



**Appeal by:**

Mr James Herd

Hayfield Homes Construction Ltd

**Location:**

Land At (Os 7500 5952),

Berrow Green Road,

Martley, Worcestershire

**Proposal:**

Outline planning permission for up to 55 dwellings (with means of access to the site be considered at this stage and all other matters reserved)

**PINS Ref:**

APP/J1860/W/24/3348743

**LPA Ref:** M/23/01711/OUT

**Town and Country Planning Act  
1990**

**Section 78 Appeal**

**COUNCIL HERITAGE  
PROOF OF EVIDENCE**

**DATE: 18 October 2024**



# **CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>1.0 Heritage Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.0 Qualifications and Relevant Experience</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3.0 Scope of Evidence</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4.0 Proposals and Description of Site</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>5.0 Policy Context</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>6.0 History of the Appeal Site</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>7.0 Assessment of Impact on Heritage Assets</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>8.0 Conclusions</b>	<b>26</b>

## 1.0 HERITAGE SUMMARY

The principal consideration of this appeal, from a heritage perspective, is whether the proposed development for up to 55 dwellings would adversely impact upon the significance of the designated heritage asset, Longstone Cottage, adjacent to the northeast corner of the site and the 4no non-designated heritage assets, Rose Cottage, Row End, 110 and 111 Berrow Green Road, located adjacent to the southeast corner of the site.

NPPF 205 requires that “great weight” is given to the conservation of heritage assets with greater weight being given to the more important assets. In relation to the appeal site, the impact of the proposals on each heritage asset has been systematically assessed, based on the guidance in *Historic England’s Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3 The Setting of Heritage Assets (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, 2017)*. This assessment has shown that the proposals would cause indirect harm to the historic significance of both the designated and non-designated heritage assets, via changes within their settings, but would not cause direct harm to the historic fabric.

It is considered that, as a result of the proposed development, the setting of these designated and non-designated heritage assets would be altered in such a way that their full significance would be reduced. This would result in “less than substantial harm” to each of the heritage assets. According to NPPF 206, any harm to heritage assets requires “clear and convincing justification” and must be taken into account when balancing harm against public benefit, as required by NPPF 208 (designated heritage assets) and NPPF 209 (non-designated heritage assets).

In summary, it is concluded that there would be **‘less than substantial’ harm to the significance of Longstone Cottage**, designated grade II. It is considered that the proposals would adversely impact the setting of this building and that this would adversely impact upon the historic significance of the heritage asset. Longstone Cottage, historically in a rural location surrounded by fields and separate from Martley village, has recently become linked to the extensions of Martley to the north, northeast and southeast. The appeal site is the last agricultural field providing a rural setting to Longstone Cottage and is therefore of increased importance in terms of setting. The loss of the site to a housing development would complete the suburbanisation of its setting and would therefore result in harmful effects to its historic significance as an isolated rural dwelling, separate from the village.

The proposed mitigation and reference in the appellant’s case to the existing mature landscaping at Longstone Cottage as sufficient to provide a rural and appropriate setting is not considered to be

acceptable. The setting of a heritage asset is defined as “the surroundings in which the heritage asset is experienced”. The proposed development would be clearly visible in relation to the Longstone Cottage site and would not present a rural setting but a suburbanised one.

The strong link between the historic fabric of Longstone Cottage and its setting, leads to an assessment that the harm caused would be at **the lower to middle end of the ‘less than substantial’** scale and should be considered under NPPF 208.

It is considered that there would also be **‘less than substantial’ harm to the significance of the cluster of 4no. non-designated heritage assets, 110 and 111 Berrow Green Road, Rose Cottage and Row End.** It has been concluded that the proposed development would link the dwellings to Martley village thus suburbanising their settings, particularly considering the housing development to the southeast of these assets. The appeal site is the last agricultural field in the vicinity to provide a rural setting for the non-designated heritage assets and is therefore of increased importance in terms of setting. The development would be contrary to the historically rural character and appearance of their existing setting, which would consequently harm their historic significance.

