

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON THORNEY CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PLAN (October – November 2007)

- Thorney Parish Council
 1. Good guidelines for future development of the village. Pleased the document will be considered as 'material consideration'.
 2. Agree with extension of Conservation area – Abbey Fields and former allotment land and possible inclusion of Duke of Bedford cottages on English Heritage 'list'.
 3. Welcome proposed work to approaches to the village. Like more emphasis on the predominant building type being two storeys and use of a limited palette of building materials.
 4. Do not agree with 'success' of Kingsline Estate – these houses exceed two storeys (2½ - not in keeping with the village type)
 5. Salvage bank a good idea that could be carried out by Thorney Society.
 6. No mention of new development in Church Street

Response

1. Comments noted
2. Comments noted
3. It is considered that there is sufficient guidance (New Building Design, 10. Draft Management Plan) for new development in the conservation area to reflect the predominant building height appropriate to the location. The following text is recommended to be included as a third bullet point at 'New Building Design (10. Draft Management Plan)'

The palette of building materials for new buildings within the Conservation Area should be confined to:

 - *Building walls - 'white' / yellow stock clay bricks with limestone / red clay brick dressings as appropriate, to reflect the 'Thorney' tradition of building variations.*
 - *Roofs - 'Welsh' slate.*
 - *Freestanding enclosures in public view - walls in coursed limestone or 'white' / yellow stock clay brick as appropriate.*
4. Adherence to a two-storey building height throughout the village is inappropriate. Flexibility in terms of building height on sites outside the conservation area, for example Kingsline Close, is appropriate, where the grain of development is not markedly different from the 'Thorney' building height tradition. Development within the conservation area should respect the scale and massing of traditional buildings, which is generally two storeys.
5. Comment noted
6. Comment noted and text amended.

- Peterborough Civic Society

Welcome Conservation area boundary extension to include historic areas of importance in Abbey Fields and the model village allotments. Comment on reference to Article 4 Directions in section on Implications of Conservation Area status

Response

Comments noted and text amended / clarified accordingly.

- Thorney Society

Support the general principle and Management Plan. In favour of actions which can preserve and restore the Tap Room. Interested, in principle, in the development of a salvage materials bank.

Response

Comments noted and text amended accordingly

- Richard Hillier Peterborough Library

Further detail and commentary suggested to text.

Response

The appraisal has been amended to incorporate this information.

- North Level District Internal Drainage Board

Object to a number of proposed locations for new tree planting as they contravene NLDIDB bylaw No. 10 (no obstruction within 9m of the edge of the watercourse) – this includes the piped section of the drain on the south side of the old A47 from the old lay-by up to Bridge House.

Response

Comments noted. Any planting proposals will be developed and discussed with NLDIDB and Thorney Parish Council.

- Resident

1. Land to Abbey Fields covered by National Trust covenant. No objection to Conservation Area extension providing archaeological digs/ reinstatement of historic finds and possible Fens Waterways Link to Thorney not compromised.
2. While support extension to Conservation Area to include allotments many now overgrown/ unattended. Some allotments (rear 42-52 ~Wisbech Road) not worked. Would wish to retain right to develop in long term.

Response

1. Support for retaining (Abbey Field) site historic features and opportunities for future archaeological research is noted. Intentions reflect the purpose for extending the C.A. – land part of the original boundaries of the Thorney Abbey estate and remains of the medieval Abbey complex may still exist West of the Whittlesey Road.
2. The allotments are a unique and historically significant feature - physical and social - of the Thorney model village. The allotments are part of the essential character of the village. The surviving layout remains largely intact and is worthy of retention and conservation. The land is outside Thorney Village envelope (Policy H8 – Village Envelope, H13 - Housing in Open Countryside and LNE1 Development in the Countryside, Peterborough Local Plan, would apply to any development proposals). The primary purpose of the village envelope is to prevent the spread of development into the open countryside; maintain the essential character and control the growth of each settlement.

- Resident

1. Support proposals, particularly extending Con. Area to include gardens to rear of cottages. Intrinsic part of cottages. Any infilling (building) would spoil sense of space and overall look of cottages.
3. Keep road through village as open as possible. Avoid 'Eye' street works style.

4. Concerns of rented property bought on potential for residential development of allotment land to rear.
5. Salvage bank supported

Response

Comments noted

- Resident

Objection to proposed extension of Con. area to include garden / former allotment land. Not welcome any extensive restriction upon these gardens. Petition signed by owners of 15 affected properties.

Response

The allotments are a unique and historically significant feature - physical and social - of the Thorney model village. The allotments are part of the essential character of the village. The surviving layout remains largely intact and is worthy of retention and conservation. The land is outside Thorney Village envelope (Policy H8 – Village Envelope, H13 - Housing in Open Countryside and LNE1 Development in the Countryside, Peterborough Local Plan, would apply to development proposals). The primary purpose of the village envelope is to prevent the spread of development into the open countryside; maintain the essential character and control the growth of each settlement. Conservation Area controls would specifically affect the removal of trees, the erection of outbuildings over 10 cubic metres in volume, and the demolition of unlisted buildings over 115 cubic metres volume.

