

PLANNING (LISTED BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION AREAS) ACT 1990

**HERITAGE STATEMENT**  
**For**  
**MODIFICATIONS AND EXTENSIONS**  
**to**  
**THE EXISTING GARAGE**  
**FARLEY HOUSE**  
**FARLEY, STAFFORDSHIRE**

**May 2017**



**DAVID LEWIS ASSOCIATES**

**Chartered Architects**

**Conservation and Historic Building Specialists**

**Delf View House**

**54a, High Street**

**Chapmanslade**

**Wiltshire**

**BA13 4AN**

**Tel: 01373 832040**

## **CONTENTS:**

### **1.0.0 INTRODUCTION**

### **2.0.0 THE SITE, ITS LOCATION AND ITS HERITAGE STATUS.**

### **3.0.0 THE HERITAGE STATEMENT METHODOLOGY**

### **4.0.0 CONSIDERATION OF THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF) IN RELATION TO DEVELOPMENT AFFECTING HERITAGE ASSETS**

### **5.0.0 BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT OF FARLEY HOUSE**

### **6.0.0 THE GENERAL CONTEXT OF CHANGE, OVER TIME, WITH REFERENCE TO HISTORIC DOMESTIC PROPERTIES**

### **7.0.0 CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPOSALS AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE OF FARLEY HOUSE AS A HERITAGE ASSET.**

### **8.0.0 OVERALL CONCLUSION**

## **APPENDICES**

### **Appendix 1**

**Location Plan.**

### **Appendix 2**

**Drawings prepared by David Lewis Associates showing Existing Plans and Elevations, as follows:-**

**1960-S-06 – Plans + elevations of existing garage**

**1960-S-05 – Site plan showing existing**

**1960-S-07 – Relationship of the existing garage to Farley House.**

### **Appendix 3**

**Drawings prepared by David Lewis Associates showing Proposed Plans and Elevations, as follows:-**

**1960-D-06A – Ground Floor Plan of Garage**

**1960-D-07A – First floor plan of Garage**

**1960-D-08A – Proposed North Elevation**

**1960-D-09A – Proposed South Elevation**

**1960-D-10 – Proposed End Elevations**

**1960-D-11A – Proposed Section**

**1960-D-12 -Site Plan showing Proposal**

**1960-D-13 – Relationship of the modified garage to Farley House.**

## **1.0.0 INTRODUCTION**

1.1.0 This is a Heritage Statement to accompany a Full Application for Town Planning Approval and Listed Building Consent for proposed improvements to The Existing Garage, Farley House. This document will demonstrate how the design procedure developed and will set out how the changes can be justified under The National Planning Framework (NPPF)

## **2.0.0 THE SITE, ITS LOCATION AND ITS HERITAGE STATUS.**

2.0.1 Farley House is a free-standing dwelling within its own grounds. The existing garage block is located to the south-east of the main house. Farley House is Grade II listed under its previous name of Greenlands. It is within the Alton and Farley Conservation Area.

### **The Statutory Listing**

Farley House was named as Greenlands and listed Grade II by English Heritage on 3rd January 1967 The listing text states:

*House. Early C19 with later alterations. Stone, plastered and lined as ashlar; plain tile roof with coped verges; ashlar integral end stacks with cylindrical shafts. Aligned east-west facing south, with extensions to east and west, 2 storeys with chamfered eaves band and single-storey extension to the right; 2:3:2 bays, wooden chamfer mullioned windows of 2 and 3 lights, main house to centre has a left hand canted bay window. French casements to right hand extension; central glazed door.*

*(Source –British Listed Buildings.co.uk with listing description – Crown copyright)*

## **2.0.2 The Proposals**

The applicant is proposing to modify, extend and improve the existing C20 garage block which is set apart and to the side of the house.

## **2.0.3 Planning History**

The Staffordshire Moorlands Council records only take the planning history back to 1981. There must have been previous applications, possibly from when the property was called Greenlands, and these are the subject of conjecture at this stage. Further details may be available for the final document.

We know that the following applications were made:-

February 1981- Ref. SM 9492. A proposal for a timber Stable and Tack Room was approved and built. It still exists, to the east of the garage.

September 1981 – Ref. SM 10296. An application was approved for a double garage and ancillary rooms. This comprised a double garage, workshop, large garden store and Kitchen to the ground floor to the east side. The kitchen projected forward as a single storey wing. A staircase led to First Floor accommodation comprising a Lounge, Bedroom and Bathroom. The first floor was largely built into the roof with a row of dormer windows on the south side. The size of the proposal and accommodation to be provided was very similar to the application which is the subject of this report. However the present, smaller garage was built.

