

MEMORANDUM

From:	Built Heritage Officer		
Service	Green Infrastructure	App No:	250517
Address:	Land off Basingstoke Road, to the south and west of Spencers Wood.		
Proposal:	Outline planning permission is sought with all matters reserved for future determination, save for the means of access via Basingstoke Road, for: up to 420 dwellings (Use Class C3), an 80 bed care home (Use Class C2), 1ha of employment land (Use Class E(g), primary school (Use Class F1), local centre (Use Classes E(a), (b), (c), (f)), GP Surgery (Use Class E(e), sports pitch and changing facility, public open space, SANG provision and associated infrastructure.		
Heritage Asset:	Archaeological Sites Nos. 26 & 28 fall in part and/or totally within site boundary. Whilst Archaeological Site No.24 lies south and outside site, directly across the Basingstoke Road from site. Closest Designated Heritage Assets outside the Site: • Barn approx. 80m north of Sheepbridge Court – grade II” listed building. • Moated site at Sheepbridge Court - Schedule Ancient Monument. • Sheepbridge Court - Grade II* listed building. Notable non-designated heritage assets adjacent to Site: • Bodys Farm (aka Mullen Farmhouse) • Montford/Bicton Villa), • 1-6 Barracks Lane, • Waring Bakery, The Limes • Chestnuts. Listed buildings are classed as designated heritage assets under the NPPF (2024) and in the Council’s Local Plan policies.		
Site Visit Made:	No.		

Summary Of Recommendations

From a heritage stance this is **no objection** raised, subject to landscaping details to the southern end of the site with respect to the setting of Sheepbridge Court and

the parklands of Swallowfield Pak. Likewise with respect the landscaping/boundary treatment and positioning of those new dwellings within the north-west corner of the site adjacent to the (non-designated heritage) residential dwellings along Basingstoke Road and Barracks Lane.

Comments On Proposal

From a heritage stance it is considered the submitted heritage statement has correctly identified those designated heritage assets (Listed Buildings, Schedule Monuments, and National Registered Historic Park and Gardens) located within 1km of the site.

In applicant's heritage statement assessment, I concur firstly with those designated heritage assets it identifies as not affected by the proposed development due to factors such as, intervening development, their distance from the site, or in, have a limited meaningful setting to them (as with the historic milestones). Likewise, I agree with designated heritage assets identified as having the most potential to have their significance, in terms of their setting impacted as a result of the residential development scheme for the current open fields of the site.

I concur with the overall conclusions reached in the heritage statement with respect to the proposals changing the rural setting of Sheepbridge Court however through, as suggested in the submitted Illustrative Land Masterplan', the design of the development and landscaping treatments will compensate for this change' such that there 'will not result in a harmful impact on how the significance of this Listed Building is presently appreciated or understood.' As for the listed barn that lies approximately 80m north of Sheepbridge Court, its setting is already compromised by the modern farm building that have encapsulated it.

With respect to the wider setting in which the historic parklands of Swallowfield Park is experienced, the development of those open fields of the site to the north-west of this Registered Park and Gardens has as the applicant's heritage statement concludes presents 'the potential to cause a low degree of harm to the significance of the Swallowfield Park' and even then, in terms defined under the NPPF what harm caused would amount to 'less than substantial harm' and then very much at the lower reaches of such harm. Whilst appropriate landscaping scheme would further ameliorate or avoid potential harm to the parkland's wider setting.

As for non-designated heritage assets, the heritage statement rightfully identifies that there are none within the site itself, whilst stating under the Executive Summary at the start of the document that there are 'four non-designated built heritage assets located within a 1km search area surrounding the site.' It does not appear clear where these are and whether or not they are the Council identified Buildings of Traditional Local Character, a classification of local historic buildings of interest that whilst not listable, are of however of local note. This Buildings of Traditional Local Interest is believed to have been a classification used by the Council that predates the emergence in 2012 of the NPPF, which defined 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', a definition applicable to both designated and non-designated heritage assets.

Given the NPPF definition of a heritage asset it is therefore considered that several of the buildings, adjacent to the site, along Basingstoke Road and Barracks, should be viewed as heritage assets (non-designated) due to their age, traditional architectural form, and/or hold social interest, such as the likes of Bodys Farm(house), Chestnuts, and Nos. 1-6 Barracks Lane)

It appears that the applicant's heritage statement has not accounted for these non-designated heritage assets or given consideration to the impact on the proposals may have on them. In a number of cases gaps between the buildings on Basingstoke Road provide views into the site. The most notable of these gaps being that formed by Barracks Lane. That said, as with the more significantly imported designated heritage assets whose setting is likely to be impacted under this proposed scheme, mitigation measures such as landscaping/boundary treatment and positioning of the new housing in the site could minimise the visual impact to the setting of these non-designated heritage assets as well.

In conclusion, from a heritage stance, overall no objection is raised albeit it is considered there is expected to be mitigation measures to be sought, in terms of landscaping/boundary treatments and positioning of the new housing, to minimise and/or to avoid detrimental impact on those heritage assets closest to the site.

Advised Conditions

- Landscaping and site boundary treatment,
- Housing heights and layout.

Date:	03/06/2025	Signed:	Keith Frost Built Heritage Officer
--------------	------------	----------------	---------------------------------------