



Vesta Architects Ltd
The Oast House
Stapeley Manor Farm
Odiham
Hampshire
RG29 1JE

t. 01256 862850
e. luis@vesta-architects.co.uk

Planning services
Hart District Council

18 September 2023

Our ref: **4915**

Dear Sir/Madam,

Chequers Cottage, Well, Long Sutton, RG29 1TL – HERITAGE STATEMENT

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This statement is written to comply with paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF) which requires applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected by alterations, including any contribution made by their setting, stating that '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'.
- 1.2 Such an approach is also identified as best practice in Historic England's 'Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2 – Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment' (March 2015), which notes that "the information required in support of applications for planning permission and listed building consent should be no more than is necessary to reach an informed decision".

2.0 Existing Property

- 2.1 Chequers Cottage is a two-storey detached dwelling of traditional design, dating from the mid-18th Century. The house is of masonry construction with a render finish under a clay-tiled gable roof. There is evidence of later single storey side and first floor side extensions. The site is located within the Well Conservation Area which is further covered by an Article 4 Direction.



3.0 Proposal

3.1 This application seeks planning permission for the demolition of 2no side extensions and erection of a replacement two storey extension, changes to fenestration, detached outbuilding, 3m boundary wall and driveway alterations. The proposal will form a respectful pitched roof extension that will compliment the host dwelling and the wider conservation area. It is considered that the proposed extension is well articulated and respects the scale, materiality, and characteristics of the dwelling.

4.0 Significance Assessment

4.1 Section 7 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that “no person shall execute or cause to be executed any works for the demolition of a listed building or for its alteration or extension in any manner which would affect its character as a building of special architectural or historic interest, unless the works are authorised”.

4.2 Assessing significance is a key principle for managing change to heritage assets and is embedded within current NPPF. Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance.

In developing this strategy, local planning authorities should take into account:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring;
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and
- opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place.

4.3 Significance can be measured according to hierarchical levels; the most usual levels are:

- Exceptional – an asset important at the highest national or international levels, including scheduled ancient monuments, Grade I and II* listed buildings and World Heritage Sites. Substantial harm should be wholly exceptional.
- High – a designated asset important at a regional level and at a national level, including Grade II listed buildings and conservation areas. Substantial harm should be exceptional.
- Medium – an undesignated asset important at a local to regional level, including local (non-statutory) listed buildings or those that make a positive contribution to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area. May include less significant parts of listed buildings. Buildings and parts of structures in this category should be retained where possible, although there is usually scope for adaptation.
- Low – structure or feature of very limited heritage or other cultural value and not defined as a heritage asset. May include insignificant interventions to listed buildings, and buildings that do not contribute positively to a



conservation area. The removal or adaptation of structures in this category is usually acceptable where the work will enhance a related heritage asset.

- Negative – structure or feature that harms the value of a heritage asset. Wherever practicable, removal of negative features should be considered, taking account of setting and opportunities for enhancement.

4.4 The existing extensions are of negative significance as they are both unsympathetic and harmful to the design of the host dwelling in terms of their condition, materiality and relationship with the original building. We propose that the extensions are replaced with a more attractive, pitched roof extension, that better compliments the architectural qualities of Chequers Cottage. We consider the replacement of the existing extension as an opportunity to replace any structure recognised to be uncharacteristic to the area, with a more respectful and appropriate extension designed to modern living standards.

5.0 Justification

5.1 Vesta Architects has prepared a scheme which aims at removing any structure or feature that harms the value of the heritage asset and developed proposals better suited to the context. Focus has been given to minimising the number of alterations which might affect the significance of the building; the scheme should help improve the chances of future viability of the building. Every attempt has been made to preserve historic fabric and, in those areas where intervention is proposed, it is for functional reasons and every attempt has been made to minimise the loss of historic fabric.

6.0 Conclusion

6.1 For the reasons set out in this Heritage Statement, the proposed alterations are totally compatible with the principles outlined in Hart District Councils 'Well' Conservation Area Proposal Statement (April 2001).

6.2 As such the proposals comply with policies aimed at conserving and enhancing the historic environment contained in the NPPF, the adopted Local Plan and, most importantly, the statutory duty set by Section 7 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Yours faithfully

Luis Floyd