

# **Great Coxwell Conservation Area Appraisal and Boundary Review**

## **Consultation Statement**

## **Introduction**

1. The purpose of this statement is to provide a summary of the representations received during the public consultation on the Great Coxwell Conservation Area Appraisal and Boundary Review held between Wednesday 6 April and Wednesday 1 June 2022.

## **Background**

### **Purpose of the Conservation Area Appraisal and Boundary Review**

2. Under Sections 69 & 71 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 local authorities have a duty to designate conservation areas and from time to time to review the boundaries. The Conservation Area Appraisal Document is the mechanism by which the local authority defines the special interest of these areas and they form part of the Local Authority Development Plan evidence base.
3. Under Section 71 of the above act, we have exercised our duty to formulate and produce proposals for the preservation and enhancement of the conservation area.
4. The appraisal document forms part of the evidence base for the Development Plan. It should be used in the development management process to manage positive change within the designated conservation area or its setting to minimise harm and encourage preservation or enhancement.

### **Summary of the Appraisal Document and alterations to the Proposed Boundary**

5. The document provides a summary of the history of Great Coxwell's development, an assessment of its historic and architectural interest by character area, a gazetteer of local interest buildings (non-listed structures) and a series of illustrative maps showing various details of spatial analysis.
6. The Conservation and Design Team proposed revisions to the existing boundary. These include rationalisation of the boundary where it crosses through a building plot and the addition of two areas considered to contribute to the significance of the area.

### **Summary of consultation responses received**

7. In total, 13 responses were received during the public consultation period. 9 responses were via the online web survey, 2 responses were received via email and 2 responses were paper replies.
8. A version of the paper copy of the consultation questions was originally deposited that had the two map extracts the wrong way round relevant to the questions. Corrected versions of the hard copies were replaced on the third day of consultation. Unfortunately, one paper copy was returned before the correct

versions were issued. The respondent was local and realised the error and this did not affect their ability to provide comments.

9. Overall, the responses received were generally supportive of the content of the document with two respondents welcoming the document that would help to manage change and one seeking to extend the boundary further to protect the natural and wild status of the southern fields.
10. Two respondents commented specifically on the justification for the proposed boundary revisions – Historic England and a Local Resident. One respondent raised concerns about the further inclusion of land associated with Greenlanes. Detailed comments on how the Conservation Team have responded to all the comments received can be found in the table below.

## **Responses**

11. The table below outlines all the responses received during the consultation with the Conservation Team's response and relevant actions.
12. Names have been removed. Respondents were invited to provide a partial postcode when responding in order to capture the geographical extent of comments on this localised consultation; postcodes have been removed from the table provided below.

## **Conclusion**

13. Overall, the level of response was broadly as expected on this localised consultation.
14. The questions asked provided specific opportunities to comment on the proposed boundary revisions and on the appraisal document itself. The comments received were useful to the team in finalising the document and boundary review.

Rep	Responding as	Name of the business / organisation, council or body you are representing:	How far do you agree or disagree with the proposed extension south of the church?	How far do you agree or disagree with the proposed extension along Dark Lane?	Overall comments	Conservation and Design Team response
1	an individual / member of the public	-	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	-	n/a
2	an individual / member of the public	-	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree	-	n/a
3	an individual / member of the public	Great Coxwell Parish Council	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	I would like to see the conservation area extended, notably to the West/ South West of the village behind Berry Hill cottage - the bottom of the lane behind here is a 'wild field' that fall in behind Clover House. This has started to be used as a dumping ground by some residents and this field needs protecting as left wild. - Help protect the field behind Clover House and adjacent properties as it is losing it 'wild status' as some people are choosing to dump items in it and this has disturbed the wildlife in this area.	Unfortunately it is beyond the remit of Conservation Area designation to include lands with wildlife interest - the focus of this designation must be the historic built form and land that was specifically adapted or designed to form part of the built environment. Protection of land for its environmental or wild character would be better achieved through neighbourhood planning or Natural England.

4	an individual / member of the public	-	Agree	Agree	Good idea! In these days of people being able to sell land for housing at the drop of a hat it becomes necessary to protect areas that are vulnerable. We also need to ensure the village retains its character for the foreseeable future.	Comments welcomed although it must be noted that conservation area designation does not prohibit development or prevent applications being made. The designation and accompanying appraisal serve to ensure where development is proposed it is informed by an understanding of an area's significance and responds appropriately.
5	an individual / member of the public	-	Agree - This is an area I regularly use for running and walking the children	Agree - ONLY agree to look for a neat boundary and existing covenants on this field	The village is so under invasion of people who do not understand or take care of our neighbourhoods now we need to protect as much as possible	Comments welcomed although it must be noted that conservation area designation does not prohibit development or prevent applications being made. The designation and accompanying appraisal serve to ensure where development is proposed it is informed by an understanding of an area's significance and responds appropriately.
6	an individual / member of the public	-	Agree	Agree	-	n/a