1983 – Ref. SM 12119. An application for a two storey extension to the house on the north side, west end, to provide a library, WC, Cloakroom, Stairwell, Bedroom, Dressing Room and Bathroom. This was fully implemented.

1984 – SM 12978. An application for alterations to the Boiler Room and Larder and new windows to the Kitchen.

### **3.0.0 THE HERITAGE STATEMENT METHODOLOGY**

3.1.0 We were appointed by the applicants to consider the heritage issues associated with the proposed changes to the garage, Farley House.

3.1.1 We have assessed the heritage significance of Farley House, taking into consideration its historical and architectural interest.

3.1.2 We have considered the proposed changes and assessed their impact on the heritage interest of Farley House in terms of the NPPF and local planning policies.

### **4.0.0 CONSIDERATION OF THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF) AND OTHER RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES IN RELATION TO DEVELOPMENT AFFECTING HERITAGE ASSETS**

4.0.0 The National Planning Policy Statement was published on 27<sup>th</sup> March 2012.

#### **4.0.0 Comment**

4.2.1 As required by the NPPF, I have observed, researched and then considered and addressed the significance of the heritage assets that will be affected by the proposal, and their setting.

- 4.2.2 The NPPF 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. Heritage asset includes designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).*”
- 4.2.3 As quoted below, “significance” for heritage policy is defined in the NPPF as: “*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.*”
- 4.2.4 When considering the proposal it is also important to appreciate the NPPF definition of “*Conservation (for heritage policy)*” as: “*The process of maintaining and managing change to a heritage asset in a way that sustains and, where appropriate, enhances its significance.*” We consider that the main issue with the proposals is to consider whether they will sustain, or where appropriate, enhance the significance of the affected heritage asset.
- 4.2.5 We commenced our initial appointment by visiting and photographing Farley House and observing its character and appearance in order to assess its architectural and historic interest and heritage significance, in the terms of the NPPF. This informed sections 5.0.0 to 7.0.0 of our statement supported by an annotated photographic survey which is included at the end of the appendices and will be referred to within my Heritage Statement where appropriate.
- 4.2.6 We also studied the historical development of Farley House as this has contributed to its historic interest and to its current appearance, character and heritage interest.

4.2.7 This brief but careful analysis contributed to our identifying and understanding the appearance, character, historical interest and significance of Farley House, so satisfying Paragraph 128 of the NPPF.

4.2.8 This analysis enabled us to consider the impact of the proposal on the significance of the existing property on the site as a designated heritage asset, in accordance with paragraph 131 of the NPPF. Whilst also taking into consideration the criteria for achieving sustainable development in the context of the heritage assets affected as established in paragraphs 131-139 of the NPPF.

## **5.0.0 BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF FARLEY HOUSE**

5.0.1 Farley was listed Grade II in 1967. The listing states that it is early C19. It is thought that it was originally a pair of cottages bounded by the large chimney stacks and roof between. The house has since been extended and adapted a number of times resulting in the present substantial house.

5.0.2 These extensions and modifications have occurred on a regular basis throughout the C20.

5.0.3 One of the more recent changes has been to the eastern end of the house where a range of single storey pitched roof extensions have been added. At first, the effect on the original house would have been modest. However, the number of changes made, to the west north and east sides have been such that the form of the original is only recognisable on the south elevation and, of course, by the prominent chimney stacks.

5.0.4 The cottages would have originally been open to the landscape, but the present house is well screened from the road and valley by mature trees and shrubs. The existing modern garage block is set to one side

of the house and is end-on to it, presenting a simple gable. This discreet arrangement does not affect the setting of the house.

#### **6.0.1 THE GENERAL CONTEXT OF CHANGE, OVER TIME, WITH REFERENCE TO HISTORIC DOMESTIC PROPERTIES**

Many historic houses, whether large or small, country or urban, have been the subject of constant changes throughout the centuries to enable them to satisfy changing aspirations, changing requirements for privacy and comfort, changing sources of heat, developments in sanitation, changing relationships with servants and staff, to account for changes in technology and the availability of materials, resulting from the necessity of repair and refurbishment, and not least to satisfy the demands of fashion.