It is considered that the harm would be at the **lower to middle end of the ‘less than substantial’** scale and should be subject to consideration under NPPF 209.

## **2.0 QUALIFICATIONS AND RELEVANT EXPERIENCE**

My name is Sarah Louise Lowe. I hold a BSc(Hons) in General Architectural Studies from Bath University, a Dip(Hons)Arch from Greenwich University and a PG Dip in the Conservation of the Historic Environment from the University of Birmingham at Ironbridge. I have worked in local authority conservation for 21 years in the North West and West Midlands, after spending several years in architectural private practice.

I have been employed as a Senior Conservation Officer in the Joint Heritage Services team of Malvern Hills and Wychavon District Councils since January 2017. I lead a team of four conservation officers across the two councils providing heritage consultation responses to planning officers, acting as case officer for standalone Listed Building Consent applications and providing advice to owners of heritage assets.

### 3.0 SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

This Proof of Evidence is confined to addressing built heritage matters in relation to refusal reason 1 of the Council's Decision Notice pertaining to outline planning application M/23/01711/OUT, as submitted by Mr James Herd for Hayfield Homes Ltd and the subject of this Inquiry.

Refusal reason 1 states:

*“The residential development of this site would, by reason of its location, scale and prominence constitute an incongruous and visually intrusive feature when viewed from a number of publicly accessible locations, and have an unacceptably urbanising and consequently adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the area, resulting in demonstrable harm to the open and undeveloped character and appearance of the land, rather than integrating as discrete infill or 'rounding off' of the existing village.*

*Furthermore, the proposal would overwhelm the Grade II listed Longstone Cottage by surrounding it with built development which would encroach upon and adversely impact its setting.*

*As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy SWDP21, SWDP25, SWDP6, SWDP24, SWDP2 and SWDP5 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan, and policy MKD1, MKD3, MKD4 and MKD6 of the Martley, Knightwick, and Doddenham Neighbourhood Plan, and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework that amongst others aim to safeguard the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and improve the character and quality of an area.”*

This Proof of Evidence covers the significance and setting (where it contributes to significance) of heritage assets potentially impacted by the proposals and assesses the level of that impact. I have carried out that assessment with particular regard to the relevant sections of legislation, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the current SWDP adopted in 2016 and published national and local guidance. I have also carried out site visits, documentary research, and analysis, including the application of methodologies in Historic England Guidance, The Setting of Heritage Assets – Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition).

Though a formal written consultation response was not submitted at the time of the Outline application, verbal discussion concerning the site was entered into with the case officer. This discussion was accurately reflected in the Delegated Report for M/23/01711/OUT.

The range of heritage assets considered to be potentially affected by the appeal scheme is largely agreed as that identified within the *Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment*, submitted by Orion Heritage Ltd and dated September 2023.

It is agreed that **Berrow Farm**, grade II listed and located 530m to the southwest of the appeal site, would see change within its wider setting but that this would not affect its historic significance.

It is also agreed that the appeal scheme would not adversely impact upon the **Martley Conservation Area** which lies to the east at a higher level. This is due to the c.320m distance between, the topography including a dense tree belt, and the late 20<sup>th</sup> century built form at the lower level.

It is therefore agreed that the heritage assets to be further assessed are:

- **Longstone Cottage**, grade II listed
- **110 Berrow Green Road (Barleycove Cottage), 111 Berrow Green Road, Rose Cottage and Row End**, which are all non-designated heritage assets considered worthy of further assessment.

Since all of the heritage assets listed above are located adjacent to the appeal site rather than within it, there can be no loss of historic fabric as a result of the appeal scheme. The focus of this Proof of Evidence is therefore the level of impact that the proposed scheme would have on the setting of these heritage assets. It must be noted that setting is not a heritage asset in itself but can be a contributing factor to the significance of heritage assets. The proposals have therefore been assessed as to their impact upon the setting of the heritage assets in so far as it contributes to historic significance.

