



Heritage Report

Greenacres, Saucelands Lane, Shipley, Horsham, RH13 8PU

Report prepared by Chilcroft Heritage Planning
April 2025



Corporate members of:
The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings
Historic Houses Association
The Georgian Group



THE
GEORGIAN
GROUP

Front Cover: Image © Google Maps 2025

CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	4
2.	LEGISLATION AND POLICY	6
3.	ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE	12
4.	IMPACT ASSESSMENT	21
5.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	24
6.	APPENDIX	25

1) INTRODUCTION

- 1.1) I am Haig Dalton, founder of Chilcroft Heritage Planning, an established independent heritage consultancy since 2006. Formerly, I was a local planning authority officer within development control departments in the South of England. I have worked on a wide range of projects throughout the United Kingdom, predominantly (but not exclusively) for private sector clients.
- 1.2) I hold a masters degree in Historic Building Conservation (MSc); a postgraduate qualification in Architectural History from the University of Oxford (Oxon); I am an Affiliate member of the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) and of the Institute of Historic Building Conservation (IHBC).
- 1.3) Over the last 20 years I have specialised in the historic environment, both in terms of understanding and analysing physical fabric, and in terms of policy application, specifically by assessing impacts, providing advice and supporting development proposals. My experience includes a diverse range of cases relating to the assessment of physical changes to, and development affecting all manner of heritage assets, and their settings.
- 1.4) I have undertaken numerous impact assessments where I have considered the impacts of new development on the historic environment (dealing with physical impacts, setting, townscape, views and inter-visibility), including dealing with the effects of development on heritage assets in rural contexts.
- 1.5) I have provided expert evidence at appeals, including public inquiries, on behalf of both appellants and local planning authorities.
- 1.6) I understand my role in producing this heritage report; to give objective evidence on matters within my expertise, based on my own independent opinion and uninfluenced by the instructing party, which is co-owned. I confirm that I have stated the facts and matters on which my opinion is based, and that I have not omitted to mention facts or matters that could detract from my conclusions.

- 1.7) I believe that the facts stated within this Heritage Report are true and that the opinions expressed are correct. I have drawn attention to any matters where I consider I lack sufficient information to reach anything other than a provisional conclusion. I have adhered to the standards and duties of the professional bodies I am a member of, and will continue to adhere to those standards.
- 1.8) I was first approached in May 2023, when I was asked to consider the potential for development of the existing site. My assessment was based on several stages/elements, the first of which was an initial case review, including a site visit. I confirm that I am able to act as the applicant's heritage expert following this initial work and a site visit.
- 1.9) As an independent professional, I have formed my own opinions and have come to my own conclusions about the effects of the proposed development.
- 1.10) I have included in my heritage report photos taken on my original site visit. The photos were taken with a compact digital camera and they have not been digitally altered, aside from cropping superfluous areas of sky and/or foreground. This visual assessment is intended to be informative, but it is not intended to be exhaustive.
- 1.11) This statement will describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by the setting, as required by Para.207 of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (2024). It will assess the significance of the heritage assets by way of Historic England guidance *The Setting of Heritage Assets* (2017) in accordance with their preferred five-step procedure, identify, assess and explore the significance of their setting and consider the applicant's scheme in relation to them.

2) LEGISLATION AND POLICY

- 2.1) Legislation relating to listed buildings and conservation areas is contained in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Sections 16 and 66 of the Act place a duty on the decision maker to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings and their settings.
- 2.2) Section 72 of the Act places similar duty on the decision maker with respect to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas, however this does not extend to the setting of conservation areas.
- 2.3) The **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)** constitutes the Government's current national guidance and policy regarding development in the historic environment. It is a material consideration and includes a succinct policy framework for local planning authorities and decision takers. It relates to planning law by stating that applications are to be determined in accordance with the local plans unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 2.4) Paragraph 203 of the NPPF deals with conserving and enhancing the historic environment with emphasis on “significance”, defined in Annex 2 as:

“The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting. For World Heritage Sites, the cultural value described within each site’s Statement of Outstanding Universal Value forms part of its significance.”
- 2.5) Annex 2 of the NPPF defines the setting of a heritage asset as:

“The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.”

