



## Heritage Statement of Common Ground

---

Land at The Old  
Cottage, Station Road,  
Lingfield

PINS REF: APP/M3645/W/22/3309334

LPA REF: TA/2022/685

July 2023 | Project Ref 7677

Project Number: 7677

File Origin: [https://heritagecollectiveuk.sharepoint.com/sites/7501-8000/Shared Documents/7601-7700/07677 - Land at Old Cottage, Lingfield/HER/ALL INQUIRY DOCUMENTS/2023.07.10 - Heritage SoCG.docx](https://heritagecollectiveuk.sharepoint.com/sites/7501-8000/Shared%20Documents/7601-7700/07677%20-%20Land%20at%20Old%20Cottage,%20Lingfield/HER/ALL%20INQUIRY%20DOCUMENTS/2023.07.10%20-%20Heritage%20SoCG.docx)

# Contents

<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Agreed Heritage Matters.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. Matters of Dispute .....</b>	<b>4</b>

# 1. Introduction

## Background

- 1.1** This draft Statement of Common Ground (“SoCG”) on heritage matters has been prepared by HCUK Group on behalf of Woolbro Morris Limited. This Heritage Statement of Common Ground supplements the Statement of Common Ground dated 25 May 2023.
- 1.2** This SoCG has been progressed to set out common ground between the Appellant (Woolbro Morris) and the determining Planning Authority (Tandridge District Council) in respect of heritage matters to be considered as part of the appeal against non-determination of an application for outline planning permission (2022/685) for a site known as Land at The Old Cottage, Station Road, Lingfield
- 1.3** The areas of common ground in relation to heritage are set out in this Statement to assist the Inspector and the appeal process:
- Agreed Heritage Matters – identifying the issues which are matters of fact and are agreed between both parties; and,
  - Heritage Matters in Dispute – identifying the areas which are disputed and are the areas of focus for the appeal.

## Description of Appeal Scheme

- 1.4** The planning application to which this appeal relates (TA/2022/685) is an outline planning application (with all matters reserved except for access and layout) a residential development of 99 dwellings (40% affordable) with associated access, formal open space, landscaping and car parking on land at the Old Cottage, Station Road, Lingfield

## Reasons for Refusal

- 1.5** Application TA/2022/685 was appealed for non-determination, and officers of the council then concluded that the application would have been refused for six reasons, of which the second related to heritage, as follows:

*"The proposal would fail to preserve or enhance [the] character and appearance of Lingfield Conservation Area and would be harmful to the setting and significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets. The application fails to set out clear and convincing justification to outweigh the harm. Therefore, the proposal fails to accord with the above identified national, regional and local policies and legislation, in particular Policy DP20 of the Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies (2014), and Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021)."*

## 2. Agreed Heritage Matters

**2.1** The following matters are agreed between the Council and the Appellant:

- That the appeal proposal will have a physical effect on part of Lingfield Conservation Area, engaging section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- That there will be no physical effect on any listed or locally listed building.
- That there will be no harm to the significance of the locally listed building known as Cyder Barn. The only locally listed building (“non-designated heritage asset” affected by the proposal is New Place Farm and its converted Oast House.
- That the main heritage effect of the appeal proposal is on the setting of five designated heritage assets, namely (1) Lingfield Conservation Area, (2) the grade I listed Church of St Peter and St Paul, Lingfield, (3) the grade II\* listed house known as New Place, (4) Pollard House, listed grade I, and (5) Church House, listed grade II\*. In all five cases, the category<sup>1</sup> of harm is agreed to be “less than substantial” (“LSH”) within the meaning in paragraph 202 of the NPPF.
- That a primary methodology to be applied is as set out in *Good Practice Guide in Planning: The Setting of Heritage Assets*, Historic England, second edition, December 2017, generally known as “GPA3”.

**2.2** The extent<sup>2</sup> of harm to the significance of the grade I listed Church of St Peter and St Paul, and the grade II\* listed house known as New Place, is agreed by both main parties to be a “low” level of LSH within the meaning in paragraph 202 of the NPPF (see Table 1 below).

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 18a-018-20190723 of the Practice Guide accompanying the NPPF.

<sup>2</sup> Paragraph 18a-018-20190723 of the Practice Guide accompanying the NPPF.

## 3. Matters of Dispute

**3.1** The matters of dispute between the Council and the appellant in respect of designated heritage assets are limited to the extent<sup>3</sup> of harm to the significance of three of the five main assets, namely (1) Lingfield Conservation Area, (2) Pollard House, and (3) Church House. While both parties agree that the category of harm is, in all three cases, “less than substantial” within the meaning in paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework, there is a difference of opinion as to the extent of that harm within the category of “less than substantial”. The Council describes the extent of the harm to the significance of the conservation area as “high”, whereas the appellant describes the extent of the harm as “medium”. The Council describes the extent of the harm to the significance of Pollard House as “low”, whereas the appellant describes the extent of the harm as “negligible”. The Council describes the extent of the harm to the significance of Church House as “low”, whereas the appellant describes the extent of the harm as “negligible”.

**3.2** The summary positions are set out below in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of effects

	Conservation Area	Church	Pollard Cottage	Church House	New Place
Appellant	Medium LSH	Low LSH	Negligible LSH	Negligible LSH	Low LSH
Tandridge DC	High LSH	Low LSH	Low	Low	Low LSH

**3.3** There is a further dispute between the main parties as to the effect of the proposal on the setting and significance of the non-designated heritage asset known as New Place Farm, including the converted Oast House.

**3.4** It is disputed by the Council that the second putative reason for refusal of planning permission is a complete record of the council’s objection on heritage grounds.

<sup>3</sup> Paragraph 18a-018-20190723 of the Practice Guide accompanying the NPPF.

Signed for the Council



Date: 11 July 2023



Signed for the Appellant .....Date 10 July 2023