Group Cornbras.

3.1.1 The Cobham Report from 1995 describes the geology at Hampton Poyle as follows: ‘Oxford Clay underlies the area but the surface geology is composed of terrace gravels and alluvial deposits associated with both rivers. The area is level and low-lying, with heavy clay soils and substantial local gravel deposits. The alignment of the River Cherwell curves south-eastwards, following a fault line which is associated with outcropping Cornbrash limestone, before joining the River Ray near Islip where it turns southwards...Arable farming has been facilitated by improvements in drainage in this area and the large, flat fields are mostly under cultivation for cereals. Fields are surrounded by hedgerows and trees, with a high proportion of willow and regenerating elm.’

3.1.2 The land varies in height above sea-level from 61 metres above Ordnance datum (AOD) near Gosford Bridge in the south to 72 metres AOD in the north, where the alluvium gives way to Oxford Clay. The village of Hampton Poyle is located at 62m AOD.

Figure 4. Geology of the Hampton Poyle area
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Figure 5. Topographical map
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Figure 6. 2016 Flood Risk Map for Hampton Poyle
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3.1.3 In 1948–9 extensive dredging of the Cherwell greatly reduced the danger of flooding. The lowest parts of the parish remain susceptible to occasional flooding and the Environment Agency’s map categorises the flood risk zones within the conservation area. Hampton Poyle is currently within Flood Zone 3 with some parts classed as Flood Zone 2 including St Mary’s Church, see Figure 6.

**Figure 7.** 2016 The small island in the river or ‘eyot’ to the south of Manor Farm is called ‘The Ham’, the smaller island has been referred to as ‘Sams Island’

area which runs from the former mill leat north of ‘the Ham’ (the small eye-shaped island south of Manor Farm – see Figure 7) eastwards to meet the Bletchingdon Road to the north east of Model Farm.

3.2.3 The fields are all grazed by sheep and horses. The low lying pastoral landscape has an open structure with willow lined watercourses and thick hedges which restrict longer views, leaving only glimpsed views through gates or at river crossings. The hedgerows are locally significant, as well as a characteristic feature of the area. Many of the hedgerows are unmanaged or show signs of past management which has grown out.

3.2.4 Hampton Poyle Conservation Area overlaps with an archaeological constraint area which includes part of the shrunken medieval village and there are other archaeological constraint areas within the parish. These are discussed further in Section 4 of this appraisal.

3.2 Variations in landscape character
The village of Hampton Poyle is located within the Lower Cherwell Floodplain Landscape Character Area as described and illustrated by Cobham Resource Consultants, 1995.

3.2.1 The River Cherwell winds through a broad floodplain before joining the River Thames in Oxford. The Lower Cherwell Floodplain is characterised by ‘fringe landscapes associated with Kidlington’ and forms the district boundary.

3.2.2 Hampton Poyle is characterised by small scale open farmland. This is a low-lying pastoral landscape with willow lined watercourses. The village is surrounded by well drained fields and Church Lane itself has a drainage ditch to the south and a series of ponds. There is a deep boundary ditch to the north of the conservation
4. Archaeology

Figure 8. Historical context and archaeological sites
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4. Archaeology

4.1 The village of Hampton Poyle grew up near river crossings and the river provided the village with much of its wealth through water mills, fishing, gravel and sand extraction whilst providing lush grass for fattening stock and milk production. Figure 8 shows Hampton Poyle in the context of adjacent archaeological constraint areas, scheduled monuments and ancient routeways.

4.2 The early history of Hampton Poyle can be patched together from the archaeological finds from the area. The quality of the farm land clearly encouraged early occupation and the presence of undated enclosures testify to early habitation. A possible (recorded by Rileys’ aerial photographs in 1996 but unverified) barrow cemetery is noted in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) 200m north-east of the River Cherwell which was reported as a complex of rectangular and sub-rectangular enclosures with associated linear features. A linear trackway to the west side of Oxford Road is recorded which may be related. The Archaeological Constraint Area is entitled ‘barrow cemetery, undated settlement and linear trackway’.

4.3 A Bronze Age socketed axe head was found near Hampton Poyle and an Iron Age bone weaving comb was found to the south of the junction of the Oxford to Bicester Highway with the road to Islip. On the footpath between Kidlington and Hampton Poyle, to the north-east of Kidlington there is a Roman Villa site, including a well, which is a Scheduled Monument and a Roman find along with an eighteenth century brooch has also been found nearby. An Anglo Saxon Viking style spearhead was uncovered in the River Cherwell by Wight Bridge in 1949 following extensive dredging of the river.

Figure 9. Map of Archaeological sites in and around Hampton Poyle
4.4 St Mary’s Church is the oldest standing building in Hampton Poyle. During a watching brief by the Oxford Archaeological Unit for a new drainage channel, foundations relating to St Mary’s were revealed for a north aisle and north side to the chancel with a porch and chapel on the south side of the church.

Figure 10. Wight Bridge over the Cherwell between Hampton Poyle and Kidlington where the spearhead was found (Reference No 2 on Figure 9)

4.5 A large proportion of Hampton Poyle lies in an Archaeological Constraint Area ‘Hampton Poyle historic core including shrunken medieval village, medieval fishponds and moat’. The site of the Old Manor House and its stables, now known as the Moat House, is recorded as having a moat in the seventeenth century. Medieval earthworks associated with the shrunken medieval village have been recorded 150m to the west of the Moat House. Medieval features consisting of ditches and domestic pits were recorded during a watching brief at Church Farm. The Victoria County History states Hampton Poyle ‘…never seems to have been large and may have decreased in size in the late Middle Ages.’ M Aston wrote an unpublished document 'Field notes/Field visit in 1972; he suggested that to the north and north east of the church the close bounded ditch contains some platforms and holloways and to the south and south-east of the church there is an irregular area that probably contains house sites. Further evidence was found during a watching brief at Church Lane which found two ditches, one from the medieval periods and the second undated. Early-Medieval finds in the ditch suggesting the village declined between the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

4.6 There is evidence of gravel and sand extraction in the fields north of the river and other undulations which suggest fish ponds and a shrunken village. The Sites and Monuments Records (SMR) states ‘As late as 1949 there were traces in the manor meadow of what were apparently the fishponds of the medieval manor house’ which were obliterated by dredging the river.

4.7 Archaeological evidence from a range of historic periods has been found in the vicinity of the village. There are limited records for a number of inhumations that were discovered during the nineteenth century in the vicinity of Hampton Poyle village. Sadly details of the locations were not recorded and the skeletons and some of the artefacts lost.

Figure 11. Sketch showing the probable maximum extent of the medieval village of Hampton Poyle from drawing held in the church files.
Figure 12. Extract from the 1875-87 OS map

Figure 13. Photograph of three hollows which may correspond to the three rectangular forms in Figure 12 above.

Figure 14. Location of Grist Mill at OS map
Ref SP 49731539

Figure 15. The Cher by the Ham, Hampton Poyle shows a remnant of the Mill under the timber footbridge that links the Ham with Manor Farm to the north.

Copyright: Mrs Parkes' Scrapbook of the Village
5. History and Development

History

5.1 The following pages give a brief overview of the history and development of the settlement. It is not intended to be a definitive history. The Victoria County History provides an excellent reference for the history of the village and much of what follows is taken from this and Mrs Parkes’ Scrapbook for the village. Other key sources can be found in the bibliography.

It is hoped that the Millennium Book for the village will be available to refer to in the next review of the conservation area.

Early History

5.2 Hampton Poyle has Saxon origins and takes its name from the old English ‘hamtun’, meaning ‘village’ and the Poyle was suffixed when William de la Poyle became lord in 1267. The name of the settlement has taken a few forms over time including Hantone, Hantome, Hamtona, Hamton and Hanton’ Stephani after its twelfth century lord and his descendants, Philipeshamton, Philippeshamton and Philippeshamtone. It is also sometimes referred to as Great Hampton to distinguish it from its smaller neighbour, Hampton Gay.

5.3 The settlement established itself at a strategic crossing of the River Cherwell and water plays a significant role in the economic development of the village. References to the bridge include Hamptone ad Pontem, Hampton ad Pontem, Hampton atte Brigge or justa pontem de Gosford.

5.4 Hampton Poyle lies within the Ploughley Hundred and compared with other villages in the area has never been large, although there is evidence that it may have decreased in size in the late Middle Ages (fourteenth or fifteenth century). The Ploughley Hundred ceased to exist in 1867 when the county courts were established.

Brief history of the Manor

5.5 There were five manors held by five thegns before the conquest (a thegn is a man of noble status). The Domesday Book records that ‘Gernio had 1 messuage’ and ‘Gernio holds of the King 10 hides in Hampton Poyle’. (A messuage is a unit of land tenure comprising a house or houses with appurtenant property and a hide is a standard assessment to tax (geld) notionally the amount of land which would support a household which is made up of four virgates; a virgate being the amount of land that a team of oxen could plough in a single annual season about 30-32 acres in area. A virgate would supply a quarter of what would support a household).

5.6 In 1166 Philip of Hampton (de Hanton’) held in chief as 1 knight’s fee. The manor was then handed down through four generations to Alice de la Poyle who as an infant married Walter de la Poyle, the village’s namesake. The manor passes through the de la Poyle line until 1423 when John de la Poyle leased the manor to Robert Warner, John Gaynesford and others. In 1440 John Gaynesford acquired all the former de la Poyle properties. By 1450 the manor is again in single ownership. In 1625, Bridget Hawtrey and her husband Sir Henry Croke obtained the capital messuage and the manorial rights though were forced to sell their shares in the manor to John West in 1648. The prosperity of Hampton Poyle was affected by the Civil War in the early seventeenth century and did not recover until the early eighteenth century. In 1717 it was bought by Arthur Annesley, the sixth Viscount Valentia and Earl of Anglesey who in turn sold it in 1723 to Christopher Tilson. Tilson’s grandson sold it back to Arthur Annesley, the eighth Viscount Valentia and Earl of Mountnorris in 1795 and it was held in the family until 1929 when the twelfth Viscount Valentia sold his farms and holdings to various tenants.

5.7 The original manor house was located south of the church, near Manor...
Farmhouse, to take advantage of the river and the mill stream and is thought to have been demolished in 1625.

**Economic History**

5.8 At the time of Domesday the value of the estate had risen from £6 to £10. Gernio’s message ‘rendering 6d pertaining to Hampton Poyle.’ and, ‘(There is) land for 6 ploughs. In demesne are 3 ploughs, and 2 slaves; and 7 villans with 2 bordars have 3 ploughs. There is a mill rendering 15s and 60 acres of meadow (which would have been of high quality being close to the river), (and) woodland half a league long and 16 furlongs broad and a water mill (15s).’

In the early part of the thirteenth century the manor had been extended but due to debts, William of Hampton had to sell some of his valuable meadow land, arable land, his mill, a miller’s cottage, and a fishery to six free tenants. He sold his mill in Hampton with a croft, arable and meadow land to Oseney Abbey around 1222, followed by other gifts of land and rents from William and his tenants.

Documents relating to Oseney show the mill was used by the lord, the villagers and outsiders, providing a good income to the lord. The mill was in much demand and William made provision for the abbot to erect a second mill. By 1279, the Abbey had two watermills which are thought to have been located on the Ham to the south of the meadow, the fishery in the Cherwell and over four virgates of land. In 1510 it was recorded in the bailiff’s accounts that fulling mills at Hampton had fallen down and the rent of 30s. 8d. had not been paid. This was still the case in 1521. There is also a record of a mill burning down in 1771.

5.9 The Hundred Rolls of 1279 record that the cultivated land had been extended with Walter de la Poyle’s manor containing 31 virgates of land of which eight were in demesne (demesne was land in ‘lordship’ whose produce was devoted to the lord and not his tenants). There were six free tenants which included the Abbot of Oseney who held eight acres in ‘fee alms’, two water mills and the fishery in the Cherwell.

5.10 There is evidence of intercommoning between Hampton Poyle and Hampton Gay. Oseney had rights of common for 200 sheep and some meadow was assigned by lot annually and some was inclosed and held in sevency with evidence of free tenants and of the conveying of land. In 1280 there was a boundary dispute between Hampton Poyle and Hampton Gay and the boundary was demarcated on two separate occasions.

5.11 Between 1279 and before the early sixteenth century the two field system (North and South Fields), by then divided into half-acre strips, had given way to a three field system comprising West Field, North-east Field and South-east Field which lay beside the smaller Colworth Field.

5.12 There are indications that there was further depopulation by the early sixteenth century. The fulling mills had fallen down and rent had not been paid. There had been some conversion of arable land for sheep and cattle pasture and in 1517, two men were accused of converting sixty acres and putting two ploughs out of use.

5.13 Payments to the subsidy of 1523 show a considerable change since the early
fourteenth century in the pattern of landholding and the distribution of wealth. There were thirteen contributors, of which Henry Rathbone paid almost 90%.

5.14 By 1547 the West Field had been inclosed. In addition, there were five customary tenants holding nearly 176 acres.

5.15 The Elizabathan inclosures caused much discontent in Hampton Poyle and Hampton Gay and led to an Agrarian Revolt in 1596. The ringleader was Bartholomew Steere of Hampton Poyle but Richard Bradshaw of Hampton Gay spread discontent on his rounds as a miller’s man. The plot grew and included men from Witney and Rycote; their aim was to destroy inclosures and inclosers. The plot fell through and one ringleader was sentenced to be hanged, drawn and quartered. In 1597 the re-enactment of the Tillage Act resulted in the lands in Oxfordshire which had been changed to pasture being returned to tillage. Before the Inclosure in 1797, it was estimated over 200 acres had previously been inclosed consisting of small orchards and closes some dating back to the medieval period but most originating in Tudor times.