2.6) Paragraph 207 of the NPPF places a duty on the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected by a proposal, providing a proportionate level of detail. The effects of any development on a heritage asset therefore need to be assessed against the four components of its heritage significance: its archaeological, architectural, artistic and historic interests.

2.7) Paragraph 208 of the NPPF notes 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 into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

2.8) Paragraph 212 states with regard to heritage assets, that great weight should be given to their conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be) irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial or less than substantial harm.

2.9) Conservation (for heritage policy) is defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF as:

“The process of maintaining and managing change to a heritage asset in a way that sustains and, where appropriate, enhances its significance.”

2.10) The importance and relevance of this definition is that it does not suggest conservation to be the same as preservation. Indeed, what sets conservation apart is the emphasis on proactively maintaining and managing change and not on a reactive approach to resisting change. In its simplest interpretation conservation could amount to a change that at least sustains the significance of a heritage asset.

2.11) Paragraphs 214 to 215 describe two levels of potential harm that can be caused to the significance of designated heritage assets, namely substantial harm and less than substantial harm. These effects are to be weighed in the planning balance according to the guidance set out within the paragraphs, bearing in mind the statutory provisions above. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, including grade I and II* listed buildings should be wholly exceptional.

2.12) Paragraph 215 deals with cases of less than substantial harm and notes that any such harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Heritage protection and the conservation of heritage assets are recognised as of benefit to the public.

2.13) Harm is defined by Historic England as a change which erodes the significance of a heritage asset.

2.14) Paragraph 219 of the NPPF notes that local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.

2.15) **The National Planning Practice Guidance** provides advice on enhancing and conserving the historic environment in accordance with the NPPF. The PPG currently relates to the 2019 version of the NPPF but will be updated in due course to reflect NPPF 2023.

2.16) In regards to the setting of heritage assets the PPG notes:

“The setting is the surroundings in which an asset is experienced, and may therefore be more extensive than its curtilage.”

2.17) The guidance notes that a thorough assessment of the impact on setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it.

2.18) In relation to harm the guidance states:

“Whether a proposal causes substantial harm will be a judgment for the decision taker, having regard to the circumstances of the case and the policy in the National Planning Policy Framework. In general terms, substantial harm is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases. For example, in determining whether works to a listed building constitute substantial harm, an important consideration would be whether the adverse impact seriously affects a key element of its special architectural or historic interest. It is the degree of harm to the asset’s significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed. The harm may arise from works to the asset or from development within its setting.”

2.19) Paragraph 020 of the document notes that public benefits can be heritage based and can include:

- Sustaining or enhancing the significance and the contribution of its setting;
- Reducing or removing risks to a heritage asset; and
- Securing the optimum viable use of a heritage asset for the long term.

2.20) The **Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning** Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (Historic England, 2017) is a document published by Historic England as a second edition in December 2017, replacing the earlier 2015 setting guidance. The document provides for a thorough understanding of the setting of a heritage asset and the relationship of the setting to curtilage, character and context.

2.21) The guidance document notes, in paragraph 18, that the protection of the setting of heritage assets need not prevent change. The document recognises that not all heritage assets are of equal importance and states that the contribution made by their setting to their significance will also vary. Not all settings have the same capacity to accommodate change without causing harm to the significance of the asset.

2.22) As per earlier Historic England guidance, the document advocates a stepped approach to assessing the impact of change within setting on the significance of heritage assets. This stepped approach is:

Step 1: identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected;

Step 2: assess whether, how and to what degree these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s);

Step 3: assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on that significance;

Step 4: explore the way to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm; and

Step 5: make and document the decision and monitor outcomes.

