

# **Gretton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan Supplementary Planning Document**

## **Statement of Consultation**

**October 2018**



## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 This document describes the methods of consultation that the Council adopted during the production of the Gretton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
- 1.2 The SPD has been prepared in line with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 as well as the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. It also takes account of national policy and guidance.

## **2. Consultation Statement**

- 2.1 On 7 March 2018, the Local Plan Committee approved the draft Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan SPDs for Great Oakley and Gretton to be published for consultation.
- 2.2 Public consultation ran for 5 weeks between 12 March and 16 April 2018, and was undertaken in accordance with the North Northamptonshire Statement of Community Involvement. This involved:
  - Details of consultation emailed to approximately 800 contacts on the Local Plan consultation database
  - The consultation was publicised in press notices in the Evening Telegraph
  - Copies of the draft SPD's were available for public inspection at the Corby Cube and public libraries
  - The details of the consultation were available online

## **3. Gretton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan SPD – representations received and the Council's responses**

- 3.1 The Council received 19 comments from 6 respondents on the draft Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan SPD for Gretton, which have been duly considered. The responses and details of the Council's response along with any necessary changes have been described in detail below.

**Gretton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan SPD – representations received and Council’s response**

Respondent	Summary of Representation	Council’s Response
Jas Martin & Co	As Agents for the Winchilsea Settled Estates, we support the removal of Area 1 along Corby Road at the south end approach to the village and the proposed revised 2018 boundary shown in red on Figure 2	Noted
Gretton Parish Council	The photograph on page 19 is incorrectly labelled as Manor Farm. The property is actually "The Yews".	Photograph label amended
Gretton Parish Council	The Parish Council is not aware of any evidence to suggest that ‘The Talbot’ or ‘Barn House’ have ever been used as farms	Noted and reference to the farms removed
Gretton Parish Council	With regard to the views the penultimate paragraph should refer to Harborough Hill House and not Hillborough House and is on Gallows Hill.	Noted
Gretton Parish Council	Please see comment under 7.2 which also relates to 5.2	
Gretton Parish Council	There is an impasse between the fact that the shortage of drive space and number of cars parking on the streets detracts from the appearance of the historic core of the village and on the other hand "the instances where stone walls have been removed to create off road parking has led to a break in the unified treatment of the streetscape". It is noted that the view of the author is that the village is "overrun with on street parking". The Parish Council feels that this is a critical issue and full consideration must be given in all planning applications.	The views of the Parish Council are reasonable and proportional and the request for ongoing consideration to be given in future planning applications to the need to accommodate car parking is noted.
Gretton Parish Council	<p><b><u>Area 1</u></b></p> <p>It is disappointing to note that there is a suggestion to remove this area on Corby Road from the conservation area on the grounds that recent "developments have changed the character and appearance of the approach to the traditional village" and that "Corby Road has taken on a suburban appearance". This must be a failure on the part of the LPA in allowing such developments to take place in an area presently</p>	<p>The development on Corby Road has introduced new housing which has changed the appearance of the approach from the south. The amended boundary would define the edge of the historic village and help to celebrate the significance of the area.</p> <p>The boundary as drawn in the existing conservation area includes three properties on Arnhill Road. The properties no meaningful contribution to the character of the area and the modification of the</p>

	<p>designated with conservation area status which has neither been preserved or enhanced. It is the view of the Parish Council that Area 1 should not be removed on the basis that a degree of control, which appears not to have been exercised in the past, can be exerted in the case of any future development proposals in this area in order to hopefully enhance the approach to the village.</p> <p><b><u>Area 2</u></b></p> <p>The removal of the three properties is neither justified or serves any purpose.</p>	<p>boundary by the removal of these properties in association with the extension of the boundary to include the property on the east side of Arnhill Road and the garden leading down to Station Road will provide an edge to the conservation area that is more consistent with conservation area objectives.</p>
<p>Gretton Parish Council</p>	<p>The Parish Council supports, in principle, the extension of the boundary to include additional areas of Station Road, Arnhill Road, Clay Lane and Winchilsea Drive on the basis of their importance to the overall setting of the village and the approach along Station Road to the historic core of the village. However one further step should be taken. The railway bridge dramatically announces the entrance to the village and therefore the Parish Council feels that the revised boundary should extend to both sides of Station Road from immediately passing under the railway bridge.</p> <p>The Parish Council further commented that that many of the existing houses within this extended area were built in the 1960's and 70's and have the characteristics of that era. These include "non traditional" large UPVC glazed windows and doors, concrete roof tiles, plastic guttering and wide double garage doors.</p> <p>Many of the properties also have roof mounted solar panels. it would be unreasonable to expect or insist upon owners of these properties having to use designs and materials suitable to a traditional historic village property.</p>	<p>The railway bridge does indeed provide an impressive and substantial entrance to the village environment. In addition it heralded a new point in the historic development of the village providing local employment and transport to other areas of employment. This suggestion is noted and agreed - the boundary should be extended down Station Road to include the railway bridge. This amendment would link the historic core of the village with the railway which is a part of the historic development of the village and creates a dynamic entrance to the village.</p> <p>Comments regarding fenestration and doors are noted. No further action is required.</p>

