

Building Conservation Consultee Comments



Reference: **183198**
Proposals: Poultry Houses
Site: Trevase Farm

1.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Subject to further information being included within the Heritage Statement we would have no objections on heritage grounds. With appropriate mitigation the proposals would not affect those aspects of the setting of heritage assets which contribute to their significance.

In terms of the Heritage Statement NPPF para 189 states: *“In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets’ importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary”* Whilst there is information on Heritage issues within the D&A statement and we note the proportionality required and agree on the limited impact, it is not felt that the current heritage information meets the requirements of the NPPF.

For matters of noise, dust and odour we would defer to our colleagues in the Environmental Health Team. Should there be a quantifiable concern over these factors the impact upon the setting of heritage assets should also be considered in the decision making process.

Conditions:

Landscape scheme and details including boundary treatments. The Western boundary of the new access road being particularly important.

Colour scheme and external materials.

Building Conservation Officer: Matthew Knight

Date: 22nd October 2018

2.0 BACKGROUND TO RECOMMENDATIONS

Description & Location of Development

The proposals are for a series of 3 poultry houses to the East of Trevase Farm with a new access road to the North.

Limitations

These comments relate only to listed buildings and historic areas, for advice on buried Archaeology or Scheduled Ancient Monuments please contact the Councils Planning Archaeologist, Julian Cotton.

For matters of noise, dust and odour we would defer to our colleagues in the Environmental Health Team. Should there be a quantifiable concern over these factors the impact upon the setting of heritage assets should also be considered in the decision making process.

Policy background

The Planning (Listed Building & Conservation Areas) Act 1990 s.66 outlines: *“In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”*

The NPPF Glossary defines ‘setting’ as: *“The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.”*

There are a number of relevant cases relating to setting. Most recently the Court of Appeal case of *Catesby Estates Ltd v Steer* [2018] EWCA Civ 1697 overturned the case of *Steer v SSCLG* [2017] EWHC 1456. These cases looked at an aspect of setting based upon the interpretation of historic connections between places rather than direct visual experience. Given the nature of the heritage assets in the surrounding area, it is not felt that this case, or the interpretation of setting within it, would apply in this instance.

Section 189 of the NPPF requires applicants to describe the significance of heritage assets and the impact of proposals upon this.

Section 193 of the NPPF states that great weight should be given to an assets conservation.

Pre-application advice has been given on the proposals, reference 172632. It was not felt that the proposals would impact upon those aspects of the setting of heritage assets which contributed to their significance.

Methodology

The method used is that outlined in the Historic England GPA3: The Setting of Heritage Assets. This is a multi-stage approach which is as follows:

1. Identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected.
2. Assess whether, how and to what degree these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s).
3. Assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on that significance.
4. Explore the way to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm.
5. Make and document the decision and monitor outcomes.

3.0 COMMENTS

In terms of the Heritage Statement NPPF para 189 states: *“In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets’ importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary”* Whilst there is information on Heritage issues within the D&A statement and we note the proportionality required and agree on the limited impact, it is not felt that the current heritage information meets the requirements of the NPPF.

Name Trevase Farmhouse	Grade II	Distance 200m to W	List Number 1099720
Description C17 Farmhouse with later additions. Sandstone rubble. The farmhouse is experienced in an environment of agricultural land with hedgerows. The property has key views out to the West. The farmhouse has evidential and historic value as well as some aesthetic value and character. Those aspects of the setting which contribute to its significance are the experience of the agricultural landscape around the site and the views of this to the West from the farmhouse. The farmhouse is well screened from the existing and proposed agricultural buildings and due to intervening hedgerows and topography it is not experienced in the same context to any degree. It is not felt that the proposed development, including the road, would adversely affect those aspects of the setting of the building which contribute to its significance. For matters of noise, odour and dust we would defer to the Environmental Health Team, who can quantify these factors and have the necessary professional experience to comment. Should they have a concern about these factors, the impact upon the setting of the building should also be investigated.			
Name Walls at Trevase Farmhouse	Grade II	Distance 200m to W	List Number 1157484
Description Sandstone garden walls. Significant as a boundary feature for the Farmhouse. See above for comments.			
Name Treberon Farmhouse	Grade II	Distance 550m to NW	List Number 1248803
Description C17 Sandstone rubble farmhouse (part of group of 4 buildings – see below). Treberon Farmhouse is located some distance below Trevase Farm. Currently a dwelling it was originally a farmhouse with areas of associated agricultural land around it. The farmhouse building has aesthetic value and together with the associated farm buildings has evidential and historic value. Those aspects of the setting which contribute to its significance are the experience of the agricultural landscape around the site. Given the topography, the areas from which the building is experienced is limited, however from the grounds to the rear of the building, the anaerobic digester plant at Trevase Farm is visible. The proposals for new farm buildings would not impact upon those aspects of the setting of Treberon Farmhouse which contribute to its significance. The new access road is proposed approx 500m to the East. The road follows an existing boundary, with appropriate boundary treatment it is not felt that the road would adversely impact the setting of Treberon Farmhouse. For matters of noise, odour and dust we would defer to the Environmental Health Team, who can quantify these factors and have the necessary professional experience to comment. Should they have a concern about these factors, the impact upon the setting of the building should also be investigated.			
Name Granary at Treberon Farm	Grade II	Distance 550m to NW	List Number 1099719
Description 1756 Sandstone rubble, part of group. (See above)			
Name Stables at Treberon Farm	Grade II	Distance 550m to NW	List Number 1157480
Description Sandstone stables, part of a group of farmbuildings. (See above.)			
Name Barn at Treberon Farm	Grade II	Distance 550m to NW	List Number 1301575
Description C16 C17 barn. Strong evidential & historic value. (See above for comments.)			

