



Essential Reference Paper B

Issue	Representations made	Officer comment
<p>General comment.</p>	<p>The appraisal showed 'real concern for our village and the environment'.</p>	<p>Comment noted and appreciated.</p>
<p>Conservation area (CA) boundaries – a proposal by the PC to include Nos. 1-4 Peasecroft.</p> <div style="display: flex; flex-direction: column; gap: 10px;">   </div>	<p>The Parish Council (PC) seeks the inclusion of Nos. 1-4 Peasecroft in the CA. These are prefabricated 'Swedish' houses dating from the mid 20th century. The PC advise, inter alia, they are good representatives of their type and are part of post war architectural history; they are claimed to be sufficiently unaltered and on their original footprints; they are capable of being maintained and repaired. The PC also advise they are part of the story of architectural evolution in the village being the next 'chapter' following on from the 1920's houses at The Crescent proposed for inclusion. The proposed CA boundary can be easily adjusted to include them.</p>	<p>The two pairs are on the north side of Peasecroft, are vacant, boarded up and owned by a Housing Association. An application to demolish and replace with higher density was refused in August 2017 principally because of density and layout. Originally they would have had open porches and vertical wooden boarding. Peasecroft is a typical mid/late modern 20th century street of overall limited visual quality.</p> <p>The properties Nos 1-4 have been altered by much replacement modern detailing and enclosure of their porches, the latter having a particularly disruptive appearance. A later modern application simulated to appear as vertical boarding has been applied which further reduces their visual quality and historical integrity. Local information advises some chimneys have been removed.</p> <p>Because the author became aware that similar buildings elsewhere in the country were listed officers sought advice from Historic England (HE) and the 20th Century Society (20S). In their responses (included as Background Papers) HE drew attention to others listed in the UK and considered on the information available a case could be made for their inclusion in the CA based on their historical value. 20S went further and thought it would be</p>

		<p>appropriate for them to form part of the CA.</p> <p>The HE response (based on limited information provided; principally photos - see 1st column) refer to the buildings as being <i>timber clad</i> (as they would have been originally) whereas in fact and noted above they have later been re-clad with modern simulated 'look alike' material. HE and 20S were later informed of this and of the consequent officer held view of their further diminished qualities.</p> <p>Nearby and on the other side of the road there are three similar pairs now in private ownership, one of which has the original wooden cladding detailing. Another pair in this location has open porch canopy detailing. However others are variously inappropriately altered and also have various boundary treatments and parking areas which detract.</p> <p>Having taken these considerations into account the conservation team has collectively concluded the CA should not be extended. Nos. 1-4 have been visually adversely affected by various inappropriate alterations including use of modern materials and enclosure of porches. The modern cladding further compromises and diminishes their importance. Whilst it is accepted they are part of the evolution of the village's post war history, a similar sense of local historical continuity will be exemplified by similar buildings on the south side of the road in private ownership and which appear in good condition.</p>
Conservation boundaries – two	One representation considered this field 'or	The field is considered to form part of the wider landscape and advice from Historic

<p>objections to the proposal to remove open countryside to the north and west of Childs Farm.</p>	<p>at least half of it' should remain in the CA.</p> <p>Another in similar vein considers the field proposed for exclusion is an essential part of the village approach and that its removal might be a 'Trojan Horse' for the field to be built on and that it should continue to benefit from the protection of CA status.</p>	<p>England (Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management advice note No. 1, 2016) advises that CA designation is not generally an appropriate means of protecting the wider landscape.</p> <p>The frontage hedge to the field and area of trees opposite Peartree Cottage remains in the CA in recognition of their contribution to the village approach. CA designation does not in itself prevent the principle of development. The principal tool for this is the Development Plan. The field lies beyond the village boundary in the emerging District Plan so in this respect there is a presumption against large scale development.</p>
<p>Improvements to land north of FP 007/east of Warren Lane.</p>	<p>The owner advises he will improve.</p>	<p>Thanks to the owner who has made improvements.</p>