

Schedule of comments received - Papworth Conservation Area Appraisal public consultation

No	Consultee	Nature of comment	Officer Response	Revision to Appraisal
1	Ross Holdgate Planning & Conservation Adviser Four Counties Government Team Natural England	Our only comment relates to the discussion of Papworth Wood under section 8.2 of the appraisal document. It may be beneficial for the report to identify the status of the wood as a Site of Special Scientific Interest. This would further acknowledge the importance of the wood in the context of the local area and help raise awareness to interested parties of further conservation based controls in addition to those which arise through the conservation area status	Papworth Wood SSSI is outside but adjacent to the conservation area boundary. Identifying it in the Appraisal will have benefits.	Papworth Wood SSSI is included on the revised Conservation Area Appraisal Map.
2	Angela Smith 7 Varrier-Jones Drive, Papworth Everard	<p>Having attended yesterday evening's presentation and discussion at Papworth Library, and having discussed the issues with my husband, we wish to comment as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We support all the proposals to extend the conservation area as laid out in Papworth Conservation Area Map 6. There are many elements of the built environment here that are unique given the social history of the village and, with the high likelihood of significant new development in the foreseeable future, this is a timely opportunity to protect elements of the character of the village by strengthening the policies governing permitted development. 2. With the impending move of Papworth Hospital it is vital that any future development on any part of the site that is vacated (i.e. not just the sites of the Buildings of Local Architectural or Historic Interest marked in yellow) is fully in keeping with the scale and the character of the village of which it will be part. It is for this reason that the whole site should be included within the 	Support and other comments noted. The protection of additional trees outside the Conservation Area will be considered.	No change to the Appraisal.

		<p>Conservation Area as it will provide an element of greater control over what Developers might seek to impose. Such development could also provide a unique opportunity to try to enhance the village by encouraging the building of some high quality buildings of architectural significance.</p> <p>3. The area marked out around the row of old Papworth Trust houses on the Western side of Ermine Street as you enter the village from the South may not appear to be of high architectural significance, but the total look (and 'feel'!) of the two storey, well spaced-out houses with their sizeable gardens is so very typical of the character of 'Old Papworth', many of which have already been demolished in the rush to maximise the commercial value of the land. Including the whole row within the Conservation Area should help ensure that any future redevelopment of that part of the Ermine Street frontage will be in sympathy with what has gone before and be protected from the wilder excesses of any Developer!</p> <p>4. Whereas Church Lane defined the heart of the village in years gone by, nowadays Ermine Street is at the very heart of the village. Everyone visiting the village must pass along it. For many people the character of Ermine Street (and thereby of Papworth) is defined by the buildings that front onto it and by the vistas of the hedgerows and the trees. There are important trees marked on Map 6 that are not within the Conservation Area. Given the poor record of the local landowner it is vitally important that these trees too are afforded legal protection from being summarily felled.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

3	Fiona Goodwille	<p>I strongly support all the proposed new Conservation Areas, however I believe that there are grounds for including further areas, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I know that Papworth Wood is an SSSI, however the line between it and the grounds of Papworth Hall is a very fine one. The wood impacts on the grounds and, I would argue, is an integral part of the Hall grounds. I imagine that its inclusion in a Conservation Area would not actually increase the protection already afforded to it, but it would make a more coherent and logical area. I would also propose including the area of newer planting between Papworth Wood and Farm Road, and extending the area to the drainage ditch to the east, taking in the two balancing ponds. This valley area beyond the end of Farm Road is particularly attractive. 2. I believe that the western extension to the existing Conservation Area is inadequate in size. The valley at the end of Church Lane is an important setting for the Church, and this does not suddenly stop at the edge of the woodland/pasture areas, but naturally extends across the arable land up to the edge of the bypass. In addition, the views to and from the south side of the Church are crucially important, in particular the view from the bypass at the point where it crosses Cow Brook. I would therefore support the extension of the western Conservation Area out to the bypass on the western and southern sides. The eastern boundary of the Conservation Area should extend to the Summersfield landscaping belt, and the southern boundary to the bypass. Only a Conservation Area of this size would fully protect the setting of the Church. 3. One of the most important and striking views in Papworth - seen by everyone travelling along Ermine Street North - is the view from Ermine Street, across the 	<p>Support for the proposed expansion of the existing Conservation Area is noted.</p> <p>English Heritage's <i>Guidance on the management of conservation areas</i> (2006) deals with the inclusion of setting and wider landscapes in sections 3.15 and 3.16. The Appraisal has been developed in line with this guidance.</p> <p>The boundaries of Conservation Areas should be selectively drawn and clearly justified. Conservation Areas are normally based on groups of buildings and individual buildings, and the spaces between them, and are focused on heritage assets. Landscape protection is often best provided by other types of designation.</p> <p>The landscape settings of conservation areas can be extensive and it is generally more appropriate to include immediate settings, and important connections such as views, rather than the wider settings of the areas.</p>	<p>No change has been made to the proposed conservation area boundary.</p> <p>Designations such as the Papworth Wood SSSI and Protected Village Amenity Areas, including the PVAA for the playing field, have been added to the revised Appraisal Map.</p> <p>Further important views have been added to the Appraisal Map, particularly from the west of the Church.</p>
---	-----------------	---	--	---

