



Chilcroft
traditional excellence

Design & Access Statement | Heritage Statement

Jendens Farm, Smithers Hill Lane, Shipley, RH13 8PP

Report prepared by Chilcroft Heritage Planning
March 2026



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



**THE
GEORGIAN
GROUP**

Front Cover: Image © Chilcroft 2025

CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	4
2.	LEGISLATION AND POLICY	6
3.	DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT	12
4.	ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE	13
5.	IMPACT ASSESSMENT	19
6.	CONCLUSIONS	20

1) INTRODUCTION

- 1.1) I am Haig Dalton, founder of Chilcroft Heritage Planning, an established independent heritage consultancy since 2006. I have previously served as a local planning authority officer, within development control departments. 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 21 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 settings.
- 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 roles as part of this assessment; to give independent and objective evidence on matters within my expertise, based on my own independent opinion and uninfluenced by the instructing party; the applicant. 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 so.
- 1.8) I was first approached in relation to the application proposal in late 2025, when I was asked to provide a heritage report in relation to the proposal on behalf the applicant. My quote was based on several stages/elements, the first of which was an initial case review, including a site visit during November 2025. 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 expert witness, I have formed my own opinions and conclusions about the effects of the proposed scheme on heritage assets.
- 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 appellant'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) DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT

- 3.1) The proposed development would see the existing windows of the dwelling replaced in favour of timber casements, double glazed with glazing bars.
- 3.2) The Grade II listed building of Jendens Farm is best appreciated from its southerly principal elevation. The proposal solely relates to the fabric of the building and would not alter the setting of the listed building or curtilage.
- 3.3) The dwelling is accessed via Smithers Hill Lane to the east of the proposed site. The detached dwelling is nestled into its setting with no public awareness of the dwelling. The external aspect of the dwelling, its setting and means of access would be unchanged by the proposals.
- 3.4) The proposed works would be centred on areas inside the dwelling, without reference to any ancillary outbuildings.
- 3.5) The existing windows of the listed building are largely unoriginal and contain metal windows that materially and subject to appropriate design, could be improved upon. As an independent specialist, Chilcroft Heritage Planning have been consulted and we have advised that any replacements are made of wood.
- 3.6) The proposal does not seek any change of use for the building or its curtilage. The existing use as a single residential dwelling will therefore remain unchanged.
- 3.7) The proposals relate to the existing dwelling, which sits above the water table. The design would not alter the ground level or involve any works to the foundations of the building, involving excavating down below this existing level. All hardstanding surfaces would remain as existing.
- 3.8) No trees would be affected by the proposed development with relates solely to the fabric of the dwelling.

4) ASSESSMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

- 4.1) The proposed site is located to the western side of Smithers Hill Lane, with vehicular access to the south-west side of the dwelling. The proposed site is located in a rural environment, forming the setting of a Grade II listed building.
- 4.2) Jendens Farm is a Grade II listed building (**List No. 1180840**) and goes by the name of Jenden's Farmhouse on the Historic England register. The former farmhouse dates from the 17th Century if not earlier and consists of a timber frame building set over two storeys with its principal elevation facing south (**see Fig 2**). It was refaced in the early 19th Century with red brick and grey headers. By the late 19th Century, the timber sash windows on the principal and side elevations were removed (**see Fig 1**) and replaced with metal casement windows with small pane glazing bars (**see Fig 5**). A single storey stone built range is located to the northern rear of the building, which was extended up and over the first floor level in the 20th Century (**see Fig 6 and 7**). At this time, new window apertures were inserted into the historic stone wall and metal casement windows of a Crittall style used, with red brick dressings also introduced (**see Fig 8 and 9**). A timber clad single storey side extension on the western side was further added in the late 20th Century (**see Fig 3**).
- 4.3) The principal elevation faces south overlooking its curtilage, being set back behind the curtilage boundary fence and driveway approach, and the listed is arguably best appreciated from this angle when stood within its curtilage or from the vehicular approach to the dwelling (**see Front Cover**). From the west and north, the appreciation is more diluted by modern 20th Century extensions.
- 4.4) Although many of the interior finishes, architraves, doors and fixtures have been lost, the overall feel and presentation of the interior of the building still allows for a clear understanding and appreciation of the building, each rooms former function and how the interior space was used. Residual historic fabric and features such as chimneypieces, plasterwork and joinery all contribute to this significance. Overall, the building, which is Grade II listed, has both historic and architectural interest, which encompasses its age, its intactness and fabric, and includes its architectural design, including internal features. Any proposals should seek to enhance the appreciation of the heritage asset.



Fig 1: Behind the metal windows sit vacant runners with pulleys, indicating sash windows once sat there.

