Philip C. Anthony

Building Services Consultant

40 Uttoxeter Road
Mickleover
Derby
DE3 9GE

Tel: 078 701 48111 e-mail: phil48472@gmail.com

Borough Development Department
Amber Valley Borough Council
PO Box 18
Town Hall
Ripley
DE5 3SZ

Our Ref: MS/002/PCA

Your Ref: AVA/2026/0188

Date: 31 March 2026

Dear Sir/Madam

Proposed Outline Application Adjacent Keepers Cottage/Sports Ground Mugginton Lane End Weston Underwood Derbyshire DE6 4PP

SUPPLEMENTARY DESIGN and ACCESS STATEMENT INCLUDING HERITAGE STATEMENT

The compilation of this supplementary DAS and addendum has taken into the consideration the following:-

Relevant Chapters of the NPPF and in particular paragraphs 207 and 215.
Amber Valley Borough Coucil Local Plan and any subsequant reviews.

The proposal site and surround is located within the boundaries of Ravensdale Deer Park Consevation Area and Scheduled Monument Number 35605. Details of these features and the steps to be taken during excavation and building works are addressed in the addendum to this Design and Access Statement that should be read in conjunction with the original documentation submitted with the application.

The proposed dwelling is for the sole use of the owners and occupiers of Keepers Cottage who are downsizing now their children have “flown the nest”. Keepers Cottage, the present dwelling of the applicants, along with its numerous outbuildings will be sold with the proceeds of the sale used for the development of this proposal. A more modest development that if granted would provide accommodation within the immediate area to which the applicants wish to remain.

Although sited within the conservation area the proposal is not disproportionate to the size of

the 5.67 Hectare area within which it will be sited. The proposed dwelling would in relation to the site and the existing surrounding buildings sit comfortably within the overall site boundaries.

The visual amenity of the locality would be protected, and as there are no immediate neighbours adjoining the site that is bordered by open countryside, a sports field, neighbouring property amenity is also protected.

Boundary treatment and landscaping within the site of this proposal will be decided at any future full plans application and be such that it reflects its setting within the deer park and surrounding area. All with the approval of Amber Valley Borough Council Planning Department.

Access for vehicles and pedestrians to and from the site would be from the one established drive that already serves the site and the proposal will lead to a minimal increase in traffic flow.

Thoughtful consideration will be given to the design of the new dwelling at full plans application to ensure its appearance would blend with the existing buildings and the locality in general. The build style will be similar to that of the existing Keepers Cottage.

The proposal although providing just the one additional dwelling, is in keeping with the government's aim to increase the housing stock nationwide.

ADDENDUM 1

This addendum is to address the affects, if any, of the proposal on Scheduled Monument Number 35605 (Derbyshire Historic Monument Number 30101) the former park pale of the medieval deer park of Ravensdale. The scheduled area passes down the eastern side of the curtilage of Keepers Cottage (formally Lawn Cottage) and continues to the south in the area used for the access track to the cottage. To the east of the park pale is an area (HER 30107) thought to represent a former deer course within the medieval park that is defined by two parallel hedges of which the continuity is broken in numerous places.

Additional research identified an article in Landscape History (2004) by Christopher Taylor that suggests on the analysis of field shapes and boundaries that the paddock now containing Keepers Cottage once contained stables, kennels or deer pens associated with the deer course. Although no evidence for these features on the ground, it is possible that they have left below-ground archaeological remains on the site in the form of post holes, footings, pits or foundation trenches. There is no evidence to suggest the area designated for the proposal building was anything other than a field.

Assessment of Importance

The remains of Ravensdale deer park, including the associated lodge, mill and fish pond. The fish pond and mill were first documented in 1230, while the first reference to the park is dated 1297-8. The perimeter of the park is defined by a pale, originally comprising a substantial earthen bank topped by a fence or hedge and flanked by an internal ditch. Roughly 88% of the boundary bank survives to a height of 0.5m or more, while the ditch survives as a buried feature. Local to the proposal site this boundary bank is not in evidence.

The deer course appears on aerial photographs as a sinuous feature running from just east of Park Hill Farmhouse to about 250m east of Hill Top Farm. The course would originally have been hedged or walled on both sides along its length but is currently defined by broken stretches of field boundary. Deer coursing probably developed in C12 or C13 and involved deer, usually one or two, being chased by greyhounds along a track to a finishing post. The

site of the medieval hunting lodge lies roughly 150m north east of Schoolhouse Farm. It is situated so as to provide a good view of the end of the deer course. Documentary records suggest a C14 date for the lodge and aerial photographs indicate that it was surrounded by a D-shaped enclosure, possibly a moat. East, south and west of Schoolhouse Farm lay the remains of a mill, mill dam and fish pond or lake. The Ordnance Survey Map Grid Reference is SK274431 and the site is a scheduled monument protected by law.