5.16 In 1625 ten farmhouses are recorded together with a Rectory and a manor house. It shows that the demesne covered just over 285 acres and included a rabbit-warren (“coneygree’) of over five acres. The lord also possessed the fishing in the Cherwell, the mill, and the parcel of meadow called Flat Hamm between the old river and the new. As the demesne was counted as four yardlands it had grazing for sixteen beasts a bull and ‘a breeder’, and 80 sheep-walks. In 1662 seventeen householders were registered for the Hearth Tax. The size of the houses can be judged by the amount of hearths; the manor had fourteen, the Rectory had six and ten other houses had from one to three.

5.17 Several of the present dwellings date from the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The Rectory has sixteenth century origins and in 1685 it was described as having a courtyard, orchard, garden, stables and barn. By 1754 it was badly decayed. The main block now dates from 1802 when the house was enlarged by adding four rooms and it was further extended in 1840s when a further extension was added making it a double pile arrangement with bay windows to the south.

5.18 Manor Farm succeeded the manor house that was known as Hampton Poyle Place in 1625. The Manor Farmhouse dates from around this time. As late as 1949 there were traces of medieval fishponds in the manor meadows.

5.19 Poyle Court, the Old Manor House and Knapp’s Farm all date from the early seventeenth century when the manor was divided.

The Old Manor House was formerly called Moat Farmhouse; Moat Cottage that adjoins it to the east was its former stable. The moat is recorded in 1625 and can be seen on early maps. The land for Moat Farm was sold off in 1928.

5.20 Knapp’s Farm was originally rectangular in plan with a staircase projection to the rear; Merton College used part of the building as a refuge in times of plague. Lincoln College are also known to have taken refuge in Hampton Poyle at these times. This was the quarter of the manor that had been partitioned in 1626 to Katherine Piggott, it then belonged to her daughter Katherine Plaistow in 1653, then to Tyrrel in 1766 and George and Joseph Knapp in 1797. It was 230 acres in 1869 and remained in the family until 1910 when it was sold to Viscount Valentia. The Knapp family consolidated their land in Hampton Poyle when they exchanged land in Kidlington for two tenements and land from Merton College in 1818 totalling seven acres.

5.21 The few village buildings are spaced at uneven intervals along Church Lane, on the 1724 map but there are more buildings shown than on the 1797 Inclosure Map. There are thirty named pieces of land and
a list of land that people were to hold including the manor by Henry Peezley. The 1796 Act records four farms and describes the land as miscellaneous: ‘Dividing, allotting, and inclosing the Common Fields, common meadows, common pastures, and all other commonable lands, within the Parish of Hampton Poyle, in the County of Oxford.’

5.22 The 1797 inclosure of the open fields awarded the main grants of over 593 acres as follows:

- Arthur Annesley and Charles Warde: (six parcels and a small manorial allotment) 408 acres
- George Knapp (gent): (seven parcels and a small manorial allotment) 88 acres
- George Knapp (merchant): (four parcels) 43 acres
- The Rector/Woodstock Corporation/Islip and the Hampton Poyle poor/Merton College/A cottager/and for the roads and stonepits: c52 acres located to the north and south of the road to Bicester.
Figure 18. Extract from the 1797 Inclosure Map

Figure 19. O.S. map 1:2500 (1875-1887) This shows a building on the Green and may have been Willis’s Cottage. The moat at the Old Manor House is shown in this map. Orchards are shown to the north of Model Farm (Knapp’s Farm), east of Manor Farm and south of the Old Manor House. The orchard north of Church Farm appears in the 1899 map.
Figure 20. O.S. map 1:2500 (1899-1905) This map shows an enclosure on ‘The Ham’ near where the mill was located but a pond remains. Two of the ponds in Manor Meadow have disappeared. There had been a minor change to the farmstead at Church Farm, Rectory Farm and Moat Farm looks to have lost its stables to the east of The Moat House. A third cottage or open shed appears to the west of Manor Farm Cottage. On the 1913-23 map, a cottage may have been built in line with the Old Manor House behind Manor Farm Cottage. There looks to be a glasshouse in front of Poyle Court (which is not shown on the 1913-23 map) and a new structure adjoining the boundary wall to the north. A cottage east of Model Farm has been demolished which may have been Blenheim Cottages. Jubilee Cottage at 16 Bletchingdon Road appears on this map for the first time.

Figure 21. O.S. map 1:2500 (1936-1939) This map shows some developments to the outbuildings at Manor Farm with larger barns. One of the ponds in the meadow has reappeared. The large Dutch Barn east of the old barn at Church Farm is shown on this map. There has been further development at Model Farm and Willis’s Cottage has been demolished on the Green. A structure has appeared in the Pound which could be Colworth Cottage.
5.23 The great benefit of Inclosure was in the lot meadows and the improvement in tillage which allowed the population to grow again. It also encouraged the amalgamation of farms and by 1850 there were four larger farms.

Population and Development

5.24 The Compton Census recorded 63 adults in 1676. In 1738 the parish was said to have few inhabitants, and in 1759 about 19 families lived there. The population had dropped to 100 persons by 1801 but rose again in 1811 when there were 24 families and 128 persons, increasing to 156 by 1851. By 1901, when the reliance on agriculture was less there were only 105 inhabitants. This trend was continued in the early part of the 20th century, but numbers rose from 80 in 1931 to 91 in 1951. The population is currently estimated at 125 according to ‘Oxfordshire Info’.

Trades

5.25 There were warriners, millers and fishermen, woodland men, bull men, cattle breeders, shepherds, ploughmen and farm labourers.
As the manor was not dominant, the parishioners were tenant farmers and farm labourers rather than domestic servants or craftsmen. In 1811 only one family was not employed in agriculture. In the latter part of the nineteenth century craftsmen such as a show maker, carpenter and blacksmith are mentioned. In 1926 one inhabitant was occupied as a ‘motor-driver’. Within the next decade the influence of Morris Motor Works in Oxford becomes increasingly apparent in the registers. In the 1950s there were university lecturers, a brain surgeon, an anaesthetist, a stick gatherer, a postman and a number of American airmen from the nearby airbase at Weston-on-the-Green.

People are known to have made a living collecting sticks for kindling as late as 1955, which would have included windfall and coppicing.

Religion
The first record of a church at Hampton Poyle is in 1225. The advowson usually followed that of the manor. The advowson was sold to Queen’s College in 1677 who held it until 1897 when the Reverend Yule bought it for £300 before selling it to Reverend Gwilliam. In 1933, the advowson passed to King’s College, London. In 1946 the bishop suggested Exeter College should obtain the patronage in exchange for some land in Sussex, allowing the Vicar of Kidlington a living from Exeter College, so that he held Kidlington and Hampton Poyle in plurality.

Nonconformity.
Both the Victoria County History (VCH) and Mrs Parkes’ Scrapbook agree that since the Reformation no record has been found of Roman Catholicism. There was criticism in the ‘English Churchman’ in 1927 of the Rector, Father Carter, who had overly Romanised the church. Mrs Parkes stated that the church had been the only religious meeting place in the village which is contrary to the VCH which records that in 1835 a private house was licensed for Protestant worship and at least until the 1870’s there were a few dissenters who gathered together on Sunday evenings. There is also a piece of land called ‘Quaker’s Ground’, listed as No 3 on the 1724 proposed Inclosure Map.

Schools.
It was noted that in 1759 many children did not attend church and many could not read, with schools being located in other parishes. In 1833, a school was set up for twenty children by the Rector and landowners, driven by Arthur Annesley. In 1837 the school was united to the National Society and the rector seems to have been the main support of a day school which occupied a small cottage at the south of the village (55 Oxford Road, now much altered). There was an infant school for children under five and a winter school held once a week for the older boys in 1854. In 1871 the school had 19 pupils but was considered below par so children were sent to neighbouring schools, paid for by the rector and the Hampton farmers according to the size of their farms. The school reopened for a short period in 1875–6, but closed soon after 1890 when the children went to Bletchingdon, and later to Kidlington.

Charities
Edward Fulham, a former rector, left a sum in 1664 to be distributed to the poor, followed by John West the Elder in 1696. Both were subsequently mismanaged by an insolvent rector, Anthony Addison, in 1719.

The lord of the manor allowed certain lands free of rent (amounting to seven and a half acres in 1625) in return for Whitsun ale from the Churchwardens. In the eighteenth century it was customary for the rector to give cheese and bread to the poor at Easter. Land was granted in trust to the poor in the 1797 inclosure award, at this time coupled by three cottages and gardens in the care of the churchwardens and overseers. At the beginning of the nineteenth century income from ‘Poor’s Piece’ was properly allocated
6. Character and Appearance

6.1 Generally

Hampton Poyle village is divided into two distinct character areas; the dispersed historic settlement of medium to large sized farmhouses and their farmsteads on Church Lane and the ribbon development along Oxford Road and Bletchingdon Road.

The roads form the spine of the village and allow details of the village to be appreciated at close hand. The network of footpaths allow walkers to view the setting of the village and its contribution to the wider landscape. Views in and out of Hampton Poyle are particularly important and the various water features are a reminder of the contribution the River Cherwell has made to the wealth of the village.

The buildings in the conservation area are very much rooted in the vernacular style of the district, with oolitic limestone walls and chimneys with brick additions. Not all of the original roof coverings have survived, all the thatch in the village has now gone and a number of Stonesfield slate roofs have been replaced in heavier concrete tiles. A number of the buildings now have Welsh slate and there are also roofs of clay tiles on some outbuildings, others are either roofless or have corrugated iron and asbestos cement.

The proportion of solid to void in the district is particularly pleasing as the buildings tend not to be over-fenestrated.

The landscape setting is as important to the character of the village as the buildings themselves. Water is a constant source of

Figure 23 – Ground Figure Plan of Hampton Poyle
reference at Hampton Poyle due to its low lying position north of the Cherwell. There are many ditches, field drains and ponds. To the west of Church Lane the form of the landscape is more open, lending itself to views out to the fields beyond and St Mary’s steeple in Kidlington which dominates views to the south.

Although most of the buildings are set back from the lane, the physical sense of enclosure is present in the form of ditches, hedges, fencing, stone walls and gates.

There are groupings of buildings along the length of Church Lane which provide collective character and interest as follows:

6.2 Manor Farm and St Mary’s Church, west end of Church Lane

Manor Farm is tucked behind the churchyard and can only be seen from the end of Church Lane and in a glimpsed view from the churchyard gate that links the two properties. The farmhouse is a dominant structure with its principal frontage facing the Ham to the south. Oddly, the rear extension to the north has a higher ridge line and has a small hip to the south so that it can adjoin the north slope of the south wing. To the west of the house there is a large stone barn. There are stone walls which enclose a tennis court with a high fence, further stone outbuildings, stables and modern agricultural sheds. The farm can be appreciated more fully from the footpath leading to Wight Bridge; views across the Ham are limited.

The modern barns to the west of Manor Farm are not of high quality and do not enhance the character of the conservation area, they do however strengthen the farm grouping (unlike the one at the Old Manor House which has lost its farming context and relationship with the land). Two of the historic barns including the dovecot gable can be seen alongside the bellcote of the church illustrating the close relationship between the two sites.
Church Lane is laid in tarmac with grassed verges and stone chippings to the field gates. There is a shaped stone with a socket for a post which may have held a way marker at some time but is now cloaked in bryophytes. There are timber styles leading to Kidlington in the south and to Bletchingdon and Hampton Gay in the north. The surrounding landscape feels open with hedgerows layering distant views.

Figure 26. Manor Farm glimpsed from the south of the Ham, note the earthwork to the Ham and the north bank of the Cherwell, in 1797 the fields were named The Grove and The Old Orchard.

Figure 27. The stone wall is a curtilage listed structure relating to the listed farm, parts have fallen down and should be rebuilt to match the original sections reusing the existing stone.

Figure 28. The depressions in the field could be sand or gravel pits in the meadow, fish ponds or the remains of a shrunken settlement. The hedgerows and pollarded tree lines along the Ham layer to give depth to the view but also screen Kidlington beyond.

Figure 29. Grouping of Manor farm and the Church from the north – there are distant views across meadow and the Ham. The fields around Manor Farm are rippled showing the old ridge and furrow pattern.

Figure 30. The ditch to the north of the conservation area has a very strong form and is best appreciated from the footpath running north, just to the east of the church. This boundary ditch can be seen in both the 1724 and the 1797 Inclosure maps and historic OS maps.
6.3 The Old Rectory, Church Farm (Home Farm) and Willow House on Church Lane

The majority of the houses in the conservation area are dual aspect, addressing both Church Lane and the adjoining fields. The grouping of the Old Rectory and its farm outbuildings is particularly successful. The barn and walled garden make a positive contribution to the street scene and in glimpsed views from the footpaths.

The ha-ha to the south boundary of the Old Rectory is obscured by fencing which impedes the uninterrupted designed setting of the building within the landscape. Mrs Parkes’ Scrapbook notes that additional fencing was erected after a prized milking cow died after eating Yew in the Rectory garden. This fence line continues in front of the walled garden to the Old Rectory. A series of trees have been allowed to grow up; the Inclosure Act of 1797 ruled that no trees should be planted within 12 feet of other proprietors’ fences.

