



SUMMARY PROOF OF EVIDENCE

Of Ruth Elizabeth Masood MRTPI IHBC

**Town and Country Planning (Inquiries
Procedure) (England) Rules 2000**

ON BEHALF OF THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

APPEAL BY: DLP on behalf of Hallam Land Management Ltd

SITE AT: Land at Junction with Carr Road /Hollin Busk Lane
Sheffield
S36 2NR

PROPOSAL: Outline application for up to 85 dwellings including
open space (amended description)

APPEAL AGAINST: Sheffield City Council

LPA REFERENCE: 17/04673/OUT

PINS REFERENCE: APP/J4423/W/21/3267168

DATE: 5th March 2020

- 1.0 My proof of evidence is confined to addressing built heritage matters relating to refusal reason No 1 of the Councils decision notice pertaining to planning application 17/04673/OUT and must be read alongside the evidence of my colleagues, Adam Chapman, Laura Stevens, and Ricardo Ares. Their proofs of evidence will address the other reasons for refusal.
- 1.1 I demonstrate that the appeal is contrary to The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (section 66(1)) as this requires decisions to play special regard to its setting or any historic interest that it possesses. The appeal is further supported by the NPPF Guidance Chapter 16 in particular Para 193 that substantial harm would be caused by the proposed development due to the contribution the historic setting plays to the significance of these designated assets. The proposed development also fails to provide a convincing justification as required by Para 194 to make an exception.
- 1.2 I demonstrate that equal weight is given to the failure of the proposal to comply with UDP policies LR5(e) that protects heritage assets in open space areas, saved UDP policy BE15, which identifies that development which would harm the character or appearance of listed buildings should not be permitted; and saved UDP policy BE19 which expects development affecting listed building(s) to preserve their character, appearance and setting.
- 1.3 I then turn to an assessment of the setting of the designated Heritage Assets following four of the five steps set out by Historic England in CD 7.3.
- 1.4 I identify the heritage assets and their settings affected in Step 1: Royd Farmhouse and The Barn and Farmbuildings which lie approx.15m NE of Royd Farmhouse
- 1.5 I assess the degree to which these settings and views contribute to their significance in Step 2. I explain the importance of the historic field system setting and the contribution this makes to the significance of the heritage assets. These are evaluated being predominately of historic value with some evidence of cultural and a lesser degree architectural value. This weight is placed on their historic value due to the evidential connection set out between collection of historic farm buildings and strong visual importance with their former agrarian functions; as the setting is a key element of their significance.
- 1.6 I assess the effects of the proposed development in Step 3 on that significance or on the ability to appreciate it using guidance from Annexe 2 of the NPPF and BS 7913:2013 to evaluate the impact of change on the historic environment. The effect on the settings of both buildings was assessed as negative and the conclusion was drawn that the proposed development would result in substantial harm both on that significance and the ability to appreciate it.

- 1.7 I then evaluate the proposals made by the appellant to mitigate and minimise this substantial harm in Step 4. The conclusion made is that these measures will not mitigate the substantial harm outlined in 1.6.
- 1.8 I then draw attention to the previous planning site history Inspector's comments in relation to a dismissed appeal and evaluate the impact of another permission being granted allowed within the setting of the DHAs at Royd Cottage.
- 1.9 I provide an analysis of the proposals against Case Law, National Legislation, National and Local Plan Policy and policies identified reason No 1 for refusal. I conclude that no convincing justification has been made to mitigate the substantial harm proposed. The public benefit assessment is evaluated by Mr Chapman.
- 1.10 My conclusion summary states that the proposal fails from a heritage perspective to make an exceptional reason to depart from the policies already assessed above. If allowed the proposal will irrevocably change the historic setting of the designated heritage asset: a currently intact ensemble that reflects the former vernacular building techniques of the Pennine region.
- 1.11 These buildings evolved alongside the agrarian economy facilitated by the 'assarted' cleared woodland and are an important remaining example of the local history. If allowed the DHAs will become devoid of any historical context essential to their understanding and subsumed within a vapid, pastiche housing estate.