

**Summary of responses to public consultation on the Draft Local Lists for  
Althorne, Cold Norton, North Fambridge, Purleigh and Stow Maries**

**Althorne**

<b>Date and source of comments</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>19/2/2019 Mr and Mrs Keeble, of The Old Forge</p>	<p>Agreed that the selected buildings meet the criteria.</p> <p>Questioned why St Croix on Summerhill was not included</p> <p>Questioned the basis of the dating of The Old Forge</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>This property was considered but discounted because of the degree of modern alteration.</p> <p>Dated by comparison with firmly-dated examples of the same type of cottage.</p>
<p>19/2/2019 Michael Siggs on behalf of the Henry Gilder Drake Almshouse Charity</p>	<p>Expressed the opinion of the almshouse charity that 'the almshouses are an asset to the village but not so much in terms of their architectural integrity but the principle of providing accommodation as a community asset for older people in the village. As such they should not be included in the Register'.</p> <p>The existing buildings contain steps which are difficult to adapt for wheelchair access. The charity is concerned that inclusion on the list may impede the opportunity to demolish and replace the existing buildings in the future.</p> <p>Stated that 'New almshouses built to modern design standards for older people would provide savings in heating costs etc. [...] There is no reason to think the architect we eventually involve on the proposed new development can't come up with designs which are equally pleasing in terms of 21st century almshouses'.</p>	<p>The entry in the draft list recognises that the buildings have architectural value in addition to their social and communal importance.</p> <p>Inclusion on the local list would not necessarily mean that the almshouses must be preserved indefinitely. It would simply mean that the buildings' significance must be taken into account in determining any planning applications. The loss of an aspect of local heritage would need to be weighed against the merits of the proposal, which may include a high-quality design and public benefits associated with more accessible and user-friendly buildings.</p> <p>I am therefore minded to maintain the recommendation to Planning and Licensing Committee that the buildings are included in the draft list, because in my judgement the buildings do meet the selection criteria. However, the planning and licensing committee may disagree with me, and decide to exclude the almshouses, on the basis of your comments which I will report to them.</p>

**APPENDIX 3**

<b>Date and source of comments</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
28/2/2019 Althorne Parish Council	Supported the inclusion of the war memorial on the list	Noted
7/3/2019 Dr Collins of Gilder Lodge	<p>Questioned how the list was compiled.</p> <p>Questioned why some older buildings in the parish have not been included</p> <p>Questioned whether inclusion on the list is optional</p> <p>Questioned whether the designation would affect development within the setting of the building.</p> <p>Questioned whether the designation would affect the ability to install solar panels</p> <p>Expressed concern about data protection issues and questioned where the list will be held</p> <p>Recommended the book <i>Crouch Valley Parishes</i> by the late Ron Fairman of Althorne as a goldmine of information on old properties in Althorne.</p>	<p>Based on surveys of the parish using the approved selection criteria</p> <p>The age of a building is an important factor in the selection process, but has to be balanced by other considerations such as architectural quality and the degree of later alteration</p> <p>A building will not be included or excluded from the local list just because the owner wants it to be, although they may make the case that it does or doesn't meet the criteria</p> <p>The NPPF advises that the significance of a heritage asset may be affected by development within its setting</p> <p>Being on the local list does not affect permitted development rights, which include the right to install solar panels on an independent dwelling house without the need for permission.</p> <p>The local list will be a public document and will be available on the Council's website. The Council's data protection specialist advises that this does not conflict with the GDPR. Data protection relates to a person's personal data and does not apply to buildings.</p> <p>Noted</p>

## APPENDIX 3

Date and source of comments	Summary of comments	Response
11/3/2019 Ian Drinkwater, of The Vicarage	<p>Questioned whether the list is a new concept.</p> <p>Questioned how and when it is envisaged this document being used as a reference point.</p> <p>Questioned where and how the information will be held.</p> <p>Questioned how historical information will be substantiated in terms of sources and referencing.</p> <p>Questioned whether the list considers trees and hedges as assets.</p>	<p>In 2012 Maldon District Council's (MDC's) Planning and Licensing Committee adopted criteria for identification of buildings worthy of local listing. A provisional list of 26 buildings was formally adopted at that stage.</p> <p>When planning applications are submitted which affect a locally listed building or its setting.</p> <p>A document similar to the draft local list will be publicly available via the MDC website.</p> <p>I have tried to reference sources where they exist. I have now incorporated reference to Ron Fairman's book in support of the dating of the Vicarage.</p> <p>The local list only concerns buildings.</p>

### Cold Norton

Date and source of comments	Summary of comments	Response
9/3/2019 Revd. Canon Sandra Manley	Stated that the Parochial Church Council for St Stephen's, Cold Norton was pleased for the church to be included on the list, on the understanding that planning regulations will not be changed.	Noted.
10/3/2019 Maria Dyer, Clerk to Cold Norton Parish Council	<p>Commented that the parish council has no objections to the draft list.</p> <p>Questioned why Norton Hall and its stables are not included on the list.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Norton Hall is grade II listed and the stables are protected since they fall within the curtilage of Norton Hall</p>