The village pond in front of the Old Rectory provides a watery reflection of the Old Rectory. The courtyard behind the big barn in the Rectory was used as the parade ground for the Hampton Poyle Home Guard during the Second World War. The Old Rectory also acted as a Polling Station in the 1950s.

The village pond also links to Church Farm across the lane which retains its physical relationship with the bothy and outbuildings to the north. There is a large elongated pond opposite Willow House, south of Church Lane which feeds into a further pond to the south and a drain that follows a ditch beside a
The Old Manor, the Moat House, Manor Farm Cottage and Poyle Court

Manor Farm Cottage fronts directly onto the lane. The Cottage was once three dwellings and can be read as such by looking at the chimneys. All entrances were accessed either on the side or the rear. Which is a common feature in agricultural housing set directly on the roadside. There is a high proportion of solid limestone wall to window opening fronting the footpath and Church Lane which is aesthetically pleasing.
The Old Manor is tucked away from Church Lane behind established planting, as is the Moat House. Poyle Court by comparison is screened behind a tall limestone wall with shaped brick coping, coupled with solid timber gates; the castellated stone parapet adds a touch of the Picturesque to the village. The general feeling is one of intimacy.

There was a large 'moat' north of The Old Manor House and Moat House which stretched as far as the modern development of 2-10 Oxford Road; part of this water feature has been refashioned in the garden of the Moat House and includes a fountain.

The entrance to the footpath leading to Wight Bridge funnels between the Old Manor House and Manor Farm Cottage and provides perhaps the greatest physical drama in the village; Once past the glimpsed side views through the pedestrian gates to the rear of Manor Farm Cottage and the front of the Old Manor House; the tiled lean-to side extension, converted cattle shed, timber gate and outbuilding provide a tactile series of materials and forms that enrich the experience. The dry stone garden wall gives way to tall hedges which constrict the path towards the narrow gate which frames the spire of St Mary's Kidlington; the prominent landmark in the landscape. Once past the gate a vista opens out across the flat Oxford Green Belt.

6.5 Model Farm and the Old Village Green

Model Farmhouse is glimpsed through scrub planting and trees and with recent planting, feels very much as if it is creating a barrier between the former Green and the village. It is difficult to appreciate Model Farm from the public domain in any detail but what can be seen is a handsome vernacular building with the added interest of a timber modillion cornice. Historical photographs show distant views into the farmhouse across parkland in the 1950s. The best view of the house is through the gate to the west of Bletchingdon Road. This also shows a barn stripped of its roof covering. To Church Lane there is a further entrance, behind which are large Dutch barns and a stone barn. The stone wall with brick capping returns from Church Lane to separate Poyle Court from...
Model Farm. There are remnants of iron fencing in need of repair and decoration.

The drainage ditch at the east of Church Lane is of interest and leads to the former village washhouse. The water in the ditches, village ponds and the River Cherwell is a thread that ties the place together.

6.6 Oxford Road and Bletchingdon Road (Outside the 1991 Conservation Area Boundary)

The character of the east side of Bletchingdon Road and the north of Oxford Road is of a ribbon development where the street line is fairly well defined. There are a number of buildings with historical associations including the Bell Inn, the village Church Day School and a few farm cottages. Development and alterations should be mindful of whether they make a positive, neutral or negative impact on the conservation area. Some modern 'improvements' have been undertaken which are not sympathetic to the traditional details found in the village and mask the true age of the properties. The physical characteristics of what makes Hampton Poyle special could be eroded if this continues. The infilling of gaps with housing pays little heed to the village context. The approach from the south has a suburban character until the cottages just south of the Bell Inn and in the first stretch of the Bletchingdon Road. The former school terrace makes a positive contribution to the village but is some distance from the conservation area boundary.

Figure 43. View of Oxford from the footpath near Wights Bridge. The tree lines help to break up some of the modern development so the impact is more contained.
Figure 44. Visual Analysis

Key:
- Significant trees
- Important hedges and vegetation
- Positive view
- Positive vista
- Tree preservation orders
- Positive landmark
- Strong boundary wall
- Sinuous views between well defined edge (walls, fences and planting)
- Long distance views
- Significant green space/verge
- Footpath
- Ditches
- Pond
- Glimpsed view

Conservation Area Boundary - Revised December 2016
7. Architectural History

7.1 The buildings which make up the conservation area, and the few remaining older properties in the wider village, are predominantly built of coursed oolitic limestone rubble with Stonesfield slate, Welsh slate, clay tile or have been replaced with concrete tiles or corrugated sheet roofs. The windows are painted timber of various traditional designs including sash and case, flush casement, metal casements within timber sub-frames and there are also leaded lights. At Model Farm there is a rare example of a horizontal sliding sash and there may be only two in the district. The doors are painted timber and are either panelled or ledged and braced. Chimneys are in stone, or stone and brick.

The houses in the village appear to be well maintained in 2016. Ongoing maintenance should help to avoid major repair projects, or at least delay them by a few years.

7.2 The Architectural Components of the Village

The village comprises a church and a dispersed ribbon settlement of medium to large sized farmsteads with supplementary farmworker’s cottages and the Bell Inn.

The Farmhouses are of a modest vernacular design, with some remodelling, all are set within a farmstead grouping although Old Manor House (Moat Farmhouse) only has fragments of outbuildings including a former cattle shed and its old carthorse stable is now known as the Moat House. The contributions of each are described below in Section 7.4, as seen from the public realm or from archive photographs in the Design and Conservation Section of Cherwell District Council.

There are other modest cottages on Bletchingdon Road and Oxford Road that have been much altered but some still contribute positively to the street scene and could be further enhanced by a return to traditional details and materials as part of their ongoing maintenance.

Figure 45. Mrs Parkes map of village with cottage names
7.3 **Listed Buildings**
There have been four known listing visits to Hampton Poyle. The church was listed in December 1966; Manor Farm and the adjacent large barn with dovecot were listed in November 1987, the Old Manor along with Model Farm and Poyle Court were listed in February 1988. All were listed as Grade II with the exception of the church which is Grade II*.

Church Farm was put forward for listing in 1999 but Historic England considered the exterior and interior had been generally too altered to merit listing. Despite not being included on the statutory list, this building and the remaining outbuildings that once made up its farm make a positive contribution to the conservation area.

In 2007 a village resident suggested the former village wash-house, opposite the Bell Inn, should be listed but Historic England have no details of a listing request having been received.

7.4 **Buildings inside the conservation area which make a positive contribution to the understanding of the village**
Generally there are a number of unlisted buildings which make a very positive contribution to the conservation area.

7.5 **St Mary’s Church, Church Lane**

![Figure 46. St Mary’s Church from the footpath north of the church.](image)

**Exterior**
The oldest remaining building in the village is the Grade II* listed St Mary’s Church, which was built around the year 1200. St Mary’s Church has a modest form, built in oolitic limestone with traditional nave, chancel, aisles and a bell-cote for two bells. The church is a symbolic focal point in the village. The monuments and dedications inside the church, together with the gravestones in the churchyard provide the most tangible link to the people who shaped Hampton Poyle.

The church was once supported by tithes, where parishioners gave a tenth of their income to the church or paid in kind, and the rector was responsible for the upkeep of the chancel. Tithes were gradually replaced by taxes following the Tithe Commutation Act of 1836 and the church now relies on donations and grants for its upkeep.

The lead roof to the nave has been replaced by a metal seamed roof which is missing part of its cast iron rainwater goods to the south. The narrow bays of the metal roof with its thin standing seams, its high reflectiveness and general lack of patina does not have the character of lead and detracts from the views looking south from the footpath. In 1847, Mr Clark, the Architect overruled the Rector by releading the roof rather than raising it to its original pitch and covering it with Stonesfield Slate; assuming the walls could not take the additional weight. The chancel and aisles are in Stonesfield Slate.

The east chancel window is of 3-lights with geometrical tracery in late thirteenth century style. The north window is in the Perpendicular style c1400-30, with stained glass of 4-lights to the tracery depicting the Lion of St Mark and scroll ‘Marcus’; the Angel of St Matthew and scroll ‘Matheus’; the Bull of St Luke and scroll ‘Lucas’; the eagle of St John with scroll misspelt as ‘lhoannes’. There is a modern lancet window with a blocked thirteenth century priest’s door to the south; the church guide suggests this was a leper’s door.

The chancel arch and aisles date from the middle of the fourteenth century c1350. The east and north windows of the north aisle are in
transitional style (Decorated to Perpendicular), reglazed in 1844 by Wailes. The east and west windows of the south aisle are in the Decorated Style. The bell-cote was added in the eighteenth century. For a period in the early 1800s, the ruinous state of the roof forced the congregation to travel to Weston-on-the-Green to worship. The church was restored in 1844 and in 1870 by GE Street, the prolific Gothic Revival Architect. The Victorian doorway set in the south aisle and the window to the east belong to the restorations of 1841 and 1860-70. The doorway arch has a simple moulding which terminates in carved corbel heads; the door itself is in oak and forms the sole entrance to the building.

During a watching brief by the Oxford Archaeological Unit for a new drainage channel north of the church, foundations were revealed for a north aisle and north side to the chancel. The north aisle had what was described as a ‘free built plinth’ and the Victorian buttress stood on an earlier foundation. As part of the excavations to the west, east and south evidence for foundations was found to support references for a porch and chapel on the south side of the church.

Interior

The 2-bay arcades which separate the nave from the aisles, have a single octagonal pier. The north capital is carved with figures with interlaced arms (more typical of the North Oxfordshire School which includes Adderbury, Bloxham, Hanwell, Alkerton and Shenington, they also appear in at least one church in Buckinghamshire where they are described as peasants). The heads have close round helmets of chainmail, commonly thought to be Knights Templar.

There is a stone pulpit to the north of the chancel arch with a timber linen fold top; it is thought the timber may enclose an earlier stone font and was donated by Mr AJ Collet of Model Farm in 1949, as a parting gift to the village.

Figure 47. Carved capital to the north arcade

Figure 48. Norman carved ornament possibly for a heart burial in the north aisle

Figure 49. 1424 brass of John Poyle and his wife Elizabeth

The circular stone font is plain and stands on a square base under the east arch of the south aisle arcade. There is a drain hole in the basin and it was large enough for full immersion.

There are oak choir stalls with minimal carving. The nineteenth century pews in the nave have sixteenth century carved oak pew ends depicting various scenes and two ends include deer. The modern pews in the north and south
aisles have been removed and replaced with moveable chairs to make space for a crèche during services.

The Tudor screen and curtains to the west of the nave enclose a vestry. An earlier vestry which stood where the organ is now located at the west end of the north aisle. The screen may have formed part of the rood screen which once separated the chancel from the nave.

7.6 Manor Farm, Church Lane
The manor was called Hampton Poyle Place and was succeeded by Manor Farm around 1625. The Inclosure map notes an area known as ‘The Grove’ to the west of the current farm and an ‘old orchard’ to the south.

Manor Farmhouse was listed in November 1987. It dates to the late sixteenth century and was subsequently remodelled in the early nineteenth century. It is built of coursed limestone rubble with ashlar quoins and dressings, including a first floor plain ashlar string course. There is a gabled roof which has lost its Stonesfield slates (it was listed with its current concrete tiles – not that these were seen as a positive alteration,

Figure 50. Walter de la Poyle (de la Puile or Paulle) (d.1298/9) husband of Alice de Hampton (c1252-1349)

Figure 51. The effigy of Katherine widow of Sir Edmund Rede and Lady of the Manor (died 1498) in the east end of the north side.

Figure 52 and 53. Manor Farm with its Stonesfield slate roof pre 1948
Copyright: Mrs Parkes’ Scrapbook of the Village

Figure 54. 1948 stables and new concrete tile roof.
Copyright: Mrs Parkes’ Scrapbook of the Village
rather that the remaining fabric in its entirety was considered to override this). There is a nineteenth century brick ridge stack, the end stacks have a stone stooling, with brick above. The farmhouse has an L-shaped plan with rear wing to the north-east, the ridge of this wing is higher than the principal ridge and a hip has been introduced so that it can abut the roof of the main house. The house is of two-storeys, with attic which provides accommodation.

The view of the farm from the north of Church Lane is of a group of buildings dominated by large roof slopes, local limestone and some feather-edge boarding. Ivy currently obscures the east and south walls to the east wing of the farmhouse.

Although there are a number of curtilage listed structures, there is a separately listed, late sixteenth century barn built in coursed limestone rubble approximately five metres north of the farmhouse. This large gabled barn was listed at the same time as the house, with corrugated asbestos cement roof sheets already in place. The barn was used as a stable, dovecot and brewhouse. The building is of three bays and of two-storeys with a three-window range. To the south bay there is a flat stone arch over an old shutter with timber lintels over two eighteenth century plank doors, an eighteenth century three-light timber mullioned window and a nineteenth century plank door. There is a late sixteenth century/early seventeenth century three-light ovolo-moulded timber mullioned window on the first floor and dove holes in the south gable wall. Chamfered beams remain to the south and the floor has been removed to the north. The roof has queen post trusses with butt purlins.

![Figure 55. The separately listed dovecot, barn and brewhouse in 1955.](image)

![Figure 56. Manor House from the end of Church Lane in 2016](image)

![Figure 57. The Rectory with external shutters in 1955](image)

![Figure 58. The Old Rectory in 2016, the old cartwheel is not shown on the 1955 photograph.](image)
The Old Rectory has sixteenth century origins but has been much altered. The house stands back from Church Lane and has a shallow plan with a low dual-pitched slated roof and tall chimneys in two stages, the top stage comprising 2-pillared square stacks joined at the crown and topped by chimney pots; the west chimney stacks are in limestone, the eastern 2-pillars are in brick above a stone base which leans to the east and should be monitored. There is a smaller chimney again of two stages with square stone stacks to the top joined by a capping set in the gable on the south slope. The windows on the ground floor of the north elevation are metal casements with leaded rectangular panes, set in timber frames with dark timber shutters externally to the eastern two windows. There is some staining on the north elevation suggesting there may once have been an extension to the north. To the first floor there are 3 over 6 sash windows (a similar window sits in the west gable).