The balancing of any harm to the setting of these heritage assets against public benefit is not covered in this statement but is addressed in the Council's Statement of Case.

The evidence I shall give and the opinions I shall express are my true professional opinions.

#### **4.0 PROPOSALS AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE**

The appeal relates to an outline proposal, as detailed in planning application M/23/01711/OUT, for up to 55 dwellings on land on Berrow Green Road, to the south of Martley village. The illustrative masterplan shows that the scheme would be accessed from Berrow Green Road, just south of Longstone Cottage, and the housing would be set back from the road behind a SUDS scheme and wildlife pond. The appeal is raised on grounds of the five reasons for refusal set out on the Decision Notice dated 11 April 2024. The only reason for refusal relating to heritage is Reason One.

The appeal site is currently an area of open agricultural land on the edge of the village of Martley. The site stretches east to west between Berrow Green Road and the existing field boundary (just under 200m), abutting the lane to Kingswood on its northern boundary and the Martley Countryside Burial Ground on its southern boundary. There is an historic path/track from northeast to southwest across the field which is part of a considerable network of historic accessways on and around Berrow Hill.

There are no built heritage assets within the site boundary and therefore the proposals would have no direct impact on any known historic fabric. However, there is 1no designated heritage asset (Longstone Cottage, grade II) adjacent to the northwest corner of the appeal site and 4no non-designated heritage assets adjacent to the southeast corner of the appeal site (Row End, Rose Cottage, 110 Berrow Green Road, 111 Berrow Green Road). Consequently, there is potential for the proposed development to impact upon their setting.

## 5.0 POLICY CONTEXT

### **Legislation:**

Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states:

*“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 it possesses.”*

The Court of Appeal decision in the case of *Barnwell vs. East Northamptonshire DC 2014* emphasised that in enacting section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (1) Parliament’s intention was that ‘decision makers should give “considerable importance and weight” to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings’ when carrying out the balancing exercise.

### **National Planning Policy Framework, 2023 (NPPF)**

The NPPF uses the following definitions within Section 16 - Historic Environment:

Heritage asset: 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).

Setting of a heritage asset: 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.

Significance (for heritage policy): The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting.

The following paragraphs are of particular relevance to the Appeal proposal:

Paragraph 200 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. Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.”

Paragraph 201 states “Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset’s conservation and any aspect of the proposal.”

Paragraph 203 states “In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) ● The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation.
- b) ● The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c) ● The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Paragraph 205 states “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 (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Paragraph 206 states “Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.
- b) 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.”

Paragraph 208 states “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, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.”

Paragraph 209 states “The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.”

Paragraph 212 states “Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.”

### **Planning Practice Guidance, 2019 – Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment (PPG)**

Paragraph 007 states “Heritage assets may be affected by direct physical change or by change in their setting. Being able to properly assess the nature, extent and importance of the significance of a heritage asset, and the contribution of its setting, is very important to understanding the potential impact and acceptability of development proposals.”

Paragraph 008 states “Understanding the significance of a heritage asset and its setting from an early stage in the design process can help to inform the development of proposals which avoid or minimise harm. Analysis of relevant information can generate a clear understanding of the affected asset, the heritage interests represented in it, and their relative importance.”

Paragraph 013 states “All heritage assets have a setting, irrespective of the form in which they survive and whether they are designated or not. The setting of a heritage asset and the asset’s curtilage may not have the same extent.

The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to the visual relationship between the asset and the proposed development and associated visual/physical considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part in the assessment of impacts on setting, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust, smell and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places. For example, buildings that are in close proximity but are not visible from each other may have a historic or aesthetic connection that amplifies the experience of the significance of each.

The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights of way or an ability to otherwise access or experience that setting. The contribution may vary over time.

When assessing any application which may affect the setting of a heritage asset, local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change. They may also need to consider the fact that developments which materially detract from the asset’s significance may also damage its economic viability now, or in the future, thereby threatening its ongoing conservation.”

