

## Essential Reference Paper B

Issue	Representations made	Officer comment
<p>General representations by the Parish Council (PC).</p>	<p>The Chairman of the PC reflects sentiments set out in the draft document that the revisions need to be considered in partnership with the Council.</p> <p>Following the public meeting of 22 October 2018 arranged by EHDC, the PC held a further open meeting which resulted in the publication of the PC's views which are widely supported by the written representations made. The PC makes the following general comments.</p> <p>(a) In agreement with removal of the large tracts of agricultural land as generally proposed by the draft plan:</p> <p>(b) However despite (a) above the PC recommend that a <i>'10-15 yard strip either side of the lanes to the hamlets be included, thereby protecting these areas for our future and ensuring an aesthetic .keeping of the village is preserved'</i>. The PC refers</p>	<p>The process of consultation, the several additional visits by the field worker and careful consideration of comments received are testament to this. Recommendations and further consideration must however reflect legislation and national advice.</p> <p>General comment. The key Govt. advice is <i>'when considering the designation of conservation areas, local planning authorities should ensure that an area justifies such status because of its special architectural or historic interest, and that the concept of conservation is not devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest.'</i>(Para 186, National Planning Policy Framework 2018, same advice appears in 2019 update).</p> <p>CA designation essentially introduces some additional planning controls relating to extensions and alterations. It also means permission is required to demolish most non listed buildings and a requirement to notify the felling of most trees.</p> <p>Noted: Historic England (HE) current advice as set out in their 2018 Advice Note <i>Conservation Area Appraisal, Designation and Management*</i> is that <i>Conservation area designation is not generally an appropriate means of protecting the wider landscape...</i>*Para 73.(same advice in revised update of 2019)</p> <p><i>'Protecting these areas for our future'</i>. Conservation area designation in itself does not prevent development. Indeed National Planning Policy advises new development in a CA which makes a positive contribution can be appropriately considered.</p> <p>As set out above some limited</p>

<p><u>In more detail:</u></p> <p><u>Proposed eastern extension at Mill Lane to include The Grove and Anstey Grove Barn. Area 1 on attached Appendix Map.</u></p>  <p>Picture 1. The Grove being of later 20th century date is considered to be of insufficient quality for the CA to be extended to include it.</p>	<p>to these as 'Conservation Margins' (CM).</p> <p>(c) The 'Ends' be included in the conservation area and historically referenced. These are identified as <i>Dawes End, Silver Street, strip to Anstey Bury with a circle to protect the houses and the same at Puttocks End. Also Paynes (Pains) End (including the houses) and around Bandons...and continue up to the Hale and to the end of the village.</i></p> <p>The PC considers such inclusion will <i>help to protect and conserve the hamlet nature of this historic village.</i></p> <p>Appendix 1 <u>attached</u> is the map prepared by the PC and shows the above proposals which are now examined in more detail.</p> <p>Include within the CA.</p>	<p>protection for trees (countryside hedgerows are protected by their own legislation) would be provided. However many stretches of these proposed CM's are either open in aspect and/or have few trees.</p> <p>The principal Planning control relating to the location of new development at Anstey is the newly adopted District Plan which essentially restricts development to infill within tightly drawn 'Village Boundaries' located in the main core of the village. The additional areas proposed for inclusion by representations lie in Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt and are subject to District Plan policy GBR2 which is similarly restrictive and recognises such areas as a <i>valued countryside resource.</i></p> <p>In summary it is contended that the protection of the countryside and location of any new development at Anstey will be adequately controlled by an up to date District Plan.</p> <p>The various areas proposed for inclusion are now considered further.</p> <p><u>Proposal to extend Mill Lane.</u></p> <p><u>Recommendation.</u> It is considered this area should not be included in the CA.</p> <p><u>Reason for recommendation.</u> The proposed area includes The Grove (see picture 1) a later 20th century detached property. To the rear there other buildings of limited importance. The area is of insufficient architectural or historic architectural interest.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Inclusion of narrow strip principally to south side of Mill Lane. Area 1A on attached Appendix Map.