		<p>playing fields, to Baron's Way. This open vista, and the Baron's Way houses - which I believe were the last to be built by the Papworth Village Settlement - are as important to Papworth and its history as are the Settlement houses on Ermine Street North and South which are included in the currently proposed extensions.</p>	<p>The designed historic parkland associated with Papworth Hall has been included in the proposed conservation area boundary. Otherwise historic landscape has been included which closely relates to the village.</p> <p>It is accepted that wider, important views of the conservation area, particularly from the west, should also be identified.</p> <p>The significance of the later Village Settlement Houses on the west side of Ermine Street south was carefully considered when deciding on the proposed Conservation Area boundary. A key reason for their inclusion is their important sponsorship plaques. There is an argument for including the Baron's Way Village Settlement Houses in the Conservation Area. However, they were built in the 1950s, later than the Ermine Street south houses, and their architectural quality and significance is not</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

			<p>considered sufficient to justify a change to the boundary.</p> <p>The playing fields are also not considered to have sufficient significance to include with the conservation area boundary. However, they do have Protected Village Amenity Area status.</p>	
4	<p>David Henry, Director, Savills on behalf of the Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust</p>	<p>The Trust fully accepts the historic significance of the Papworth Settlement and its critical role in the evolution of the village. It also recognises that its designation as a Conservation Area is appropriate through the relevant legislation and meets the criteria set out in English Heritage guidance. The Trust is, therefore, happy to accept the <i>principle</i> of the designation.</p> <p>However, in order to meet the requirements of PPS 5 <i>Planning for the Historic Environment</i>, it is important that the “nature, extent and level” of the heritage asset’s significance is fully assessed and expressed prior to designation. To this end, whilst there is much interesting and descriptive analysis of the various built and landscape elements which combine to form the Conservation Area, we do not consider that the relative merits of certain items have yet been fully explained or evaluated, so as to be helpful to future decision-making.</p> <p>For example, Map 6/Appraisal Map, which indicates a range of buildings as benefiting either from statutory or potentially ‘local’ architectural or historic merit, it is largely silent on those buildings of negative impact. In particular, the hospital site does not appear to have been comprehensively evaluated in these terms where there are, in fact, many buildings which might otherwise appear to be of negative</p>	<p>We accept that a more comprehensive assessment of the buildings on the Papworth Hospital site would be worthwhile and strengthen the Appraisal.</p> <p>A more comprehensive assessment of the buildings on the Papworth Hospital site has subsequently been carried out with the support of Papworth NHS Trust and their agents, Savills.</p>	<p>More information on the Papworth Hospital site buildings has been included in the Appraisal, particularly on the revised Appraisal Map.</p>

		<p>visual or physical impact on the core assets – for example, the Portacabin buildings. PPS 5, Policy HE9.5, explains that “not all elements of a ... Conservation Area will necessarily contribute to its significance” and we consider that the Character Appraisal should be more specific in defining these parameters.</p> <p>If Map 6, in particular, is to be adopted for use as a material consideration within planning decisions, we consider that further analysis of the hospital site still needs to be undertaken to provide more helpful and complete guidance. In our opinion, this process of evaluation should be carried out prior to designation in order to meet the full requirements of PPS 5; to assist the consultation and adoption process; and to form a robust planning tool for the future. The NHS Trust would, of course, be willing to be involved in this collaborative process.</p> <p>We note the intention to require a ‘Conservation Plan’ in the future to inform the re-development of the Papworth Hospital site and that this document would inevitably feed into a future SPD. A Conservation Plan is likely to involve significance and impact evaluation, no doubt, but we consider that the process of adopting a Conservation Area should be more explicit regarding relative significance in the first instance, particularly in the context of the relatively new PPS 5 guidance, to avoid repetition and re-appraisal at a later stage, and thus ensure a more robust document on which future stages can be firmly based.</p> <p>The Trust would therefore request that further up-front evaluation of the hospital site is undertaken in advance of the designation, preferably in collaboration with the Trust and other stakeholders.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