2.23) Guidance under Step 2 notes that the asset's physical surroundings and how the asset is experienced (such as views, noise, tranquillity, sense of enclosure etc.) should be taken in to consideration.

2.24) Step 3 is also important in making it clear that a proposed development should not be assessed in terms of its impact on setting; instead it should be assessed in terms of the impacts on significance. That is to say, what matters is not the extent of visibility of the development or change to the setting of an asset, but the extent of change to its archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic interest. In some circumstances, this evaluation may need to extend to cumulative and complex impacts which may have as great an effect on heritage

assets as large-scale development and which may not only be visual. At the very least the assessment should address the key attributes of the development in terms of its location and siting, form and appearance, additional effects and permanence.

- 2.25) Paragraph 39 notes that options for reducing the harm arising from development may include the relocation of elements of a development or changes to its design. It notes that good design may reduce or remove the harm.
- 2.26) **Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990** requires great weight to be given to preserving the setting of a heritage asset. In *Jones v Mordue [2015] EWCA Civ 1243* the court confirmed that if the decision-maker has worked through the relevant heritage paragraphs in the NPPF, they will have complied with the s66 duty.
- 2.27) In *Barnwell Manor [2014] EWCA Civ 137* the court confirmed that great weight should be attached to the desirability of preserving the setting of a heritage asset.

3) ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

- 3.1) The proposed development is situated in a rural environment to the south of Saucelands Lane, among the ribbon of development that makes up pockets of existing dwellings, farm buildings and other commercial properties. The proposed site has a public footpath that runs adjacent to its western boundary, siting between it and the Grade II listed building of Saucelands (**List No. 1026963**) that sits further to the north-west. The proposed site comprises commercial single storey buildings and a large expanse of hardstanding with existing vehicular access to the northern side, linking up with Saucelands Lane.
- 3.2) The proposed site is largely self-contained within existing hedgerows and trees and additional landscaping is likely to enhance this still further. From Saucelands Lane, the proposed site is well set back from the frontage of the streetscape with little awareness of the proposed site that lies beyond. What awareness there is, is confined to the vehicular access and the proposed site benefits from a naturally beautiful appeal from this aspect, with trees along the western boundary creating a tree lined entrance to the proposed site. An existing commercial building in a green corrugated finish is visible at the end of this vehicular entrance, as witnessed from Saucelands Lane, which jars with the otherwise rural outlook into the proposed site. Any proposals should be mindful of this and seek to enhance this appearance by resighting new buildings away from this line of sight.
- 3.3) The proposed site shares its setting with a number of other well established buildings that can also be found along this part of Saucelands Lane. The oldest of these is the former farmhouse of Saucelands, a Grade II listed building which dates from the late 16th/early 17th Century and its associated outbuildings. Later dwellings have been added in the form of Fayreholme just to the east of the proposed site and Piper to the northern side of Saucelands Lane, late 20th Century dwellings which have also furthered the changes to the built setting in and around the proposed site. The development of the proposed site at Greenacres in the late 20th century was constructed at a similar time to these other later buildings and the proposed development will continue this steady evolution.

3.4) Saucelands is a Grade II listed building (**List No. 1026963**). The original building dates from the 17th Century if not earlier and is constructed of red and brown brick with stone set on a stone base. The dwelling is set over two storeys with the principal elevation facing west overlooking Saucelands Barn (**see Fig 3**), away from the proposed site. The building uses stone on its principal elevation and sides with brick infill and tile hung upper elevations at the rear facing east (**see Fig 4**). It has stone mullion casement windows with brick dripstones over and leaded diamond glazing bars. The dwelling is finished off with a half hipped tiled roof, believed to be originally Horsham slab stone, and giant threaded brick chimney stacks atop the centre of the ridgeline. Externally, the building has seen little in the way of remodelling unlike many dwellings that were facelifted in the Victorian style and at the time of its original construction, would have been a high status property being fully constructed in stone and brick, unlike many tenant farmhouses of this period which still used a timber frame construction.