There are stone outbuildings to the east with tiled, slated and corrugated iron roofs and plain boarded doors. The large barn has a hipped cart entrance to the south with a cart opening to the west bay. To the south-east corner, the roof extends down to single storey height for a former brew or wash house. The north wall of the barn range continues westwards and this is topped by an unsympathetic dark plywood garage structure to the west. It is understood many of the historic internal features remain. To the south of the outbuildings there is a brick walled garden with lean-to structures inside the east wall. The lower section of the east wall is rendered suggesting there may have been cold frames or a heated wall to the north.

The boundary to the Old Rectory includes a dry stone wall to the pond to the north-west which is overlooked by a timber pagoda with felted roof, and stone steps lead down to the pond. There are two sets of fine iron gates to the driveway, supported on round posts beside an ashlar limestone wall. The gates are of lattice design with shields and scrolls. The east boundary has stock fencing in front of iron railings. There is a timber arch with an iron gate with scroll detail next to a timber stile which leads to the field to the west. To the south there is an iron field gate with scrolls (the restored kissing gates from the Green), then stanchions with uprights. To the south there is a ha-ha with a timber and mesh fence to the field to the south of the Old Rectory, this obviously impacts on the significance of this designed landscape feature but is necessary when agile horses are kept in the adjacent field.

7.8 Church Farm (Formerly Home Farm), 58 Church Lane

The mid-eighteenth century Church Farmhouse has previously been known as Home Farm. It is a limestone house of two rooms with a central passage in the front range. The west room was the parlour and the east room would have been the kitchen with an integral outshut at...
the rear. The farmhouse was remodelled and enlarged around the late nineteenth century and the rear outshut was heightened and extended; the central entrance passage was widened and a staircase was inserted which reduced the size of the original kitchen. The house has been extended into outbuildings at the rear and the building that was described as a brewhouse is now a summerhouse. The house has a three-bay front, the stone mullioned two-light windows have been replaced with sash windows and the stone mullions (which are a recurrent feature in Hampton Poyle) have been lost. The other windows and dormers date to the twentieth century. All internal joinery is either late nineteenth or twentieth century, apart from the eighteenth century plank door to the attic. The kitchen fireplace has the remains of an oven and there is a damaged timber bressumer. The parlour has lost the chimneypiece to the fireplace. The main range retains the original eighteenth century tenoned-purlin roof structure. The Stonesfield slate roof was replaced in concrete tiles before 1955. The coach house and stables sat behind the farm house, separated by a thin strip of grass. The property came with two cottages and the land covered 139 acres and 1 rood, and Bell Cottage was acquired in 1928.

The large simple barn, formerly belonging to Church Farm, adds gravitas to the strong farming history of the village. It has plain oolitic limestone walls and large cart openings, with deeply recessed solid timber doors. The loss of the thatch and replacement with corrugated asbestos, including the lowering of the roof over the eastern section c1954 is regrettable but the character of this building still contributes significantly to the street scene. The lack of maintenance of this building is, however, a threat to its future; it would benefit from a structural appraisal by a conservation minded structural engineer followed by some repointing in lime to the limestone walls and brick buttress. A further threat to this building is conversion to housing. When John Baker was the tenant, a
barn behind this one caught on fire and villagers formed a chain to pass water from the pond through this barn to dampen the fire whilst they waited for the fire brigade.

The large, five bay Dutch barn in the 1955 photograph has since been removed to form a courtyard for a new building called Willow House. In the 1950s corn and root crops were grown on this farm and it was completely mechanised by 1953.

There is a further one and a half-storey bothy/barn behind the barn which is of some interest and contributes to the homogeneous style of the agricultural buildings in the village.

Willow House and the barn to the east are both modern buildings which have a neutral impact on the significance and character of the conservation area. As part of the planning permission a parcel of land was gifted to the parish and this is the new village green.

The large old barn and the stone bothy are discussed under Church Farm as they historically belonged to the farmstead rather than Willow House. The close boarded fence is not a traditional boundary treatment.

There are a few workers’ cottages in the village. Manor Farm Cottage was once three ‘day-men’s’ cottages built in two phases. The two original cottages were extended to the west before 1905. The walls are in coursed oolitic limestone, although the south elevation of the two western cottages was built in brick and is now rendered. The roofs are slate with brick chimney stacks; there is a timber porch canopy to the rear where once there were three. According to Mrs Parkes’ Scrapbook, the eastern cottage was known as Well Cottage in the 1950s. Although extended, this small terrace adds to the understanding and significance of the farming village, whilst also providing a strong townscape feature to Church Lane and the footpath which once formed the entrance to Moat Farmhouse, now the Old Manor House.

Mrs Parkes mentions the two western cottages were entered through a gate which led to a cottage garden, in 1955 all were in a poor state from lack of maintenance. The cottages originally went with the Glebe but were sold
by the Reverend Gwilliam to Mr Frank Kerwood in 1919. The day-men who had worked at the Rectory, or any farm in the village, left and the cottages became tied to Manor Farm. These cottages have been sympathetically restored and the use of flush painted timber side-hung casements on this building is encouraged.

7.11 **The Old Manor House (Formerly Moat Farmhouse), 27 Church Lane**

The Old Manor House was listed Grade II in February 1988 and dates from the mid seventeenth century. It is a two storeyed former farmhouse with attic built of thin coursed local oolitic limestone rubble and has a gabled Stonesfield slate roof with dormers set partly within the wall. The chimneys are built in brick. The plan is of three units with a four window range. There are timber lintels over a twentieth century door to the west of centre and twentieth century casements. To the south, or rear elevation, there is a stone stair turret with hipped roof which projects forward of the original building. The house is double pile between the stair turret and the west gable, the rear pile being early nineteenth century. There are some leaded metal casements in timber subframes to the rear.

The interior is noted as having stone flagged floors, chamfered beam and a stop chamfered bressumer; a fireplace has been blocked. There are winder stairs in the stair turret. There is a well in the garden that is reported to serve some of the rooms in the house.

The lean-to extensions to the west gable and a pyramid roofed stone outbuilding abuts the footpath which runs between the house and Manor Farm Cottage. A dry stone wall with rounded cement capping forms the western boundary nearest the house, this changes to a beech hedge to the south. There is a further gabled stone structure within the garden that can be seen behind a solid timber gate.
Moat Farmhouse was divorced from its land in 1928 and was sold shortly after some 'improvements' were carried out, which included the demolition of some stone outbuildings under the name of 'The Old Manor House', which is misleading. The stone building on the right of the photograph was a cowshed that was converted to a garage.

7.12 **The Moat House, 25 Church Lane**

Formerly known as Moat Cottage, this building was once the adjoining stable for the Old Manor House (Moat Farmhouse). The building has been extended to the east. It is one and a half storeys high with a gabled Stonesfield slate roof. The first floor wall continues as dormer and the roof slates run over the top of the canted dormer. The main door has a modern Tudor style hood moulding with a solid timber door with small visibility panel. The windows are modern timber leaded lights of non-historic pattern. The rainwater goods are cast iron.

There are old pollarded trees in the driveway, the building is well screened by perimeter planting and views are limited to the driveway.

As the Moat House was in separate ownership at the time the Old Manor was listed it is not deemed a curtilage listed building, however, development at the Moat House may affect the setting of the conservation area and the listed building.

The southern half of the garden has recently received a change of use to garden. The entire garden now lies in the revised conservation area boundary, see Section 9.
Poyle Court, 30 Church Lane

Poyle Court was Grade II listed in February 1988. Poyle Court was formerly known as ‘The Cottage’, and was once two tenements entered from the north and owned by Tyrrell Knapp who died in 1829. The Cottage became a house for ‘feeble minded girls’ in 1903. The house is very private, hidden behind a fine stone wall with brick capping and hedging. Only the parapet can be seen from the highway and the west gable from the new village green.

It is a double fronted former farm building of seventeenth century origin which was refronted around 1830, with a Tudor-style castellated parapet. It was extended to the rear at the same time and further remodelled in the mid-nineteenth century with a brick rear gable and stack; the plan is of three units, extended to an L-shaped plan. There is a twentieth century extension to the west and a wing has been added to the east. There are stone end stacks to the gables. The steep rear roof suggests this was once thatched but is now covered in concrete tile.

There are two storeys with three canted attic dormers behind the castellated parapet. The three window range is in the domestic Tudor Style with stone mullions and hood moulds. There is a hood mould over the central door with blind tracery. At first floor the windows are of two-lights with central timber mullion, to the ground floor either side of the door the windows are three-light with timber mullions with sunk spandrels to Tudor-arched heads and glazing bar casements.

The interior has a stone flag floor, an open fireplace and stop-chamfered bressumer. There is a dog leg stair with winders dating to the mid-nineteenth century. The roof is of four bays with butt purlins.

The Timber Yard was located between Poyle Court and the Green, the barn at the end of the yard was called the Woodman’s Cottage, which was last occupied in c1907. The thatched roof was replaced by corrugated iron in 1921, when the chimney was also removed, although Mrs Parkes notes an iron fireplace remained inside in 1955. The stables were rented by the Old Manor House sometime between 1931 and 1936. The Woodman’s Cottage no longer exists, nor do the modern pigsties seen in the 1955 photograph. The stables have been modernised with a pitched roof but remain largely as they were.
Model Farm (formerly Knapp’s Farm), Bletchingdon Road (formerly London Road)

The views of Model Farm from the village and views out of the farm were once more open when the boundary was well-managed. It is noted that there has been much new planting around the boundary. The buildings which make up Model Farm include the farmhouse, a cart shed, a granary, a piggery, a milking parlour, an old workshop, open sheds, Dutch barns, outbuildings and walls.

Model Farmhouse was built in 1697 according to the datestone and remodelled c1840, a number of the outbuildings are curtilage listed. It was previously known as Knapp’s Farm. Until recently it was a working dairy farm but the 300 acres of working pasture and arable land was considered too small to support a modern dairy farm. The farmhouse is now a family home with the potential to continue as a working farm as the agricultural structures including historic dairy, stables and cattle buildings form a cohesive unit. The best use for a listed building is always the one for which it was built and farming is historically at the heart of Hampton Poyle. The continuity of farming on this land is encouraged to retain the character of the setting.

The house was listed Grade II in February 1988. It is built of coursed oolitic limestone rubble with a gabled stone coping and Welsh slate roof. There is a brick chimney stack to the south and a stone chimney stack to the north. There is a modillion eaves course in painted timber. The plan is double depth of two storey with asymmetrical window range. The windows are sash and case set within a window surround with central stone mullions. The front door is twentieth century in six panels, the top four panels are glazed. An open mid-nineteenth century gabled porch covers the door.

To the north there is a single storey service wing in the style of the original house with a date-stone on its gable and a stone lintel over a six-pane sash window. There is a mid-nineteenth century dentilled eaves cornice.

The views of Model Farm from the village and views out of the farm were once more open when the boundary was well-managed. It is noted that there has been much new planting around the boundary. The buildings which make up Model Farm include the farmhouse, a cart shed, a granary, a piggery, a milking parlour, an old workshop, open sheds, Dutch barns, outbuildings and walls.

Model Farmhouse was built in 1697 according to the datestone and remodelled c1840, a number of the outbuildings are curtilage listed. It was previously known as Knapp’s Farm. Until recently it was a working dairy farm but the 300 acres of working pasture and arable land was considered too small to support a modern dairy farm. The farmhouse is now a family home with the potential to continue as a working farm as the agricultural structures including historic dairy, stables and cattle buildings form a cohesive unit. The best use for a listed building is always the one for which it was built and farming is historically at the heart of Hampton Poyle. The continuity of farming on this land is encouraged to retain the character of the setting.

The house was listed Grade II in February 1988. It is built of coursed oolitic limestone rubble with a gabled stone coping and Welsh slate roof. There is a brick chimney stack to the south and a stone chimney stack to the north. There is a modillion eaves course in painted timber. The plan is double depth of two storey with asymmetrical window range. The windows are sash and case set within a window surround with central stone mullions. The front door is twentieth century in six panels, the top four panels are glazed. An open mid-nineteenth century gabled porch covers the door.

To the north there is a single storey service wing in the style of the original house with a date-stone on its gable and a stone lintel over a six-pane sash window. There is a mid-nineteenth century dentilled eaves cornice.
There is a late seventeenth century two-storey wing to the rear with horizontal sliding sash (sometimes referred to as a Yorkshire Slider) with a mid-nineteenth century outshut to the north. There is a mid-nineteenth century two-storey gabled range to the south.

There are chamfered beams to the north and a nineteenth century straight flight stair with stick balusters within a central hall.

The sixteenth century cottage known as the Cottage-on-the-Green, formerly Willis’s Cottage and ‘Starlings Hall’ was demolished between 1928 and 1946.

Blenheim Cottages comprised a terrace of three stone properties and belonged to Model Farm (Knapp’s Farm) and stood on the opposite side of Bletchingdon Road to Scot’s Piece. The cottages were abandoned in 1890 following extensive neglect and the stones were used to repair farms. The site was known as Morby’s Close which was a dumping ground for the village, the land separating it from Model Farm (Knapp’s Farm) was called the Rookery. The 1724 draft and 1797 Inclosure maps show further buildings which have since disappeared.

