

Heritage Statement

Re: 8 Heritage Gardens, Didsbury, Manchester,

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

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 HERITAGE GARDENS AS A HERITAGE ASSET.

8.0.0 OVERALL CONCLUSION

1.0.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1.0 This is a Heritage Statement to accompany a House Holder Application for Town Planning Approval for the erection of a part single, part two storey, part first floor side extension to provide additional living accommodation. 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.

The house is one of several similar properties within the Heritage Gardens development which were constructed in the mid-nineties within the Didsbury St. James Conservation Area. They are of a new multi coloured Cheshire type of brick and feature hipped roofs and painted timber sash-look windows.

2.0.1 The Proposals

The applicant is proposing to extend the property on top of the existing create additional bedroom and ensuite space.

2.0.2 Planning History

12th May 2009

CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT for the demolition of double garage and single storey rear extension to allow redevelopment of site.

Status – Approved

02nd Oct 2009

Erection of two storey side extension and single storey rear extension following demolition of existing side garage to form additional living accommodation.

Status - Approved

13th Aug 2012

Erection of two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation following demolition of existing garage.

Status – Approved

13th Aug 2012

CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT for demolition of garage

Status – Approved

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 extensions to Number 8 Heritage Gardens.

3.1.1 We have assessed the heritage significance of Heritage Gardens, 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 Heritage Gardens 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 27th 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 8 Heritage Gardens and observing its character and appearance in order to assess its architectural and historic interest and heritage significance, in the terms of the NPPF.

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

4.2.7 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.

7.0.0 CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPOSALS AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE OF HERITAGE GADRENS AS A HERITAGE ASSET

We propose to build over the existing garage to provide two good sized bedrooms with en-suite's. The side extension has been designed to be sympathetic to the original form of the house. The two storey height is broken by a small pitched roof over the extended garage. The extension is similarly recessed from the rear wall of the property and the roof is hipped into the existing roof at a lower level than the main ridge. The garage doors are to be reused and materials and windows will match existing ensuring that it is sympathetic to Heritage Gardens and the conservation area. Access to the Rear of Property Access to the rear of the property is maintained at the side of the garage and bins are stored in the side passage out of view. Summary The proposed extension has been arrived at to meet the needs of the occupants and will provide much improved accommodation suitable for modern family living. Due regard has been given to the policies set out in the Manchester UDP and the design guidance for Didsbury St. James.

In conclusion, we maintain that the extension will not damage the setting of Heritage Gardens and that the design will provide enhancement.

9.0.0 OVERALL CONCLUSION

9.2.0 For the reasons already stated we consider that the proposals will all sustain and enhance the significance of Heritage Gardens 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”*.

There can be no doubt that the proposal will meet the needs of the present owner of Heritage Gardens, 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 will be granted for the above proposals at 8 Heritage Gardens.