3.5) The dwelling is accessed via a driveway to the northern side of its curtilage. Despite the loss of former farmland in more recent times, Saucelands still benefits from a generous 51 acres of land which includes the historic main curtilage areas of garden extending to the south and eastern sides of the farmhouse (**see Fig 1 and 2**) with a good degree of separation between the formal areas of the house and its working farmstead. Historically, the farmhouse would have been centred around its farmland, without the additional buildings that there are today. The range of farmstead buildings that once served it remain in the form of the former farm buildings set around a traditional courtyard layout, now known as Saucelands Barn.

3.6) The layout of the historic farmstead principally allowed for views to the east and south, over the wider setting and these aspects remain. The areas to the north-west involve buildings associated with the former farm including Saucelands Barn. Although the addition of newer dwellings along Saucelands Lane in the late 20th Century has changed the setting of the listed building, they have not harmed it. Historically, the farmhouse and its farmstead would have been the most prominent buildings within the landscape and despite these subsequent changes, this can still be said to be the case.

3.7) The significance of Saucelands and its associated farmstead buildings are not substantively derived from archaeological or artistic interest, although they do have a degree of aesthetic value. Whilst there is some potential for archaeological interest in the form of evidence of the building's adaptation and use, this is unlikely to be of inherent special interest, or of considerable heritage significance.

3.8) The significance of the listed building stems primarily from its historic fabric and age. The building is not of historic interest because it was historically at the heart of a farm, but instead because of its age and intactness and its role as a link between the past and the present. Nevertheless, as the former owner of this land, it is associated with the proposed site. By extension this association with farmland beyond the farmstead can therefore be said to contribute to the way in which the listed building is understood.

3.9) The former farmhouse was not internally inspected as part of this report but original or residual historic fabric and features such as chimneypieces, plasterwork, joinery, etc., as well as the plan form, will all contribute to its significance. Overall, the building, which is Grade II listed, has both historic and architectural interest, which encompasses its age, intactness and fabric, and includes its architectural design, including internal features.

3.10) The setting of the listed building can essentially be divided into the following three distinct 'character areas':

- i. Saucelands and the context of the former farmhouse, as experienced from the highway of Saucelands Lane, which contains the principal drive to the north side and driveway hardstanding leading from the entrance gates; the carriage driveway approach leading from Saucelands Lane and glimpsed views of the northern side elevation which sits beyond.
- ii. The well-defined curtilage, which includes the principal curtilage lawned areas to the south and eastern sides of the former farmhouse, comprising the formal gardens to the historic dwelling.

iii. The land to the north/east, including the proposed site, which represents the wider rural context beyond the developed area that immediately surrounds the listed building.

3.11) **Saucelands Lane:** This is the area from where the farmhouse would have been publicly viewed from and the context of this remains exactly unchanged. Where once the farmhouse would have been seen as the only dwelling, it is now part of a smattering of development found along Saucelands Lane. Unlike the stone built farmhouse, other farmstead buildings that may have once formed part of the farmstead would have been timber framed and may have been lost from earlier centuries. The proposed development site sits to the south-east of the former farmhouse and has been no more visible from this aspect in previous centuries, than it is today. It is from within its curtilage that the principal elevation to the west is best appreciated, with glimpsed views of the sweeping driveway from the entrance from Saucelands Lane to the north.

3.12) **The well-defined curtilage:** The farmhouse is now a domestic dwelling in its own right, devoid of much of the farmland that it once owned. With an expanse of lawn to the southern side, a large easterly garden and generous driveway and hardstanding areas, the grounds to the listed building remain extensive with an impressive 51 acres. The listed building has a generous and well-defined curtilage that is quite separate from the land further to the east that it once owned. The continued presence of the former farmstead outbuildings enriches the historic connection between these buildings and their shared sense of setting. This shared appreciation to the north-western side of the curtilage remains unchanged and enables the former farmhouse to be readily understood.

