

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Open Meeting to discuss the Heritage Asset Report and Receive Representations.

Held on Thursday 4th October 2018 in the Blue Duck Bar, Springhead Pub, Sutton Poyntz, commencing 11.30 hours.

Present: Steering Group members - Peter Dye (Chair), Bill Egerton, Huw Llewellyn and Colin Marsh.

Consultant from Angel Architecture – Kim Sankey.

The following residents were also present – Sarah Ayling, Rosy Birch, Caroline Crisp, Simon Darcy, Dorothy Emblen, Simon Emblen, Dave Emery, Yvonne Emery, Jane Gear, Tim Gear, Lyn Grant-Jones, Jill Kelsey, Dave Morris and Alun Reece.

1. Apologies

Apologies received in advance from Bill Davidson (Steering Group)

2. Introduction

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and summarised the information that had been pre-circulated to affected residents following issue of the report by Kim Sankey of Angel Architecture in September.

The key areas for discussion could be divided into general issues associated with the process, methodology, assessment criteria, etc and specific issues relating to individual properties including errors in the narrative, factual information, etc. There would also be an opportunity for residents to raise any other issues.

The Chair explained that the village had clearly expressed the desire to have a list of local heritage assets in an earlier survey but it was the Steering Groups responsibility to develop a viable policy that took into account residents' concerns, clarified the context and the implications of the production of such a list.

3. Representations on General Issues and Methodology

The Chair addressed each of the representations on methodology - as summarised in the list circulated to residents and the steering group the previous evening.

3.1 Lack of consultation on assessment criteria – The Steering Group had conformed to the Historic England advice on local heritage listing. The issue was the timing of the consultation on the criteria to be used. This could now be undertaken as the publication of the consultant's report and the feedback from property owners, offered a proper context for this question to be addressed.

3.2 Non-use of three Advice Note criteria – Kim Sankey explained that this had been agreed with the Heritage sub-group in advance of the survey since only the 'built' environment was being considered.

3.3 Use of 'locally distinctive materials' criteria – Kim Sankey explained that this was identical to the 'aesthetic' criteria used by Historic England. The term had been used in previous reports in relation to designated assets (such as Portland) in her capacity as a professional planner for the local authority, without challenge. It was entirely acceptable for the non-designated assets being discussed.

At this point, in response to a question about the Conservation Area status the Chair explained that the Sutton Poyntz Conservation Area document was a character assessment not supported by a management plan and so offered no real protection. The Neighbourhood Plan offered an ideal opportunity to provide more detail and in fact already contained much of the information found in a full conservation area appraisal. Kim Sankey referred to the relevant plan for Osmington produced by West Dorset Council as a good example of what should be included. This was a substantial document that offered detailed guidance to the Planning Authority.

In response to a question as to why the current Sutton Poyntz & Preston conservation area document did not give adequate protection, the Chair explained that the document comprised a single page and simply defined the area and gave no detail on the characteristics of a building or the heritage value. There was also no Management Plan – a document that should have been reviewed every ten years. BE suggested that a comparison with the Osmington example, which was made available, would quickly demonstrate the inadequacy of the Sutton Poyntz assessment. The Chair commented that the report provided by Angel Architecture would undoubtedly assist the Planning Authority in their decision-making since they would now have detailed information available which had received the support of the local community. Kim Sankey added that a statement of heritage value was a significant one in support of a planning application as it provided an applicant with much of the necessary information they would require in completing the documentation.

One resident was concerned that the listing of individual properties would be overlooked as a result of the community taking an overview when voting on the overall plan. This would give the impression to local council planners that the whole village supported the listing of specific property, which may not be the case. The Chair explained that the forthcoming Regulation 14 formal consultation would provide an opportunity to identify and comment upon specific concerns about individual properties.

3.4 Lack of details of age criteria –Historic England advice note criteria had been used. Kim Sankey confirmed this included any building that was of a pre-1945 date.

3.5 Lack of detail on individual properties – It was confirmed that the scope of the content was typical of a conservation area report.

3.6 Minutes of the Heritage Asset Survey – It was confirmed that these were publicly available and had already been provided to individuals who had requested a copy.

3.7 Need for Local Listing in a Conservation Area – this is addressed in 3.3 above.

3.8 Why some buildings were chosen in preference to others of a similar age –
The Chair stated that there had been no favour shown and this was an open process. It was agreed that Kim Sankey would review and re-evaluate the following properties and provide a rationale for a decision on inclusion or otherwise; Littlecot, The Cottage, Streamside and Southview. **Action BE**

4. Representations on Matters of Fact.

4.1 Fox Cottage – Agreed to remove from the list. There was no further comment. **Action BE**

4.2 White Horse Cottage - Agreed to remove from the list. There was no further comment. **Action BE**

4.3 Rose Cottage – KS confirmed this as late 19th century sited on an earlier footprint.

4.4 Silver Street group value - BE explained that the Heritage sub-group had met on the previous afternoon, and had agreed to recommend that the focus of protection was the layout of the street and the aligned cottages and that it was hoped that with assistance from Kim Sankey a suitable form of words could be found to accommodate this on the list. Kim Sankey commented on the need to adopt a whole area view which included the houses, water and nearby listed buildings as part of the unique characteristic of this street. SD considered that such an approach needed to either include all of the houses or none. KS suggested that treating Silver Street as a collective entry without the identification of individual buildings was one possible approach. BE agreed that the general layout rather than the individual house structures was the priority for protection. The Chair suggested that such an approach provided a basis for collaboration with the affected parties as a means of reaching a consensus. In discussion it was agreed to try to seek a form of words that would be useful to the planners along these lines and that this would provide an opportunity for the neighbourhood plan to act as an alternative to a conservation area management plan, which was unlikely to be implemented due to a lack of resource. Dave E suggested opening up the heritage sub-group so as to involve the affected property owners and SD offered to engage with the Silver Street residents in this respect.

