
Heritage Statement

Land at Pool Farm, Haresfield, Stroud

Haresfield Farms

Heritage Statement

Pool Farm, Haresfield





Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Site and Surroundings	2
3.	Legislation, Policy and Guidance	4
4.	Heritage Assessment	8
5.	Conclusions	13

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Heritage Statement has been prepared by Savills on behalf of Haresfield Farms (the “applicant”) in support of a full planning application. The application proposals involve the relocation and erection of farm buildings, including supporting infrastructure and landscaping on approximately 1.85 hectares of land at Pool Farm, Haresfield (‘the Site’).
- 1.2 The purpose of this Statement is to give consideration to the heritage assets associated with the proposals and explain how these have shaped the proposals included within the full planning application.
- 1.3 The description of development without the outline planning application is as follows:

“Relocation, reconfiguration and erection of new farm buildings to include the creation of a new farm office, grain stores, agricultural deadstock building and workshop. Alterations to existing vehicular access road and forecourt, the installation of a weighbridge and associated landscaping and drainage.”

- 1.4 As set out within the Planning, Design & Access Statement, the proposals within the submission have evolved following extensive pre-application discussions and consultation with the Council, the general public and other stakeholders including Stroud District Council’s (SDC) Historic Environmental Services team. This process has been an important influence on the formation of the proposals and has helped to shape the scheme submitted as part of the application.

2. Site and Surroundings

- 2.1 With a comprehensive description of the site and its surroundings included within the Planning Statement, this Section focuses solely on the site and surroundings insofar as they relate to the historic environment and heritage assets.
- 2.2 To confirm, the site is not within or directly adjacent to any conservation areas, nor does it contain any statutory or locally listed buildings.
- 2.3 The nearest Conservation Areas are the Stroud Industrial Heritage Conservation Area, Randwick Conservation Area and Pitchcombe Conservation Area. Although, it should be noted that all of these areas are a significant distance from the site.
- 2.4 The nearest statutory listed buildings are:
- Mayflower Lodge
 - This building is located directly to the west of the application site
 - Grade II (List entry no. 1090517)
 - Probably mid/late C17 detached cottage. Square panel timber- framing on stone plinth with brick infill partly painted, brick and stone on right hand return, stone forming base for stack. Steep pitched tile roof formerly thatched.
 - Pool Farmhouse
 - This building is located directly to the north of the application site
 - Grade II (List entry no. 1154771)
 - Probably early C17. Farmhouse - square panel timber-framing on stone plinth with rendered infill and stone wing to right, steep pitched concrete tile roof probably originally thatched.

Heritage Statement

Pool Farm, Haresfield



2.5 There are a variety of other listed buildings and structures surrounding Haresfield, however, these are all physically and visually separated from the site via existing built development and / or landform. As such they are not considered within this statement.

3. Legislation, Policy and Guidance

National Legislation, Policy and Guidance

Heritage Assets

- 3.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)(February 2019) (**Annex 2: Glossary**) defines a heritage asset as:

“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. It includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).”

- 3.2 Designated heritage assets are specifically identified on the basis of their significance and are subject to particular procedures in planning decisions that involve them. These include world heritage sites, scheduled monuments, listed buildings and conservations areas.
- 3.3 Non-designated heritage assets are afforded a degree of protection proportionate to their particular local heritage significance “having regard to the scale of any harm of loss and the significance of the heritage asset”. Non-designated heritage assets include locally listed buildings of heritage value, where defined by the local authority.

Heritage Significance

- 3.4 NPPF (**Annex 2: Glossary**) defines the significance of a heritage asset as:

“The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting. For World Heritage Sites, the cultural value described within each site’s Statement of Outstanding Universal Value forms part of its significance.”

- 3.5 In addition to listed buildings and structures, the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a duty upon the local planning authority in determining applications for development affecting conservation areas to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the area.

- 3.6 Good practice guidance for assessing the significance of heritage assets can be found in Historic England’s (formerly English Heritage) Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment (2008) and Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2 – Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (2015).
- 3.7 Taking account of the guidance within these documents and to facilitate a useful assessment, we have set out below broad categories of heritage significance.