3.13) The curtilage/rear garden is divided into two distinct areas with a formal grass lawn nearest the rear of the listed building and the easternmost part contains a large expanse of open lawn, which is hemmed in by well-established trees and vegetation along its eastern and southern curtilage boundary. Beyond this, the western boundary of the proposed site itself includes a dense line of trees providing a solid visual barrier with no apparent glimpses to the land beyond. This is the same bank of trees that runs parallel with the vehicular access to the proposed site and sits at the back of some existing buildings (see **Fig 8**).

3.14) **The land to the south-east, including the proposed development site:** This is the rural hinterland to Saucelands. The land was farmed as part of the landholding of the farm at the time of the 1897 tithe map and the proposed site is identified as 959 (see Fig 2). There is, therefore, a degree of associative interest, although in reality such associations are more abstract and academic than something that can be experienced when standing on the ground. This land is not experienced as inextricably linked with the farmhouse and it is plain to see that the dwelling does not rely on the land for its significance. Conversely the land beyond, insofar as it can be experienced in a peripheral way, is understood to be part of the historic rural hinterland/context to the farmhouse/former farmstead.

3.15) There are no important views of the proposed site from the curtilage/garden areas of Saucelands and there notably would not have been any such views historically. The bank of trees both along the eastern curtilage boundary of Saucelands and the western boundary of the proposed site are well established and clearly shown in situ at the time of the 1879 tithe map (see Fig 1). This implies that the trees along both of these boundaries were intentionally planted there to provide a greater sense of privacy to the curtilage of the farmhouse.

3.16) It is possible to get a glimpsed view of the eastern boundary of Saucelands when transversing the public footpath that sits adjacent to the western boundary of the proposed site; facing outwards beyond the bank of trees that sits behind you. It is not a view that carries through to the proposed site itself, from where the listed building and curtilage cannot be seen.

3.17) Overall, the proposed site plays a peripheral, albeit positive, role in the setting of Saucelands as part of the historic rural hinterland/context to the former farmland, with a degree of associative interest. It is peripheral in the sense that it is beyond the curtilage, with a very limited sense of association. In terms of how it contributes to the significance of the listed building, it plays a very limited role. It is not a critical or demonstrably important component of the setting of the designated heritage asset. Nevertheless, any development proposals should be mindful of the historic context of this land and the role it played as part of a farmstead, with a farmhouse at its core.



Fig 1: The proposed site historically formed part of the farmland of Saucelands Farm, a listed building.

© Ordnance Survey 1879



Fig 2: The proposed site east of the footpath is recorded as 959 on the tithe map and remains undeveloped.

© Ordnance Survey 1897



Fig 3: Saucelands is a Grade II listed building and dates from the late 16th/early 17th Century and was historically a farmhouse. Saucelands Farm farmed the land of the proposed site till the late 20th Century.
© Strutt & Parker 2025



Fig 4: The former farmhouse of Saucelands is an imposing stone built dwelling, with the principal elevation facing west, away from the proposed site. It retains extensive grounds totalling over 51 acres of land.
© Stutt & Parker 2025



Fig 5: The proposed site is well set back from the frontage of Saucelands Lane, with limited visibility between the two. What visibility there is focused on the well-established vehicular access lined with trees.

© Chilcroft 2023



Fig 6: Greenacres is a brownfield site with a mixture of derelict commercial single storey buildings and an extensive area of hardstanding. The site is devoid of landscaping, sporadic and capable of improvement.

© Chilcroft 2023



Fig 7: The existing buildings across the site are of no particular quality and do not respond to the rural landscape or significance of the former farmstead. Subject to appropriate design, they could be replaced.

© Chilcroft 2023



Fig 8: A view from the centre of the proposed site looking towards the listed building of Saucelands (Farm). There are no direct views that carry and limited awareness between the two, regardless of its former owner. Even without the existing buildings, the mature trees along the public footpath provide sufficient screening.