5	Dr Nick Noble	<p>I am writing to you to express my comments upon the proposed expansion of the Papworth conservation and would like to express my view that you have misses an important part of the village.</p> <p>I think that you should include the bluebell woods that run from Ermine Street South, along the edge of the South Park Drive to Farm Road and then along the back of the Hospital to the centre of the village. The woods that separate the industrial park form the housing development and are an important part of the character of the village. My children and family walk in these woods on a weekly basis any loss of this would be detrimental to the village character. I understand that some of the tree are protected, however, this does not seem to matter to the land owner, the Varrier Jones Trust as it has been reported that they have acted in a manner to thwart due process and have removed trees within the village against the express views of the parish council. Without the conservation area being extended this could happen to the woods thus destroying an important irreplaceable part of the village.</p> <p>I believe that by adding the woods to the conservation area and putting the boundary along the edge of eth industrial estate would safeguard this important part of the village whilst not affecting the business park in any manner.</p> <p>In Summary:</p> <p>Extend the conservation area to include the woods that run alongside the edge of the business park and around the rear of the hospital grounds.</p>	<p>The officer response to consultation comments no. 3 is relevant here. It describes the approach taken to selecting landscape for inclusion in the conservation area boundary.</p>	<p>No change to Appraisal and boundary.</p>
---	---------------	---	--	---

6	Papworth Everard Parish Council	<p>Preliminary Comments</p> <p>Papworth Everard Parish Council acknowledges the imaginative proposal to enlarge the Papworth Everard Conservation area to include, and strongly supports the inclusion of, buildings of the early village, the estate village, and the 1917 to early 1950s period.</p> <p>However, having now considered the full version of the conservation area appraisal document the Parish Council considers that the area of land included in the conservation area should be significantly expanded: a) to provide greater protection to the setting of the historic buildings and landscape identified in the appraisal document; and b) to protect the landscape and buildings of one area of the village that is greatly valued by the community and visitors to the village (Baron's Way houses, the playing field and the backdrop of woodland strips to the east of Baron's Way and north of the playing field).</p> <p>Comments on the inclusion of individual buildings and the importance of significant groups of buildings.</p> <p>As one of only two thatched buildings in the village, and the only surviving building from pre-1900 with a timber frame, the cottage at 28-30 Ermine Street South is of particular significance.</p> <p>The Parish Council strongly supports the inclusion of all the surviving Papworth Village Settlement houses on both sides of Ermine Street South. It is accepted that the buildings, viewed individually, are unprepossessing ordinary houses of the early 20th century, not dissimilar to local authority housing found in small groups in other villages. However, including the houses within the conservation area <i>en masse</i>,</p>	<p>The support for the proposed expansion of the Conservation Area is noted. The Parish Council has provided invaluable information about the history of the village, here and at other times through the development of the Appraisal.</p> <p>The officer response to consultation comments no.3 is relevant here, particularly to the Parish Council's request to include within the conservation area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ a wider landscape setting ○ the Papworth Wood SSSI ○ Baron's Way housing ○ The playing fields 	<p>No change has been made to the proposed conservation area boundary.</p> <p>The Papworth Wood SSSI and Protected Village Amenity Area designations have been added to the Appraisal Map.</p> <p>Further important views have been added to the Appraisal Map, particularly from the west of the Church.</p>
---	---------------------------------	---	--	---

		<p>many with their sponsor or dedication plaques, emphasises their importance and function as an 'institutional' development. The inclusion of all the houses allows the historic landscape to be 'read' correctly. (The larger detached houses in this group – i.e. those to the east of the main road - retain features designed to meet the perceived needs of recuperating tuberculosis patients.)</p> <p>The historic value of the Ermine Street houses and other dwellings and buildings constructed during the 'Papworth Village Settlement' period, is greatly enhanced by the existence of a large documentary record, known as the Papworth Archive and maintained by the Cambridgeshire County Archive Service.</p> <p>The Estate Office (until recently the head office of the Papworth Trust) is a building that is highly valued by both long-term and recent residents. Built around 1900, the 'mock-Tudor' façade and its location on the bend in Ermine Street South at the bottom of a hill, make this a landmark building in a prominent and dominant position in the street.</p> <p>The first Papworth Stores building (currently a carpet showroom) is an important building for which to provide protection. 'Mock-Tudor' applied wood detailing on the gable facing the street reflects that used at the Estate Office.</p> <p>Together, Papworth Hall, the Lodge at the foot of the Hall drive, the Estate Office and the first Papworth Stores building form an important group that reveals the 'Estate' period of Papworth Everard's history. It is important that all the elements are protected.</p> <p>Further north on Ermine Street, the semi-detached white-brick cottages and the 'Music School' (the second Papworth</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>Everard Primary School), which is inserted into the housing of approximately the same age, is again of the 'Estate period' and the Parish Council supports the inclusion of these buildings in the proposed conservation area.</p> <p>Understanding the ways in which the Papworth Settlement operated in order to bring about the rehabilitation of former TB patients, is of vital significance in Papworth. One way in which this was done was gradually to reintroduce former patients to work by providing employment in one of the many factories and industries in the village. Disappointingly, the only substantial building surviving from the pre-war period in Papworth is the printing factory (the foundation stone at the factory was laid by the future King Edward VIII, when Prince of Wales, in the 1930s). The Parish Council very strongly supports the retention and protection of this building.</p> <p>Some years ago the Parish Council invited the appropriate authority to consider including Papworth Hall and its parkland in an enlarged conservation area. Our Council's support for this proposal is maintained now that SCDC has included this element in an enlarged Papworth Everard Conservation Area. The importance of the area in providing an immediate setting for Papworth Hall and the Papworth Hospital is obvious and unarguable. Further, the Parish Council fully understands and supports the inclusion of the entire Papworth Hospital site within an enlarged conservation area. Not only was the area formerly part of the parkland surrounding Papworth Hall but, following the relocation of Papworth Hospital to Cambridge in c2015, it will ensure that the new design of a redeveloped site provides a sympathetic setting to the retained first-phase (1920s & 30s) of hospital buildings.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

Proposals for extending the conservation area beyond the new boundaries proposed in the Consultation document. (See plan in Annex C).

