

From: [Ailsa Teasdale](#)
To: [Planning](#)
Subject: FW: NYM/2017/0807/FL
Date: 20 December 2017 15:31:35

From: David Carruthers
Sent: 20 December 2017 13:42
To: Ailsa Teasdale
Cc: Edward Freedman
Subject: NYM/2017/0807/FL

Ailsa,

Application Number: NYM/2017/0807/FL
Site Address: Lowdale Hall, Lowdale, Sleights

The main issue here is the impact the development proposals will have on the setting of the heritage asset and, how this could affect its significance. The NPPF makes it clear that the setting of a heritage asset is the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3, recommends a broad approach to assessment, undertaken as a series of steps as follows:

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

Step 1 is to 'identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected'. If we apply Step 1 then the setting of Lowdale Hall has the potential to be affected by the proposals. In my opinion, and having due regard for the definition in the NPPF, the 'setting' of this asset will be affected by the proposals.

Step 2 is to assess whether the setting of a heritage asset makes a contribution to its significance and the extent and/or nature of that contribution. In this case views to and from the asset, particularly their open nature, make a positive contribution to its significance. The principal (front) elevation is also enhanced by the landscape in front of it. The applicants own heritage statement also emphasises this when it says, *[t]he main view of the front of the house is unobstructed*.

Step 3 is to identify the range of effects a development may have on setting(s) and evaluate the resultant degree of harm or benefit to the significance of the heritage asset(s). The proposal is too close to the listed house and I disagree with the Heritage

Statement, accompanying the application, which says the *garage will be sited well away from the existing building*. The proposed garage is large and will have a negative impact; on the asset's primacy in views towards it; and, in views from the asset. In addition the proposed design is of a style and materials that are alien to its context.

Step 4 revolves around managing the effects on the significance of a heritage asset arising from development liable to affect its setting. In this situation I would suggest, that to avoid a negative impact on the assets significance, an alternative location for the garage is found. Any new location should avoid an impact on important views.

Step 5 is that, in conclusion, the proposed location of the garage is unacceptable due to its negative impact on the setting of the house. The views to and from the house are an important factor to consider, and the new building will have a harmful effect on these, with a resultant loss to heritage significance. It is suggested that alternative locations are explored to minimise harm.

Thanks

David

David Carruthers
Conservation Architect

(Please note my normal working days are Tuesday and Wednesday)