7.15 Buildings outside the 1991 conservation area boundary which make a positive contribution to the understanding of the village or have strong historical associations:

There are a few remaining older limestone properties in the wider village, some were originally thatched and their roofs now vary between Welsh slate, plain clay tiles or concrete tiles. There are some flush traditional timber casement windows which are well suited but there are others that have been replaced with unsympathetic UPVC windows and doors which detract from the traditional character of the buildings and the village as a whole. A number of the doors are traditional painted timber ledged and braced or panelled with their upper panels glazed, these enhance the village. One old stone cottage has been unsympathetically rendered. The rendering of old stone cottages is limited in Hampton Poyle and is not encouraged. The repair of historic lime renders would be supported. Chimneys are either in stone or stone and brick which make a positive contribution to the village of Hampton Poyle, however a number have sadly been lost.

Mrs Parkes’ Scrapbook has helped to piece together the significance of the pre-1955 properties which are discussed in turn below as part of the reassessment of the conservation area boundary.

7.16 Oxford Road (formerly known as Village Lane)

Colworth Cottage, 3 Oxford Road (formerly known as Francot) was built on the former village pound in 1937 to the east of Corner Cottage. It has been significantly altered, its gable chimneys have been removed and a lean-to extension has been added across its full width with a garage to the side and a gabled porch entrance has been added.

![Colworth Cottage in 1955](Copyright: Mrs Parkes’ Scrapbook of the Village)

![Colworth Cottage in 2016](Copyright: Mrs Parkes’ Scrapbook of the Village)

The Bell Inn (11 Oxford Road) and Bell Cottage (13 Oxford Road) form a small stepped terrace, and although these have been extended, they provide a positive grouping which enhances the approach to the conservation area. As the Bell Inn is a business, there are no permitted development rights.
The Bell was once thatched as can be seen in a photograph from Mrs Parkes’ Scrapbook; the thatch on the west was replaced by a tin roof prior to 1955 and is now in Welsh slate. The window pattern on the earlier photographs show the flush timber casement windows divided into six rather than three panes. A new door has been added to the west bay but otherwise the building remains much as it was in the early part of the twentieth century.

**Figure 91:** Interior of the Bell bar before it was made into a sitting room in the 1950s.

Copyright: Mrs Parkes’ Scrapbook of the Village

**Figure 92 and 93:** The top photograph shows the Bell Inn with a thatched roof and sign over the door, the bottom photographs shows a corrugated roof having replaced the thatch in 1955

Copyright: Mrs Parkes’ Scrapbook of the Village

The Hovel or Former Village Wash-house opposite the Bell Inn is built of oolitic limestone and has a slate roof, painted timber door and window. This building sits immediately on the north side of the drainage ditch which was diverted southwards around this building and the two cottages that can be seen on the 1875-87 and 1899-1905 maps. The Hovel or

**Figure 94:** The Bell in recent times.

**Figure 95:** The Bell Inn and Bell Cottage in 2016

**The Hovel or Former Village Wash-house**

opposite the Bell Inn is built of oolitic limestone and has a slate roof, painted timber door and window. This building sits immediately on the north side of the drainage ditch which was diverted southwards around this building and the two cottages that can be seen on the 1875-87 and 1899-1905 maps. The Hovel or

**Figure 96:** The Hovel or former village wash-house in 1955.

Copyright: Mrs Parkes’ Scrapbook of the Village
Old Wash-house may have been a communal facility provided for the villagers by the Estate or the cottagers who lived in the semi-detached parish cottages to the north which belonged to Manor Farm (the cottages are shown in red on the draft 1726 inclosure map but were demolished in 1903 following an outbreak of diphtheria). This would make the wash-house a rare survivor and therefore of historic importance and worthy of being considered for listing. Special architectural detail such as the old coppers, hand-pump, are understood to have been lost.

The Hovel or former village wash-house has also served as a smith’s ‘tinkers shop’ a hen-hut and a gardener’s tool shed.

To the south of Bell Cottage lie Stonecroft, 15 Oxford Road and 17 Oxford Road.

Mrs Parkes refers to them as ‘Two Moss’s Cottages’ in the lane which were extended and modernised by Model Farm. They both have a central chimney suggesting they may each have been two cottages. The walls of the cottage are oolitic limestone. The windows on No17 are not original.

Figure 97: 1875-87 OS Map showing the former village wash-house and the cottages which stood north-west of this.

Figure 98: The Hovel or former village wash-house in 2016.

Figure 99: Stonecroft, 15 Oxford Road and 17 Oxford Road in 1955

Copyright: Mrs Parkes’ Scrapbook of the Village
in that they have non-traditional UPVC storm proof casements. The general proportion of the windows suit the buildings. The roofs have been recovered in tiles. The cottages form a small group.

Between these cottages and 45-47 Oxford Road there are modern houses and bungalows.

There is a pair of semi-detached, one and a half-storey ex-council houses of good basic design. The extension to the west and different render finishes detract from the original symmetry.

**45-47 Oxford Road** (formerly known as Ben Casey’s Cottage and Lesters). No 45 was once a handsome thatched cottage that was harmed by ‘improvements’ in 1933. The roof was raised, the thatch replaced with blue slate and two gabled dormers were added. The roof is asymmetric with a higher eaves to the north elevation and the grouping is now encased in a non-traditional pebble-dashed render.

**Figure 100:** Stonecroft, 15 Oxford Road and 17 Oxford Road in 2016

**Figure 101:** The semi-detached council housing as built.

Copyright: Mrs Parkes’ Scrapbook of the Village

**Figure 102:** The semi-detached housing in 2016

**Figure 103:** ‘Ben Casey’s Cottage’, now 45 Oxford Road with its thatched roof.

Copyright: Mrs Parkes’ Scrapbook of the Village

**Figure 104:** 45-47 Oxford Road in 1955.

Copyright: Mrs Parkes’ Scrapbook of the Village

**Figure 105:** 45-47 Oxford Road in 2016
Hampton Poyle’s Church Day School was set up in this double gabled cottage (55 Oxford Road). The School closed in 1872, reopened in 1875 and closed again finally in 1882. No 55 may originally have been two cottages. It has lost its double gable and chimneys to the main cottage. The windows have been altered and a new gable window has been added. 53 and 51 Oxford Road adjoin to the north.

Figures 106 and 107: 55 Oxford Road, the former school, in 1955.

Copyright: Mrs Parkes’ Scrapbook of the Village

Figures 109 and 110: Corner Cottage around 1905, and in 1955 without its thatched roof.

Copyright: Mrs Parkes’ Scrapbook of the Village

Figure 111: Corner Cottage in 2016.

7.17 Bletchingdon Road (formerly London Road)

Around 1905, Corner Cottage (4 Bletchingdon Road) had a thatched roof, oolitic limestone walls and trefoil ground floor window heads, indicating it was a cottage of some status. The central photo shows the building in 1955 before the roof was heightened and the stone porch added; the outline of the former porch can be seen as clean stone. The village stocks were located slightly to the north.

8 Bletchingdon Road formerly known as Home Farm Cottages (as oppose to Home Farm
Cottage on Church Lane) were thatched until 1935. The cottages stand at a tangent to the road and were modernised in 1954 to include bathrooms and the well which served both cottages was filled in. The west cottage was called ‘Long Furrows’ and served as a general store c1890. Long Furrows has lost its chimney and the door has been filled leaving only its stone lintel. The cottage to the south now has a gabled extension; the simple flush timber casements have been replaced with non-traditional and unsympathetic UPVC storm proof casements and the deep-struck pointing gives the cottage a more modern appearance than its origins.

**Jubilee Cottage** (16 Bletchingdon Road) lies to the south of the brick and stucco bungalow that was built in 1946 and bought by Model Farm in 1954 to house the agent. The gabled front of the 1950s brick cottage is of a similar form to the remodelled Corner Cottage. **14 Bletchingdon Road (New Gabled Cottage)**

These were extended and modernised by Model Farm. Although Jubilee Cottage has lost its thatched roof it retains its inglenook fireplace.
8.0 Management Plan

Policy context

8.1 The 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act places a duty on local planning authorities to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of its conservation areas. In line with Historic England’s guidance (2011) Conservation Area Management Proposals are published as part of the process of area designation or review. The Conservation Area appraisal document is designed to inform planning decisions, and other actions that the council and/or property owners within the designated area take. The role of the Management Plan is to identify actions that could contribute to the enhancement of the special character and appearance of the area by the council, owners and other stakeholders alike.

8.2 The main threat to the character and appearance of any conservation area would be the infilling of the important space between the individual farmsteads as this would harm the significance of the dispersed ribbon development along Church Lane. The next significant threat is the cumulative impact of alterations, some quite small in themselves, to the traditional but unlisted buildings within the area. These changes include such works as the replacement of traditional flush timber window casements with non-traditional storm proof casements or top opening or bottom opening hoppers (which may be traditional in stables); or in an unsympathetic material such as UPVC. Metallic edge spacers in double glazing can also be unsightly where matt black is less conspicuous when seen against the edge of the glass. Slimline double glazing is more suited to traditional buildings as this lessens the impact of the edge spacers between the sheets of glass. False glazing bars between the sheets of glass or glued onto the face of the glass lack authenticity and can drop off. Other changes which can erode the character of the village include the replacement of original doors with unsympathetic design and materials, additions such as non-traditional porches and erection of satellite dishes on the front elevations of properties. The change of a roofing material to a non-traditional material. Poor repointing and masonry repairs can also have a negative impact. Such alterations to unlisted residential properties are for the most part permitted development and therefore do not require planning permission. Unauthorised alterations and additions may also be a cause for concern and are often detrimental to the appearance of a property. The loss of dilapidated stone walls can also have a significant impact. Both unsympathetic permitted development and unauthorised development cumulatively result in the erosion of the historic character and appearance of the conservation area. Landscaping can also have both a positive and negative effect on the conservation area and the design needs to be mindful of setting, character and views.

8.3 The aim of management proposals is not to prevent changes but to ensure that any such changes are both sympathetic to the individual property, sympathetic to the streetscape and above all enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

8.4 The General Permitted Development Order 2015 explains what is permitted development and gives further detail on conservation areas. Building owners should also check there are no restrictive covenants or removal of permitted developments rights on their property. The principal policies covering alterations and development of the historic built environment are given in Appendix 1.

8.5 Demolition in a conservation area is now covered by planning permission and not conservation area consent.
8.6 Any alteration to a listed building internally or externally, including curtilage listed buildings and structures will require listed building consent and sometimes planning permission.

8.7 In addition building control approval is required for a number of works under the ‘approved documents’. It is always worth considering any building work holistically, taking into account both planning and building control guidance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Proposals for Preservation and Enhancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boundary Treatments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As specific character features of the conservation area, total demolition of traditional boundary features will be resisted. The wrought iron gates and fences surrounding the properties should be maintained and repaired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The traditional stone boundary walls and mature trees and hedges also make a valuable contribution to the character of the settlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ha-ha at the Old Rectory is an interesting feature in the English Landscape Style where garden and landscape were viewed as one. However, it may only function as a barrier for sheep and cattle in the field and not more agile horses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Important Views</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Views into and out of the conservation area should be maintained; although there has been planting of hedgerows and trees, these should be managed to ensure glimpsed views through are maintained to allow some relationship between the village properties and the public highways and footpaths. This will help to add variety and interest to the various walks around the village. Views towards the steeple of St Mary’s should be maintained as should sweeping vistas across the fields and to the horizon in views looking north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meandering Church Lane allows select views of the main properties in the village, ending with the view of the churchyard at the end of the lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fields and gaps between the dispersed ribbon development along Church Lane and the north of Bletchingdon Road needs to be maintained as does the open view across fields on the south of Oxford Road as these open spaces are part of the character of the settlement. They also allow the land to be cultivated and grazed providing an ongoing tie to the land on which the settlement prospered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ridge and furrow, the undulations in the fields and drainage ditches are also important landscape features of the settlement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Building Maintenance</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive repair and regular maintenance will be encouraged through distribution of guidance notes and general advice via the Development Management process. It is of the utmost importance that traditional techniques and materials are used to retain the special historic character and appearance of the area. In particular, this includes the use of lime mortar and like-for-like repairs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Archaeology</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Poyle is thought to have the remains of a shrunken medieval village earthworks and medieval fishponds. There are two archaeological constraint areas in the village and early consultation with Oxfordshire County Council’s Archaeology Department in relation to any proposed new works involving foundation excavation or ground levelling is encouraged at the outset to prevent delay at the application submission stage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **New development** | As a Category C village (The Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 Plan for Adoption 20 July 2015), the village is considered suitable for conversion of existing buildings and infilling but not all infill gaps will be suitable for development in Hampton Poyle, the open spaces are important to the character and significance of the conservation area. See c.264 of The Local Plan and c.269. Any proposed development or extensions must respect the scale, design, proportions and materials of the surrounding architecture to strengthen the cohesion of the street scene. It is crucial that the scale and diversity of the surrounding architecture is respected and that an imaginative and high quality design is employed. The street scene in the conservation areas is a fairly loose network of historic farms nestled in their farmstead settings; the land around them provides the wider setting and is an equally important contributor to the special interest and significance of the conservation area. Church Lane forms the spine of the settlement and maintains the feel of an old country village. The river, ditches and ponds provide further enrichment to the setting within the Oxford Greenbelt.