Name Pencoyd Court	Grade II	Distance 920m to N	List Number 1179975
Description C17 Stone House. This has strong aesthetic value and is set within its own landscaped grounds with views out to the SE & SW. Due to intervening vegetation the significance of the site is not experienced in the same context as the proposed development. As such the proposals would not adversely affect those aspects of the setting of Pencoyd Court which contribute to its significance.			
Name Pencoyd Court Dovecote	Grade II	Distance 960m to N	List Number 1099741
Comments Sandstone Dovecote. Whilst dovecotes have a high level of historic interest due as a winter supply of food, in the supply of materials for gunpowder manufacture and as status symbols, given the location of this dovecote and the way in which it is experienced it is not felt that the proposals would adversely affect those aspects of its setting which contribute to its significance.			
Name Church of St Dennis	Grade II*	Distance 980m to N	List Number 1348774
Comments C14 Nave, with late C19 Chancel and Porch. The church has aesthetic, evidential, historic and symbolic significance. The building is experienced within a rural hamlet and its environs. Given the intervening distance, vegetation and location within the centre of the hamlet it is not felt that the proposals would adversely affect those aspects of its setting which contribute to its significance.			
Name Pencoyd Manor	Grade II	Distance 1.09km to N	List Number 1348775
Comments C17 Gentry house on an H plan. Given the intervening distance, vegetation and location on the North the hamlet it is not felt that the proposals would adversely affect those aspects of its setting which contribute to its significance.			
Name Michaelchurch House	Grade II	Distance 600m to E	List Number 1099722
Description Early C19 House. The building is located in a prominent valley and clearly screened from the proposed site. It would not be experienced in the same context as the proposals as such it is not felt that the proposals would adversely affect those aspects of its setting which contribute to its significance.			
Name Church of St Michael	Grade II	Distance 650m to E	List Number 1348804
Description C11/C12 church restored in C19. Interesting Roman altar and C13 wall paintings. The building has aesthetic, evidential, historic and symbolic value. The building is located in a prominent valley and clearly screened from the proposed site. The significance of the asset would not be experienced in the same context as the proposed development, as such it is not felt that the proposals would adversely affect those aspects of its setting which contribute to its significance.			

Name Michaelchurch Court	Grade II	Distance 720m to SE	List Number I 348804
Description C18 Sandstone farmhouse, formerly a Millworkers cottage, with former mill opposite and mill leat to South. Much expanded. The building has evidential and historic value and some aesthetic significance. The context of the former mill to the South is an important aspect of the setting which contributes to its significance. The topography is such that the significance of the building would not be experienced in the same context as the proposed development, as such it is not felt that the proposals would adversely affect those aspects of its setting which contribute to its significance.			
Name Barn to S of Michaelchurch Court	Grade II	Distance 1 km to SE	List Number I 348805
Description The topography is such that the significance of the building would not be experienced in the same context as the proposed development, as such it is not felt that the proposals would adversely affect those aspects of its setting which contribute to its significance.			
Name Bannut Tree Barn	Grade II	Distance 1.4km to SW	List Number I 099744
Description Timber frame and stone barn dated 1763. The topography and intervening distance is such that the significance of the building would not be experienced in the same context as the proposed development, as such it is not felt that the proposals would adversely affect those aspects of its setting which contribute to its significance.			

In conclusion it is not felt that the proposed development would adversely impact those aspects of the setting of nearby heritage assets which contribute to their significance. If approved we would ask for careful design of landscape treatment, in particular the boundary treatment to the edge of the proposed new road. Minor amendments to the heritage statement are required to meet the requirements of the NPPF.