Paragraph 018 states “What matters in assessing whether a proposal might cause harm is the impact on the significance of the heritage asset. As the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear, significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting.

Proposed development affecting a heritage asset may have no impact on its significance or may enhance its significance and therefore cause no harm to the heritage asset. Where potential harm to designated heritage assets is identified, it needs to be categorised as either less than substantial harm or substantial harm (which includes total loss) in order to identify which policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraphs 194 to 196) apply.

Within each category of harm (which category applies should be explicitly identified), the extent of the harm may vary and should be clearly articulated.

Whether a proposal causes substantial harm will be a judgment for the decision-maker, having regard to the circumstances of the case and the policy in the National Planning Policy Framework. In general terms, substantial harm is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases. For example, in determining whether works to a listed building constitute substantial harm, an important consideration would be whether the adverse impact seriously affects a key element of its special architectural or historic interest. It is the degree of harm to the asset's significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed. The harm may arise from works to the asset or from development within its setting.

While the impact of total destruction is obvious, partial destruction is likely to have a considerable impact but, depending on the circumstances, it may still be less than substantial harm or conceivably not harmful at all, for example, when removing later additions to historic buildings where those additions are inappropriate and harm the buildings' significance. Similarly, works that are moderate or minor in scale are likely to cause less than substantial harm or no harm at all. However, even minor works have the potential to cause substantial harm, depending on the nature of their impact on the asset and its setting.”

### **South Worcestershire Development Plan, adopted 25 February 2016 (SWDP)**

#### Policy SDWP 6: Historic Environment

- a. Development proposals should conserve and enhance heritage assets, including assets of potential archaeological interest, subject to the provisions of SWDP24. Their contribution to the character of the landscape or townscape should be protected in order to sustain the historic quality, sense of place, environmental quality and economic vibrancy of South Worcestershire.
- b. Development proposals will be supported where they conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets, including their setting. In particular this applies to:
  - i. Designated heritage assets, i.e. inter alia listed buildings.
  - ii. The historic landscape, including locally distinctive settlement patterns, field systems, woodlands and commons and historic farmsteads and smallholdings.

## Policy SWDP 24: Management of the Historic Environment

- a. Development proposals affecting heritage assets will be considered in accordance with the Framework, relevant legislation and published national and local guidance.
- b. Proposals likely to affect the significance of a heritage asset, including the contribution made by its setting, should be accompanied by a description of its significance in sufficient detail to allow the potential impacts to be adequately assessed. Where there is potential for heritage assets with archaeological interest to be affected, this description should be informed by available evidence, desk-based assessment and, where appropriate, field evaluation to establish the significance of known or potential heritage assets.

## **Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable management of the Historic Environment, 2008.**

Understanding the values (pages 27-32) describes a range of *heritage values*, arranged into four groups, which may be attached to places. These are:

- Evidential value: the potential to yield evidence about past human activity.
- Historical value: the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be connected through a place to the present – it tends to be illustrative or associative.
- Aesthetic value: the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place.
- Communal value: the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory.

## **The Setting of Heritage Assets - Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3 (Historic England, Dec 2017) (GPA 3)**

Amongst the Government's planning objectives for the historic environment is that conservation decisions are based on the nature, extent and level of a heritage asset's significance and are investigated to a proportionate degree. Historic England recommends the following broad approach

to assessment, undertaken as a series of steps that apply proportionately to complex or more straightforward cases:

- Step 1: Identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected.
- Step 2: Assess the degree to which these settings and views make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s) or allow significance to be appreciated.
- Step 3: Assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on the significance or on the ability to appreciate it.
- Step 4: Explore ways to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm.
- Step 5: Make and document the decision and monitor outcomes.

## 6.0 HISTORY OF THE APPEAL SITE

The appeal site lies to the southwest of Martley village and forms part of the agricultural field system and woodlands stretching over to the River Teme to the west. The views from Martley village to Berrow Hill and Berrow Hill Camp, a scheduled monument, incorporate the appeal site.