The NPPF states the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl and to keep land permanently open. It also states that inappropriate development is harmful and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate subject to a number of exceptions as set out in NPPF Paragraph 89. Cherwell District Council’s Local Plan 2011-2031 Policy ESD14 adopted on 20 July 2015, refers back to NPPF. |
| **Conversion of farm buildings** | Conversion and extensions to farmhouses and their outbuildings needs special care in order that they retain their character and significance. Historic England provides guidance as does Cherwell District Council. It is important that outbuildings on redundant farms or farms which are now solely residential are not neglected but maintained. |
| **Retention of historic features and reinstatement of lost** | Traditional architectural details and local materials are important and should be retained, repaired or reinstated where lost. The unsympathetic alteration of minor features could have a significant impact on the character and appearance of Hampton Poyle. An Article 4 Direction could ensure that existing original and traditional details are protected and where necessary sensitively replaced in the future. |
| **Wiring, satellites and aerials** | Overhead wiring, television aerials and satellite dishes in the settlement do detract from the historic character, particularly along Church Lane, Bletchingdon Road and Oxford Road and can also spoil views of the conservation area from the public footpaths. The overhead cables are a negative feature in the landscape, although not a planning matter, the Parish Council and Statutory Utilities should be mindful of the impact they have on the landscape both in close and distant views. Overground wiring can be seen in many views of Hampton Poyle; the siting or burial of cabling can have a positive effect on the conservation area and greenbelt subject to due consideration being given to archaeology. Satellite dishes in particular can pose a threat and should be positioned in an inconspicuous location hidden from public view. |
Car parking and passing places on the Highway

Car parking is an issue in the village around the church and The Bell Inn. Some traffic is generated by the Manor Farm livery business but as the livery clients are aware of the potential for hacking horses, speeds are typically limited. There is some large farm machinery that access Manor Farm and passing vehicles can erode the grass verge. Vehicles are generally not parked on the lane unless there is a building project, or when walkers park their car in the village.

Visitors to The Bell Inn park on the verge when the car park is full. A solution needs to be driven by the owners.

Management of the village ponds, hedgerows and trees

The Parish Council maintain the village ponds and notify the Arboricultural Officer at Cherwell District Council of the work to trees in the public domain. In addition, the local planning authority also manage the Hedgerows Regulations 1997 for any proposal to remove a hedgerow or part of a hedgerow. (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/countryside-hedgerows-regulation-and-management)

Owners also need to notify the council of the intention to do work on trees in conservation areas. Further details can be found at www.cherwell.gov.uk. Where trees are of little significance and used for coppicing it may be possible to negotiate a five year management plan with the council’s Arboricultural officer, see section 10. Work to a tree or hedge covered by a TPO needs a planning application.

Making the most of the new village green

The new village green is very inward looking and appears to be underused. There is potential to create something that could be better used whilst respecting the character of the village. The planting around the new village green has blocked a distant view to the horizon from the north and the lane between the Old Manor House and Manor Farm Cottage.

Landscaping

Materials used in gardens should be permeable and suited to this rural setting. Planning permission is required for new driveways and other structures.

Garden design, pools and tennis courts

The impact of fountains, tennis courts and pools can have a negative impact on the setting of the village. Their siting and screening needs careful consideration so that they do not impact on the special character of the conservation area or setting of the listed buildings. Archaeology also needs to be taken into account in any proposed excavations.

Screening Kidlington to maintain the pastoral scene and setting of the conservation area

Distant screening to the south west would camouflage the office development near the airport which can be seen in the south vista from Hampton Poyle

Further detail is given in Section II ‘Design and Repair Guidance’.
Figure 119: Utilities can have a negative effect on the character of the conservation area.

Figure 120: The treatment of grass verges can have an impact on the character of the conservation area. Issues arise when vehicles continually mount the grass verge, undermining the quality of the grass.

Figure 121: Hedge laying at Church Farm and pollarding of crack Willows by the pond are examples of positive landscape management in the conservation area.

Figure 122: There are rusted estate railings to the left of the fine double set of iron gates at the Old Rectory which are a typical feature of rural fields. There are a series of painted bollards which protect the grass verge to the west of the driveway, staddle stones are used for protection at the east end of Church Lane.

Figure 123: The grass verge is being eroded by vehicular movement and a sensitive rural solution is needed to protect it.

Figure 124: Removing algae from the pond and pollarding the trees on Church Lane is an important part of their maintenance.

Figure 125: The barn between Church Farm and Willow House makes a positive contribution to the streetscene and reinforces the agricultural character of the village.
9. Conservation Area Boundary Justification

Policy context
9.1 A conservation area is 'an area of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance.' Different planning controls apply in conservation areas and it is vital that only areas which are demonstrably of special architectural or historical interest be included.

9.2 Hampton Poyle Conservation Area was first designated in 1991. The original boundary was drawn to cover the historic core of the settlement and buildings of architectural or historical interest that were known at the time. This is the first review of the 1991 Conservation Area boundary and it has been guided by Historic England’s ‘Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management Advice Note 1.’ Wherever possible, the conservation area boundary coincides with physical features such as walls, fences, hedges, ditches or other land boundaries for ease of identification. The detailed study of the village and archival material for this first appraisal of the village has identified some additional buildings and features with historical interest.

9.3 The whole village is in the Oxford Greenbelt which provides statutory protection for the area. Different planning controls apply in conservation areas and it is therefore vital that only areas which are demonstrably of special architectural or historic interest be included. Due to the different character of modern development compared to the historic core of the village it was considered inappropriate for the whole village to be included in the conservation area designation.

9.4 The conservation area boundary has been assessed from the public domain with the help of aerial photographs and historic maps. St Mary’s Church, Manor Farm, Poyle Court, Model Farm, the Old Manor House and their curtilage structures are protected through their listed status. However, there are other significant unlisted buildings including Church Farm, the Barn and Bothy belonging to Willow House, the Old Rectory and the Moat House within the 1991 conservation area boundary and others with historical associations in the wider village which are also important to understanding of the village. The proposed changes to the 1991 Conservation Area boundary include key areas of the Oxford and Bletchingdon Roads, together with the clarification of some irregularities in the 1991 boundary.

North Boundary:
9.5 The 2016 revised north boundary of the conservation area now includes the boundary ditch that runs from the River Cherwell north of the Ham around what was referred to as ‘The Grove’ on the 1797 Inclosure Map, west of Manor Farm. The boundary continues along the north of St Mary’s churchyard wall to the north side of the ‘boundary ditch’ annotated on Figure 11 of the Map Showing the Possible Maximum Extent of Medieval Village of Hampton Poyle in the church files and on the 1724 draft and 1797 Inclosure maps of the village. The boundary then follows the historic field boundaries (Smiths Home Close and the Orchards behind Poyle Court and Model...
Farm and the land referred to as The Rookery and Bales's Close on the 1797 Inclosure map) where it meets Bletchingdon Road.

9.6 The inclusion of the ditch and field to the east of Model Farm known as the Rookery and Bales's close (Morby's Close and the terrace of three ‘Blenheim Cottages’ which were demolished and the land was then used as the village dump) remains unchanged. The ditch is clearly shown on the map of the extent of the medieval village which is held in the church files (Figure 11), it is also shown on the 1724 draft Inclosure Map (Figure 17) and the 1797 Inclosure Map (Figure 18) as well as on the historic OS Maps. The 1724 draft Inclosure Map shows a house on the Rookery strip and another on the field known as Bales’s Close on the 1797 map which shows a house straddling both properties with additional outbuildings. Mary Parkes’ Scrapbook states a terrace of 3 cottages was demolished c1890; the stone was reused in repairs to walls and buildings in the village and the land became the village dump. The land was clearly part of the village rather than the surrounding agricultural fields.

East Boundary:

9.7 The boundary returns southwards along the centre of Bletchingdon Road and steps to include the domestic curtilages of Jubilee Cottage (16 Bletchingdon Road) and 14 Bletchingdon Road (New Cottage or New Gabled Cottage) which have historical associations with Model Farm. The boundary steps back to include the boundary of Nos 10 and 12 Bletchingdon Road with the Highway before stepping eastwards to include the domestic curtilages of No 8 Bletchingdon Road, the Pound House (No 6 Bletchingdon Road), Corner Cottage (No 4 Bletchingdon Road), Colworth Cottage (No 3 Oxford Road) and Goukamma (No 5 Oxford Road). The boundary includes a historic hedgerow but excludes the field beyond which has been bought by a number of properties from the Duchy of Cornwall. The boundary then encloses the car park belonging to the Bell Inn and the curtilage of Bell Cottage along with the domestic curtilages of Stonescroft (15 Oxford Road) and 17 Oxford Road and includes the lane from Oxford Road to the fields beyond.

South Boundary:

9.8 The boundary runs along the south side of the drainage ditch to the south of Oxford Road, to include the Hovel or Former Village Wash-house and continues westwards until it diverts south to include the field to the west of 2 Oxford Road and the domestic curtilages of the Moat House and the Old Manor. The boundary continues past the end of the lane between Church Lane and the fields to include the paddock behind Manor Farm Cottage. The boundary then runs southwards to include the field (Lumber's Close on the 1797 map) to the east of the Old Rectory. The curtilage of the Old Rectory, the ha-ha and railings are included and the boundary line then follows the field boundary which is beside the earthwork highlighted on Figure 11. The boundary returns south as it meets the tennis court at Manor Farm and continues to the edge of the River Cherwell beside the Ham where it stretches westward to meet the south of the land once known as ‘the Grove’ and includes the site of the Grist Mill.

Summary of changes to the boundary:

9.9 The 1991 conservation area boundary excluded the established garden of the Moat House and is now included. The field between the Moat House and 2 Oxford Road is now also included. The line of the field boundary has been straightened to the south of the field between the Old Rectory and Manor Farm and the boundary now runs down to meet the River Cherwell and includes the area referred to as ‘The Grove’ to the west of Manor Farm, following the full extent of the historic boundary ditch and ponds until it meets Bletchingdon Road to enclose what was Bales's Close on the 1797 map.

9.10 The review of the boundary has looked at other properties in the village which make a positive contribution both in terms of form and historical association which have been described in Section 7.5.

9.11 The buildings which are considered to make
a positive historical contribution to the village and are worthy of inclusion in the revised conservation area boundary are as follows:

9.12 The Bell Inn (11 Oxford Road), Bell Cottage (13 Oxford Road), and the small tin-roofed building opposite which is reputed to be a hovel or the old village wash house and are all of some historical interest and can be fairly easily incorporated within the boundary as an extension of the street, along with Stonescroft and 17 Oxford Road (formerly known as Two Moss's Cottages) to the south which have connections to historic farms.

9.13 The site of the village Pound is of historical interest, as is the site of the village stocks west of Steer's Close. The modern cottages of Goukamma (5 Oxford Road) and the stone built Colworth Cottage (3 Oxford Road, formerly known as Francot, built in 1937 on the site of the village Pound) are included in the proposed boundary extension. The once thatched Corner Cottage (4 Bletchingdon Road) is included in the group, along with 8 Bletchingdon Road (formerly known as Longfurrows); Pound House (6 Bletchingdon Road) is included for group value. Model Farm Herb Garden (The New Gable Cottage, 14 Bletchingdon Road) and 16 Bletchingdon Road (Jubilee Cottage) are included for their associations with Model Farm and for the contribution they make and could potentially make to character of the conservation area and village as a whole.

9.14 The former church school building at 55 Oxford Road was in transient use and has been much altered, it lies at the eastern extremity of the village and has not been included in the revised boundary but instead has been put forward for inclusion in the Register of Local Heritage Assets.

9.15 To the southeast, the former Ben Casey’s Cottage at 45 Oxford Road and the adjoining 47 Oxford Road have been excluded as the once thatched cottage is now rendered with pebbledash and no longer provides a positive contribution to the character of the village.

Figure 127: The revised conservation area boundary as proposed
10. Effects of Conservation Area Designation

Conservation areas are designated by the council under Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. There are different planning controls in conservation areas and anyone proposing development should seek advice from Development Control and Major Developments at an early stage. The main effects of designation are as follows:

10.1 Development should preserve or enhance the area
Development should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area, ‘the special architectural or historic interest of which it is desirable to conserve or enhance’. This enables the achievement of higher standards of design in new developments and secures the conservation of existing important features and characteristics. Information supporting planning applications must demonstrate the proposal, and its impact on the conservation area, in sufficient detail to enable a thorough assessment.

10.2 Control over demolition of buildings
Planning permission is required from Cherwell District Council, as the Local Planning Authority, for the demolition or substantial demolition of unlisted buildings in the conservation area. Where a building is of demonstrable architectural or historic interest, consent for demolition will only be given as a last resort.

10.3 Control over trees
The council must be notified of any intention to carry out works to fell, lop or top any tree over 75mm (3 inches approx.)

Figure 128: Tree Preservation Orders
in diameter not already the subject of a tree preservation order. This provides the council with an opportunity to consider making a tree preservation order and the provision of an extra degree of control over the many trees that are important to the appearance of the conservation area. (Hedges are controlled under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 and are not dependent on conservation area status). Where trees are of little significance and used for coppicing there is the opportunity to agree 5 year management plans with the council’s Arboricultural Officers.

Any work to a tree or hedge covered by a Tree Preservation Order needs a planning application.

10.4 Protection of important open spaces and views
It is important to protect the open and aesthetic quality of the countryside adjacent to the village because it is integral to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Open space sometimes has its own historic significance. The inclusion of peripheral open spaces around the settlement in the designation of the conservation area is specifically to ensure that the character of these spaces is preserved.

