|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

**Heritage Statement P0374/24/OUT**

1. **Site Address**

|  |
| --- |
| Land adjacent to The Lowfields, Church Way, Blakeney, GL15 4DT |

1. **Is the application site (identify all that are applicable):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Heritage Asset** | **Yes** |
| A [listed building](https://www.westminster.gov.uk/planning-building-and-environmental-regulations/design-and-heritage-planning/listed-buildings) (Grade II, Grade II\* or Grade I) |  |
| Within [a conservation area](https://www.westminster.gov.uk/planning-building-and-environmental-regulations/design-and-heritage-planning/conservation-areas) |  |
| A [scheduled ancient monument](https://www.westminster.gov.uk/planning-building-and-environmental-regulations/design-and-heritage-planning/archaeology) |  |
| Within the [Westminster World Heritage Site](https://www.westminster.gov.uk/planning-building-and-environmental-regulations/design-and-heritage-planning/world-heritage-site)[[1]](#footnote-2) |  |
| A [registered park or garden](https://www.westminster.gov.uk/planning-building-and-environmental-regulations/design-and-heritage-planning/historic-parks-and-gardens) |  |
| In the [setting](#Setting) of or adjacent to one of the above? |  |
| Within [an archaeological priority area](https://www.westminster.gov.uk/planning-building-and-environmental-regulations/design-and-heritage-planning/archaeology)[[2]](#footnote-3) |  |
| A [non-designated heritage asset](#Nondesignated) |  |

1. **In each case where you have answered yes in 2 above, please identify the asset and its heritage designation (i.e. the grade of listed building, conservation area name etc)**

|  |
| --- |
| The proposed development is situated on the northernmost border of the Conservation area that encompasses most of the village of Blakeney |

1. **The** [**significance**](#significance) **of the heritage asset(s)**

What makes the heritage asset(s) special? Please describe each asset, including its age, architectural style, materials, features of interest, history etc and how these contribute to significance. If the building is listed, this may include both internal and external features. Where appropriate, you should also identify contribution of setting to significance. Photographs, archival materials (such as historic plans) may assist with this and should be appended, where relevant.

|  |
| --- |
| There is no specific identified aspect of the heritage asset that is particular to the proposed development land that distinguishes it from the general conservation area of the village. The current property is on the furthermost north border of the conservation area, and in fact has property surrounding it that are not included. There are no archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic element notable for the development area, and no identifiable deleterious outcomes arising from the proposal when comparing current and proposed use, either for current or future generations.  Aerial photos attached to application. |

1. **The proposed works**

What works are you planning to do to the heritage asset or the surrounding area? For listed buildings, please include both internal and external works, if relevant.

|  |
| --- |
| Outline permission with all matters reserved for development of a single private dwelling in what is currently a section of land / garden already used for garage and vehicular access / parking. Application is for outline permission only at this time, with all matters reserved. |

1. **Impact on significance**

How will the proposals impact on the significance of the heritage asset(s) and/or their settings? Please discuss the impact of the proposals including for example impact on architectural detail, historic fabric, plan form, change of relationship with neighbouring buildings etc. What is the impact on views, the character or townscape of the wider area? Explain how have any harmful impacts been avoided or [mitigated](#mitigation), including alternative options considered? Where harm is identified, what is the level of harm (substantial or less than substantial)?

|  |
| --- |
| The impact on significance of the heritage asset is essentially zero. The historic fabric of the area is unaltered by the proposal, and there are no designated assets other than the conservation area boundaries. With regard the conservation area itself, the proposal would make no material change to the land and its significance to this or future generations. The development area is one notable gap in a building line that runs the length of Church Way on the East side. On the conservation area plans it actually shows two clear gaps in that building line within the conservation area, (section of plan appended) but the lower of the two gaps was developed with an additional dwelling being approved and built there in around 2006. This proposal is essentially the same for the last remaining infill gap in the East building line. On the appended conservation area plan, (which is now out of date) the building added in the lower infill in 2006 is marked in blue, and the proposed infill development for this application is shown in green.  On this plan section, also note the area hatched in yellow – this is the All Saint’s council estate, a comparatively large council estate built in the 1950’s – this estate forms the west and north west boundary of Church Way, and dominates the setting and view – it is in appearance starkly contrasting with the East houses which are stone built, largely in the late 18th and early 19th century, and will have perhaps unsympathetically altered the nature of Church Way and the setting of the proposed application for permission. Certainly nothing in the proposal will have a deleterious impact on the setting and character of the area, and indeed it is assumed that reserved matters addressed later will ensure any subsequent building would be visually in keeping with the dwellings on that building line and add to the original character of the village in a positive way. Any potential harmful outcome to the area could only be by unsympathetic building design, and this would be prevented at a later stage when reserved matters were addressed.  It is of note that the current use for the land is essentially additional garden, with a double garage and a vehicular access and circular drive / track. It is not of any historical note, contains no archaeological or historic features of interest, and would not be materially affected by the addition of a dwelling which would also have space for off road parking with the existing garage and drive.  The road is on a steep lane, with the house above (currently within the same curtilage as the development area) significantly higher. The house below is a large, 3 story house that would sit on broadly the same level as the development land, and be taller than any proposed dwelling, meaning any subsequent building would not dominate the building line, sit higher than the current roof lines, nor adversely affect the relationship with neighbouring houses on any side, and would not affect enjoyment of views or light in any appreciable way for neighbours.  The overriding principle is that no historic or significant characteristics of the old village of Blakeney would be in any way harmed by the proposal, and any finer matters to ensure a building would be in character and keeping, sympathetic to the existing features of the village with appropriate appearance and building materials would be controlled in reserved matters decided on at a later date. |

1. **Enhancement and Public Benefits (where applicable)**

Please describe how the proposals have been designed to enhance or better reveal the significance of the asset e.g. removal of later unsympathetic alteration. Where harm is identified, will there be any [public benefit](#Publicbenefit) as a result of the works?

|  |
| --- |
| The development proposal is essentially a neutral proposal that would have no material effect in either direction. |

1. **Other**

Use this space to provide any other useful information, for example details of relevant planning history and consultation undertaken or links to other relevant information and statements submitted, including your sustainable design statement.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The proposal is made, sympathetically to the peripheral conservation area location, noting that the area has already been significantly change over the last 70 years with addition of the council estate, and with other gaps in what is an obvious building line already filled. The land is already used for vehicles and garage, and a dwelling addition causes no damage to the fabric of the area. Historically, the development of the other gap in the building line in 2006 has shown that no adverse outcome is to be expected from the proposal, and this is a very obvious and logical infill development that would be congruent with previous permissions and building. In fact, the outline permission sought is for one dwelling only – there would in all likelihood be space for more than that, certainly two joined dwellings as appear further down Church Way - but in limiting the application to a single dwelling, the character of houses in the building line with reasonably spacious gardens would be maintained and in keeping, and ensure off road parking for multiple vehicle, avoiding any impact on the limited parking for residents in the council estate buildings opposite. | | |
|  |

1. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)