© Chilcroft 2023

4) IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- 4.1) The proposed site is situated to the south-east of the listed building of Saucelands, beyond the curtilage boundary and with a field dividing the two. It is within the greater setting of the heritage asset and was historically owned by the farmhouse, in previous centuries. The smattering of existing late 20th Century buildings near the listed building and along Saucelands Lane are well established and largely predate Saucelands's listing as listed buildings in 1959. Many of these changes to its setting were therefore well established at the time that its significance as a heritage asset was officially recognised.
- 4.2) There is a degree of visual permeability between the curtilage of Saucelands from the boundary that divides it from the dividing field and public footpath, albeit to a limited degree. Nevertheless, I consider it relevant that historically there would not have been a sense of continuity or visual connection between the curtilage of the farmhouse and the proposed site. Historically there has been clear spatial and visual separation between the buildings of Saucelands farmhouse and the proposed site. This was probably an intended separation as the proposed site would have been a working part of the farmstead.
- 4.3) Before coming to any wider conclusions, it should be noted that the significance of the listed building and its historic interest linked to its age, presence in the settlement, architectural form and historic fabric, and its place within the context of the former farmstead – will not be at all affected. These components of the significance of the listed building, and the areas from where it can be best appreciated, will be preserved.
- 4.4) In terms of how the historic association of the listed building and its former landholding is best experienced, there is a low degree of awareness of it. Rather than being directly experienced, it can only be inferred by virtue of proximity, when standing on the ground. On balance, no harm to the setting of the listed building can be ascribed by the developing of this land, an established brownfield site. The magnitude of the harm is related to the extent to which the experience is altered. The proposal would not involve a perceived change to this experience.

4.5) The NPPF defines setting as the surroundings in which the heritage asset is experienced. There is presently a good spatial separation between the proposed site and the listed building and the proposal has adopted additional landscaping. This planting will further preserve the experience of the heritage assets as part of their wider setting. The incorporation of former historic farmland for development more generally, is not a new phenomenon and indeed has already been done in the case of the proposed site, an existing brownfield site. This addition to the setting is not inherently harmful, but a symptom of the way in which places evolve and expand to meet modern day uses. That is implicit in the way in which Greenacres is already understood.

4.6) Any residual impact on the setting of Saucelands would be minor in nature and be attributed to an awareness of the proposed development, rather than to any direct visibility of it, and any awareness is tenuous at best. When judged against the whole of the significance of the heritage assets, of which its setting is one component (and of which the proposed site is one aspect), the impact would be neutral. If anything, the proposal is likely to improve the setting of the heritage asset by enhancing the existing poor quality appearance of the commercial site. Where there is an effect, this is readily understood in the context of the evolution of the heritage asset, where it can be expected that the setting of a heritage asset will change over time; change in itself is not necessarily harm – it is only harmful to the extent that significance is eroded.

4.7) The setting has already changed from its historic origins. The former farmstead has seen land sold off and new dwellings established on land it once owned, including the existing development of the proposed site, one of a number along Saucelands Lane. The development of this land has already altered the setting of the listed building beyond its late 16th Century origins. This in itself is not surprising and change within the historic environment is to be expected. As it is, the former farmhouse of Saucelands remains a substantial property, with over 51 acres of attached land. As such, the context and way the former farmhouse is appreciated remains one associated with land. The modern day building continues to include a stud, stables and menage to the eastern side of the listed building, features best associated with a rural property of this size. The loss of former farmland has therefore not eroded our understanding of it.

4.8) The existing site at Greenacres comprises a selection of single storey gable end commercial buildings, built of a blend of materials from brick and blockwork to corrugated metal. There is a large inner hardstanding area, an established vehicular access from Saucelands Lane and the commercial site has clearly been established for some time, dating from the late 20th Century. The proposed site, formerly farmland owned by Saucelands, is typical of an improvised rural commercial site that sprung up in this period. It is of no particular design or layout quality and could easily have been better arranged with thought given to aesthetics and its place in the rural environment. The brownfield site is capable of improvement, subject to appropriate design.