Area A – The historic landscape around Fir Tree Farm is a vital part of the setting of St Peter's Parish Church: views of the Church from the valley are as important as views from the Church across the valley. It is therefore the Parish Council's considered opinion that the boundary of the enlarged conservation area should be extended to include the area marked 'A' on the attached sketch plan.

Area B – Views to St Peter's Church from the Papworth Everard bypass (A1198) were recognised as an important benefit to the users of the road. Roadside landscaping (tree planting) has been designed in such a way as to ensure such views are not interrupted. The Parish Council believes that the extension of the conservation area into the area marked 'B' on the plan would further enhance the protection and importance of the views to the church and to this historic south-western part of Papworth Everard, where the earliest nucleated settlement was almost certainly located.

Area C – The area of Papworth Wood has been excluded from the Conservation Area because it does not contain or act as the setting for historic buildings. The Parish Council disagrees with this conclusion. A 'setting' should be considerably more extensive than the mere curtilage of historic buildings. Papworth Wood is - and was in the past - the immediate visual setting of the parkland surrounding Papworth Hall, the area on which the 1920s/30s hospital was constructed. The Wood was also an integral part of the environment and economy of the earlier estate. In addition, it can be argued that Papworth Wood is the setting for the timber family bungalows on Farm Road. On the attached

		<p>plan, the extension of the proposed conservation area is identified as 'C'. Papworth Wood, with its designation of an SSSI, already carries more protection than a conservation area status provides, however its inclusion would make a more comprehensible and logical conservation area.</p> <p>Area D – The view of the housing on Baron's Way from Ermine Street North across the wide, green expanse of the village playing fields has always been greatly valued by village residents and visitors alike. This is an iconic view which is brought readily to mind by anyone who has lived or worked in the village, who visits to play sport on the playing field, or who regularly travels on the bus route through the village. The Baron's Way houses were built by the Papworth Village Settlement in the very early 1950s, in a style reminiscent of white-painted vernacular cottages edging a village green. The views are enhanced by 'enclosure' – from the tall woodland strip behind (east of) Baron's Way and the wood at the north end of the playing field, along Wood Lane.</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire District Council recognised the value of the views and the attractiveness of the housing in by designating the east side of Ermine Street North (formerly the A1198) in the section adjacent the playing fields as a 'protected frontage'.</p> <p>Baron's Way was the last major 'general-needs' house-building project undertaken by the Papworth Village Settlement. (A large plot was made available at the south end of the row for a new Rectory, which was built by the Anglican church.) The playing fields were levelled and laid out at about the same period. (A period of 20 years of relative stagnation followed the Baron's Way development until, in the 1970s and 1980s, the Papworth Village Settlement turned to building care hostels and wardened</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>bungalows).</p> <p>The Parish Council proposes that the conservation area should encompass Baron's Way and the playing fields – including the wooded strips behind Baron's Way and the north of the playing fields (see the area labelled 'D' on the attached sketch). Not only is this an important and attractive view, but the housing was the last constructed by the Papworth Village Settlement, to fulfil the same function as the housing on Ermine Street South, though to a different design. The proposed extension is also contiguous to the northern end of the extended conservation area currently proposed in the appraisal document.</p>		
7	<p>Conrad Stephen Strategic Asset Development Manager, Strategy & Estates, Cambridgeshire County Council</p>	<p>As a manager of Cambridgeshire County Council's property assets I am concerned that by proposing to define the former 1901 school situated on the west side of Ermine St South, currently occupied by Cambridgeshire Music as a Building of Local Architectural or Historic Interest in your Consultation document, you are potentially creating a presumption against further significant alternations or indeed its demolition and replacement should this ever prove appropriate.</p> <p>Having inspected the building inside and out it is apparent that it has been much altered and extended since it was built and the alternations that have taken place have led to a loss of architectural interest/integrity.</p> <p>If the County Council is to provide energy efficient buildings that meet modern needs it is essential that it has the ability to adapt them or replace them as required. Given that the building is likely to be within the enlarged Conservation Area I would suggest that sufficient protection already exists in terms of ensuring that any replacement building or buildings</p>	<p>Despite the alterations to the 1901 school we believe that it is of local interest as part of the collection of Estate buildings, and that it makes a positive contribution to the townscape of the conservation area.</p> <p>An important function of the Appraisal is to identify buildings of local interest or significance, and their townscape contribution. This provides an upfront guide to decision-making and part of the assessment and evaluation which would anyway be required by <i>PPS 5 Planning for the Historic Environment</i> (HE 7.1) to</p>	<p>No change to the Appraisal in terms of the identification of the Cambridgeshire Music building as having local interest and making a positive townscape contribution.</p>

