

**GLAVEN VALLEY VILLAGES CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISALS
& MANAGEMENT PLANS 2022**

Summary:

This report seeks approval to adopt the draft Brinton, Edgefield, Hunworth, Sharrington, Stody and Thornage Conservation Area Appraisals along with the associated Management Proposals contained therein.

Recommendations:

- 1. That Working Party recommend to Cabinet to adopt the six Glaven Valley Village Appraisals for statutory planning purposes and for the Appraisal documents to become material considerations in the planning process.**
- 2. That Working Party recommend to Cabinet to agree the proposed boundary changes as recommended in the draft Appraisal documents and that they be published in accordance with the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990.**
- 3. That Working Party recommend to Cabinet to agree the proposed Local Listings as identified within the draft Appraisal documents.**

Cabinet Members(s)	Ward(s) Affected
All Members	All Wards
Contact Officer(s), telephone number and email: Alannah Hogarth, Conservation & Design Officer, 01263 516367	

1. Introduction

- 1.1 At its meeting on 17 May 2021, Working Party approved the Draft Glaven Valley Village Conservation Area Appraisals (CAA's) for public consultation purposes. A nine week period of consultation was undertaken from 22 November 2021 to 21 January 2022. As a result of the representations received from members of the public and interested bodies; the six CAA's have been amended and plans updated.
- 1.2 As resolved at the aforementioned meeting, the CAA's were presented before Working Party in their final draft form on the 25th April 2022, where Councillors deferred a decision on the basis of limited time prior to the meeting, and a number of unresolved issues within the documents.
- 1.3 The CAA's now come back to Working Party for consideration by Working Party and final adoption by Cabinet, following a number of changes as put forward by Councillors following the April Working Party meeting. Comments received will be addressed individually and any responses will be shown in red below.

2. Comments Received

- 2.1 There has been a FOI request regarding the cost of the project, it would be helpful to have some clarity on this issue.

The total fee proposal for all 11 Appraisals up to this point is £77,900, which includes all of the Glaven Villages and the Glaven Valley itself. Costs were not attributed on a place by place basis, so we can only give an average cost per Appraisal of c. £7,081.

- 2.2 There has been concern raised regarding the absence of a prescribed mechanism for reviewing the outstanding Glaven Valley Rural CA (GVCA), we need to ensure that the correct areas excluded from this appraisal is mirrored in the GVCA when it's reviewed later this year. The area around Thornage Hall is particularly at risk of the GVCA boundary being underestimated.

The village appraisals presented to Working Party are in essence a separate entity to the Glaven Valley designation, Working Party are not being asked at this stage to make any decisions about the Glaven Valley designation, a separate consultation for this part of the work will follow once the village boundaries have been finalised.

- 2.3 Area E (on agenda page 523) on the Boundary Review Plan for Sharrington shaded brown is the site of several planning battles in the past and given the village is the exception to the rule that each village is within the wider rural GVCA, there is a question about why this small area of open landscape adjoining Bale Rd is being removed and it should be reconsidered.

It is general best practice when reviewing conservation area boundaries, as advised by Historic England, to ensure that boundaries are logical and where possible follow distinct

features on the ground, such as hedgerows, fences or roadsides. In this instance, the small portion of the field that the area marked E includes follows no physical marker, and in practice becomes difficult to defend when it cuts somewhat arbitrarily through a field. Leaving this small portion of field within the boundary is considered to dilute the value of the designation, and any planning proposals that may come forward in this area will always have to consider and be assessed for their impact on the Sharrington Conservation Area by virtue of being situated in its immediate setting.

Following a representation received as part of the public consultation, the decision was made to remove the area marked E. At this stage, the officer recommendation has to remain that this area does not positively contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area, and should therefore, remain outside of the conservation area boundary as part of the immediate setting.

- 2.4 A Glossary of Acronyms would help to navigate the text more easily.

There is already a glossary of terms within each appraisal, but further acronyms can be added to help the documents more navigable.

- 2.5 Why is the LDP/Local Plan/Core Strategy not included in the Endnotes and Bibliography in each Appraisal, given that the purpose of the consultation is to frame planning policy?

The Conservation Area Appraisals are not planning policy documents, once adopted they are Supplementary Planning Documents, that are designed to act in an advisory capacity as opposed to setting out precise planning policies as the Local Plan does.

- 2.5 At what stage will the text be proofread to identify errors and omissions, examples of which are given below in the numbered points 18 and 20 below. This Appraisal document has been presented to the Working Party as a final draft with too many errors and textual inconsistencies in several factual contexts.