© Chilcroft 2025

- 4.5) The windows throughout Jendens Farm are almost entirely unoriginal to the 17th Century building and have been previously replaced. The original timber framed building would have had timber framed mullioned windows which quite understandably have been replaced with time however, the extensive remodelling of the building in the early 19th Century arguably brought about the greatest level of intervention. At some point in time, sash style casement windows once adored the building and which is evidenced by the presence of framing and vacant runners that sit behind the existing windows, where pulleys remain visible beneath layers of paint (**see Fig 1**). The existing metal casement windows were a later addition to the building and although broadly of a style that preserves the significance of the heritage asset, timber frame windows are thought to be the more preferable. Added to this, the condition of these later metal windows is now in an increasingly poor state of repair and broadly thought to be capable of replacement, subject to appropriate design. Only the timber side windows in the porch are believed to be early 19th Century (**see Fig 9**). In appearance terms, the design of casement windows with glazing bars play an important role in the architecture of the listed building and this style needs to be upheld.



Fig 2: Jendens Farm dates from the 17th Century if not earlier and was refaced in brick in the early 19th Century. Its principal elevation as shown here faces south, from where the heritage asset is best appreciated.

© Chilcroft 2025



Fig 3: The west elevation showing a single storey side extension added in the late 20th Century. A first floor extension was added with a gable end to the rear of the building (left side).

© Chilcroft 2025



Fig 4: Jendens Farm is a Grade II listed building and is of a timber frame construction. Metal casement windows were added to the front and sides in the late 19th Century, replacing earlier sash style casements.

© Chilcroft 2025



Fig 5: An example of an existing late 19th Century window from the principal elevation. They sit inside of plainly finished timber frames with metal glazing bars sat inside, also found on each side of the dwelling.

© Chilcroft 2025



Fig 6: At the rear to the north side, a single storey stone wall comprises what was once a single storey lean-to, like that to the left with the door, which was extended in the late 20th Century with a first floor brick extension.

© Chilcroft 2025



Fig 7: This rear facing elevation contains modern Crittall windows added when the building was extended.

© Chilcroft 2025



Fig 8: The windows are in a poor state of repair and are capable of replacement, subject to appropriate design.

© Chilcroft 2025



Fig 9: The windows to each side of the porch are believed to be the oldest and considered historic fabric.

© Chilcroft 2025

5) IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- 5.1) The proposal would see the existing metal casement windows replaced in favour of timber frame casement windows with glazing bars, designed to match the former sash style casement windows that predated the existing metal and Crittall style windows.
- 5.2) The existing metal windows are not original to the building, but predate the listing of the dwelling in 1980. It is therefore important to carefully distinguish between what is believed to be the most original and oldest windows in the building, compared with what has come later.
- 5.3) Windows 2 and 4 are the only two fully timber windows proposed for replacement. These are believed to be the oldest windows in the building and are believed to date from the early 19th Century, when the porch was built at the time the dwelling was refaced in brick. In view of this, they would be considered to be of historic fabric value.
- 5.4) The south elevation (front) and west and east elevation (sides) contain windows that date from the late 19th Century (see **Fig 5**). These are timber framed with metal glazing bar frames inserted between the two. Although they are of an age and their style is broadly considered to preserve the significance of the listed building, they do not accord with the earlier sash style casement windows that predated them and nor is the use of metal considered an appropriate choice. The frames, although timber, are excessively plain and devoid of proper joinery details. The proposed design would revert to a more closely recognised sash style, complete with fully timber made windows with glazing bars. The joinery details, at our insistence, would be of a good quality and more consistent with the earlier appearance of the Grade II listed building.
- 5.5) The windows to the north elevation (rear) comprise the most recent additions to the building and were added in the late 20th Century at the time that the first floor extension was built. These use Crittall windows of a fully metal style. Once again, although from a distance, their broad appearance with glazing bars preserves the appreciation of the heritage asset, the use of materials is not thought to be appropriate. The proposed fully timber frame windows with glazing bars are considered to be a material improvement.

6) SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Legislation, Policy and Guidance

- 6.1) 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.
- 6.2) 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.
- 6.3) The Horsham District Council's adopted Development Plan policies require development proposals to conserve heritage assets (such as listed buildings), and their settings.
- 6.4) The guidance in Historic England's GPA3 provides a framework for considering and assessing effects on the setting of heritage assets.

Conclusions

- 6.5) The proposal would replace the metal casement windows that have been added to the Grade II listed building in the late 19th and late 20th Centuries, which are not original to the 17th Century timber frame building.
- 6.6) The proposed sash style timber windows with glazing bars would be more reflective of the earlier windows that once graced the former farmhouse.
- 6.6) The proposal would preserve the setting of the Grade II listed building and ensure that the way in which it is best appreciated from its principal elevation and driveway approach to the south, is maintained.
- 6.7) The two timber porch windows are believed to be the oldest and would be considered to be of historic fabric value. The proposed design could accommodate their retention, if this was thought to be necessary.

© Chilcroft Limited 2006 – 2026

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