		<p>are an enhancement to the Conservation Area. The worry over your proposed designation is that it could create a view within the community that the building should be retained regardless of the merits relating to any proposed replacement.</p> <p>The County Council has no immediate plans for the building but one never knows what educational or other demands may arise at a future date and clearly the building as it stands has space planning drawbacks and is quite inefficient in terms thermal efficiency. If the building were listed its designation would fit comfortably in the Conservation Area but as there is no suggestion that the building is of listable quality the County Council is concerned that if you confirm the designation you propose you are potentially reducing the flexibility for alterations to the building or the site which clearly offers scope for greater use.</p>	<p>support a planning or other application affecting an undesignated heritage asset.</p> <p>When assessing a planning application, the significance and townscape contribution of the building will be considered in more detail, along with factors such as viable use, wider public benefits, and the merits of any alterations or alternative design, depending on the nature of the proposals.</p>	
8	<p>John Willis, Chief Executive, The Varrier-Jones Foundation on behalf of the Papworth Trust and Varrier-Jones Foundation</p>	<p>These comments, made jointly by the Papworth Trust and the Varrier-Jones Foundation, are submitted in response to the public consultation exercise being carried out by South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) on its proposals - (a) to extend the present Conservation Area, (b) to create a wholly new - second - such area centred on the Hall, the Hospital and lengths of Ermine Street; and (c) on the contents of a Conservation Area 'Appraisal' for both the extended existing and the new conservation area.</p> <p>The concept of Conservation Areas was introduced by the Civic Amenities Act 1967. Nowadays, the duty on local planning authorities to designate Conservation Areas, to keep them under review and to prepare conservation area appraisals is enshrined in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; the statutory definition of a conservation area as one which by virtue of its "special</p>	<p>The comments mention the approach to un-designated heritage assets introduced in PPS5. The Appraisal formally identifies heritage assets which are important to the area in line with <i>PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide</i> (14). We believe that the selection of buildings is justified by their architectural, and often historic, interest. The selection is supported by an analysis of important periods</p>	<p>The appraisal has been revised to in a number of ways.</p> <p>More information and greater clarity on the implications of local interest, and its relationship to condition and viability, are given in the revised Appraisal.</p> <p>The approach to future national listing is clarified.</p>

		<p>architectural or historic interest the character or appearanceit is desirable to preserve or enhance" remains unaltered however. The existing Conservation Area in Papworth Everard - in the vicinity of the Church - was formally designated in 1993. Ever since Papworth was identified by the local planning authorities in the late 1980s as a location where accelerated growth should be concentrated, considerable development has taken place in the village both in its centre and on its margins.</p> <p>Arguably what has now changed matters is the publication in March 2010 of PPS5 'Planning for the Historic Environment' and its companion 'Good Practice Guide'. As they themselves observe - "Nothing in the PPS changes the existing legal framework for the designation of scheduled monuments, listed buildings, conservation areas, registered parks and gardens or protected wrecks". What they do, however, is to establish the notion of 'heritage assets'. These can include assets which fall short of the necessary standards for national or statutory protection. What distinguishes "heritage assets from other components of the environment" is that heritage assets are those which hold "meaning for society over and above (their) functional utility". Thus it seems to us that 'heritage assets' can mean more or less whatever you want them to mean or to include; they will vary in nature from location to location; and hence be subjectively chosen. However that may be, we are told by the Good Practice Guide that "It is this heritage significance that justifies a degree of protection in planning decisions. The aim is to conserve these assets, for the benefit of this and future generations. This is done by supporting their maintenance and by requiring that change to them is managed in ways that sustain and where appropriate enhances their heritage significance". But this, it is counselled, "requires proactive and intelligent management".</p>	<p>and themes which gives a coherent rationale. The advantage of an upfront assessment of heritage significance, which would anyway be required with an application, is highlighted in the response to consultation comments no. 7.</p> <p>The <i>Planning Practice Guide</i> (11) notes that heritage significance justifies a degree of protection in planning decisions and (83) that the desirability of conserving heritage assets (such as local interest buildings) and the contribution their setting may make to their significance is a material consideration, but individually less of a priority than for designated assets (such as listed buildings or conservation areas) or their equivalents.</p> <p>The nature and implications of heritage significance could be better described in the document along with the relationship between designated and non-designated heritage assets.</p>	<p>Descriptions of buildings and sites outside the conservation area are revised in terms of their relevance to the setting of the area.</p> <p>A less proscriptive approach is taken in the text to the future of some buildings.</p> <p>.</p>
--	--	---	--	---