Referring to the Appellant's DBA submitted by Orion Heritage Ltd and in particular to the map regression figures, the appeal site historically comprised of several land parcels, most of which were used for pasture or arable farming. The southern area of the site consisted of two east-west fields which may have been linked to the non-designated heritage assets bounding the site at the southeastern corner. One of these fields is shown as an orchard on the Epoch One OS mapping, along with dense tree planting in the hedges to both fields. The orchard, hedgerow trees and hedgerows have been absent from this part of the site since the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. However, there was a short-lived orchard adjacent to Berrow Green Road during the 1940s as shown on the Epoch 5 10k: County Series mapping.

The historic maps of the area show that the appeal site has always been split diagonally by a path/trackway linking into an extensive network of paths accessing land a considerable distance from the settlement of Martley. The track followed a hedge line in the 19<sup>th</sup> century though this hedge was removed in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century.

The appeal site in its current layout is largely a single, open field with hedge boundaries and a field access immediately south of Longstone Cottage. There is however an area of allotments located along the northern site boundary which were granted permission in 2014. These are accessed via the lane to Kingswood which borders the north site boundary.

To the south of the site is the recently established Countryside Burial Ground. The small pavilion on the Burial Ground is single storey and shows how prominent even a small building can be in altering the experience of a rural landscape.

## **7.0 ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT ON HERITAGE ASSETS**

The stepped approach to assessing the impact of development on the setting of heritage assets is outlined in Historic England's *Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3 The Setting of Heritage Assets (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, 2017)*. With reference to the DBA provided by the appellants, this method has been adopted in order to systematically assess each of the heritage assets individually.

### **Step 1: Identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected.**

The appellant's DBA identified Berrow Farm and Longstone Cottage, both grade II listed, as potentially being impacted by the development proposals. Also identified were the buildings adjacent to the southeast site boundary which are considered to be non-designated heritage assets.

As stated above in Section 3: Scope of Evidence, it is agreed that the proposed development would only have a negligible impact upon the wider setting of Berrow Farm. It is not considered necessary to undertake further analysis of this grade II listed building.

The non-designated heritage assets just outside the southeastern boundary of the site are assessed as being three in number in the DBA, Row End, Rose Cottage and Barleycove Cottage. Barleycove Cottage, or 110 Berrow Green Road, is in fact the eastern one of two semi-detached properties, with the other being 111 Berrow Green Road. The proximity of these four heritage assets to the site would result in changes to their settings from rural landscape to housing.

While inter-visibility is not the only determining factor in deciding whether the setting of a heritage asset may be impacted, it is agreed that due to their nature or siting, the settings of other heritage assets within the 1km study area taken in the appellant's DBA would not be significantly impacted by the proposals and may be ruled out of further analysis.

As such it is considered that the setting of five heritage assets would be affected by the proposals: Longstone Cottage (grade II), 110 Berrow Green Road (Barleycove Cottage), 111 Berrow Green Road, Rose Cottage and Row End. The impact of the proposals on each of these assets has been considered in turn in this statement.

### **Longstone Cottage (NHLE 1082996, WSM45525), Berrow Green Road, Martley**

**Step 2: Assess whether, how and to what degree these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset (what is the significance of the heritage asset)**

Longstone Cottage was first listed on 5 October 1976. The list description states *“Cottage. C17 with C19 and C20 alterations. Timber-frame with brick infill, on brick plinth, plain tile roof, brick end stacks. Two storeys; three two-light C19 casements in three framed bays, entrance off centre left, C20 glazed door; single storey brick lean-to on left. Framing: four square panels high to wallplate, queen strut trusses to gables.”*



**Figure 1: Longstone Cottage, east front**

The historic significance of Longstone Cottage is considered to lie in its 17<sup>th</sup> century timber framing and its simple form. Whilst the list description states that there are four infill panels from ground to wallplate level, the 1999 photographs indicate that there is a brick plinth to ground floor window cill level with three panels above. This generally occurs when the lower timbers have decayed extensively and are removed in favour of a brickwork plinth. However, the original four panel structure suggests that it was a building of more than basic status, which would have seen three panels or even two. The infill panels are now of brick but are likely to have originally been of wattle and daub, the evidence for which may lie in the detailing of the timbers. The two brick external chimneys are typical of the period though the condition of the brickwork may suggest that they have been rebuilt during the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

The form, structure, materials and detailing all contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the building. Further evidence derived from the Epoch 1 OS mapping indicates that

the building may have originally provided a cottage with barn attached, as the rectangular footprint is divided in two.