10.5 Control over the demolition of enclosures
Consent is also required to demolish any means of enclosure over 1 metre in height abutting a ‘highway’ (including a public footpath or bridleway), waterway or open space; or above 2 metres in height in any other case. This means that walls not relating to listed buildings, that add so much to the character and appearance of the street scene, are afforded protection.

10.6 Powers to seek repair of unlisted historic buildings
The council has powers to seek the repair of unlisted (as well as listed) buildings in a poor state of repair where the building makes a valuable contribution to the street scene or is of local importance as a building type.

10.7 Reduced permitted development
There are no permitted development rights for commercial properties.

Within conservation areas there are restrictions on the size of extensions to domestic properties that may be carried out without specific planning permission including:

- A two storey rear extension of any dimension;
- A single storey side extension of any dimension;
- A building, enclosure, pool or container at the side of a dwelling;
- Cladding in any material;
- Any alteration or extension to the roof;
- A satellite dish on any chimney, wall or roof slope that faces onto or is visible from a highway;
- A flue or chimney on a wall or roof slope that fronts a highway or can be seen from a highway and forms the principal or side elevation of the house (NB external drainage such as a soil or vent pipes already need planning permission).

Further information can be found in the General Permitted Development Order 2015 which can be found on the Planning Portal: www.planningportal.gov.uk

10.8 Enhancements should preserve and enhance the area
Land use planning policies in the Cherwell Local Plan and the emerging Local Development Framework aim to ensure that special attention is given to the preservation or enhancement of designated conservation areas, and proposals for new development will be acceptable if they assist in the achievement of that objective.

Any enquiries concerning permitted development within conservation areas should be addressed to the Development Management Team, planning@cherwell-dc.gov.uk or telephone 01295 221006.
11. Design and Repair Guidance

The following design guidance seeks to ensure that the character of the Conservation Area is enhanced, through imaginative and high quality design. There is very limited opportunity for development in Hampton Poyle which is defined as a Category C Village in the Cherwell Local Plan 2015 Part 1, where only appropriate infilling and conversions will be considered.

High quality design and informed decision making are essential if we are to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The palette of materials found in the conservation area includes oolitic limestone walls, stone and red brick chimney stacks. Thatched roofs have been replaced by other roofing materials. Stonesfield slate, Welsh slate and clay tile predominate. Modern concrete tiles have been introduced without considering the impact the increased weight will have on roof structures. Some farm outbuildings have lost their original roof coverings and are now covered by asbestos cement and corrugated iron. The north aisle of the church was historically covered in lead but in a recent re-roofing project the lead has been lost. Windows are generally metal casements in timber sub-frames (some with diamond leaded lights). There are also timber sash and case windows and plain flush balanced timber casements. Doors range between painted panelled timber doors to boarded doors, a couple have iron studs. Rainwater goods tend to be painted cast iron. Some black some stone coloured. Boundary treatments range from stone walls to iron and timber fences. There are church gates, solid timber and elaborate iron gates; there are many field gates and mechanised large timber gates to Model Farm. Hard landscaping varies from stone chippings and flagstones through to tarmac.

A number of these elements have a positive impact on the conservation area but there are others which have a harmful effect.

The following aspects are particularly important:

11.1 Scale and settlement pattern
There are limited, if any, opportunities for infill development in Hampton Poyle to ensure that the significance and character of the individual farmsteads is not compromised. The scale of any new development, including extensions and alterations to existing buildings must be consistent with, respect and relate to the original buildings and its surroundings in the conservation area.

Restoration and re-development must respect traditional plot widths, building line and orientation. Properties should front the street and avoid repetitive and unrelieved facades which typify so many modern designs.

There should be no back land development as a general rule. Hampton Poyle has variations of plot size, but there is a consistency in the scale and mass of traditional buildings.

11.2 Proportion
In most buildings within the Conservation Area, the relationship between windows, doors, floor heights and the proportion of solid to void in the design of elevations is a fundamental language that unites the character. It is of particular importance that traditional proportions are respected in any extensions to existing properties; in most instances they will need to be subservient to the existing properties.

11.3 Building Line
Frontage development must conform to the historic street pattern. The historic layout of the village is linear with the buildings facing onto the road with their rooflines parallel to it with the exception of No8 Bletchingdon Road.

The building line is fragmented, with buildings generally being set back from Church Lane.
behind walls, fences and hedges, historic ditches and only a few properties truly address the lane.

11.4 **Roofs**

The roof line is a dominant feature of a building. The retention of the original height, shape, pitch, verge and eaves detail including any ornamentation is essential. Flat roofs are alien to local tradition and should be resisted where possible. Chimneys are stone or stone and brick, they are important features of the roofscape and should be retained, even if no longer required. Where traditional roofing materials are to be replaced, the new materials should match the material, colour and texture of those being replaced. Where inappropriate roofing materials are being replaced with traditional roofing materials, these should match a good surviving example in the village. The weight of roofing materials also needs careful consideration. If ventilation is required, this should be achieved by inconspicuous means (e.g. under-eaves ventilation); visible roof vents are discouraged. Lead roofs and flashings should be marked with a forensic coating, have CCTV and be alarmed to deter thieves.

Where natural slate is in place, this will be a British slate which has a fairly limited variation in colour. There are cheaper slates available which may be very flat, thin or mineral rich which may be a weakness in the material and will discolour over time with brown streaks. All slate should be carefully considered and as a natural material and there will be some variation depending on where it comes out of the quarry. Before purchasing a slate, suppliers should be asked to provide examples of where their slate has been on a roof for a number of years so that a judgement can be made and if the proposed slate is suitable for Hampton Poyle. The slate should conform to British Standards (BS) and/or European Standard (BSEN). Where local Stonesfield slates are being repaired or new roofs covered, reclaimed slates should be sourced from a reputable source. If large numbers of new stone slate are required they should be of a similar thickness and be suitable for purpose. In a major re-roofing project the more publicly visible or principal façade would normally be recovered in the old slates with new slates being used on less visible roofslopes. The slate should match both dry and wet.

Old plain tiled roofs have some character as the tiles were hand-made, modern clay tiles are machine made and can change the character of a building.

On some farm outbuildings original thatched or stone tiled roofs may have been replaced with a lighter corrugated roof, as cheap alternative to provide a watertight hat or where the roof covering might have been too heavy for the structure. Corrugated roofs have become a traditional roof covering, having been in existence for almost 200 years.

The treatment of the ridge should be based on historic precedent as should verge and eaves details.

11.5 **External Walls**

Walls are predominantly Oolitic limestone but there is some red brick. Any alteration or repair to external walls must respect the existing building materials and match them in texture (including tooling), quality and colour. When selecting a stone for replacement it can be useful to break a sample in half and compare this against an unweathered original stone or fragment of the stone. The stone should match both dry and wet. Every effort should be made to retain or re-use facing stonework. Rendering, pebble-dashing or painting masonry is discouraged and is not permitted development on a principal elevation or an elevation facing a highway or public right of way. Repointing should be carried out with a mortar to match the existing in colour, type and texture; historically this would have consisted of lime and sand. Hard, modern cement mortars are inappropriate as they prevent the evaporation of moisture through the joints, which instead is drawn through the next softest material, the masonry itself. This damages both the appearance and structure of the building. The size of mortar joints should be based on the original existing, sometimes hidden behind unfortunate later repointing schemes. Many buildings in the district have excellent masonry and repointing should be carried out only where
needed. Often buildings, are totally, repointed where only localised ‘like for like’, well-matched pointing is required. There are many unfortunate examples where mortar has been chiselled out, causing damage to the corners of both stone and brick, so that when the wall is repointed, there are thick joints with a much higher proportion of mortar which can change the character of a building.

The replacement of stone should be well considered. There will be a hierarchy of masonry features such as chimneys, verges, window surrounds, door cases, strings as well as the general walling. The patina of age on a weathered string should be retained until it is not performing its function in protecting what is below. When it is ready for replacement it may be that it is the only stone that needs to be replaced. Where possible templates for new carved stone should be taken from the best surviving example, a good banker mason should interpret the template to provide the geometrical setting out and check this against the stone on site prior to carving the new stone. It should be noted that although stone is laid on its natural bed for general walling that there are positions where it should be laid edge-bedded, a good mason should be able to advise.

There is very little use of render historically in Hampton Poyle where the use of Oolitic limestone predominates and the use of render is discouraged. Original render should not be stripped off to expose rubble stone or brick walls, which were not intended to be exposed. Traditionally, render finishes were lime-based. More modern, hard cement renders prevent the evaporation of moisture, which can accumulate between the wall and the render causing damp internally. When appropriate and when the damage caused by removal is minimal, hard cement renders should be replaced with a breathable lime alternative. Any historic breathable render should be repaired 'like for like'.

11.6 Rainwater goods
Rainwater goods (guttering, downpipes, hoppers) should be repaired if original or reinstated in original materials. Plastic guttering is not appropriate for listed buildings or buildings in conservation areas as it is not historically authentic and does not enhance a building’s character.

11.7 Soil Vent Pipes
These should be kept off principal elevations, they can be sited internally if this will not damage any historic fabric, and can reduce to a much smaller diameter to pipe at roof level. If internal siting would cause damage to historic fabric then they should be located in a discreet location on a rear elevation. UPVC soil pipes are not appropriate for listed buildings or buildings within a conservation area.

11.8 Mechanical Ventilation
On external walls, stone slate vents can look less obtrusive than a proprietary vent. Plastic vents should not be visible in a conservation area.

11.9 Boiler or wood burner flues
Flues should run up within existing chimneys, where they exist. The detail of termination may need planning permission and should be simple. Flues should not be located on the highway or principal elevations.

11.10 Micro-energy generation
Whilst the use of micro-energy systems is generally encouraged, special care will be necessary to find suitable sites for their use within a conservation area. Equipment fixed to main or visible elevations or roof-planes will damage the character and appearance of the conservation area.

11.11 Windows
Windows should be correctly proportioned, well related to each other and neighbouring buildings, and should respect any existing openings. Retention and repair of original traditional windows is the preferred option, and guidance is listed in the Bibliography, any replacement should match the original. This not only includes the structural elements of the window (e.g. frame, lintel) but also historic glass and window furniture. Where windows are modern in a listed building there may be scope to introduce slimline double glazing but this will be judged
on a case by case basis. Where acceptable, the edge spacer should be a dark matt charcoal/black in colour, Historic England guidance defines slimline double glazing as between 10 and 16mm. It is possible with some glazing companies to include a glass which has some character (not too much!) which is reminiscent of historic glass. This is most appreciated from the outside where reflections in historic glass can lend some life to the reflections. Where windows are replaced on non-listed buildings in a conservation area, the same principles are recommended even with standard double glazing. UPVC windows are not appropriate for a conservation area. Traditionally windows would be painted flush timber casements, sash and case, or metal casements within a masonry or timber sub-frame. Some windows would once have been leaded. The windows at Model Farm are sash in a single stone-mullioned opening – a similar window opening with central stone mullion existed until recently at Church Farm.

Particularly important is the method of opening, the set back within the reveal and the sections of glazing bars. The thickness and moulding of glazing bars, the size and arrangement of panes are vital elements in determining appropriate replacement windows, which respect the age of a building. The exterior profile of a glazing bar should be angled to replicate a putty-line. Replacement of timber or metal windows in a UPVC alternative, no matter what the pattern or design, is unacceptable. Dormers are not a traditional feature for this area. They are discouraged on front, principal or highway elevations where they don’t already exist, although there are some early examples within the District. Rooflights have appeared on some roofs, not all of which are sympathetically placed or of a flush conservation type set between rafters, they are discouraged on elevations fronting the highway or on the principal elevation of a building. Rooflights to the rear would be preferable where possible and should be flush conservation types set between rafters of appropriate size. Where rooflights also provide escape they should not be off-centre within the opening. Where inappropriate windows are proposed to be replaced, historically correct fenestration will be required. Inappropriate replacement windows damage the character and appearance of a building and its surroundings and can undermine the value of a property. Timber for both windows and doors should be sourced from sustainable managed suppliers. It should be selected for its longevity and ability to take a paint finish.

11.12 Doors
Doors are generally painted timber panelled doors or painted plank doors. There are many historic patterns that can be followed. In historic openings, avoid the tendency to cut down off the shelf doors as this can result in strange door proportions. Door ironmongery can also impact on a conservation area. The buildings in Hampton Poyle are relatively modest and ironmongery should reflect this, again there are good precedents in the village and district. Where possible original fabric should be repaired and overhauled – see the Bibliography. UPVC doors would be entirely inappropriate no matter what the design. See note in 11.11 above

11.13 Porches
There are a few open timber porches in the conservation area including the Old Rectory, Model Farm and Manor Farm Cottage. These make a positive contribution to those properties but may not be suitable for all the buildings in the conservation area.

11.14 Boundaries
The strengthening of boundary treatment has an effect on views through, within and out of the settlement. The distant views over the flat landscape should not be lost or the journeys will become stagnant and the connection with the countryside lost. There are some metal railings in need of conservation and redecoration; at Model Farm these are fairly utilitarian and at the Rectory there are simple scroll details which are quite fine.

There are some stone boundary walls. Repairs should be carried out to match the original wall to include material to match, tooling, couring, bedding, capping, pointing and joint size.
11.15 **Village Pond, drainage ditches, hedgerows and Green Space**

The village ponds and ditches in the village reinforce the low lying nature of the conservation area and its contribution to the development of the village. Not only do these watercourses support nature but they provide a mirrored view of adjacent buildings and positively contribute to their setting. The careful management of tree growth from self-set sycamores and the willows, including continuing the tradition of pollarding the crack willows is important. The key views, landmarks and diverse sensory experiences should be considered in any project so that the sense of anticipation on travels through the landscape is not lost whether, on foot, horse or wheel.

