

SLINFOLD

Consultee Ref	Comment Number	How consultee responded	Nature of Response	Comment	Officer View and Recommendations
1	1	Email	Observation	The 'Legend' for the "Proposed Extension to Slinfold Conservation Area" maps shown on pages 7 & 67 refers to "Extension to include ... Barn Cottages" (plural). Please note the property is known as "Barn Cottage" (singular). The third paragraph on page 23 refers to: "the mid-nineteenth century dwellings of The Rectory and Hightrees." this should refer to either: "the mid-nineteen hundreds ..." or "the mid twentieth century ..." (see line 3 on page 24)	Noted – text to be updated.
2	2	Email	Observation	No objection to increasing size of Conservation Area to include The Old Stables and Barn Cottage.	Noted – no action
2	3	Email	Observation	The writer is particularly concerned about the protection of the special relationship between the Conservation Area and its setting in the landscape, the importance of the open rural space that it adjoins and the subsequent views (in and out of the Conservation Area) that, contribute hugely to the character of Slinfold. The importance of the recreational value associated with the network of public rights of way cannot be overstated, and one of the most popular walks (being circular) starts from Clappgate Lane and, going clockwise, ends in the churchyard.	It is recognised and agreed that the character of the Conservation Area is influenced by the landscape and development that surrounds it, particularly in a rural settlement like Slinfold. It is also agreed that the value of the public footpath and their enjoyment contribute amongst others to the appreciation of the conservation area. Noted – no action
2	4	Email	Objection	Writer objects to the development of the area north of the cricket field as being contrary to the Conservation Area leaflet.	The land north of the cricket club, has been allocated for development in the village's 'made' neighbourhood plan and is currently subject of a planning application. Whilst there is disappointment of the respondent that this is the case, the conservation area appraisal cannot disregard strategic policy documents (such as the made neighbourhood plan), which define areas for settlement expansion and

SLINFOLD

					are committed for development, in its assessment. Noted - No action
2	5	Email	Objection	Writer disagrees with the conclusion that landscape fringe 3 has a medium sensitivity to change.	The sensitivity of the landscape fringes have been evaluated following a set criteria (shown on page 58 of the draft document) and based on our Landscape Officer's professional judgement. A ranking of medium sensitivity of the landscape fringe by no means suggests that the importance of the landscape setting is being disregarded or that the landscape is suitable for development. Simply that the sensitivity of this landscape fringe, based on key characteristics present and other influences, is less susceptible than others to change. The landscape fringe 3, is considered of medium capacity because amongst other things, has a much more urbanised character with some level of intrusion and urban influence, lower levels of tranquillity owing from the proximity of the road and use as a cricket field but also views out of the conservation area are filtered through the cricket field and views in towards landmarks are filtered or curtailed by development. Noted - No action
2	6	Email	Objection	The tiny parcel of land sandwiched between Fringe 2 and Fringe 3 (Page 14, Part 1 of the Appraisal) seems to have slipped through the net.	The land in question refers to the land north of the cricket club, which has been allocated for development in the 'made' neighbourhood plan and is currently subject of a planning application. The conservation area appraisal cannot disregard strategic policy documents (such as the made

SLINFOLD

					neighbourhood plan) which define areas for settlement expansion and are committed for development in its assessment. Noted - No action
3	7	Email	Objection	In principle the writer is happy with the proposals however they do have serious concerns over another area of land which butts up to the existing conservation area (to the north of the cricket field) but which seems to have been overlooked and is now in danger of being lost forever to new high density development (currently awaiting planning permission).	The land in question refers to the land north of the cricket club, which has been allocated for development in the 'made' neighbourhood plan and is currently subject of a planning application. Whilst there is disappointment of the respondent that this is the case, the conservation area appraisal cannot disregard strategic policy documents (such as the made neighbourhood plan) which define areas for settlement expansion and are committed for development in its assessment. Noted - No action
3	8	Email	Objection	The writer agrees and endorses the comments of consultee 2 with regards to the landscape fringe 3, and the parcel of land between landscape fringe 2 and 3.	Noted - See responses to comments number 5 and 6 above.
4	9	Email	Objection	The writers agree with the comments of consultee 2 in particular relating to the inconsistencies between the statements in the Conservation Leaflet and the Parish Design Statement and in the Draft concerning the land bordering the Conservation Area between "Fringe 2" and "Fringe 3". Whilst this gap clearly bounds the Conservation Area there is no or no sufficient appraisal of its benefits and value to the Conservation Area as emphasised in the Leaflet and Design Statement and, indeed (but about other "fringes"), in the Draft for consultation.	The land in question refers to the land north of the cricket club, which has been allocated for development in the 'made' neighbourhood plan and is currently subject of a planning application. Whilst there is disappointment of the respondent that this is the case, the Conservation Area Appraisal cannot disregard strategic policy documents (such as the made neighbourhood plan) which define areas for settlement expansion and are committed for development in its assessment. Noted - No action
5	10	Email	Objection	Concern that the fields to the north of the cricket pitch are not protected.	Refer to responses above.