The building sat within a triangular plot until the later quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, rather than its current roughly square site, with the diagonal trackway that is still in evidence across the appeal site forming the rear boundary. Longstone Cottage does not appear to have significant land directly associated with its plot, though, as the DBA highlights, the cottage plot on the 1843 tithe mapping and apportionment is occupied by William Rogers and owned by Lord William Ward as are the two adjacent plots, one for pasture and one for arable. The single occupant recorded for the site would accord with the possibility that the cottage had an adjacent barn on the Epoch 1 OS mapping rather than two cottages. Such evidence serves to expand and illuminate the understanding of Longstone Cottage over time.

The tithe apportionments show that Longstone Cottage has been historically linked to the appeal site in terms of management. It is also clear that the western part of the current garden at Longstone Cottage was formerly part of the historic field to the west of the diagonal path/track across the appeal site. The current curtilage is therefore not the historic curtilage being only recently incorporated.

The setting of Longstone Cottage has historically been agricultural in character with pasture, arable and woodland surrounding the historic triangular plot. Since the cottage formed a part of the management system of that landscape and in particular the appeal site, there are clear links between the history of the heritage asset and the appeal site. This is considered to contribute to the historic significance of the heritage asset.

The building, until recently, occupied a site that was a significant distance from the village of Martley with the closest buildings historically being about 155m away, with those buildings also being remote from the village. Consequently, Longstone Cottage did not appear as part of the village landscape but as part of the surrounding countryside. This characteristic is also considered to contribute to the historic significance of the heritage asset.

Though the recent housing developments have reduced the rural setting of Longstone Cottage to a degree, it still sits adjacent to the remaining rural landscape and benefits from an open aspect over the playing fields to the east. This is made all the more important by the pressures of

suburbanisation from the other housing developments to the north and southeast. Approaching the heritage asset from most directions, it is an agricultural field that is either in the forefront or forms an immediate backdrop to the building.

**Step 3: Assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on that significance.**

The development of the appeal site for housing would permanently sever Longstone Cottage from the immediate visual connections it retains with its agricultural origins and context. The heritage asset would be just part of the suburbanisation of this area of Martley. This is considered to be an adverse impact of the proposal on this heritage asset.

It is acknowledged that the main, or most obvious, historic significance of this heritage asset is in the age, form, scale, structure and materials, but the setting also has a pertinent role. The setting, being defined as the experience of an asset rather than merely any visual interconnectedness, does not require Longstone Cottage to be actually visible from the appeal site. To know the cottage's location allows for it to be experienced and its context to be understood as a rural cottage, as distinct from a village cottage not involved in the management of the countryside. The appeal proposal would permanently change that understanding, even more so if the current dense planting at Longstone Cottage were to be lost or removed, when the heritage asset would be even more visibly part of the suburbanisation proposed by the appeal development.

The proposed development would place housing between Longstone Cottage and its agricultural setting. This would significantly reduce the understanding of the historic asset and its role within the countryside. The appeal site is the last agricultural field available to provide that understanding and is therefore of greater importance than if agricultural fields continued to surround the heritage asset.

The existing access to the appeal site is via the field gate off Berrow Green Road immediately south of the Longstone Cottage plot. It is considered that the change from a field entrance to an access to up to 55 homes would bring noise effects to the heritage asset and a significant increase in vehicle movements, all of which would result in adverse effects on the environment round the heritage asset.

