

Hi Martin,

From:

To:

Subject:

Sent:

[Martin Smith](#)

Re: 3Daggers

13/03/2026 12:40:54

Sorry as thought these had been sent through and discussed, this was an over sight on my part.

In my email of 13 January, I set out that the comments from Fiona Webb appear at least in part to repeat the concerns of the previous CO about the 'urbanisation' of the village/countryside.

In considering the issue of setting with regard the listed buildings, of which there are 9 individually listed properties in the village - No.10 with attached railings (Grade II listed); The George Inn (now Mulberry House), Tinhead Road (Grade II listed); Shore House (Grade II listed); Wall to road front of Shore House (Grade II listed); Lambourne Cottage (Grade II Listed); May Cottage (Grade II listed); Becketts House (Grade II listed); Wall and gates to front of Becketts House (Grade II listed); and 3 Salisbury Hollow (Grade II listed). Of these properties, one can realistically discount any significant impact on all other than No.10 and its railings and potentially Lambourne Cottage, although the latter is not mentioned in sth LPA comments, so will not discuss this further to.

In considering the issue of setting, this must also include the wider conservation area.

Setting is described in the NPPF 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.**

The setting of heritage assets is described more fully in the Historic England document GPA3 *The Setting of Heritage Assets* provides guidance on the management of change within the setting of heritage assets. The document restates the definition of setting as outlined in Annex 2 of the NPPF. Setting is also described as being a separate term to curtilage, character and context; while it is largely a visual term, setting, and thus the way in which an asset is experienced, can also be affected by noise, vibration, odour and other factors. The document makes it clear that setting is not a heritage asset, nor is it a heritage designation, though land within a setting may itself be designated. Its importance lies in what the setting contributes to the significance of a heritage asset.

In looking tag the setting of No.10, the buildings' setting is one that is characterised by the open field/paddock to the south (one could say this particular field which provides a notable open space associated with the wider playing field) forms part of the historic western edge to the older village and in effect it is within the historic core, the group of buildings and the grass triangle. The core of these buildings contribute the character of the CA. Likewise, the surrounding rural landscape provides the overall setting of the village, however as that landscape runs up to and wraps around the village, it is apparent that the rural setting (and landscape) has over time, been whittled away by incremental development including the housing of the Weir/Greenhills, Berry Road, Court Lane and Little Court Lane. The effect of this has been to tighten the urban grain of the village, which historically had a much looser character. Equally, the western boundary of the site (ie the treelike fence line that runs between the existing playground and farm shop to what is now the Weir), has always provided a strong separation from the wider rural landscape and the land more closely related with the village. Today the footpath which ran along this treelined boundary has migrated diagonally to the Weir, thus reducing (in a sense), the importance of this, which nonetheless still provides a strong sense of separation from the wider rural pastureland.

As regards the openness of the Site paddock, this provides a sense of openness in the wider village view, notably those form the playground and the 3 Daggers PH but presumably also in those reverse views from the garden of No.10. The Site forms part of that setting (in the wider sense) but it is one which has developed a stronger semi-residential character as buildings have developed along it northern and eastern boundaries, notwithstanding that the development which historic ally sat on the playing field has been lost, but in turn the southern boundary has witnessed a stronger sense or enclosure from the development of the 3 Daggers.

Today, the Site is enclosed upon three sides by development with ether treelined boundary maintaining its strength as a 'green' boundary to between what is seen as the village the farmland beyond. In these views, the contribution of this Site will not be lessened by scheme that includes sensitive landscaping that seeks to blur the distinction between open pasture and the gardens and playgrounds.

It should also be noted that there is no Character Appraisal and although this doesn't not lessen the importance of the designed CA, the fact that the boundary of the CA was drawn highly does indicate that the wider setting was at that time, considered to less relevant that the buildings within the village.

Turning to the setting of the Listed Building (No.10), this is characterised by its relationship to and with streetscape, the built form that defines the street and which has resulted in a varied and diffused layout of streets and spaces around the triangle, and has also contributed to the distinctive variety in the age and character of the different buildings and building groups within the conservation area. It also contributes to those views from the south, across the paddock and

playing field, providing a prominent feature in those views. In those views, No.10 does not appear as having a sense of privacy, rather it is very on display in those views from the south.

The proposed development of a carpark (and its landscaping) will reduce the sense of openness to the south of the Weir and No.10, but it will not result in the total loss to or of the setting as there will continue to be an open paddock alongside the property and it will remain prominent in views from the south.

Likewise, the open nature of the car park and the manner in which it will be landscaped will provide a soft landscape that is transparent and although there will be some enclosure, but it will be of a quality that is sympathetic to etc wider landscape. The overall openness of the land in this location/area will be larger retained and the impact will thus be one that does not compromise the CA with its variety of architectural styles, street layout and wider rural setting. Equally, the car park proposal sits within the historic natural boundary line of the village and thus does not encroach upon the rural landscape.

Overall, the significance of the Conservation Area is derived from its historical development, which remains legible in its existing pattern of its central green triangle and surrounding streets and in its built form. Although predominately residential, this area has a diversity in terms of the character of its building types, uses and building groups. This has resulted from its gradual and piecemeal development of a typical rural village.

Hope these comments are of assistance.

Regards,
Greg

Gregory Beale
Planning Heritage
Rengen House
4 Argyle Street
Bath
BA2 4BA