Picture 2. CA controls do not prevent new development in open countryside locations like this.

Retain Pains End (Paynes End) within the CA and extend the CA to include Bandons and other properties nearby. Pains End and Bandons area to be linked by CM. Areas 2 and 2 A on attached Appendix Map.



Picture 3. The area is part of open countryside including land on the left of the picture which the PC seeks to reintroduce.



Picture 4. A modern property at Pains End very recently completed of limited architectural and no historical interest.

Include in CA as a 'Conservation Margin'. The PC considers such CM's will protect the countryside beyond.

Retain and extend the CA.

Proposal to extend CA to include a strip south of Mill Lane.

Recommendation. It is considered this area should not be included in the CA.

Reason for recommendation. CA designation would not provide the additional protection sought. As advised above such protection will principally be determined by interpretation of the recently adopted District Plan. The strip is essentially open with no trees of importance (Picture 2) on frontage.

Proposal to retain Pains End and extend CA to Bandons and other properties nearby.

Recommendation. It is considered this area should not be included in the CA.

General description of area. The draft Appraisal omitted Pains End as set out at para. 5.55 (f) in the draft document (now para 5.57(f) ).

Beyond Two Acre Farm the road in open in character and forms part of the open countryside (Picture 3).

There is a small group of properties including three that are modern and of limited architectural or historic merit (Picture 4). Woodside Cottage is listed Grade II and thus protected by its own legislation. There is a Scheduled Monument at Northey Lodge, a site protected by the need to obtain Scheduled Monument Consent. Some mature trees.

The area proposed by the PC for inclusion and linked by an EM (as suggested by the PC) is essentially



Picture 5. The area to Bandons is linked by road appearing as open countryside.



Picture 6. Unlisted property dating from late 19th century whose location appears isolated in the open countryside.



Picture 7. Bandons and any pre 1948 buildings in its curtilage are protected by listed building legislation.



Picture 8. Agricultural land and poor quality modern agricultural barn of no architectural or historic value is clearly part of the open countryside. An application for change of use to residential was refused in 2017.

devoid of vegetation and in the view of the fieldworker forms part of the open countryside (Picture 5).

Property to north of Bandons is not listed and originally was a pair of cottages dating from the late 19th century. Later extension to rear. Appears as isolated dwelling in the open countryside (Picture 6).

Bandons itself is listed grade II and protected by its own legislation (Picture 7). Ancillary buildings pre 1948 are also considered as being listed. There are several groups of trees, some veteran.

Land and agricultural barn to the west of Bandons. This structure is relatively modern, in poor condition with asbestos cladding. It clearly has no architectural or historic interest and, together with adjacent land the PC recommends for inclusion, appears as being within the open countryside (Picture 8).

Reasons for recommendation. The character of Pains End and the proposed extension to include land and buildings around Bandons is a dispersed scatter in the open countryside some distance from edge of the CA and main core of the village (Two Acre Farm to Bandons by road is about 0.75 km). Most buildings have limited merit. Two other buildings and one site are respectively protected by Listed Building and Ancient Monument legislation. One unlisted building and a number of trees would be afforded some protection but this is insufficient reason to include this area in the CA.

Retention of Silver Street area. Area 3 on attached Appendix Map.



Picture 9. Thatched properties at Snow End represent an appropriate boundary to the CA along the road to Brent Pelham.



Picture 10. Some of the less attractive buildings at Essex Cottage Farm, now proposed for exclusion from the CA.



Picture 11. Open area of horse grazing no longer proposed to be within the CA.



Picture 12. Area consisting of woodland in association with nearby listed properties Welspen Thatch and Dove Cottage is, on reflection, considered to be appropriately retained within the CA. Field to left of picture is open countryside beyond the CA.

Retain within the CA.

Proposal to retain Silver Street Area.

Recommendation: It is recommended much of this area continue to be excluded but that Welspen Thatch and adjacent area of woodland and Dove Cottage remain in the CA. See hatched areas on revised plans (Character Analysis Plan and Management Plan).