Table 1: Categorisation of Heritage Significance

Level of Significance	Description	Definition
High	As per NPPF paragraph 194 , these are the highest significance designated heritage assets, including Grade I and Grade II* listed buildings	Designated heritage asset
Medium	Other lower order designated heritage assets, including Grade II listed buildings	Designated heritage asset
Low	Buildings and structures with a degree of significance due to their heritage interest	Non-designated heritage asset
Negligible	Buildings and structures with no heritage interest and therefore the NPPF’s planning policy on heritage does not apply	Not a heritage asset

Effect and Harm

- 3.8 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out the legal position on planning controls with regard to listed buildings and conservation areas. At **Section 66** it states that when making planning decisions with regard to development, the local planning authority “shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.”
- 3.9 In determining applications, the NPPF (**paragraph 189**) states that:

“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.”

3.10 The NPPF goes on to state (at **paragraphs 193 to 196**) that:

“When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.”*

“Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent ... ”

“Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.”

Local Policy:

Local Plan – Stroud District Local Plan (November 2015):

3.11 Local Plan Policy ES10 is most relevant to heritage assets within the District. It requires ‘*Stroud District’s historic environment will be preserved, protected or enhanced, in accordance with the principles set out below:*

1. Any proposals involving a historic asset shall require a description of the heritage asset significance including any contribution made by its setting, and an assessment of the potential impact of the proposal on that significance, using appropriate expertise. This can be a desk based assessment and a field evaluation prior to determination where necessary and should include the Gloucestershire Historic Environment Record.

2. Proposals and initiatives will be supported which conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the heritage significance and setting of the Districts heritage assets, especially those elements which contribute to the distinct identity of the District.

These include:

A. the 68 sites of national archaeological importance (which are designated as Ancient Monuments), any undesignated archaeology of national significance, and the many buildings that are Listed as having special architectural or historic interest

B. the stone, bronze, iron age and roman settlements and remains; the medieval settlements including Berkeley Castle; historic houses; historic parks; gardens and villages

C. the townscapes of the larger towns such as Stroud where the industrial heritage influenced its historic grain, including its street layouts and plot sizes

D. the District's historic market towns and villages, many with designated conservation areas, such as Berkeley, Wotton Under Edge, Minchinhampton, Painswick and Dursley.

3. Proposals will be supported which protect and, where appropriate, enhance the heritage significance and setting of locally identified heritage assets, such as buildings of local architectural or historic interest, locally important archaeological sites and parks and gardens of local interest.

4. Proposals will be supported which protect and, where appropriate, enhance key views and vistas, especially of the spires and towers of historic churches and mills.

5. Any harm or loss would require clear and convincing justification to the relevant decision-maker as to why the heritage interest should be overridden. A full programme of work shall be submitted with the application, together with proposals to mitigate any adverse impact of the proposed development, and where appropriate, be implemented through measures secured by planning condition(s) or through a legal agreement.

Emerging Local Plan Review

3.12 Stroud District Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review. It is proposed that Policy ES10 of the adopted local plan will be revised within this review, with the review highlighting that the *proposed changes seek to strengthen and clarify existing policy in relation to locally distinctive landmark features.*

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- 3.13 The Heritage strategy Supplementary Planning Advice Document was adopted by Stroud District Council in February 2018. This document makes reference to guidance in relation to non-designated heritage assets which, in general can be found throughout the District. The document does not include a list identifying those structures within the District which are deemed to be non-designated heritage assets however.

Neighbourhood Plan

- 3.14 There is no adopted or emerging Neighbourhood Plan for Haresfield or covering Pool Farm itself and therefore there is no relevant policy in relation to heritage, at the neighbourhood level.

4. Heritage Assessment

- 4.1 Using the categorisation of significance set out in Table 1 (above), Table 2 (below) applies this to the heritage assets identified in Sections 2 and 3.

Table 2: Application of Significance Criteria

List Entry No.	Name	Heritage Significance
1090517	Mayflower Lodge (Grade II)	Medium
1154771	Pool Farmhouse (Grade II)	Medium

- 4.2 The potential impact of the proposals on each of these heritage assets, as well as the nearby Conservation Areas, are considered below in turn in a level of detail proportionate to the significance of the asset and sufficient to understand the potential effect.
- 4.3 To confirm, the site does not contain any heritage assets and as such the proposals would not physically alter any of the below.

