



Appeal Ref: APP/ M3645/W/25/3374913

LPA Tandridge District Council Ref: TA/2023/1281

Appeal by Nutfield Park Developments Ltd

Former Laporte Works, Nutfield Road, Nutfield, Surrey, RH1 4HG

Summary Proof of Evidence: Heritage

CD 11.5

Andrew Josephs (BA Hons)

on behalf of Nutfield Park Developments Ltd

E:mail andyjosephs@hotmail.com • Telephone 07990 571908

Offices in Thirsk•Bury•Leamington Spa•Bath•Norwich

www.andyjosephs.co.uk

Correspondence and Accounts: 43 Middle Green, Higham, IP28 6NY

Andrew Josephs Associates Ltd. Registered Office, Fulford House, Newbold Terrace, Leamington Spa, England, CV32 4EA

Registration no. 13428825. VAT No. 390520313

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Scope of my evidence	4
3.	Statement of Significance	5
4.	The Effects of the Proposed Development on the Significance of the Heritage Assets	7
5.	Conclusion	8

1. Introduction

1.1 I am Andrew Josephs, Managing Director of Andrew Josephs Associates, a cultural heritage consultancy founded in 2002. I hold a BA (Hons) in Archaeology and Environmental Studies awarded by the University of Wales in 1985.

1.2 I was previously Principal Consultant (Director of Heritage and Archaeology) at Entec and Wardell Armstrong, where I started in 1992, becoming one of the UK's first consultants in the post-PPG16 era of developer-funded heritage and archaeology. I have authored over 1000 Heritage Statements.

1.3 The evidence that I have prepared and provide for this appeal is true and has been prepared and is given in accordance with my professional experience, irrespective of by whom I am instructed.

2. Scope of my Evidence

2.1 My role in this Inquiry is to present expert evidence that explains: the significance of the affected heritage assets; the contribution setting makes to that significance; and the effect of the proposals on that significance or the ability to experience and/or appreciate it.

2.2 This Proof of Evidence focuses on the Grade II* Church of St Peter and St Paul, Nutfield (approximately 130m north east) and the Grade II Folly Tower approximately 110m south east).

2.3 The statutory legislation most relevant to the Appeal Site is the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. I am familiar with the body of case law relating to the interpretation and application of this statutory provision and understand its relevance to decision-making. However, its application to the facts of this case is addressed in Mr Richard Henley's planning evidence.

3. Statement of Significance

Church of St Peter and St Paul

3.1 The Church is listed Grade II*. Within the Churchyard, and 8m from the Church, is a Grade II eighteenth-century chest tomb. The tomb is not assessed separately below but conjoined with the Church.

3.2 The Church has 13th century origins but, externally, little remains of the original architecture. The 13th century tower was rebuilt in 1786. A full programme of restoration was carried out in 1882.

3.3 The architectural significance of the Church is predominantly appreciated from within. These architectural and historical elements, and their significance, will not be affected by the proposed development.

3.4 The Church is not a prominent feature in the local landscape sitting in a topographically lower location amongst trees and woodland.

3.5 Externally, the architectural significance of the Church, including the tower, can only be appreciated from the south, on Church Lane and within the Churchyard. The curtilage of the Church is well-defined by mature trees (including evergreen to the west side) and a yew hedge. The curtilage encompasses the Churchyard, and there is a clear sense of enclosure.

3.6 The Church sits 130m north east of the proposed IRC to the east of Church Lane. Between the Church and the Appeal Site is Beechcroft Cottages and mature woodland. In summer this is likely to prevent views of the proposed built development from the Church at ground level. Highly filtered views may be possible from the curtilage boundary, next to the lych gate.

3.7 In winter, glimpsed views are likely through trees without leaves although, from the porch, an evergreen tree within the churchyard will largely block this view. The prominent built development within the view is Beechcroft Cottages, 35m south west of the Church, a house constructed after 1945.

3.8 Views of the development are likely from the parapet of the tower roof, although filtered to some extent by woodland. This is not accessible to the public.

3.9 The proposed development will have no effect upon any key views of the Church.

3.10 Due to the enclosed nature of the churchyard, proportionately the built fabric contributes more to the heritage significance of the Church than its wider setting.

3.11 Historically, the Church's setting and its relationship with Nutfield is unusual. It is not in a topographically dominant position; the Church being built

some 20m lower than the focus of the village along the ridge that the A25 follows and some 200m south of the village core. There is no evidence of an earlier settlement around the Church, nor of medieval desertion.

3.12 Today, within the wider setting, are an active quarry with access road 225m to the east of the Church, and beyond the M23.

3.13 The proposed development is within land that has previously been worked for Fullers Earth from the 19th century and restored. There is therefore no original surviving historical context between the Church and the Appeal Site, in the way that agricultural fields or built assets could provide a link between the Church and its parishioners.

Folly Tower

3.14 Folly Tower is listed Grade II. It was built in 1858 within the gardens of Well House, a 'gentleman's residence' that fronted onto High Street and is now apartments.

3.15 The Tower is 3 stages high with a battlemented parapet to the top. There is a modern extension to the north side and a raised patio adjoining to the south. Recently, a swimming pool has been constructed 20m north west of the Tower that is prominent in its setting.

3.16 Appreciation of the significance of the Tower is from within the grounds of Redwood, a much-extended house built within the former grounds of Well House. This appreciation is not affected by the proposed development. Due to surrounding development, there is no appreciation of the asset from Well House or the High Street.

3.17 Historically the setting of the Tower would have been formed by Well House and the views the Tower offered of the surrounding landscape. Since the Tower's construction, the surroundings have been subject to mineral extraction that commenced in the 19th century and modern development. There is no original surviving historical context between the Folly Tower and the Appeal Site.

3.18 Between the Folly Tower and the IRC is dense woodland. It is predicted that there would be no views at ground level from the Tower. It is considered likely that the rooflines of the proposed development would be visible from the upper storey roof of the Tower. This would not affect appreciation of the Tower's architectural significance.

4. The Effects of the Proposed Development on the Significance of the Heritage Assets

The Church of St Peter and St Paul

4.1 Overall, I conclude that views of the proposed IRC will cause a minor adverse impact on a visitor's experience of the Church (especially in winter) and a minor adverse effect to the appreciation of the significance of the Church. This results in a low level of less than substantial heritage harm to the Church's setting and significance, as defined by NPPF.

Folly Tower

4.2 I conclude that there would be a minor adverse effect to appreciation of the significance of the Folly Tower resulting in a low level of less than substantial heritage harm to the setting and significance of the Tower, as defined in the NPPF.

5. Conclusion

5.1 I have concluded that in relation to the Church and Folly Tower there would be low level of less than substantial harm to their setting and significance.

5.2 Applying, paragraph 212 of the NPPF and relevant case law, great weight must be afforded to the assets' conservation and the proposal should be weighed against public benefits, as set out in Paragraph 215 of NPPF.

“Where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.”

5.3 The balance under paragraph 215 of the NPPF is carried out in the proof of evidence of Mr Henley.



consultancy | project management | expert witness

Specialists in Archaeology and Cultural Heritage ~ Telephone 07990 571908 - Visit our website at www.andyjosephs.co.uk