SLINFOLD

5	11	Email	Objection	The writer supports and endorses all the comments made by consultee 2.	Refer to responses above.
6	12	Email	Observation	Agree with content of the appraisal.	Noted – no action
6	13	Email	Objection	Suggest that the effect of the proposed development at Crosby Farm will in fact change the character of the fringe (between 2 and 3) completely and therefore impact the Conservation Area by degrading its defined edge here and removing the view North to the wider landscape.	<p>It is agreed that the proposed development at Crosby Farm will change the character of the land immediately adjacent to the conservation area in this location, however the land in question refers to land which has been allocated for development in the 'made' neighbourhood plan and currently subject of a planning application. In this regard, the conservation area appraisal cannot change the policy context of the site however it can be used to inform and guide the future development.</p> <p>Public views, from the adjacent public footpath, north towards the wider countryside will not be affected by the development as development sits south of the footpath and the existing vegetation curtails the view.</p> <p>It is however recognised and agreed that views from Lyons road (albeit outside of the conservation area) towards the Crosby Farm development and landscape beyond will be curtailed by the development.</p> <p>Noted – no action</p>
6	14	Email	Observation	People who move into the Conservation Area are often not aware of what that means, either for trees or heritage. I wonder if this could be remedied somehow?	Noted – to be considered
7	15	Email	Observation	Generally supportive with one critical exception (see below).	Noted
7	16	Email	Objection	The exception concerns all references to the fields surrounding the Conservation Area, ie the land comprising Fringe Areas 1,2 and 3,	The land north of the cricket club, has been allocated for development in the 'made' neighbourhood plan and is currently subject of a planning

SLINFOLD

				plus the land between Fringe Areas 2 and 3. In this context it appears totally inconsistent with either proper management or prudent stewardship of the Conservation Area that the land to the north of the cricket field, ie the land between Fringe Areas 2 and 3, should be allocated for development	application. Whilst there is disappointment of the respondent that this is the case, the conservation area appraisal, cannot disregard strategic policy documents (such as the made neighbourhood plan) which define areas for settlement expansion and are committed for development in its assessment. Noted - No action.
7	17	Email	Observation	It should be seriously considered, because of their special importance, that the fringe fields should be incorporated into the Conservation Area.	This consideration took place when the land in question was assessed for development by the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group and the harm to the setting of the conservation area considered to be outweighed by the benefits of the proposal, provided the forthcoming development meets parameters of Policy 8 of the Slinfold Neighbourhood Plan. Noted - No action.
8	18	Letter	Observation	There is upset within the village about the development of the field behind the cricket pavilion, which would destroy views across the field. There would be lost another beautiful village scene, adjoining the Conservation Area.	Noted – see comments above.
9	19	Email	Objection	If there was a choice the writer would not wish Old Stables to be included in the Conservation Area.	It is considered that Old Stables should be included in the Conservation Area as the building appears on the 1870/71 OS map and is connected in function and form to Old House Farm and therefore better informs the special interest of this property. Noted – No action
10	20	Email	Observation	Do not object to the principle of extending the Slinfold Conservation Area, given that the farm buildings being incorporated include historic buildings connected to an early listed	

SLINFOLD

				farmhouse and therefore better informs its special interest.	
10	21	Email	Objection	There are a number of designated and non-designated heritage assets within the Conservation Area, however, whilst the Gazetteer identifies assets that are listed or locally listed, it does not appear to capture buildings outside these categories which could be considered to positively or negatively contribute to the Conservation Area. As such it is believed that the inclusion of an analysis of non-designated 'positive' and 'negative' buildings, in addition to those that have been designated, would help better understand the quality of the built environment within the village. This would inform opportunities to improve, and build upon, the character, heritage and setting of the Conservation Area by future development, in line with the NPPF's stance in Paragraph 185 that plans should set out positive strategies to the conservation and enjoyment of the built environment through new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.	Noted –inclusion of an analysis of non-designated 'positive' and 'negative' buildings is now included in the revised draft.
10	22	Email	Objection	The Conservation Area appraisal places substantial weight on views within, into and out from the Slinfold Conservation Area which is supported by photographic examples. As identified within the appraisal on page 32 these are not comprehensive, however, and does not encompass all the views into and out of the Conservation Area that it should. The appraisal also fails to show different types of views, and how these contribute to the experience and character of the Slinfold Conservation Area. This would inform further appreciation and understanding of the Conservation Area and help inform any future decisions on	It is suggested that the text is amended to further support the views presented in the appraisal, and to justify the reasons why they were chosen. A further view is suggested for inclusion from Stane Street. This is an example of the long distance views to the Conservation Area across open fields with the importance of the wooded boundary enclosing and to some extent camouflaging the extent of built form within the Conservation Area (along its northern boundary), with the view of the church tower suggesting the presence of further buildings. This view is different to that from the Downs Link to the south where the open (Central) Fields, enable a clear understanding of the

