

Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council Hadlow Conservation Areas



Comments Form

Please send completed Comments Forms by post to the address below or place in the Box at the Exhibition.

The closing date for comments is 5pm on Friday 22 October 2010.

Your Details

Name:

Tom Hutchinson BA(Hons), MA, MRTPI, Associate Planner

Organisation (if applicable):

Howard Sharn & Partners LLP

Client (if applicable):

Jason Rutherford

Address:

c/o agent

79 Great Peter Street
Westminster
London
SW1P 2EZ

Email Address:

tom@howardsharopartners.com

Telephone Number

0207 2224402

Data Protection Statement: Please note that your name, contact details and comments on the Conservation Areas Appraisal may be made available for public inspection and cannot be treated as confidential.

Do you have any comments on the content of the Hadlow Conservation Areas Appraisal?

Please include reference to the page number(s)

Continue on separate sheet if necessary

Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to the boundary of the Conservation Area (Please refer to the numbered additions and deletions) or the proposed new Conservation Area at the Freehold?

1. My client objects to the proposed new Conservation Area at the Freehold.
2. The justification for the proposed designation fails to demonstrate the area is of special architectural or historic interest. This area was not included within the original designation of the Hadlow Conservation Area in 1972, which only included the historic core of the village, centred on the High Street. There is no reason to believe that in the intervening years the special interest of the Freehold has increased relative to other parts of the village.
3. Regarding the group value of the buildings and its supposed integrity, it is obvious that the group of buildings has changed substantially over time. There were just nine families in this part of the village (which became Fairfield Road, then later known as the Freehold) recorded by the 1851 Census, but this had risen to thirty nine families by 1871. The large gable-fronted mid-nineteenth century villas are now interspersed with more modest terraced worker cottages dating from later in the nineteenth century as well as post-war stock, both with noticeably lower ridge heights and less prominent roofscapes. As a result, the group is demonstrably not of a relatively uniform age and scale, as claimed. The gaps between the buildings are not regular and the smaller units are not regularly spaced, but are instead focused at the southern end of the street, giving a lop-sided appearance to the group. The openings in the main elevations vary considerably across the various house types and some have been subject to recent porch additions. With such a random mix of historical eras, house types and architectural styles, it is difficult to understand what is meant by the “strong sense of place and identity” claimed in the statement.
4. The materials vary considerably, with windows being a mix of slate, clay tile and concrete tile and the windows being a mix of hardwood, softwood and uPVC. Even amongst the older properties the brick ranges from solid red to a multi-brick. Such a colour palette is entirely

commonplace and does not amount to any architectural interest. With regard to the claim that the buildings have many original features, it is clear that in fact they have been substantially altered. For example, as the enclosed schedule demonstrates, most windows have been replaced with uPVC, most slate roofs have been replaced with modern concrete tiles and most metal rainwater goods having been replaced with plastic. In some cases there has been substantial rebuilding in a non-matching style. There is no evidence presented that any of the buildings are important surviving examples of the Victorian era.

5. It is claimed that the architectural interest derives in part from the fact that the buildings face towards an open space. However, this is an entirely commonplace arrangement and is not architecturally significant. Furthermore, the open space does not function as public open space, but is in a patchwork of ownerships, without general access for the occupiers of the houses. Some parts of it have been fenced off scrubland, some is used as a car park and some is in private amenity/recreational use. It is described in the designation statement as a 'square' but is not laid out or managed as a traditional urban square, which would normally involve a coherent shared space for use by residents. It is a matter of public record that the open space originally functioned as allotments/garden plots for the nearby houses. Such an arrangement was commonplace in the nineteenth century and early twentieth century as growing local vegetables was a necessity for most families at that time.
6. With regard to any historic interest, the designation statement relies on the land being originally owned by members of the National Freehold Land Society. In response to this, my client advises me that the Freeholders Association and Hadlow Historical Society have never been able to put forward any credible evidence of this. In fact, during the non-statutory public inquiry regarding the failed application for a village green the government inspector noted that the Freeholders Association were unable to demonstrate any evidence to back up this claim. Moreover, in the evidence presented in 2007 by the County Divisional Director of Environment and Waste in the failed footpath application (from The Freehold to Carpenters Lane) that the Finance Act 1910 Maps and Valuer's Field Book describes the land as 'Hadlow Freehold called Haugh Field... land let in small plots to tenants as gardens to their houses'. And irrespective of the original legal arrangements, there is no sense of these having resulted in a character or appearance which ought to be conserved. Rather, the central open space is clearly of poor quality as a result of its piecemeal ownership arrangements and using Conservation Area powers to achieve its improvement is not justified.

(Please see enclosed schedule of building materials)

Continue on separate sheet if necessary

Thank you for your Comments. Please place the completed form in the Box at the Exhibition or post to:

Planning Policy
Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council
Gibson Building
Gibson Drive
Kings Hill
West Malling
Kent ME19 4LZ

Completed Forms can also be Faxed to 01732 876317

Or download the Comments Form from the Council's Website www.tmbc.gov.uk, complete the form and then email it to ldf@tmbc.gov.uk by the deadline of **5pm 22 October 2010**

18th October 2010

Architectural Conservation Survey

The Freehold Hadlow Kent

House Nr	Windows			Facade			Soffits/Facias			Gutters Ironmongery			Adaptions			Roofs		
	Original Vic Sash	Timber Other	PVC	Original Brick	Render	Other	Original Vic	Timber Other	PVC	original Vic	Other	Plastic	Original Layout	Drive	Porches extensions	original Vic slate/peg	Concrete	other
1		1		1			1					1		1			1	
2																		
3																		
4																		
5																		
6			1	1				1				1		1			1	
7			1		1			1				1		1			1	
8			1	1				1				1		1		1		
9			1	1				1				1		1			1	
10	1			1				1		1			1	1		1		
11		1		1				1				1			1		1	
12			1			1*		1				1	1		1		1	
13			1			1*		1				1		1		1		
14			1			1*		1				1		1	1		1	
15			1			1*		1				1	1				1	
16			1	1					1			1	1				1	
17			1	1				1				1	1				1	
18			1	1				1				1		1			1	
19			1	1			1			1				1		1		
20			1	1			1			1				1		1		
21		1		1				1				1	1			1		
22		1		1				1				1	1			1		
23		1		1				1				1	1			1		
24			1			1			1			1		1		1		
25		1		1				1				1		1		1		
26		1		1				1				1	1			1		
27		1		1				1				1	1			1		
28		1				1	1					1		1		1		
29			1			1			1			1		1				1
30			1	1			1					1		1			1	1
31			1	1					1			1		1			1	
32			1	1					1			1		1			1	
33			1	1					1			1	1			1		
34			1	1					1			1	1			1		
35			1	1					1			1	1			1		
PH	1											1	1			1		
85 Carpenters	1											1	1					1
total score	3			23			5			3			15			16		
Best possible score	37			37			37			37			37			37		

Score Total 65 out of a possible 222 =29% Originality

1* = Changes to lintels

1970s construction