Gretton Parish Council	The Parish Council questions the expression " <u>urban</u> form characterisation" which seems to be inappropriate.	Unable to locate the comment on 'urban form characterisation' in 9.1
Gretton Parish Council	The following should be added to the list of Heritage Assets: The railway bridge built in the 1870's. West Wells and the stand pipe at the top of Clay Lane. Caistors Cottage on Caistor Road which was the home of the principle village shepherd. Church Gap behind St James Church where there is a wagon wash and animal watering place. The 5 village sign posts of early design for finger posts	The railway bridge is managed by Network Rail, including the bridge as an historic asset would require consultation with the management company. The inclusion of West Wells and the standpipe at the top of Clay Lane and the wagon wash and animal watering place are part of the historic fabric and story of the village and should be included in the list of heritage assets. The finger posts could be included following consultation with Northamptonshire County Council.
Gretton Parish Council	The reference to Cottingham and Middleton should be removed	Noted
Gretton Parish Council	The appraisal document is a well prepared and most interesting piece of work which provides a fascinating glimpse of the history of Gretton	Noted
Highways England	No comments to make	Noted
Natural England	No comments to make	Noted
NCC Archaeology	The references to archaeological consultation in the Management Plan are appropriate and I have no further comments to make on the document	Noted
Insight Town Planning Ltd on behalf of [REDACTED] INDIVIDUAL	<p>On 12 March 2018, Corby Borough Council (the LPA) issued a draft Gretton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan for public consultation, with the consultation period ending on 16 April 2018. This response document is being submitted within the consultation period and is therefore duly made.</p> <p>[REDACTED] shares the ownership of land at Kirby Road, Gretton. The owners have submitted a full planning application for the erection of 10 dwellings with garaging and means of access on that part of the land closest to Kirby Road. The application carries the reference 18/00024/DPA. It is being reported to the LPA's Planning Committee</p>	The comments made are noted. Due process was undertaken as part of the planning application as described in the comments received as part of the consultation process.

