

CONSERVATION CONSULTATION RESPONSE

To: Becky Jones
Ref: 17/05957/FUL
Location: Knighton Mill, Knighton Road, Broad Chalke, SP5 5DX
Proposal: Demolition and replacement of the single family dwelling
Comments by: Jocelyn Sage
Date: 4 August 2017

Becky

As you are aware, this is an unlisted building and not within a conservation area. I was consulted at pre-application stage on the basis that this could be considered an undesignated heritage asset. As part of the pre-application documentation, the applicant submitted a Statement of Significance produced by Asset Heritage. My comments in respect of this statement were as follows:

"The existing mill is an unlisted building and not within a conservation area. It is clearly of some age (late 19th century) so can reasonably be construed as an undesignated heritage asset. The applicant has supplied a statement of significance which appears to be a comprehensive assessment of the mill building's interest (although not the context – to which I shall return). The report concludes that the building has some historic significance, archaeological value and evidential significance but that its interest has been limited by the removal of machinery and the later unsympathetic alterations relating to its conversion to residential. The report refers to the Historic England listing criteria and concludes that it is a late standard example and not worthy of listing. I believe this to be correct. 4.5 of the report says:

'Consequently I attach more heritage significance to the site and its archaeology and to its setting than to the building itself'.

Again, I would concur with this conclusion and didn't dispute this at the time of the pre-application enquiry.

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF says:

*'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 affect directly or indirectly 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.'*

My view (which accords with the applicant's heritage consultant) is that the building has limited

'significance' and I would therefore not object to its replacement with a new dwelling of good design (ie to meet core policy 57) and providing that the features which are of interest (namely the mill pond, sluices and leats) are retained and their setting enhanced (in this respect I hope that the proposals include the removal of the modern folly – see plate 15 of the heritage statement).

Whilst there is a garden/landscape plan, I can't see any reference to proposed works to the existing leat, mill pond and sluices (repairs are briefly referred to in the planning statement). It seems to me that the application fails to demonstrate how these features, which we have all agreed are the significant heritage elements of the site, will be better served by the proposed new development. I would ask for a further planning statement in relation to the physical management of the existing site.

JS