Mayflower Lodge:

- 4.4 Mayflower Lodge, a cottage, is thought to be a mid/late C17 detached cottage. Square panel timber-framing on stone plinth with brick infill partly painted, brick and stone on right hand return, stone forming base for stack. Steep pitched tile roof formerly thatched.
- 4.5 The cottage is located immediately adjacent to the site. As a Grade II Listed Building, it is of 'medium' and 'local' significance. The principle architectural elevation, which faces north west towards the M5, comprises small 4-pane casement windows, three at the ground floor with a plank door to the left of centre. At the first floor, there is one similar window to the left hand side of the elevation and one 4-light dormer to the right which punctuates the eaves.
- 4.6 The cottage, a private residence, has no open function within the wider community. Its setting is confined to the immediate surrounding context. The historic surrounding land use is agricultural, which remains the case now. However, the construction of the M5 motorway, which lies circa 100m to the north of the cottage and application site, in the 1960s has significantly changed the setting of this Listed Building.

- 4.7 Further, as farming practices at Pool Farm have evolved overtime, this has resulted in the erection of modern farm buildings in the form of a grain store (which is now redundant) and a fertiliser store (which is attached to the southern elevation of the former dairy building) which have been built in close proximity to the north eastern boundary of the cottage. The proposals seek to remove these structures, reliving the built form in close proximity to the cottage.
- 4.8 Mature vegetation between the cottage and the site limit the degree of intervisibility between the two. This will be further reduced through the implementation of supplemental landscape planting along the north east boundary of the Cottage.
- 4.9 The removal of more modern farm buildings from the immediate north eastern boundary will enhance the setting of the cottage.
- 4.10 The proposed development is entirely appropriate in relation to the historic use of the surrounding land. Given the lower level of significance of the cottage, we consider that the proposals would result in a negligible level of harm to the significance of the heritage asset and its setting. Indeed, the works to remove modern farm buildings in close proximity to the property, as well as the inclusion of additional landscape planting between the heritage asset and the site would enhance its setting.

Pool Farmhouse:

- 4.11 The Farmhouse, located directly to the north of the application site is likely to be early C17. Farmhouse - square panel timber-framing on stone plinth with rendered infill and stone wing to right, steep pitched concrete tile roof probably originally thatched.
- 4.12 Similarly to the cottage, this building is also located adjacent to the site and the significance of the farmhouse is therefore important to the proposal.
- 4.13 The Farmhouse has a historic functional relationship with the farm buildings and wider landscape. The proposed buildings are situated on the opposing side of farm complex to the Farmhouse. There is a degree of screening created between the existing complex of farm buildings limiting intervisibility between the two. Nonetheless, where the proposed buildings are perceptible between one another, the proposed buildings are of a comparable in scale, design and use to the existing structures. Accordingly, the structures are entirely appropriate for the farm complex and the wider land use.
- 4.14 As a result, given the lower level of significance of the Church, we consider that the proposals would not result in any harm to the significance of the heritage asset and its setting.

5. Conclusions

- 5.1 This statement has given proportionate consideration to the heritage assets that could be affected as a result of the proposed development including an identification of their significance and a contribution made by their setting.
- 5.2 Taking account of the parameter plans and illustrative masterplan, table 3 (below) summarises both the heritage significance of the assets considered and the level of harm to the asset as a result of the proposals.

Table 3: Impact of the Proposals

List Entry No.	Name	Heritage Significance	Impact of Proposals
1090517	Mayflower Lodge (Grade II)	Medium	Negligible
1154771	Pool Farmhouse (Grade II)	Medium	No Impact
N/A	Pitchcombe Conservation Area	N/A	No impact
N/A	Randwick Conservation Area	N/A	No impact

- 5.3 From this appraisal it is clear that the proposals would not result in substantial harm to any heritage assets or conservation areas which are much further afield. As a result, and in accordance with **paragraph 196** of the NPPF, the harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme. The principal benefits of the proposals are as follows:
- Enhancement of an existing farming enterprise enabling high value crop to be stored and dried on site rather than transporting it for drying elsewhere.
 - The consolidation of farming practices in one location, enabling greater and more sustainable management of the enterprise as a whole.
 - The retention and reuse of farm buildings at Colethrop Farm which would otherwise be recycled.

- Sustained and increased direct and indirect employment in agriculture which is important to Stroud District Council's economy.
- The proposals have drawn inspiration from the local historic environment, as per Local Plan **Policy ES10**. Most notably, this is reflected through the use of sensitive materials that reflect the agricultural vernacular of traditional farm buildings, typical of the setting of the site and rural areas in general.

5.4 We consider that the combined weight of these public benefits is significant and that they substantially outweigh the (at most) low level of harm to heritage assets and their settings arising from the proposals. Accordingly the proposals put forward in this application should be considered acceptable from a heritage perspective.