The management of hedgerows helps to enhance the countryside and setting of the conservation area. If they are allowed to grow up into trees they can restrict distant views of significance. Development in the surrounding area such as Kidlington needs to take account of the significance of distant views from the conservation area and the significance of the historical relationship between the surrounding villages. Where suitable development is permitted in neighbouring villages might affect important views out of the Hampton Poyle Conservation Area the onus should be on proper screening as part of the development rather than relying on hedgerows to grow into treelines.

11.16 **Highway**

Hampton Poyle is in a secluded rural location and street furniture, signage and road markings are at a minimum within the conservation area. The width of the highway has changed over time, with the erosion of the verge by parked cars and passing vehicles which mount the grass. Church Lane has grassed verges and historical ditches which make an important contribution the rural character of the settlement and it is important that this is not urbanised as part of any proposal for parking or passing places. It may be possible to widen parts of the highway subtly whilst keeping the grass verge to allow vehicles to pass but this should be localised.

Plastic coated metal mesh grass reinforcement is used to protect grass on buildings sites; providing this is laid on healthy grass and not overly trafficked it is possible that healthy well established grass can grow up over the reinforcement but care needs to be taken to ensure any holding down staples are well secured and do not cause a trip hazard. In addition, the form of the verge needs to allow for easy trimming of the grass without exposing the mesh. Trials should be undertaken to allow a full assessment.

The option of concrete grass pavers would not suit the conservation area as they remain visible as a geometrical grid.

Cars could be discouraged from mounting the verge by introducing boulders as has already been done at the south-east end of Church Lane. Bollards whether metal or timber would be alien to this country lane and should be avoided.

Traffic speeds on Church Lane are typically low as the majority of traffic is familiar with the narrow lane and high possibility of pedestrians and horses. Formal traffic such as speed bumps and priority halts would have a negative impact on what makes this rural lane special.

Maintenance of the lane is important to ensure water runs off into the ditch system which has carefully evolved since medieval times. Potholes should be reported to the Parish Council and Oxfordshire County Council when they appear.

There may be conflict between farm vehicles and cars from time to time but the farms should be encouraged to continue the management of the land as part of a rich tradition in the parish. Local knowledge of the land and village should be celebrated.

11.17 **Signage**

Historic signs in the village should be conserved and maintained. A good scaled photographic record should be lodged in the parish files.
Any new signs should be carefully considered as there is potential for these to have a harmful effect on the streetscene.

11.18 Utilities
The presence of overhead cables detracts from the setting of the conservation area. Proposals to bury cables subject to any archaeological investigation would be encouraged.

The co-ordination of work by the utility companies should be ‘joined up’ as part of a strategic management plan for the village. This would avoid unsightly patched roads etc. and reduce the inconvenience of road closures.

11.19 Satellite Antenna, aerials
Where possible satellite antenna should be located in gardens rather than placed on historic buildings. Satellite dishes should not be located on an elevation, roof or on a chimney fronting a highway, public footpath or public open space. If they need to be attached to the building this is best done below eaves level or disguised against welsh slate.
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Appendix 1: Policies

There are a number of policy documents which contain policies pertaining to the historic built environment. The main policies are summarised in this section. Other policies of a more general nature are also of some relevance. These are not listed here but can be found elsewhere in the specific documents mentioned below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Legislation</th>
<th>National Policy Guidance</th>
<th>Local Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Hedgerows Regulations 1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Planning Policy Framework
in particular:

Paragraph 17 Core planning principles.

Paragraph 56 to 68 Section 7 – Requiring good design.

Paragraph 77 Local green space identification.

Paragraph 100 to 104 Flood risk

Paragraph 126 to 141 Section 12 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Point 157 Identification of land within the Local Plan.

Point 169 Using a proportionate data base.

Cherwell Local Plan 1996 (Retained Saved Policies)

H19: Proposed conversions will need to retain existing appearance and not cause harm to historic assets or wider countryside.

H20: The council will normally resist proposals to convert rural buildings to provide two or more dwellings within a farmstead situated beyond the built up limits of a settlement unless the buildings are unsuitable for conversion to an employment generating use.

H21: Residential conversion favoured unless it would harm the character or interest of a building of historic interest.

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.

C23: Presumption in favour of retaining positive features within a Conservation Area.

C28: The layout, design and materials proposed within a new development should respect the existing local character.

C30: The design of the proposed scheme should show compatibility with the existing street scene and vicinity.

C33: Undeveloped gaps of land which have historic value, preserve the character of a loose-knit settlement or the setting of a listed building should be retained.

C38: Satellite dishes within a conservation area or on a listed building will not normally be permitted when they would be visible from a public highway.

S29: The loss of existing village services would be strongly resisted.

AG2: Construction of farm buildings should be mindful of the setting of listed buildings. The conservation area, the Green belt and the River Cherwell.
AG5: An existing livery business supports Manor Farm. Development associated with this should be mindful of the setting of the listed buildings, the conservation area, the River Cherwell and the green belt.


ESD1: Mitigating and adapting to climate change.
ESD5: Renewable energy.
ESD6: Sustainable Flood Risk Management
ESD10: Protection and enhancement of biodiversity and the natural environment.
ESD13: Local landscape protection and enhancement.
ESD 14: Oxford Green Belt
ESD15: The character of the built environment.

Policy Villages 1: village categorisation: the village is Category C and therefore development will be restricted to infilling and conversions only.

Policy Villages 2: distributing growth across the rural areas: the village is Category C and development will be restricted to infilling and conversion only.

Policy Villages 3: rural exception sites: rural exception sites will only be considered where there is an identified and demonstrable need which has the support of the local community.
### Appendix 2: Listed Buildings

#### Figure 129. Listed Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designated Heritage Assets within the Hampton Poyle Conservation Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Church Of St Mary Listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Manor Farmhouse Listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Outbuilding approximately 5 metres north west of Manor Farmhouse Listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Poyle Court Listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> The Old Manor House Listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> Model Farmhouse Listing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Buildings and Features that make a Positive Contribution

**Definition**

**Heritage Asset:** A building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest. Heritage asset includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing). (NPPF, Historic Environment, 27 March 2012 (Glossary)).

A number of ‘non-designated heritage assets’ (unlisted buildings) within the village make a significant positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. There are also a number of buildings outside the conservation area which nevertheless are associated with Hampton Poyle and similarly make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration of the heritage asset. Therefore, non-designated heritage assets are protected under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the retention of such buildings within any conservation area is preferable to demolition and redevelopment.

The following buildings are considered regionally or locally significant either for their architectural detail or for their part of the social history of Hampton Poyle and therefore have been put forward for consideration for inclusion to the district-wide register of non-designated heritage assets. See section 7,

**Buildings and features that make a positive contribution to the character of the Hampton Poyle Conservation Area**
- The Old Rectory, Walled Garden, Outbuildings, Boundaries including iron gate, iron fence stanchions and Ha-Ha, Church Lane
- Church Farm (Home Farm) and Outbuildings, 58 Church Lane
- Stone Barn at Willow House, Church Lane
- Stone Bothy at Willow House, Church Lane
- The Moat House, 25 Church Lane
- Manor Farm Cottage, 29-31 Church Lane
- Village Ponds and Ditches, Church Lane and Oxford Road
- Earthwork features and ditches in the fields, including ridge and furrow
- Remains of an old mill under the footbridge to the Ham
- The Bell Inn, 11 Oxford Road
- Bell Cottage, 13 Oxford Road
- Stonecroft, 15 Oxford Road
- 17 Oxford Road
- The Hovel opposite the Bell Inn (possible former Village Wash House)
- Corner Cottage, 4 Bletchingdon Road

**Buildings with historical associations**
- 8 Bletchingdon Road
- New Gabled Cottage 14 Bletchingdon Road
- Jubilee Cottage (thatched cottage) 16 Bletchingdon Road

Although inclusion into the Register of Local Heritage Assets is not subject to the same rigorous controls as statutory designation, once identified as a local (non-designated) heritage asset the council has a duty of care.

NB. The former school at 55 Oxford Road is subject to a separate Local Heritage Asset assessment to be included on the district wide register of non-designated heritage assets.
Figure 130. Local Heritage Assets (Non-designated Heritage Assets) within the Hampton Poyle Conservation Area

Key:
- Conservation Area Boundary - Revised December 2016
What is an Article 4 direction?
Certain types of minor alterations, extensions to buildings and changes of use of buildings do not require full planning permission from the council. These forms of development are called ‘permitted development’. An Article 4 Direction is a special planning regulation adopted by a Local Planning Authority. It operates by removing permitted development rights from whatever is specified in the Article 4 Direction.

The effect of these Article 4 Directions is that planning permission is required for developments that would otherwise not require an application.

In September 2013 the executive of Cherwell District Council approved the rolling out of a district-wide programme of limited Article 4 Directions to ensure that accumulative minor changes do not undermine the visual amenity of heritage within the district. By doing so this enables the council to consider these developments through the planning process so as to ensure that they accord with its policies to improve the local environment, protect businesses or any other issues.

The Planning Portal (http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/permission/responsibilities/planningpermission/permitted) provides a useful summary of permitted development and provides links to the legislation which need to be referred to. It also sets out the Use Classes Order and permitted changes of use.

What are the effects of Article 4 directions?
Once an Article 4 Direction has been made planning permission becomes necessary for the specific changes as set out in the Direction. This is only the case for the buildings covered by the Direction.

There is no fee for any application made necessary by the serving of an Article 4 Direction.

How will an Article 4 direction affect Hampton Poyle?
The Conservation Area Appraisal identifies a number of non-listed dwellings which make a special contribution to the character and appearance of Hampton Poyle.

The buildings that have been identified either make a positive contribution to the streetscape of Hampton Poyle and/or contribute positively to the setting of a significant listed building or are significant buildings in their own right.

Article 4 directions are proposed for the following non-listed buildings because of their contribution to the conservation area and its environs:

- The Old Rectory, Walled Garden, Outbuildings, Church Lane
- Church Farm (Home Farm), 58 Church Lane
- Stone Barn at Willow House, Church Lane
- Stone Bothy at Willow House, Church Lane
- Manor Farm Cottage, 29-31 Church Lane
- The Moat House, 25 Church Lane
- Bell Cottage, 13 Oxford Road
- The Bothy opposite the Bell Inn (possible Village Wash House)
- Stonecroft, 15 Oxford Road
- 17 Oxford Road
- Corner Cottage, 4 Bletchingdon Road

The directions cover changes to the front and/or principal elevations of these buildings which may include:

- The removal of traditional boundary walls, fences and gates
- The removal or rebuilding of chimney stacks
- The replacement of doors
- The replacement of windows
- Changes to roofing materials and the insertion of rooflights
- Erection of porches
- Erection of renewable technology including solar panels
- Replacement of rainwater goods and external drainage (some drainage already needs planning permission)
- Erection of satellite dishes and other antennae/aerials
Cherwell District Council considers public consultation an important part of conservation area designation and review.

As part of the review of the Hampton Poyle Conservation Area the historic settlement in question and the environs are assessed and an appraisal document produced setting out what is significant about the place.

A similar process is undertaken for individual buildings, either for putting a structure forward for statutory designation as a heritage asset (formerly known as ‘listing’), or for those buildings, structures or archaeological features that are locally significant for inclusion in the district-wide Register of Local Heritage Assets.

The draft appraisal document was prepared and an exhibition and public meeting arranged for Thursday 31 March 2016 to enable local residents and those interested to inspect the draft document in order to comment upon the proposed conservation areas boundary and to identify buildings of local interest.

Public consultation took place on the draft appraisal between 31 March 2016 and 13 May 2016, with the approval of the former lead member. The document was available to download from the council’s website. It was also available in hard copy from Bodicote House and at the Banbury, Kidlington and Mobile libraries. The parish council members received copies of the document and a few paper copies were given to individuals on request at the end of the presentation. Publicity was undertaken through local leaflets dropped through all doors in the village and posters.

The draft appraisal document covered the existing conservation area for Hampton Poyle with a minor amendment of the northern and western boundaries to include the historic ditch, and amendments to the west, east and south to include properties with historical associations to the village and farms.

Residents and members of the public were asked to complete a questionnaire and annotate a map to indicate where the boundaries should be changed (if at all) and secondly to make a list of buildings and structures that they would like to see identified as special. All comments received were considered. The appraisal and conservation area boundary have been revised where appropriate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Document title</strong></th>
<th><strong>Executive date</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Poyle Conservation Area Appraisal</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recommendation of the Executive</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delegate authority to Lead Member for Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Further recommended changes to the document</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No changes undertaken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Amended document approved by</strong></th>
<th><strong>Date approved</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Member for Planning</td>
<td>1 August 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How to contact us

Design & Conservation Team
Cherwell District Council
Bodicote House
Bodicote
Banbury
Oxfordshire
OX15 4AA

Tel: 01295 227006
e-mail: design.conservation@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
www.cherwell.gov.uk

The information in this document can be made available in other languages, large print braille, audio tape or electronic format on request. Please contact 01295 227001

Jeżeli chcieliby Państwo uzyskać informacje w innym języku lub w innym formacie, prosimy dać nam znać. 01295 227001

如欲索取以另一语文印製或另一格式製作的資料，請與我們聯絡。01295 227001

01295 227001