## North Fambridge

Date and source of comments	Summary of comments	Response
10/2/2019 Richard Edwards, no address provided	Pointed out that the village church is located on Church Road and not The Avenue as stated in the draft document.	Document corrected accordingly.
14/2/2019 Paul Boyce of Hallwood Cottage	Provided some more recent photographs showing new windows.	Photographs incorporated.
19/2/2019 Sandra Nunn, Chair of North Fambridge Parish Council	<p>Questioned why the Ferry Boat Inn is not included.</p> <p>Holy Trinity Church is believed to date from 11th or 12th century. There are entries at the Public Record Office (R283-025, R285-025,D/P206/1) that confirm that there was a church on the site on or before 1296. The stone church was clad in brickwork in the 17th or 18th century and restored in 1889.</p>	<p>The Ferry Boat Inn is a grade II listed building.</p> <p>Thank you very much for the documentary reference. Although there was evidently a medieval church on this site, this appears to have been completely replaced. In 1768 Philip Morant described the church as 'new-built with brick and tyled'.</p> <p>Is there any evidence that the existing 18th century brick walls enclosed the stone walls of an earlier church? If this was the case, I would expect the walls to be much thicker than they appear to be.</p>
9/3/2019 Revd. Canon Sandra Manley	Stated that the Parochial Church Council for Holy Trinity, North Fambridge, was pleased for the church to be included on the list, on the understanding that planning regulations will not be changed.	Noted.

## Purleigh

Date and source of comments	Summary of comments	Response
11/2/2019 Christine Cook of Greenvale Cottage	Provided a more up-to-date photograph of the property, following recent renovation.'	Thank you.
13/2/2019 Lucy Winward on behalf of New Hall Vineyards	Stated: 'The Partners would like to decline the invitation to feature on this Local List, but thank you for your invitation'.	It is proposed to include the building on the local list due to its local architectural and historic interest.

## APPENDIX 3

Date and source of comments	Summary of comments	Response
16/3/2019 Jane Potter, Clerk to Purleigh Parish Council	Expressed the Parish Council's thanks for the 'initiative and hard work in producing this valuable and informative document, which if adopted by the Local Planning Authority as a material consideration in the planning process can only, it appears have a beneficial effect on future development in the parish'.	Noted.
15/2/2019 Alex Macfadzean	Commented that the draft list is very interesting and offered to provide additional historical information.	Noted.

### Stow Maries

Date and source of comments	Summary of comments	Response
7/2/2019 Kym Marshall, no address provided	Suggested that The Old Vicarage and associated Coach House ought to be included on the list/	This building is actually on the statutory list of buildings of special architectural and historic interest, at grade II.
7/2/2019 Simon Hollington of Great Hayes	<p>Pointed out that there is an existing planning permission for B1 – B8 on the farm buildings at Great Hayes, due to be implemented soon.</p> <p>Acknowledged that Great Hayes Farm Buildings are of interest but suggested that as they are in the process of being re-developed it is inappropriate for them to be included on the list.</p> <p>Also suggested that 'the same applies to Morris Farm', which also belongs to the family.</p>	<p>In light of the impending works to the farm buildings it is recommended that this building is omitted from the list, with the option reviewing the eligibility of the building following the work.</p> <p>Re-evaluated this building and concluded that it lacks sufficient architectural interest.</p>
25/2/2019 Pat Stratton on behalf of the Smythe Hall Management Committee	<p>The Committee agreed that Smythe Hall meets the selection criteria.</p> <p>A more recent photograph of the hall was submitted, illustrating the results of recent refurbishment.</p>	Noted and thank you.

**APPENDIX 3**

<b>Date and source of comments</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>7/3/2019 Mr and Mrs Vickery of All Saints</p>	<p>Objected to inclusion of All Saints on the list.</p> <p>Stated that they are unhappy that photographs were taken and published of their property without their consent. Concerned that a decision was taken to include their property on the draft list without consulting them.</p> <p>Upset that the consultation letter was not addressed to them by name.</p> <p>Concerned about the restrictions the designation will impose, and how these might affect the saleability of the property in the future.</p> <p>Argued that the building does not possess architectural or historic interest, unlike the Prince of Wales PH which is absent from the list. All Saints has undergone 'extensive refurbishment' over the years and is 'nothing like its former self'.</p>	<p>Apologised for lack of earlier consultation, and for the distress this has caused.</p> <p>The Prince of Wales Public House is a grade II listed building, so it is not eligible for local listing.</p> <p>Taken on board your comments about the degree to which the building has been altered. Having reviewed the situation and carefully re-considered the merits of building in relation to the criteria, it is accepted that actually the building falls short of the selection criteria.</p>