The documents have been proofread by several people at several stages, there will inevitably be some oversights when working with such large and detailed documents, as well as a number of parallel and competing workstreams. However, the consultation process is an important part of ironing out any of those inconsistencies before the documents are then adopted in their final form. Even at that stage, any errors that may slip through are unlikely to be of such a degree that undermines the content and tone of the documents themselves.

3. Itemised Changes

- 3.1 Page 34 Response/Recommendations column. The proposed addition of Clause 7.6 is not consistent with the aims and objectives of the appraisals and the 2nd and 3rd sentences should be removed. The comments on funding and grant acquisition are misplaced, were not part of the original response and therefore risk objection from other village Church Councils who made no issue of their financial viability because they assumed it is not relevant in the process.

Issues of financial burdens are not usually a consideration for the Conservation Area Appraisal process, there are circumstances where it is a relevant observation where financial burdens are leading to a deterioration in the character and appearance of the conservation area and as a result causing harm to its significance. Section 7.6 was added into the Sharrington appraisal as a result of representations received during the public consultation, and so a brief observation was included in the document noting that communal buildings do face financial constraints that affect their upkeep. No change recommended.

- 3.2 Page 47 Response/Recommendations. Response on p 79 CA in line 4 should read "Please see above". Page 50 Response/Recommendations. Response to 16 & 17 The Street should read "they do not contribute" in 3rd line. Page 55 Response/Recommendations. For clarity insert "and Full Council for adoption" after the words "Working Party to Cabinet."

These points are noted, however, they refer to the officer responses already made, and submitted to the previous Working Party agenda. The purpose of this follow up report is to get the appraisals adopted not to make amendments to documents already submitted to and recorded on the agenda. The comments matrix is not being brought back before Working Party at this stage, as agreed at the April meeting.

- 3.3 Page 67. Brinton 1.1 refers to the village of Thornton in line 4; this has been corrected to "Thornage".
- 3.4 Page 131. Brinton. Following reference to the Council website criteria for local listed buildings, a link to the NNDC website has been inserted to the text.
- 3.5 Page 148. Brinton. Should we be focusing on identifiable properties with property specific photos of UPVC doors and windows when presumably residents are aware of what UPVC looks like generically.

Photos are used to leave no doubt about features that are considered harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area. There is a vast amount of variation that falls under the term uPVC, as such Conservation & Design consider it worth highlighting particular examples where necessary.

- 3.6 Page 154. Brinton. Same issue applies to photo of grey wheelie bins as UPVC windows in previous point.

As above, photos are not used to name and shame, but to leave no room for doubt about the point being made.

- 3.7 Page 212, para 1 line 11, 262. Reference to petrol station to "former petrol station" at RMC Autos MOT and service garage has been amended.
- 3.8 Page 236 and Page 262. Edgefield. 4.3.5 line 16. After 75mm insert "and 1.5m in height from soil level" and remove 'six weeks' and substitute 'a period' for consistency with similar text in other CAs.
- 3.9 Page 271. Edgefield. Vehicle number plate in photo 4 pixilated for consistency and anonymity.
- 3.10 Page 354. Hunworth. 4.3.5 Trees and Vegetation. Reference added to minimum dimensions for consistency with other CAs.
- 3.11 Page 473. Sharrington. Reference to trees being subject to the Diocesan Faculty system (DFS) has been carried over to other appraisals to cover churchyard trees.

- 3.12 Pages 430, 486, 489, 492, 507, 523. Sharrington. The maps on these pages have been corrected to reflect the update to the boundary around the pond at Ash Yard.

4. Procedural Matters and Next Steps

- 3.1 Once adopted, the CAA's will be published on the Councils website and the relevant statutory advertisement undertaken. The documents will then become material considerations in the planning process and can be referred to and referenced as part of the development management process.
- 3.2 Following the adoption of the final six village conservation area appraisals and revised boundaries within the Glaven Valley, the Glaven Valley Conservation Area draft appraisal will be brought before the Working Party seeking approval to undertake the public consultation process that will underline the final stage of the Glaven Valley review programme.

Recommendations:

- 1. That Working Party grants delegated authority to officers to make the final amendments to the text of the appraisals in line with the comments received following the previous working party on 25 April 2022.**
- 2. That Working Party recommend to Cabinet to adopt the six Glaven Valley Village Appraisals for statutory planning purposes and for the Appraisal documents to become material considerations in the planning process.**
- 3. That Working Party recommend to Cabinet to agree the proposed boundary changes as recommended in the draft Appraisal documents and that they be published in accordance with the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990.**
- 4. That Working Party recommend to Cabinet to agree the proposed Local Listings as identified within the draft Appraisal documents.**