There can be no doubt that the ability to change in order to satisfy developing technology, provide acceptable social and housing conditions, and satisfy the aspirations of owners taking into account the changing status and values of housing in individual areas and their sustainability in a continuously changing world is a significant factor in those buildings which have survived over the centuries and will continue to be a vital factor in the survival, appearance and character of existing houses into the future. Change has always been an important element of sustainability and this is recognized in clause 131 of the NPPF. The heritage significance of Farley House is based partly on it being designed to meet the particular needs of the family at its time then subsequently being altered until the present day to accommodate changing social conditions, its changing status as a house, changing domestic technology, and the changing requirements, expectations, and aspirations of its occupants. The proposed changes

to the Garages at Farley House should be considered in the context of the manner in which most houses have changed over time in order to remain desirable and sustainable, and in particular to the manner in which Farley House has changed since its construction in the early C19.

## **7.0.0 CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPOSALS AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE OF FARLEY HOUSE AS A HERITAGE ASSET**

- 7.0.1 The existing garage building is approximately 11.5 metres to the south-east of Farley House. The general development of Farley house has been along the contours forming an east/west axis with the driveway running along the frontage. The garage is a further development of this arrangement. It is forward of the house, but both the house and garage are screened from the road and valley by a thick belt of trees and shrubs. The proposals will require the removal of one tree, but this general arrangement will be retained.
- 7.0.2 When viewed down the driveway the existing garage presents a simple gable end view. The proposals retain this concept.
- 7.0.3 The design of the existing garage is basic C20 with little effort taken to create a relationship with the main house. There have always been problems with the garage as built. It was intended to accommodate two cars but is not wide enough to do this comfortably and the ancillary spaces, i.e. workshop, garden store etc., have proved to be inadequate for the needs of the applicants.
- 7.0.4 The proposal is to retain the depth of the existing building, thereby presenting a similar gable-ended view from the house, but to extend it both to the west and the east. On the east side there is a paved area which is a rather ambiguous space of indeterminate use. An extension

to this end will be generally hidden from the view along the drive. On the west side an extension will extend the garage in order that it can comfortably accommodate two cars. It will be necessary to remove one tree, but the screening to the road and to the drive will be unaffected .

**7.0.5** The ridge line will be raised by approximately 1.1 metres in order to accommodate the proposed first floor accommodation. This will have a slight effect on the view along the drive from the house but, in general, the gable-end view will be similar to the existing.

**7.0.6** The proposed design of the re-ordered garage is typical of outbuildings adjacent to large houses, i.e. a more modest version of the formality of Farley House but with some references to the forms and detailing of the original house, plus a touch of whimsy with the addition of the clock tower. Materials will match Farley House with off-white stucco walls and clay tiles. Windows and garage doors to be in timber.

**7.0.7** In conclusion, we maintain that the re-construction of the existing garages will not damage the setting of Farley House and that the more appropriate design will provide enhancement.

## **9.0.0 OVERALL CONCLUSION**

9.1.0 It has already been explained that even small cottages and houses have generally survived by changing to satisfy the needs and aspirations of each generation that occupy them and such requirements change over time.

9.2.0 For the reasons already stated we consider that the proposals will all sustain and enhance the significance of Farley as a heritage asset so fully satisfying policies 131 and 137 of the NPPF.

9.3.0 Policy 129 of the NPPF states that *“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".* It is hoped our detailed assessment of the particular significance of the heritage asset affected by the proposal illustrates that the proposal will minimise or avoid any conflict between the proposal and the heritage asset's conservation.

9.4.0 Should it be perceived by others that the proposal does cause harm to any affected heritage asset, in my consideration such harm can only be much less than substantial and will be "*outweighed by the public benefit of the proposal which includes securing its optimum viable use*". It also needs to be noted that the Planning Guidance for the NPPF, published in 2014 clarifies that public benefit includes:

- "*Sustaining or enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and the contribution to its setting*"
- "*Securing the optimum viable use of a heritage asset in support of its long term conservation*".

It also states public benefit could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental progress as described in the NPPF paragraph 7 and this includes "*A social role-supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations*".

There can be no doubt that the proposal will meet the needs of the present owner of Farley House, and that its optimum use will be secured in support of its long term conservation. Therefore, should others consider that the proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to any designated heritage asset Policy 134 of the NPPF will be satisfied.

9.5.0 In our consideration the proposals fulfil the NPPF definition of Conservation (for heritage policy) as “*The process of maintaining and managing change to a heritage asset in a way that sustains and, where appropriate, enhances its significance*”.

9.6.0 Taking all of the above into consideration, it is hoped that Planning Permission and Listed building Consent will be granted for the above proposals at Farley House