		<p>With that background, the draft appraisal has been prepared for the local planning authority by a consultant whose forté (to judge only by the way that he styles his practice) appears to be the built heritage, to which the majority of the report is devoted. The draft is acknowledged, from that perspective, as thorough, well researched and well supported by documentation. We would not seek to challenge it so far as it is an analysis of the past; although we would not necessarily agree on the weight it gives to some heritage assets. Where we do have very real difficulties with it, however, is in what little it says (or does not say) for the future, for some of its opinion on matters outside either area and in relation to certain of the individual buildings singled out by the appraisal as having local interest.</p> <p>For the future, the former (the second) Village Stores for example is noted as a building with negative interest, but - generalities apart - there is no guidance whatsoever (that we have found) on the form of what might replace it. Whilst the use to which the site might be put is set to be decided by a separate exercise, one would have expected some comment on what it is about this part of the conservation area to which regard should be had in any design. In relation to extraneous comment, observations about the form of Pendrill Court and the vacant site at Jubilee Green which "needs to be completed by planned development on its northern edge", neither of which are located in the new conservation area, are unnecessary and contribute nothing.</p> <p>In respect of individual buildings, the Good Practice Guide advises local planning authorities to be mindful that future uses need to be viable and that "The local planning authority will often need to take into account the condition of the asset in its decisions, particularly when considering viability". Thus</p>	<p>Future national listing of heritage assets is mentioned in the Appraisal (10.8) but there are no plans to put buildings forward for listing and this will be clarified in the revised Appraisal. We would involve stakeholders and the community before suggesting any buildings for listing.</p> <p>The comments say that there is insufficient direction given for new development e.g. in the case of the replacement of the second Village Stores. The Appraisal identifies the character, appearance and significance of the area and what it contains. The proposed West Central SPD will give more design direction for the potential development sites it covers.</p> <p>PPS5 stresses the importance of identifying the significance of heritage assets and a positive approach to their value and benefits (e.g. in HE7.4).</p> <p>Issues of condition, use and change of use, conversion</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>the remarks (in paragraph 9.7 for example) that "the estate office is boarded up and needs attention and to be occupied"; and in paragraph 9.17 that "Other Settlement cottages here are vacant and boarded up and need to be repaired and occupied" are wholly aspirational and of little value. They have been made with neither enquiry nor with any regard to the background nor their condition or with suggestions as to alternative and viable uses.</p> <p>In sum, therefore, the view is that the present exercise (i) falls well short of providing even the framework for a strategy for "proactive and intelligent management"; and (ii) it will give rise to unrealistic local expectations as to what is achievable, particularly in the matters of the future of individual buildings, to arresting further development in a village identified by policy as a Minor Rural Centre and in the design and control of whatever new development which may occur.</p> <p>In relation to individual buildings, the Foundation and the Trust have, we suggest, a commendable record in safeguarding buildings which are both of architectural or historic interest - whether at national or local level - and for which a beneficial use has been identified. Recent examples are the Hall, the former stables and laundry to its north and the main entrance lodge at the foot of the drive up to the Hall. There comes a point, however, where buildings have outlived the purpose for which they were built, and become beyond salvation at a reasonable cost and reflecting a future beneficial use. Included as an annex are details of those buildings which the Trust and the Foundation consider as coming within that category at present, with reasons. The draft appraisal implies the availability of grant aid towards the renovation or repair of such buildings. As we know, however, grants are discretionary and token only. Given the</p>	<p>and the wider benefits of proposals are considered at application stage. This reflects the approach taken with listed buildings when selection is based on factors that give special interest or significance and not on condition and viability, which would be considered later, particularly at application stage. The relationship between local interest, condition and viability will be clarified in the revised Appraisal.</p> <p>The revised Appraisal should discuss buildings and sites outside the conservation area in terms of the part they play in its setting.</p> <p>There should be a less proscriptive approach to the future of some buildings.</p> <p>The Council's historic buildings grants are currently still being offered. Support for maintenance can take different forms, and are not just reliant on grants.</p> <p>Conservation area</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>present state of public finances, it is not unreasonable to suppose that they will soon be a thing of the past. The appraisal should be more candid about the realistic availability of such grants. Highlighting individual buildings will not automatically guarantee them a future. Highlighting and allusions to grant aid certainly fall well short of the 'maintenance support' which the Good Practice Guide advises.</p> <p>In the matter of the design of new development, it sadly - sadly leastways so far as the authors of the appraisal are concerned - is concluded that the exercise has been undertaken too late in the piece. Having studied the appraisal in its entirety, the reader will find it difficult to cite any example of a development in the village, conceived or carried out in the last three or so decades, of which the authors approve. Again this is borne of subjectivity but the viewpoint may be advanced as an argument why there belatedly needs to be an appraisal and greater control than hitherto. However, what confidence can there be based on the flimsy guidance in the appraisal that the parties responsible - be that landowners, developers or the local planning authority itself - will improve their 'performance' in the years to come?</p> <p>Otherwise and generally, the appraisal wrongly implies that the local planning authority now has a battery of new powers to arrest anything which the local population might individually or collectively consider harmful. With the possible exception of the control of work to unprotected trees (an anomaly which the recently published alterations to the TPO regime are set to change), the authority already has the powers of control should necessity warrant their use. On that basis, the publication of the appraisal appears to us to be an overreaction; and that the energy and effort which</p>	<p>designation does give extra control over development, influences other decisions, and raises the profile of the area and its importance.</p> <p>We do not accept that the Appraisal and revised boundary are too late given the amount of change that has taken place in the village. Papworth Everard has had major change. However, many of the Estate and Village Settlement houses, for example, have not been greatly altered, largely because of their ownership by the Trust. The area has retained sufficient architectural, and particularly historic, character to merit designation.</p> <p>We do not agree that the Appraisal raises unrealistic hopes about what it can achieve.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