	<p>meeting on 17 April 2018 with an Officer recommendation that full planning permission should be granted, subject to planning conditions. The application site falls at the extremity of, but within, the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The Conservation Area is a designated heritage asset within the meaning of the NPPF. The application was accompanied by a Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by a conservation specialist, which assesses the significance of the designated asset and the degree to which the proposed development affects that significance. This is fully in accordance with the NPPF.</p> <p>The Heritage Impact Assessment reaches the following conclusion:-</p> <p><i>Gretton is a village which has grown organically over several centuries and it is this evolutionary growth which accounts for much of its special architectural and historic interest. The site at Kirby Road presents an opportunity for further organic growth which, through careful design and choice of materials, can add to the village's distinct character. This carefully designed scheme will inevitably change the character of this part of the conservation area but in a way which preserves the special features of the site and safeguards the setting of the various listed buildings on High Street. The siting, scale, massing, style and materials of the proposed new homes are appropriate to the location and will sit well in their local context, without any harmful impact on the significance of the conservation area or the settings of nearby listed buildings. For the reasons set out in the body of this report, the proposed development is entirely compatible with the preservation of the conservation area and the setting of the nearby listed buildings."</i></p> <p>The application has been the subject of scrutiny by the LPA's consultant Conservation Officer. In making his assessment, he has had available to him both the submitted Heritage Impact Assessment and the consultation draft Conservation Area Appraisal. He has concluded that on balance the application should be supported.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>The LPA’s professional officers and specialist conservation advisor have therefore reached the conclusion that the development of 10 dwellings as proposed would meet the test at s72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Accordingly, there is not resultant harm and the proposed development meets the policies for the historic environment within the NPPF. It is against this background that our client now makes representations in response to the draft Conservation Area Appraisal.</p>	
<p>Insight Town Planning Ltd on behalf of [REDACTED] INDIVIDUAL</p>	<p>Our client’s comments on the draft document are limited to those parts that relate to the land in their shared ownership. The draft document includes a ‘spatial analysis and appraisal map’ in figures 4(a) and 4(b). Together with Paddock Park, figure 4(b) applies a green hatching to our clients’ land and labels it as “open space”. Page 31 of the draft document lists features shown on figures 4(a) and 4(b), including “important open space”. It is assumed that this is intended to refer to the green hatching on figure 4(b), although the wording differs. The page 31 definition reads:-</p> <p><i>“Important Open Space – these are elements of the settlement which have a strong historic interest as open space. This should not be taken to imply that other open areas are not of landscape value or of value as open spaces on amenity grounds.”</i></p> <p>In light of this definition, it is surprising that the draft document does not seek to define or explain the ‘strong historic interest’ of our client’s land. It does include a paragraph devoted to the Paddock Park’s recent creation (since the Conservation Area was designated), but it is silent as to the historic significance of our client’s land. In this respect, the draft document does not fulfil its own claim as set out in its introduction:-</p> <p><i>“This document meets the requirements placed on the local planning authority to define and record the special architectural and historic</i></p>	<p>The appraisal identifies those areas where the open space is considered important to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Reference is made in the appraisal document to the value of open space and how it can enhance and add value to the character and appearance of the area. The areas identified in the appraisal document for Gretton have the special quality of being important to the character and appearance and are appraised as being valuable to the historic character of the area.</p>

	<p><i>interest of the conservation areas and identify opportunities for enhancement.”</i></p> <p>Further, it is notable that the key characteristics of the Conservation Area listed at pages 5 and 6 of the draft document do not include any reference to open spaces.</p>	
<p>Insight Town Planning Ltd on behalf of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] INDIVIDUAL</p>	<p>Our client has two fundamental concerns about the draft document as it relates to their land:-</p> <p>The draft document sets out no reasoned justification for its designation as open space. The designation of the Paddock Park as open space does not appear to be based upon historic significance but on its recent land use for community purposes. However, the draft document is entirely silent on the significance of our client’s land. A possible explanation is that our client’s land has been included as a reflection of the saved Local Plan Policy 13(v). However, that policy itself includes no justification for its application to this land, and it is common ground with Officers that the policy carries little if any weight in decision-making. If it has been transposed across to the draft Appraisal document, then to do so is wrong.</p> <p>The draft document should make clear both in introduction and in its textual section dealing with figures 4(a) and 4(b) that the ‘open space’ designation does not preclude development, but instead any proposed development should meet the statutory test of s72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. To the casual reader of the document, as presently drafted it could be inferred that the ‘open space’ is sacrosanct. That cannot be right, as the NPPF requires an assessment of how a particular proposed development affects the significance of a designated heritage asset, and as demonstrated in the Conservation Officer’s advice on the current application, it is possible to achieve a development of this land that meets the statutory test. It is not only logical but essential that the draft document makes clear that the ‘open space’ is not sacrosanct.</p> <p>In order to address our client’s representation:-</p>	<p>The site was already included in the conservation area boundary. The site and Paddock Park contribute to the setting of the village of Gretton as an historic asset. Open space is not sacrosanct and an additional comment has been included in the definition of open space to make clear that designation as open space does not prevent appropriately designed developments that meet the statutory test at s72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Our client's land, as shown outlined in red on the plan overleaf, should be omitted from the 'open space' designation in the draft document. As drafted, the document only explains inclusion of the Paddock Park and it should not include other land without a clear historic justification; or</li><li>2. If it is not omitted, the draft document should have text inserted (we suggest in the definition of open space) to make clear that designation as open space does not prevent appropriately designed developments that meet the statutory test at s72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</li></ol>	
--	---	--