The appellant's DBA recognises that there would be less than substantial harm to Longstone Cottage and in mitigation has located a SUDS scheme and wildlife pond between Berrow Green Road and the built form of the housing development. It is assumed that this is intended to reduce the impact of the development on the setting of the heritage asset. It is considered however that such a layout would not serve the intended purpose as the houses would remain prominent and the historic field would no longer have any agricultural character. Consequently the proposed mitigation in relation to Longstone Cottage is not considered to be acceptable.



**Figure 2: Existing field entrance proposed as access to housing. Entrance to Longstone Cottage visible immediately to the right. 110 and 111 Berrow Green Road visible across the field. (Photo: L Walton)**

Overall, it is considered that the impact of the proposal to provide up to 55 houses on the appeal site would result in **“less than substantial harm”** to Longstone Cottage, a grade II listed building. It is further considered that this harm would be in the **low to middle of the range**.

### **110 Berrow Green Road (Barleycove Cottage) and 111 Berrow Green Road, Martley**

#### **Step 2: Assess whether, how and to what degree these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset (what is the significance of the heritage asset)**

The appellant's DBA does not recognise that the building named as Barleycove Cottage is only part of the building. Barleycove Cottage refers to the eastern part, nearest the road, whilst 111 Berrow Green Road is the western part and is accessed via an entrance to the south of the garden to Barleycove Cottage.

As noted in the DBA, this building does not appear in the WHER, however it does appear on the Epoch 1 OS mapping. The two cottages share a simple brick building on a west-east axis and appear to date to the early-mid 19<sup>th</sup> century. They may have been associated with the orchard to the west

111 Berrow Green Road has seen little alteration, with recent planning history only showing an approval for a 2-storey extension for a kitchen, stairs and bedroom in 1979. It would appear that the windows and doors are not of any historic significance.

Barleycove Cottage (110 Berrow Green Road) had considerable work carried out to extend and rebuild part of the property in 2007. In addition, the garden has been fenced with a close-boarded fence with a high hedge behind.

The historic significance of the two cottages mainly lies in their age, simplicity of form and design and the probable direct association with the surrounding agricultural landscape. The rural setting of the building contributes to the significance by evidencing the relative separation of the, assumed, agricultural workers' cottages from the village of Martley. The setting informs the use of the building and presents further questions about how the agricultural cottages fitted into the surrounding community. Whilst there is the opportunity for enhanced understanding of the historic significance, the building alterations particularly to Barleycove Cottage are considered to have reduced that significance.

**Step 3: Assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on that significance.**

Most of the assessment of the appeal proposal's impact on Longstone Cottage is considered to apply to 110 and 111 Berrow Green Road, situated to the south of Longstone Cottage. The proposed housing development would permanently sever the immediate visual connections the cottages retain with their agricultural origins and context. The proposed housing would link the suburbanisation of Martley to this non-designated heritage asset, thus significantly changing its setting, eliminating its historic separation from the village and the legibility of its role in the countryside. This is considered to be an adverse impact of the proposal on this heritage asset.



Figure 3: 110 and 111 Berrow Green Road, Martley in April 2009 (Google Maps)



Figure 4: 110 and 111 Berrow Green Road, Martley in April 2021 showing effect of a change to landscaping plus gradual suburbanisation of locality (Google Maps)

The setting, being defined as the experience of an asset rather than merely any visual interconnectedness, does not require the two cottages to actually be visible from the appeal site. Figures 2 and 3 above demonstrate the difference in legibility of an historically rural building when the level of landscaping changes. An increase in landscaping within the cottage gardens would tend to isolate the building from its surroundings, but a change from a rural to suburban setting would be a legible, and permanent, further reduction in historic significance.

Overall, it is considered that the impact of the proposal to provide up to 55 houses on the appeal site would result in **“less than substantial harm”** to 110 and 111 Berrow Green Road. It is further considered that this harm would be in the **low level of the range**.