Action BE

4.5 Staddles aesthetic interest – KS referred to a 1972 letter which had proposed the listing of all five Wamsley Lewis houses. She considered these to be all of equal value and noted that Staddles was associated with the most detailed construction records held in the Dorset history centre. The owner of Wyndings confirmed that sadly it was not a Walmsley-Lewis house. With regard to this property it was agreed that there was no reason why archaeology should not be mentioned in the report.

In response to a question on non-designated status KS explained that this did not give any extra protection but did recognise the importance of the property and that the main consequence would be a “more thorough” planning application.

4.6 Bellamy Cottage – actions agreed.

4.6 Springhead Pub; reasons for listing and economic impact – KS stated that there was no obligation to maintain a non-designated building as opposed to the situation with a designated (listed) building; however, as a public asset of community value there would clearly be an interest in ensuring that this building was maintained. She explained that the building was historically and architecturally important due to the connection with the architect George Crickmay as well as the group value alongside the Coach House and Waterworks Cottages. The Chair commented upon the granting of planning permission for demolition of the Duck Bar in the past and KS noted that a policy of non-demolition in a conservation area would override such decisions. Commenting on the impact on the business, BE suggested that the local authority would have to strike a balance between the economic impact and historical responsibilities.

The Chair concluded by suggesting that a summary of the implications of non-designated listing would be useful in support of a policy.

Action BE

5. Other Issues

The Chair asked each attendee in turn for any further points that they wished to raise. The following matters were addressed.

5.1 LGJ received confirmation from Kim Sankey that reference to two of the Puddledock Cottages was an historical perspective of the site (since there were now four cottages) and that the group value alongside The Old Dairy House related to the past agricultural connection. LGS pointed out that the RJW on the date plate (1890) is Reginald Joseph Weld. In response to a further question Kim Sankey confirmed that later alterations can be of interest and that non-designated listing had no impact on choice of external décor.

5.2 In response to a question as to whether properties on the heritage asset list would have added value, KS confirmed that this was unlikely to be the case as conservation area status would ‘trump’ listing and research confirmed that properties in a conservation area already have an enhanced value by around ten percent. In this respect non-designated status would therefore neither reduce nor increase value.

5.3 It was acknowledged that the report incorrectly referred to the removal of Chipps Cottage and Southview from the list when in fact this should have stated 115 Sutton Road (Streamside) and Southview.

The Chair raised the question as to whether a policy should be included requiring the local authority to produce a conservation area report along with a management plan since this would cover areas not dealt with by a local listing process. BE added that the draft neighbourhood plan already has an improved Conservation Area Appraisal as a community aspiration.

5.4 SD was of the opinion that it would have been beneficial to have included the research referred to by Kim Sankey in the report that had been issued to property owners. Kim noted that a more detailed foreword to the report had been discussed

and it was a question of trying to achieve the right cost balance when summarising the large amount of information available.

5.5 Dave E suggested that a thorough final consultation with the full involvement of affected property owners on the list would help to remove the strong objections. The Chair confirmed that no final decision had been taken as to the inclusion of a list or modified list but it was the intention to include heritage policies within the draft Neighbourhood Plan.

5.6 AR asked whether inclusion on the list of heritage assets would materially affect changes to the property. The Chair explained that only in those situations where planning consent was required would reference be made to the list as a means of providing some detailed guidance, rather than simply making a decision based upon the property being sited within a conservation area. Kim Sankey informed the meeting that any planning application adjacent to a non-designated heritage asset would have to take the significance of that asset into account. She gave an example of a house being built adjacent to such a property where the planners would have to consider the impact of the new build design and materials on the non-designated property rather than simply taking a view based on the amenity impact. The purpose was not to obstruct development but to ensure that it was appropriate in terms of the style, materials used, etc. She also noted that since planners would not visit the site, due to them using satellite imagery, the list would provide useful information to help inform the decision-making process.

5.7 Dorothy E commented on the need for properties to be included on the list for the right reasons and had no objections to her property being included.

5.8 RB noted that inclusion on the list would make obtaining planning on adjacent land, such as a field at the rear of a property, more difficult. This implication was acknowledged.

5.9 In response to a question from SD it was confirmed that if a list was included as part of a policy in the Neighbourhood Plan that would take precedent, whereas if it did not form part of a policy the local authority would take the heritage asset report into account when constructing their own list. In such a situation the local authority would have to explain the reasons for inclusion of specific properties on the list and inform property owners of their right to appeal. KS stated that it would be unlikely that the local authority would fail to adopt the list of properties included in her report but would be required to go through several stages of consultation and would involve Historic England in that process.

6. Summary

The Chair emphasised the need for clarity in the Steering Group's proposals for local heritage listing since this would have a wider impact beyond the individual property owners - the community as a whole would need to take a view. He referred to the forthcoming Regulation¹⁴ process of formal consultation and the need to include specific proposals in the draft Neighbourhood Plan, with a supporting narrative that explained the independent assessment process and feedback received, to allow the village to take an informed view on the proposed policy. The Chair concluded by

inviting people to become involved in the work of the Steering Group and sub-groups in order that all views could be represented with the aim of achieving a consensus.

The meeting closed at 12.54 hours.