7	an individual / member of the public	-	Neither agree nor disagree - The review document is very comprehensive, but nowhere does it say why the field below the church is being added.	Neither agree nor disagree - Again, the review document gives no reason for this extension. I would like to why.	-	Comments noted and welcomed. It is agreed that the justification for the proposed extensions is not well presented in the boundary revisions section. The appraisal document does describe why the areas proposed for inclusion are of particular significance worthy of inclusion and this has been drawn out into an improved summary of justification in Section 7 as revised. It is considered the areas are still worthy of addition and the improved presentation of information within Section 7 resolves these comments.
8	an individual / member of the public	-	Agree	Agree	-	n/a

9	an individual / member of the public	-	<p>Strongly disagree - Strongly disagree to the inclusion of Greenlanes rear garden; the property "Greenlanes" is already part of the existing conservation area which currently ends at the property. There is no benefit to the public to further extending the boundary to include the rear garden of Greenlanes but it will adversely impact any property owners of Greenlanes. If there is a true public interest to include the rear garden of Greenlanes this would also incorporate the</p>	Agree	<p>A consultation prior to plans being drawn and proposed would have been much more inclusive, in particular prior consultation with property and land owners would have been helpful.</p>	<p>The plot of Greenlanes is already more than 50% included within the designated boundary. The proposed revision here corrects a boundary anomaly where the existing designation crosses at random through the historic property boundary. In conjunction with the proposed extension to include the field, the boundary can be more naturally drawn to include the historic domestic curtilage of Greenlanes, over 50% of which is already within the designated boundary. The designation should not be considered to be a burden on the property owner, especially given that the building and over half its curtilage lies within the designated boundary meaning the current permitted development restrictions in place would not change as a result of this boundary correction. This public consultation was the first opportunity</p>
---	--------------------------------------	---	---	-------	--	---

			field that it sits within; as the southern field is not included it is not logical to include the garden situated here. This is not to say there is disagreement to the entire proposal; disagreement only extends to the inclusion of Greenlanes garden.			for comment on draft proposals. Decisions are not made without consultation and therefore informal consultation with property and land owners prior to this formal consultation was not considered to be necessary.
10	an individual / member of the public	-	Agree	Agree	-	n/a

11	an individual / member of the public	-	Strongly Agree	Agree	I was very pleased to see that you were able to make use of my photograph of the Great Barn and the Vale and White Horse on the cover of your excellent report. It was taken (with others) on 20th April 2013. The Vale District Council is welcome to use this image in the future for any of their publications. Great Coxwell village is quite unusual in that it is almost entirely built along the lines of a long North to South cul de sac. This confers enormous benefits with no through traffic, it's use as a pedestrian precinct, a safe place for children, peace and quiet. All of this results in a caring sense of community. This status has to be protected in the future against any proposals which might be made to join the south of the village by a road to the A420 highway.	Comments welcomed. It is recommended that the inside cover of the document is amended to include specific credit to Mr Rounce for the cover photo. It must be noted that conservation area designation does not prohibit development or prevent applications being made. The designation and accompanying appraisal serve to ensure where development is proposed it is informed by an understanding of an area's significance and responds appropriately.
12	statutory consultee	Historic England			Appraisal is missing a methodology and public consultation statement from the introduction.	Noted. It is recommended that the standard text from the in-house appraisals be added.
					Summary of special interest should be formatted to be more succinct using bullet points.	Noted. One paragraph would easily form a bullet point list. Other paragraphs are already summarised.

					Section 3.0 Statement of Special Interest should be re-titled 'Character Assessment of Great Coxwell'	Disagree. This section is a more detailed assessment of overall special interest. Character Assessment is at Section 6 Character Analysis. As there are not character areas is it suggested the heading is changed to character analysis or assessment of Great Coxwell to be clear it is the whole area. No action
					Spatial analysis to be included as a sub heading to section 3.0 rather than an individual section	Disagree. I do not think it detracts from the document for this section to read as a separate detailed analysis. No Action
					Further photographs and detail should be included as part of the section on important views in order to strengthen their protection.	Noted. Add fig. refs to existing images within document and supplement as needed with new images. No new text required.
					The identified NDHA's in Appendix B lack indications of significance and justifications	Disagree. The simple list of prominent features, age and character meet the requirements of HE guidance. No action
					A list of detracting buildings and spaces is also advised.	Noted. However, there are very few areas in the village which actively detract. It is not considered necessary to

						identify detracting areas at this time. No action.
					It is advised section 6.0 Character Analysis is redrafted as a new one concerning 'Character Areas' and these sub-areas should be displayed on an accompanying map.	Noted. However, given the small nature of the settlement, the differentiation between north and south is all that is required and additional subdivision would not add to the detail already presented. No action.
					The Boundary Review is lacking in sufficient explanation and justification for the proposed boundary changes.	Noted. It is recommended that the details of the additional interest of these areas as described elsewhere in the document be better consolidated into the boundary revision section.
					Further detail and an alternative format is advised for section 8.0 Management Plan.	Noted. However this section is consistent with other appraisals and identifies those elements specific to Great Coxwell. Further work on this element is not proposed. No action.
13	Statutory consultee	Natural England			No specific comments.	n/a