**Rose Cottage and Row End (HER ref: WSM59037), Berrow Green Road, Martley**

**Step 2: Assess whether, how and to what degree these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset (what is the significance of the heritage asset).**

Rose Cottage and Row End are situated just south of 110 and 111 Berrow Green Road and have an entry in the HER as given in the appellant's DBA. Both buildings are located to the west of Berrow Green Road, set back slightly behind a narrow grass verge, making them prominent in the street scene.

The DBA assessments of significance of Rose Cottage and Row End in terms of the historic fabric and legibility are generally agreed. It is interesting to note however that the HER entry states that Rose Cottage was formerly two cottages rather than the 4no cottages inferred from the tithe apportionments of 1843. The four windows in the east elevation appear to suggest that the outer two windows on the ground floor were doorways historically, being of a different width to the central windows. Rose Cottage has lost its historic chimneys and has been extended to the rear.

The setting of Rose Cottage is a rural working landscape rather than the village of Martley itself. It is likely that the occupants of Rose Cottage, in its original form, were agricultural workers which would strongly link the building to the surrounding landscape. However, there is no definitive evidence that this was the case.

Row End was previously called The Row, possibly when it became residential, however its origins as a small three-bay threshing barn can still be seen in the fabric. The outer bays are constructed in stone with brick quoins and the central cart bay has been bricked up. The southern gable contains evidence of a former ventilation slit that has also been bricked up plus a pitching hole at first floor level that is now used as a window. There has been extensive domestication of the original barn including the addition of extensions and outbuildings to the rear, however the character of the former barn can still be seen.

The Row was possibly an out farm to Berrow Farm, but it was certainly constructed as an agricultural barn and therefore is use related directly to the landscape immediately surrounding it. With the domestication of the site, the connection has been lessened, however it remains a relatively isolated

building that does not sit within the village of Martley. The setting is considered to contribute to the historic significance of Row End as a non-designated heritage asset.

**Step 3: Assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on that significance.**

The proposed housing of up to 55 dwellings would remove the last agricultural field between Martley village and the non-designated heritage assets of Row End and Rose Cottage, situated on the southeastern border of the appeal site. The proposal would link these historically separate buildings to the village and change the setting from rural to suburban. The contribution that the rural context makes to the understanding and legibility of these buildings would be permanently lost. The historic significance of the buildings would be adversely affected causing “**less than substantial harm**” in **the low range**.

## 8.0 CONCLUSIONS

The appeal site is the last agricultural open land within the immediate settings of the grade II designated Longstone Cottage and the non-designated heritage assets of 110 and 111 Berrow Green Road, Rose Cottage and Row End. With the recent growth of housing developments along Berrow Green Road to the north and southeast, the appeal site is the only location where the open countryside from the west can meet the road.

The historic separation of the heritage assets from the village buildings is a contributing element to their historic significance. It provides evidence of their use and place in the community and countryside. The agricultural setting that the appeal site provides for the historic assets would be lost if the appeal were to succeed. The development would link the suburbanisation occurring to the north and southeast such that the setting of the heritage assets would cease to make a positive contribution to heritage significance.

Due to the contribution that this setting makes to the significance of the heritage assets, it is considered that the proposals would cause:

- low to moderate level of ‘less than substantial harm’ to **Longstone Cottage**, a grade II listed building
- low level of “less than substantial harm” to **110 and 111 Berrow Green Road** and **Row End**
- negligible harm to **Rose Cottage**.

The proposed mitigation measures in relation to Longstone Cottage are not considered to alleviate the perceived harm to the heritage asset.

Consequently, it is considered that the proposals would be contrary to the requirements of SWDP 6 and SWDP 24 as they would fail to conserve or enhance the significance of the setting of Longstone Cottage, 110 and 111 Berrow Green Road and Row End.

With reference to NPPF paragraphs 205 and 206, great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through development within its setting and any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.

With reference to paragraph 208 relating to designated heritage assets, less than substantial harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

Referring to non-designated heritage assets and NPPF paragraph 209, “a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.”