

**01 Sycamore Grove
London
RM2 5GF**

Heritage Statement

November 2024



- 1.0 Introduction**
- 2.0 Legislation, Planning Policy**
- 3.0 Historic Background**
- 4.0 Conclusion**

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background

This document has been prepared in support of a planning application for the certificate of lawfulness of existing use.

1.2 The Site and Surroundings

The property is a detached dwelling with brick and tile facing material. The site is bound by trees and bushes and a pond to the south. The properties within the area are similar in appearance, this property forms a part of a larger development that was constructed early 2000s.

1.3 Identified Historic Assets

The closest assets within close proximity to the site include:

41 Heath Drive
43 Heath Drive
27 Meadway
16 Meadway

However these assets are some distance away and the likely hood of any works affecting these assets are minimal and unlikely to have any negative or significant harm to these assets.

1.4 Development Proposals

The application is for conversion of garage to study and hobby room and installation of automatic sliding gates. Our proposals include retaining a similar appearance to the existing gates which would be iron. The proposals would retain a similar appearance but the gate would be automatic. The existing garage currently has space for 2 cars these would be relocated within the site which has ample space on the existing hard standing. The proposals would convert the garage to study and hobby room and install new windows and doors.

2.0 Legislation, Planning Policy

2.1 Overview of the decision-making process

The decision-making process of planning applications is within the role of the Local Planning Authority (LPA), which will have consideration of relevant legislation and planning policy at both national and local level. As such, this section will examine the relevant legislation and planning policies and guidance in relation to the Sites' development proposals. A comprehensive assessment of these are outlined below. The current regime recognises that planning applications should consider the potential impact of development proposals on historic assets. This term includes: designated historic assets, which have a statutory designation (e.g. Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) and non-designated historic assets, such as those compiled into a Local List by LPAs.

2.2 Legislation

Legislation relating to the built historic environment is primarily set out within the *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990*, which provides statutory protection for Listed Buildings and their settings and Conservation Areas.

In addition to the statutory obligations set out within the aforementioned Act, Section 38(6) of the *Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004* requires that all planning applications, including those for Listed Building Consent, are determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

2.3 Plan Policy

2.4 National Planning Policy Guidance

National Planning Policy guidance relating to the historic environment is provided within Section 16 of the Government's *National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)*, was published in December 2023. The *NPPF* is also supplemented by the national *Planning Policy Guidance (PPG)* which comprises a full and consolidated review of planning practice guidance documents to be read alongside the *NPPF* and which contains a section related to the Historic Environment. The *PPG* also contains the *National Design Guide*

2.5 The Development Plan

Applications for Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent in Freeland are currently considered against the policy and guidance set out within:

London Plan (adopted 2021)

Policy D1 - London's form, character and capacity for growth
Policy D4 - Delivering good design

3.0 Historic Background

- 3.1 The following Section provides an assessment of elements of the historic environment that have the potential to be impacted upon by the proposed development.
- 3.2 Development proposals may adversely impact heritage assets where they remove a feature which contributes to the significance of a heritage asset, or where they interfere with an element of a heritage asset's setting which contributes to its significance, such as interrupting a key relationship or a designed view.
- 3.3 It is however widely accepted (paragraph 213 of the *NPPF*) that not all parts of a heritage asset will necessarily be of equal significance. In some cases, certain elements of a heritage asset can accommodate substantial changes whilst preserving the significance of the asset.
- 3.4 Significance can be derived from many elements, including the historic fabric of a building or elements of its surrounds.
- 3.5 Consideration, based upon professional judgement and on-site analysis, was therefore made as to whether any of the heritage assets present within the surrounding area may include the site as part of their setting, whether the site contributes to their overall heritage significance, and whether the assets may potentially be affected by the proposed scheme as a result.
- 3.6 It has been observed that the following heritage assets may have the potential to be sensitive to the development proposals

41 Heath Drive

43 Heath Drive

27 Meadway

16 Meadway

The above assets are some distance away and the likely hood of any works effecting these assets are minimal and unlikely to have any negative or significant harm to these assets. The property subject to this application is well screened from heritage assets by intervening vegetation and properties which form apart of the estate.

- 3.7 With regard to other heritage assets in the vicinity of the site, assessment has concluded that the site does not form any part of setting that positively contributes to overall heritage significance due the nature of the asset and a lack of visual connections, spatial relationships or historic connections. Accordingly, the proposed development is not anticipated to result in a change that would impact upon the overall heritage significance of these assets.

4.0 Conclusion

Consideration has been made as to whether the proposed development would harm the heritage significance of heritage assets in the vicinity of the site through changes in setting.

In respect of built heritage matters the development proposals comply with the requirements of relevant legislation, planning policy and guidance at national and local levels. As such, there are no reasons on heritage grounds for the application to be refused. In relation to the conservation area the works reflect minor alterations that would not significantly harm the conservation area. The conversion of the garage would provide additional room without encroaching on the conservation area furthermore the 2 carpark spaces will be relocated onto existing hardstanding which is also screened. The use of materials for is the same as the host property and the proposed gate is similar in design to the existing previously approved gate.