SLINFOLD

				<p>development proposals that could provide the opportunity to positively enhance views in the surrounds to key features in the landscape and townscape in the spirit of paragraph 185 of the NPPF. The incorporation of further views will help better inform their contribution to the Conservation Area and develop a clearer understanding of how any future development in, or particularly around the Conservation Area will impact upon it or these views. It should be noted that the Planning Practice Guidance emphasises that the contribution of the setting does not depend on there being public rights of way, or the ability to otherwise access or experience that setting in Paragraph 013. As such, to develop a full understanding of the visual relationship the setting has with the Conservation Area, and the stance that settings are not fixed but evolve over time, this element of the appraisal is not considered to be satisfactory.</p>	<p>amount of built form within the Conservation Area. Suggested text to be;</p> <p>The views identified are all from public viewpoints and were specifically chosen following site visits as being representative of the visual relationship between the rural surroundings of the Conservation Area, and the importance of visual landmarks such as the church. The Appraisal by its nature is unable to highlight every view into and out of the Conservation Area. Consequently, the views chosen are considered to be representative of the experience and character of the Conservation Area. The views help to inform and appreciate the understanding of how the Conservation Area has evolved within its landscape. Paragraph 13 of Historic England's Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (second Edition) "The Setting of Heritage Assets" also indicates that although views may be identified by local planning policies and guidance, this does not mean that additional views or other elements or attributes of setting do not merit consideration.</p> <p>By necessity each view provides a pointer to the key features in the landscape and their association with the Conservation Area. These pointers may be expanded in private views that may come forward through proposed development and these would need to be addressed in a site allocation or development management context. Paragraph 013 Planning Policy Guidance – Historic Environment is clear that the contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights of way or an ability to otherwise access or experience that setting.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

SLINFOLD

					<p>Specific analysis would need to be carried out in relation to applications which would impact on the setting of the Conservation Area from areas which are not accessible from public rights of way, including considering the positive attributes development could bring to enhancing the character of the Conservation Area and where there are cumulative impacts of several developments.</p> <p>This is required as the Conservation Area Appraisal presents a general rather than site detailed understanding of the setting of the Conservation Area as it stands at a moment in time, from land that is currently accessible. Paragraph 13 of Planning Policy Guidance: Historic Environment (updated July 2019) also notes that; <i>“The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to the visual relationship between the asset and the proposed development and associated visual/physical considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part in the assessment of impacts on setting, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust, smell and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places.”</i></p> <p>Consequently although important views are not the only factors to be considered when understanding setting.</p> <p>Noted – text to be amended to include information summarised above.</p>
10	23	Email	Objection	The use of four landscape fringes which have been identified within the appraisal's assessment of the setting,	The landscape fringes have been identified through the variation in characteristics of the land immediately adjacent to the Conservation Area.

SLINFOLD

			<p>helps understanding of the relationship between the Slinfold Conservation Area and its immediate setting. However, utilising a spatial buffer does raise the question of the value of the landscape beyond it. For instance, the views enjoyed in Fringe 1 are viewed not only immediately around the Conservation Area, but from longer distance views from Stane Street. The lack of analysis beyond these views, and the views from public rights of way, removes the capability to provide better opportunities to ensure future development that enhances long distance views, and which retain the character of the setting that is highly valued. It fails to enable a full understanding of the positive and negative elements of the setting. Both should be considered in impact of the heritage asset, along with any opportunities to enhance it. Policy 2 of the emerging Horsham Local Plan 2019 – 2036, highlights Slinfold as a medium sized village with a moderate level of services, making the settlement viable and a sustainable location for residential development. As such, it is considered that to ensure compliance with Policy 35 of the emerging Horsham Local Plan 2019 – 2016 which seeks to preserve and enhance heritage assets through protecting their settings and taking reference from the local vernacular, further assessment should be undertaken of these buffers to understand how any new sustainable development can be accommodated within the village that positively enhances the heritage asset. Failure to do so could increase the risk of the Appraisal unnecessarily restricting sustainable development that would otherwise bring social, economic and environmental benefits to the village and its community infrastructure.</p>	<p>It is called a fringe because it is trying to describe the transitional area between the conservation area and the wider countryside. These are indicative and have blurred boundaries but importantly are providing guidance to what is important about the fringe and conservation area setting. It doesn't determine or undermine the value of the landscape beyond.</p> <p>Noted – no change apart from amendment to visual representation of the fringe on the landscape fringe map.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

SLINFOLD

				To be contrary to the NPPF, in particular Paragraph 186, and Local Plan policy in this regard would weaken the weight attributed to the document in planning decision making.	
11	24	Email	Observation	Extension of conservation area – there is no objection to this subject to the public consultation.	