4.9) From the outset, we had a clear vision for the site and its relationship with Saucelands. The appointed Architects were chosen at our instigation and the design evolved following our assessment of significance and an understanding of the context of the former farmstead. The proposed design is of a style that reflects the historic farmstead and responds to it architecturally. Although it evokes a modern interpretation, the broad design and use of materials is considered to be appropriate to the setting of the listed building and capable of preserving and enhancing the landscape character. It would also ensure the appearance looking into the site from Saucelands Lane is enhanced (**see 3.2**). The proposal for four dwellings is considered proportionate and does not seek to push beyond a comfortable scope of development, with care given for well-spaced out buildings, curtilages and an informal rural landscape character that feels at one with its setting. The proposed design would introduce timber frame barn style dwellings to the site which are reflective of Saucelands and the farmstead and some tenanted style of buildings that may once have been found locally. This improved vernacular is only likely to enhance the setting of the listed building and is broadly welcomed over and above the existing incongruous site. The proposed design would also move built structures further away from the existing western boundary closest to the listed building and public footpath and would adopt an landscaping scheme to soften the overall setting of the proposed site and its context within the rural environment. This is likely to further enhance the appreciation of the setting in and around the curtilage boundaries of the listed building and improve the wider setting beyond it. The proposed residential use is also likely to reduce awareness.

5) SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Legislation, Policy and Guidance

- 5.1) The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 contains a statutory duty to give considerable importance and great weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of a listed building in the planning balance. Preserving means to do no harm.
- 5.2) The NPPF lays down an approach that corresponds with the statutory duty of the 1990 Act. In cases where harm occurs, the NPPF requires balancing the benefits of a proposal against harm resulting from it.
- 5.3) The Horsham District Council's adopted Development Plan policies require development proposals to conserve heritage assets and their settings.
- 5.4) The guidance in Historic England's GPA3 provides a framework for considering and assessing effects on the setting of heritage assets.

Conclusions

- 5.5) The proposed site comprises an existing commercial use brownfield site that is incongruous within the setting of the Grade II listed building of Saucelands and capable of improvement, subject to appropriate design.
- 5.6) The proposed site historically formed part of the farmstead of Saucelands and the proposed design would invoke traditional materials and a design vernacular, with barn style dwellings constructed with timber framing.
- 5.7) The proposed site is situated in land with established trees and vegetation around it providing excellent natural screening, historically planted to screen it from the listed building. Enhanced landscaping will improve this still further.
- 5.8) The proposed residential use is broadly welcomed and is likely to reduce awareness over commercial. Overall, the proposal is of design and material quality that will enhance the setting and appreciation of the listed building.

6) APPENDIX

Historic England List Entry

SAUCELANDS

Grade II

List Entry Number: 1026963

Date first listed: 22 September 1959

DETAILS

SHIPLEY COOLHAM 1. 5404 Saucelands

TQ 12 SW 15/484 22.9.59

Restored late C16 or early C17 house, now fronted with red and brown brick on a stone base. North side stone, south side tile-hung. East front of east wing red brick and stone. Tiled roof with pentice on south side of east wing. Casement windows with cement-covered millions but original brick dripstones over. West front has a 2-storeyed brick porch with gable over. This has a 4-centred brick arch on ground floor with dripstone over and a 2-light window on first floor. East wing ends in a half-hipped gable end. Two storeys. Four windows

Listing NGR: TQ1196421593

© Chilcroft Limited 2025

Registered in England and Wales No. 05951378

All rights reserved. Permission is given to reproduce this document for personal and non-commercial purposes, subject to appropriate acknowledgement. For all other purposes please contact Chilcroft Heritage Planning.

CHILCROFT, A5 New Barn Office, Chichester, West Sussex PO18 9DA
Tel: 01243 631243 | Email: haig.dalton@chilcroft.co.uk