clearly went into it to be disproportionate to what it can realistically hope to achieve. As such, it represents a questionable application of scarce public monies.

Annexe

Former Print Works (the former printing factory depicted in the photographs on page 43) - the appraisal seems to exhibit a certain ambivalence towards this property. In paragraph 7.41 it is described as 'a utilitarian structure'; in paragraph 9.7, however, 'its saw tooth roofline gives rhythm and incidence'. For our own part, any claim to local interest cannot be based on aesthetics in our opinion but upon its historic use. Be that as it may, the appraisal needs to be realistic in accepting that the property is no longer in employment use for very good reasons; to wish otherwise is naïve. Appended is a report by Bidwells detailing the costs and practical difficulties of re-using the buildings. The property is asbestos-ridden, structurally awkward and laid out on different levels. Taken in combination, these factors mean that the building(s) are incapable of providing a satisfactory living or working environment - let alone at reasonable cost in today's market.

Fairwood (the property featured in one of the photographs on page 38 and called 'Original Cottage') - as with Farm Lane Cottages (below), Fairwood is an example of housing provided in the past for short-term use, in this case in the form of a timber frame construction. It has not been used for residential purposes within living memory, but latterly as an implements store. The property is sub-standard in today's terms: it has no running water, no electricity supply and no drainage: and has been completely gutted inside. The

		<p>property could not be brought to a state for residential reoccupation without complete rebuilding, more than likely extension and total reconfiguration of the accommodation. Consequently, as such properties are vacated, they are not re-let.</p> <p>Farm Lane Cottages (described and featured as 'surviving wooden cottages' and 'family huts' on page 39) - these timber framed dwellings are similarly substandard. The one that remains occupied (arguably unlawfully) only does so because the tenants, who enjoy security of tenure, steadfastly refuse to move. For the same reasons as for Fairwood, once that last property is vacated it will not be re-let. Inasmuch as the new Conservation Area's extent seems to us to have been 'stretched' beyond the reasonably cohesive environs of the Hospital and the Hall with the sole purpose of including the site of these cottages, it should now be redrawn to exclude them.</p> <p>Carpet Shop (called the First Village Stores by the appraisal) - this property is in the wrong place for use as a retail unit and is in very poor repair. It is only occupied because it has been made available at a sub-market rent pending its demolition. The property is incapable of repair at a reasonable cost reflecting any viable future retail or other use.</p>		
9	Peter Aveston 13 Barons Way, Papworth Everard	I was born and lived here all my life and my father came here at the later end of the First World War. I worked for 'Papworth Group' all my working life of 51 years, 32 years as a printer and the rest as a driver in the transport department. I attended the meeting in the Papworth Library in September and what I heard I thought was enough for me. As this village has a historic history I feel it should be kept from any more development. This is not only my opinion but many	Support for the Appraisal is noted.	No change to the Appraisal is required.

		<p>more of the older people that have lived here a long while feel the same because the centre is becoming more like the Oxmoor estate in Huntingdon.</p> <p>I have lived here 78 years and looking around other villages I see a need to expand these more. I think the people would be glad, maybe they would get a few shops and PO etc. You must remember nearly all these houses in Papworth were given to house people that came here with TB including my wife. Its is a crime to pull affordable houses down, they keep saying we are short of houses, all they are doing is building houses for the rich.</p> <p>I have one thing more to say. I hope you keep your word that the old head office will not be pulled down, the village hall and the stables in the middle of the old printers and the old village shop.</p>		
10	David Grech, Historic Areas Adviser, English Heritage	<p>English Heritage welcomes the preparation of up-to-date appraisals for conservation areas and I have now had the opportunity to read the document, along with the comments made by some of the other consultees, and respond as follows:</p> <p>Boundary Changes</p> <p>The appraisal makes the case for a significant enlargement of the conservation area to take in a number of buildings and land associated with the Papworth Village Settlement of the first half of the 20th Century, and which was so influential in the development of the village as it exists today. I note the Parish Council have suggested the addition of 4 further parcels of land, but the rationale for including parcels A, B and C is not clear. Conservation Areas are principally about conserving buildings and the space between buildings; the additional parcels of land suggested by the Parish Council are either agricultural land or woodland, and all lie outside the village framework. One must therefore question what is to be achieved by including these areas within an expanded</p>	<p>General support for the Appraisal and proposed boundary is noted.</p> <p>The important tree group identified on Church Lane between the two parts of the conservation area is protected by TPOs.</p> <p>We have accepted that further assessment work is needed on the Papworth Hospital site (see comments no. 4 above).</p> <p>More views of the conservation area should be included.</p>	<p>The revised Appraisal includes additional information on the buildings on the Papworth Hospital site.</p> <p>More views of the conservation area, particularly from the west of the Church, are identified.</p> <p>The meanings, implications and relationships of local interest,</p>