Proposal

As stated in the main section of the Design and Access Statement the proposal is to build a modest dwelling that would be in keeping with its location within the conservation area and its countryside setting.

Impact

In a previous dialogue with Mr T Allen of English Heritage the client established that Scheduled Monument Consent was not required for the numerous developments that have taken place on the site of Keepers Cottage. The siting of the proposal outside the curtilage of Keepers Cottage is such that the building will have no impact whatsoever on the Scheduled Monument and as such we consider that Scheduled Monument Consent would not be required.

The subsoil of the area is predominantly clay and foundations for the proposal with strip footings would be taken down to the usual depth in soils of this type that is approximately 1m. Load from foundations dissipates at 45 degrees and as such can have no effect on the banking or ditch of the deer course due to the distance that the foundations are away from this proposal. Excavations of the strip foundations will be by machine to ensure a clean line for the strip that will also enable the storage of the removed top soil to be placed far away from the area of the Scheduled Monument. All these steps will be taken to ensure that impact if any on the ground especially that which is the closest to the Scheduled Monument, would be minimised.

During the building of Keepers Cottage and associated outbuildings on the site there have been various watching briefs by Mayfield CA Ltd the latest being in November 2015. During the watch on excavations by Mayfield CA Ltd no archaeological remains were identified. The site in general and the site for this proposal have been disturbed during antiquity and no structural evidence has been exposed. If any pens or other structure did in fact exist within the area, these must have been light-weight structures requiring no deep foundations. Also, since the time of that watching brief the area around the existing buildings and area in general have been rotated, grassed and cut for silage.

Notwithstanding the above it is recognised the importance of this local feature and the area adjacent to the deer course although being some distance from any proposed construction be fenced off with a secure fence in order that both vehicular and foot traffic, as well as potential materials storage is excluded and cannot in anyway impact on the Scheduled Monument.

Conclusion

In consideration of the above statements and recommendations that are to be implemented prior to and during construction it can be concluded that this proposal will not impact or affect the significance of this heritage asset or conservation area in general.

The footprint of the proposal, including the garage is 120sq.m. Compared to that of keepers cottage and associated outbuildings at 326sq.m. Considerably less and sited considerably further away from the actual deer track/course, All these developments received full planning permission from Amber Valley Borough Council while respecting the conservation area and

Scheduled Monument and its wider setting.

Within policy, harm is not absolute and needs assessing on the basis of scale. A scale of harm can be assessed by consideration of four levels of harm:

1. Total Loss
2. Substantial Harm
3. Less than Substantial Harm
4. No harm

Total loss is self explanatory and would involve the loss of the physical fabric of an asset or destruction of its setting. Substantial Harm has to be harm that would mean that the value of the asset in terms of its historical or other heritage value was reduced by a significant amount so that it may well no longer merit the designation that it had been given or that it would be unrecognizable or unreadable. Substantial Harm is not necessarily caused by, for example, extending a building or sub-dividing a building, or development within its setting; all things which English Heritage recognize in its policy documents can be done to buildings. Normally, development in the setting of a heritage asset will cause less than substantial harm or no harm to significance. It will only be where the setting of an asset has specific importance to the asset's significance; and that the harm to that setting is great, that development in the setting of a heritage asset will cause substantial harm to its significance. An example could be the loss of a Grade II country house.

The setting of listed buildings is protected by statute and the setting of non-designated heritage assets by planning policy. In both cases the definition of setting is the same as being the surroundings in which an asset is experienced.

Not all aspects of setting are of equal value, this being judged in relation to the benefit of the setting to the significance of an asset. There is a general presumption in favor of development, subject to other material considerations, for development that leaves the most significant aspects of setting unchanged.

It can be observed that there is probably low earthworks surviving of ridge and furrow in the field immediately west of the sports ground, part of the proposal site. In general, such earthworks are both of limited archaeological potential and low landscape potential. Their principle significance in this context is that they attest to normal medieval agriculture being undertaken within the deer park. This significance is not threatened by the proposed development.

Overall, no negative impact to any asset has been identified and as such the development will cause no harm. It is therefore concluded that there are no heritage or conservation reasons to preclude the granting of planning permission for this application.

ENC

Keepers Cottage
Mu 1 – Proposal site
Mu 2 – Arial photo.