

Ropsley Conservation Area Appraisal

Comment

Summary of representations:

Concerns were raised about the removal of No 16-18 Chapel Hill. This was formerly the village bakery until 1908, likely dating from the 1860s, set back from the road. The stone extension, built in 2000, faces Chapel Hill. The building is considered to add to the conservation area, due to its history and appearance.

Response:

The additional information we received regarding No 16-18 Chapel Hill resulted in a reconsideration of the exclusion. The building has now been added back into the Conservation Area, as a neutral feature within the streetscape.

Action:

No 16-18 Chapel Hill will be inclusion back into the Conservation Area. The boundary will be adjusted to include all of the property.

2610

Comment

Respondent: Mrs Suzanne Cordon

Summary:

I agree with all the suggestions apart from removing 16-18 Chapel Hill from the conservation area. It is noted that an extension running parallel with the road has been added to part of the property at the rear but the rest of the building is original. The extension is also in keeping with character of the village. Therefore, 16-18 Chapel Hill should be retained within the conservation area.

2613

Comment

Respondent: Mr Harry Whinney

Summary:

Regarding 18 Chapel Hill, statement 9.3.3. on the Conservation Area Appraisal document is incorrect. Formerly the village bakery until 1908, this stone-built 1860s house extends to the North away from Chapel Hill. The stone extension, built in 2000, faces Chapel Hill. As such, it brings the house to the road, reversing the argument that this house has been altered to face away, or distract from, the Conservation Area. Although planning permission for the 2000 extension granted uPVC windows & doors, [REDACTED] the front door has been replaced with a traditionally crafted timber door to reflect the heritage of the house & village.

2617

Comment

Respondent: Mrs Jane Whinney

Summary:

Re 18 Chapel hill, Ropsley. Formerly village bakery until 1908. Object to para in from SKDC letter 6.1.25 Ropsley Conservation Area 2025 'The proposed amendments....'. The houses continues to offer positive contribution to the Conservation Area. To take number 18 out of the conservation area based on the quote given above would be erroneous.

Comment

Summary of representations:

The property was originally the village blacksmith. The front doorway of the property is wider than a normal doorway which was to accommodate heavy horses in and out, this fact seemed to be confirmed when a new door was required as this had to be made to measure. On the strength of this information a stable door was made as part of keeping the character of the original use.

Response:

Further study of historic maps confirmed that No 4 Peck Hill is of historic origin. While it could not be confirmed the building was a smithy in the 19th century, the building is the last remnant of a courtyard of buildings, all other buildings have been removed in the mid to late 20th century. Albeit heavily altered, the building has some level of historic significance as part of the historic layout of the village. As such, the proposed exclusion of the building is being reversed.

Action:

No 4 Peck Hill is being added back into the CA, No 2 Peck Hill is still excluded.

2616

Comment

Respondent: Mrs Jean Doughty

Summary:

Paragraph 9.3.2. - The property was originally the village blacksmith. I was told no one was aware of this information and said that it could be of interest. The front doorway of the property is wider than a normal doorway which was to accommodate heavy horses in and out, this fact seemed to be confirmed when a new door was required as this had to be made to measure. On the strength of this information a stable door was made as part of keeping the character of the original use.

Comment

Summary of representations:

The appraisal seeks to enhance the harmonious character of the area by including additional traditional buildings and removing those that do not contribute. The recommendation includes an extension to include No 48 High Street, which is a post war, 1970s, property that does not match the style of the properties upon which the conservation area focuses. The frontage of the No 48 plot is already included, covering visuals of the high street. It is proposed that the entire plot of No 48 should not be included as the extant inclusion of frontage of the plot and associated TPO already suffices.

Response:

While No 48 is not considered as a positive unlisted feature, the plot of No 48, its landscaping within the grounds and garden contributes positively to the conservation area. The decision is based on the historic extent of the Rectory, now set to the rear of No 48. When comparing the area to historic cartographic material, especially the 1887 OS map, it became clear that the property was once part of the landscaped/designed garden of the rectory, and intertwined with No 42. The area is therefore considered to be of importance to the setting of the rectory, as well as the conservation area. It contributes positively to the conservation area, and links the rectory to the Conservation Area through its historic grounds and plot.

Action:

The proposed extension is retained. Further clarifications regarding the reasoning for its inclusion will be added to the report.

2619

Comment

Respondent: Mr Allan Marshall

Summary:

The appraisal seeks to enhance the harmonious character of the area by including additional traditional buildings and removing those that do not contribute. The recommendation includes an extension to include No 48 High Street, which is a post war, 1970s, property that does not match the style of the properties upon which the conservation area focuses. The frontage of the No 48 plot is already included, covering visuals of the high street. It is proposed that the entire plot of No 48 should not be included as the extant inclusion of frontage of the plot and associated TPO already suffices.

Comment

Summary of representations:

Hopefully the amendments won't affect the schools ability to grow + adapt to suit the future needs of children, and not be limited by being in the conservation area.

Response:

Any extension and alterations of a school fall under Class M of the General Permitted Development Order 2015, restrictions by being in the Conservation Area are focused on ensuring any extension or alterations are of similar external appearance of the principal building.

Action:

Excerpts of the restrictions to be added into the document.

2620

Comment

Respondent: Elizabeth Hicks

Summary:

Hopefully the amendments won't affect the schools ability to grow + adapt to suit the future needs of children, and not be limited by being in the conservation area.

Comment

Summary of representations:

Some confusion about which Ropsley Rectory, as there has been several in Ropsley.

Please can you confirm why these boundaries have changed and the choice of the boundary changes and confirmation of which Ropsley Rectory?

Concerned regarding potential restrictions on building a garage/carport within the conservation area.

Nos 2&4 School Lane misleadingly named, it is 2-4 School Lane, also 'Honeypot Cottage'.

Response:

To avoid confusion, we will confirm in text that the Rectory, High Street, is referred to.

Boundary changes are reflective of a re-assessment of the area, through which buildings and areas were identified to either positively contribute to or detract from the village, and thus the conservation area.

The construction of car ports and garages would fall under Class E restrictions of the General Permitted Development Order 2015.

No 2&4 School Lane will be relabelled to the correct address as provided.

Action:

Amendments to text will be undertaken to clarify the buildings referred to and adjusting the address.

2628

Comment

Respondent: Cllr Sarah Trotter

Summary:

Some confusion about which Ropsley Rectory, as there has been several in Ropsley, but the original Rectory is on the High Street, although the private bungalow on School Lane was also once lived in by the local Rector.

Please can you confirm why these boundaries have changed and the choice of the boundary changes and confirmation of which Ropsley Rectory?

Concerned regarding potential restrictions on building a garage/carport within the conservation area.

Nos 2&4 School Lane misleadingly named, it is 2-4 School Lane, also 'Honeypot Cottage'

Comment

Summary of representations:

There are concerns regarding the upkeep of trees within areas to be added to the conservation area.

Response:

Details regarding the potential limitations of works to trees can be noted within the document. It is acknowledged that any works to trees within a conservation area will require a Section 211 notice. This would not incur a fee, and a response to the notice would be provided within six weeks. The Council strives to respond as soon as possible within the six week period. In emergencies, where trees are dangerous or dead, works can be undertaken without a notice in place, however evidence and justification for these works should still be provided to the local planning authority. Useful information is provided here: <https://www.planningportal.co.uk/planning/planning-applications/consent-types/consent-under-tree-preservation-orders>

Action:

Additional information regarding works to trees will be provided in the document.

2621

Comment

Respondent: Ann Cook

Summary:

I'm concerned about limitations to the up-keep of trees.