- Resident

1. Support proposals set out in summary leaflet.
2. New weight restriction signs to Whittlesey Road (raised from 3.5 to 7.5 tonnes) – experiencing cracking and vibration to own property, and same at other properties (The Green).
3. Higher volume of traffic using The Green. Condition of access road (The Green) is poor. Patched in black asphalt. Centre height (of road) increases – road needs to be re-laid to enhance adjacent old properties.

Response

1. Comment noted
2. Transportation issues are not tackled through the Character Appraisal, however the comments made have been passed on and will be discussed further with Highways Authority
3. Surface condition of The Green does not satisfy Highway Authority criteria for resurfacing. Agree that patching in asphalt is visually intrusive and greater control needs to be exercised over implementation of utility works. No resources available for resurfacing or reconstruction for aesthetic benefits.

- Resident

1. Existing conservation area sufficient. Gardens (rear Wisbech Road properties) are abandoned and untidy. Could be in better use – if residents choose – village needs more selective housing in keeping with the village. Difficulty for local young residents owning in village. Small low cost starter homes & large homes needed – to keep village ‘alive’ and retain services.
2. Question the necessity of retaining speed cameras.

3. Opposed to street claming and narrowing of road.

Response

1. The allotments are a unique and historically significant feature - physical and social - of the Thorney model village. The allotments are part of the essential character of the village. The surviving layout remains largely intact and is worthy of retention and conservation. The land is outside Thorney Village envelope (Policy H8 – Village Envelope, H13 - Housing in Open Countryside and LNE1 Development in the Countryside, Peterborough Local Plan, would apply to development proposals). The primary purpose of the village envelope is to prevent the spread of development into the open countryside; maintain the essential character and control the growth of each settlement.
2. Width of Wisbech Road is wide for a main village road and with less traffic there is significant opportunity for increased vehicle speed. Speed cameras help control vehicle speed.
3. Comments noted.

- Resident

Surprised that part of house and garden were within current conservation area and lower part of garden was not. Restrictive covenants in place with National Trust since 1940's. Do not believe adding lower garden will provide it with any more protection than it already has or be of any particular benefit.

Response

The land west of Whittlesey Road / Abbey Place is known to be part of the original estate boundaries of the Thorney Abbey estate and the remains of the medieval Abbey complex may still exist. Omitting the lower part of the garden would create an 'island' inside the extended conservation area and for archaeological and historical reasons and consistency, there is logic and justification for including within a Con. area extension. Conservation Area controls would specifically affect the removal of trees, the erection of outbuildings over 10 cubic metres in volume, and the demolition of unlisted buildings over 115 cubic metres volume.

- Resident

1. Open front gardens (nos. 162-176 W.R.) - some owners now planting low hedges, one with gravel parking area. erosion is affecting nature of village.
2. Agree making boundary walls important features to be retained and re-planting trees.
3. Concerned at disregard of hedges – agree that these are not a feature of the conservation area – but should consider the village as whole entity. Hedges should be protected. Plant Hawthorn, rather than proposed Beech or Yew.
4. Extension of Con. area supported.
5. More consideration should be given to street scene – road narrowing, no speed humps. Retain speed cameras.
6. Why mini-roundabout at school if road de-trunked? An intrusive feature. Remove 'give way' outside school.
7. Greater numbers of vehicle from Whittlesey – route in am period to Peterborough. Queuing getting worse at roundabout (A47) – 2 lanes on A47 merging to single lane. Reduce the two lanes to one before the roundabout.
8. Bungalow infill (south side W.R.) has no reference to Teulon style and out of keeping

Response

1. Comment noted – planting is not subject to planning or conservation area controls. Advice to owners to promote retaining open frontage character is required.

2. Comments noted
3. Benefits of hedges for nature and biodiversity agreed, but only limited amount of hedge within the conservation area and not a significant feature of character. Hedging to field boundaries and wider village benefits are noted. Use of Beech and Yew as hedge material would provide year round cover and character.
4. Comments noted
5. Comments noted
6. Discuss with Parish Council and Highways Authority.
7. Transport issues are not tackled through the Con. Area Appraisal, however the comments have been forwarded to Highway Authority.
8. Reference to no. Wisbech Road. In the context of site the design and materials are considered appropriate.

- The National Trust

Since 1944 there has been a restrictive covenant over land (west) of Abbey Place – applying to Abbey Fields. The Trust agrees that the area is significant to the history and present character and appearance of Thorney and supports additional level of protection offered by extending the Con. area.

Response

Comments noted

- Resident

Support inclusion of former allotment gardens north of Duke of Bedford cottages and Abbey Fields in Con. area.

Response

Comment noted

- Resident

1. Support proposals listed in draft management plan, particularly extension of Con. area.
2. Ownership of allotment gardens needs to be established as some previous owners of cottages have sold houses and retained allotment gardens for future building plots.

Response

1. Comments noted
2. See comments on importance of former allotments and planning policy.

- Resident

1. Support proposals.
2. No additional parking spaces provided for visitors outside Wisbech Road cottages to north.
3. Do not support extension of Con. area to conserve the allotment and gardens to rear of Wisbech Road. We do need to build more houses – need low cost housing.

Response

1. Comments noted
2. Parking lay-bys to Wisbech Road would encroach onto existing grass verge and may encourage resident parking to W.R. in preference to existing off-street parking provision at rear of properties.
3. See comments on importance of former allotments and planning policy.