		<p>conservation area. It would be appropriate to record the views in to the settlement on the Appraisal Map (map 6) and the woodland might be better protected through the use of individual or area TPOs. The merits of including Parcel D will need to be assessed by SCDC.</p> <p>I also note that the Appraisal Map (map 6) identifies an important tree group on Church Lane in the gap between the original conservation area and the new area that is proposed for designation to the east. If this group of trees is important to the character and appearance of the conservation area then I suggest that it would be appropriate to include it within the boundary of an expanded conservation area. Alternatively consideration should be given to protecting the most important trees via TPOs.</p> <p>Appraisal Map (Map 6) David Henry, writing on behalf of the Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, notes that this map does not identify the negative buildings within the expanded conservation area. From my walk around the hospital site it is apparent that many (if not all) of the post war structures could be described as negative and I must agree that it would assist in the future management of the conservation area if all negative buildings (ie those where there would be a presumption in favour of demolition) are identified on the appraisal map. The presumption would then be that those that are neither positive nor negative are neutral.</p> <p>The appraisal map also identifies ‘buildings of local historic interest but overall negative interest’ and ‘buildings of local architectural/historic interest – some negative impact’. However, it is not clear what these two designations represent in respect of the future management of the enlarged conservation area. Is there a presumption in</p>	<p>The meaning and implications of local interest and townscape contribution should be clarified, including in terms of PPS 5 and the processes for developing proposals and applications.</p> <p>The positive, neutral and negative townscape contribution of buildings in the conservation area should be noted.</p> <p>One important public open space has been identified. Others were considered too small to include on the Appraisal Map. Protected Village Amenity Areas have been added to the Appraisal Map.</p> <p>Surface treatments are generally asphalt and not worth distinguishing. It was felt that street clutter and negative boundaries were more effectively identified in the text and photographs rather than on the Appraisal Map.</p>	<p>townscape contribution, condition and viability are clarified in the Appraisal, along with how they should be addressed in developing proposals and making planning applications.</p> <p>The townscape contribution of buildings in the conservation area is identified.</p> <p>An important open space is identified. Protected Village Amenity Areas have been added to the revised Appraisal Map.</p>
--	--	---	---	---

		<p>favour of demolishing those identified as being of historic interest but having an overall negative interest? If so it would be helpful to clearly state this. Again is there a presumption in favour or retaining those buildings that are identified as being of interest but having 'some negative impact'?</p> <p>It would be helpful if the map identified important open spaces (both hard and soft landscaped areas), where there is a presumption in favour of retention, and also the negative as well as the positive boundaries. Good and poor surface treatments might also be graphically captured by the map, together with any excessive street clutter. In order to incorporate all this additional information it might be preferable to re-format the map as an A3 fold-out (or double-page spread).</p> <p>Future Development Both David Henry and John Willis (writing on behalf of The Papworth Trust and The Varrier-Jones Foundation) make reference to future development. This Appraisal is an opportunity to record those buildings, spaces and trees that make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area and those buildings that are of local architectural or historic interest. Having identified these assets, future changes to them would need to be assessed in accordance with the guidance given in PPS 5. This would include the case for demolition. In my opinion it is correct for the appraisal to identify structures that are of interest, even if those structures are vacant and possibly in need of significant work to bring them back into beneficial use. I am aware that redundant agricultural buildings are frequently put forward for conversion to residential use, even though they lack all services, have no insulation and may only have an earth floor. The condition</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>of a structure is relevant, but may not preclude its adaptation and conversion for appropriate beneficial use. Therefore, while there is a presumption in favour of retaining a building identified as being of local interest in the appraisal, that would not prejudice an application for demolition that is made in accordance with the guidance set out in PPS 5 and its supporting text.</p> <p>A conservation area appraisal should not be seen as the only guidance that a local planning authority need prepare. Given the planned move of Papworth Hospital to the Addenbrooke's site, and the size and importance of this site to the character and appearance of the conservation area, it might be appropriate for the local authority to commission (possibly jointly with the Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust) a development brief for the site. The aim would be to prepare a suite of documents that would inform the future development of Papworth Everard and not to attempt to address all issues in a single document.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you would advise me on the outcome of this consultation process and provide me with a copy of the revised boundary map for our records if and when the revised boundaries are confirmed.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--