Woodward, Amy

From: Joshua Mellor
Sent: 20 October 2022 10:29
To: Claire Turner
Cc: Eddy Stratford; [redacted]; Woodward, Amy
Subject: WD/2022/1637/MEA - Downlands Farm - Conservation Officer comments

Morning Claire,

We have reviewed the Conservation Officer's comments in respect of the impact of the scheme on several heritage assets, as well as the request for additional information/clarification. Given the breadth of the comments, it would be useful to arrange a meeting to discuss the identified heritage issues and the way forward in terms of the approach to addressing the concerns. We have set out below some of the issues which we require clarity on in order to be able to move forward with a response or additional information. Please can you liaise with the Conservation Officer on this?

- Para 6 mentions Chicory Cottage, '*which has the potential to be considered a non-designated heritage (if not curtilage listed)*'. However, Chicory Cottage is not identified by WDC as a non-designated heritage asset and clearly it does not qualify to be curtilage listed in respect of any other listed building. Can WDC confirm their position on this?
- Para 6 (and 10) mentions '*further unlisted historic buildings at Downlands Farm Cottages… which may also have the potential to be considered non-designated heritage* assets' can WDC confirm a clear position on this as currently they are not identified in policy as such. None of the buildings at Downlands Cottages (former Bridge Farm) align with the location of buildings on historic mapping, and the current dwellings all appear modern. Therefore no further assessment is considered appropriate in this context.
- Paragraph 9 identifies reservations that the AHA is not '*rigourous enough to support its conclusions'* with refence to 'the former Downlands Farm group'. We would be grateful for some clarification as to what is perceived to be lacking in this respect. Para 10 mentions the evolution of these building in the 20th century, although it is considered that that is addressed in a proportionate way in the assessment given that the buildings are not located in the site.
- Paragraph 10 mentions Downlands Farm and the lack of analysis in the AHA in respect to Bridge Farm (Downlands Cottages), Downlands House and Gormanston. Bridge Farm is addressed in the point above. For Downlands House, this is not in the site and neither is there considered to be any potential for the development proposals to change its relationship with the buildings at Downlands Farm. We do not consider that further assessment is warranted. Gormanston is not identified by WDC as a heritage asset. It is a mid-20th century house and therefore no assessment is considered necessary.
- Paras 10 and 13 refer to Buckwood Grange (the conservation officer identifies it as a GII* listed building; it is however GII). A minor point, but the WDC scoping response (18.11.20) did not identify this asset as relevant to the assessment of the site, but nonetheless a proportionate assessment was provided in the assessment accompanying the application. The AHA acknowledges that the farmland and woodland in the site has an association through historic ownership, as does most of the surrounding land, but the findings of the assessment are that the site forms no part of the surroundings in which this asset is experienced. We would be grateful if the Conservation Officer can provide any information they have that enhances our understanding further. With respect to Lake Wood, again, this is not identified as a heritage asset by WDC and neither would the proposals affect this area or any contribution it makes to the setting of Buckwood Grange.
- We would like to understand further the Conservation Officer's comments in paragraph 11, as we contend that the AHA fully accords with GPA3 guidance and the definition of the setting of heritage assets in the NPPF.
- Para 12 addresses concerns over the illustrated layouts. It may be helpful to undertake further discussion here, although the outline nature of the application for this part of the site must be acknowledged and therefore any design concerns might be better addressed at a detailed stage.

- Para 13 also addresses the proposals for the curtilage of Chicory Cottage, we think it would be of value to discuss the rational for the design of the proposals here, so officers are aware of the drivers for the inevitable demolition of Chicory Cottage.

Kind Regards

Joshua Mellor
Planning Associate Director

Direct: [redacted]
Mobile: [redacted]

bartonwillmore.co.uk
26 Kings Hill Avenue, Kings Hill, West Malling, Kent, ME19 4AE

Consider the environment, do you really need to print this email?

The information contained in this email (and any attachments) is confidential and may be privileged. It may only be read, copied and used only by the addressee. Barton Willmore, now Stantec, accepts no liability for any subsequent alterations or additions incorporated by the addressee or a third party to the body text of this email or any attachments. We accept no responsibility for staff non-compliance with our IT Acceptable Use Policy.