General description. The draft Appraisal omitted an extensive area which included this location for reasons set out at Para. 5.55 (d) (now 5.57 (d) ) in the draft document. The numbers of historic listed buildings at Snow End are important to the quality of the CA. (Picture 9). Travelling south east along the north side of the road to Brent Pelham beyond the above group of listed buildings, development consists of Essex Cottage Farm buildings (of limited architectural or historic merit, Picture 10), Yew Tree Cottage (Modern), 1/2 Dawes Cottages (thatched but altered, non listed) - various spellings of these properties noted; The Old Bell (listed) and The Mayflower (modern and set back from the road).

On the south side of the road there is an area of open horse grazing (Picture 11) and Bell Cottage (of historic importance) but with attached unsympathetic large extension.

To the west of the horse grazing area there are two modern properties on Silver Street and also two listed buildings, Welspen Thatch and Dove Cottage. There is also an extensive area of woodland with footpath to its immediate west which links into the main CA to the south (Picture 12).

Reason for recommendation. The

Further extension proposed by PC in easterly direction extending along road to Brent Pelham as far as Puttocks End. Areas 3A and 3B on attached Appendix Map.



Picture 13. Anstey Bury one of three separately buildings protected by listed building legislation.

Extend the CA.

sporadic development on both sides of the road to Brent Pelham is limited in terms of architectural interest to The Old Bell which is listed and thus protected.

However on reflection, it is considered appropriate to retain the small group of listed buildings, Welspen Thatch and Dove Cottage, in combination with the nearby woodland (Picture 12). The latter is a high quality landscape feature contiguous with the main CA and forming a clear boundary with the open countryside to the west . See hatched areas on Revised Plans 2 and 3. (One of the above 2 properties requested to remain in the CA. No reps from the other who will be notified of this recommendation to Members).

Proposal to extend CA along road to Brent Pelham to Puttocks End.

Recommendation: It is considered this area should not be included.

General description of area. The road link between the Mayflower and proposed by the PC as a CM (Area 3 - 3A, Appendix 1) is principally hedging to both sides with intermittent trees. Countryside hedgerows are protected by the Hedgerow Regulations.

Anstey Bury (Picture 13) and barn at Anstey Bury are individually listed and of early date. Coltsfoot Farm is also listed being of 19th century date. Barns near Coltsfoot Farm have been converted to residential but were not considered as being 'curtilage listed' when determined. Nevertheless these are attractive and of architectural and historic merit (Pictures 14 and 15). Coltsfoot Cottage nearby is partly thatched but much extended. There



Pictures 14 and 15. Grouping of converted barns to east of Coltsfoot Farm of architectural and historic worth. These have been converted.



Picture 16. Land to south of Anstey Bury barn and west of Coltsfoot Cottage proposed by the PC to be included in an extended CA.



Picture 17. The road link between Anstey Bury and Puttocks End proposed by the PC as a Countryside Margin is partly hedgerow, partly open with intermittent trees.



Picture 18. Pleasant complex of farmhouse and converted agricultural buildings at Puttocks End.

are also some trees of quality. Also ponds.

The grouping as proposed by the PC includes some open land which the fieldworker interprets as being part of the open countryside (Picture 16).

The road link between Anstey Bury and Puttocks End proposed by the PC as a CM (Area 3A - 3B, Appendix 1) is partly hedging and partly open with intermittent trees (Picture 17). Countryside hedgerows are protected by the Hedgerow Regulations.

Puttocks End Farm is a pleasant building of architectural and historic interest with a flint and brick wall to front (Picture 18). Former agricultural barns have been converted. Nearby modern agriculture building/ Nissen Huts. Water feature. Part of larger countryside Area of Archaeological Importance.

Elsewhere at Puttocks End two other buildings one of which is clearly mid to late 20th century (Picture 19).

Reasons for recommendation. Whilst it is accepted there are several buildings of architectural and/or historic value it nevertheless is



Picture 19. Modern property at Puttocks End of limited architectural or historic interest.

considered these areas are essentially two small groups of buildings in the open countryside, some being protected by listed building legislation. The surrounding 'private land' as described by the PC and proposed for inclusion, is generally considered to be more part of the open countryside the inclusion of which within a CA would not be appropriate. The two small groupings are linked by strips of countryside proposed by the PC as countryside Margins (Snow End to Puttocks End is about 1.75km). A combination of the limited impact by CA legislation, general protection already afforded by the DP and distance from the main village has formulated Officer view that this extension would not be appropriate.

**Overall summary.** The main concern of the community is interpreted as providing protection for the hamlets and the strips of countryside that join them with the principal village area. Any fear that these hamlets and the countryside linking them will be engulfed by significant development is most improbable, especially in the current plan period until 2033. Protection is already provided by the policies set out in the District Plan. Additional paragraphs are now proposed underlining the protection afforded by the adopted District Plan.

Within the various areas there are numbers of buildings which are either listed and thus protected or others which are modern and of limited architectural or historic interest. The means proposed to link them to the main village by means of 'Conservation Margins' is tenuous.

Whilst it is accepted there are a few buildings of quality and some trees that would benefit from protection by

		<p>CA legislation this is outweighed by the alternative considerations as set out above.</p> <p>Exceptionally it is considered a case can be made for retaining the woodland and listed properties of Welspen Thatch and Dove Cottage within the CA.</p>
<p>Representations from the general public supporting the PC position and similar.</p>  <p>Picture 20. Properties at Lincoln Hill are not considered to be of sufficient quality to be included in an extended CA. These illustrated in the picture above have been significantly altered.</p>	<p>General support for the PC position. Of the 20 or so additional representations there is general support of the PC position. Several others essentially object to the removal of the large areas of agricultural land as originally proposed and highlight importance of views across it.</p> <p>Within the above representations some specific points are raised.</p> <p>These include: Anstey is not a linear village.</p> <p>Include Lincoln Hill within the CA.</p> <p>Does removal from the CA make it easier for land to be built on?</p>	<p>See above.</p> <p>It is accepted Para. 6.1 of the draft document advises that 'Anstey is a linear village' which more appropriately describes the format of the CA as presented by the Appraisal. A text amendment has been made. However at Para 3.1 its historical reference to being a string of linked Ends and Greens is noted. There are other similar historical references.</p> <p>The properties at Lincoln Hill date from the mid-20th century. Some have been significantly altered and are not considered to have sufficient qualities to be included in an extended conservation area (Picture 20).</p> <p>See above, controlled principally by District Plan.</p>

	<p>What will the areas removed from the CA be designated as?</p> <p>What protection is there when the current DP expires?</p> <p>Small paddocks and woodland should be retained.</p> <p>The importance of views.</p> <p>Refer matter to Historic England.</p> <p>No valid reason given for proposed changes.</p> <p>Heartened to see section on Light Pollution.</p>	<p>The removed areas are overlapped by the policy relating to Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt as set out in the DP which will continue to apply.</p> <p>A new DP will be prepared.</p> <p>Areas of concern not identified. Some such areas have been retained. One area of woodland previously proposed for exclusion is now retained.</p> <p>It is accepted views across open countryside may be important. Retention of open agricultural land from inappropriate development will be controlled by District Plan policies.</p> <p>Confident HE advice has been properly interpreted.</p> <p>Consider best effort has been given to draft proposals and subsequent questions raised.</p> <p>No reference in Appraisal document. May be a reference to Policy EQ3 of District Plan which was available for examination at the public meeting.</p>
Specific site representation.	One representation (received before the formal consultation period started) concerned comments in the draft Appraisal which related to the untidy nature of the Blind Fiddler PH.	The fieldworker has undertaken further investigation and negotiated with the adjoining owner (a Housing Association). There is a broken dividing fence which is most unattractive. The HA has advised repairs will be undertaken. Subsequently repairs have been carried out. The draft appraisal has been modified to reflect this.
Error.	One representation advised the location of an important wall illustrated in the Appraisal had been incorrectly described.	Noted and amended.

Appendix 1 Map – See next page.

Appendix 1. Map prepared by PC showing their suggested boundary proposals.

