

Wolverley & Cookley Local List Consultation: Responses

Name and address of respondent	Respondent Comment	WFDC Officer Response
Entec UK Ltd, Canon Court, Abbey Lawn, Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury – on behalf of Worcestershire County council property Services	<i>To date a substantial amount of work has been undertaken by architects appointed by the County Council to investigate the way in which the current school buildings operate. Whilst a final decision on whether to refurbish or redevelop the existing buildings has yet to be taken, it is looking increasingly likely that certain buildings and in particular the Main School House would be very difficult to modernise. The inclusion of the buildings on the local list will add an additional level of protection to certain buildings which provide inadequate levels of accommodation to serve current and future educational needs. I am of the opinion that the existing level of protection afforded by [the Conservation Area and] relevant policy is sufficient to provide the Council with opportunities to influence proposals for the school</i>	Whilst the buildings do lie within the Conservation Area, they are also highlighted within the Conservation Area Appraisal as of being of local interest. Furthermore, no argument has been put forward to refute that the buildings in question are of local interest, and do not comply with any of the criteria. As such, it is the Officers opinion that the buildings should remain on the Local List, and be recognised as being of local interest.
Mr PJ Smith, The Elms, Drakelow Lane, Wolverley	This building is not suitable for listing for the following reasons – the original building has been extended twice since it's original design, and does not even have the appropriate fenestration for a property typical of its age, having plastic mock leaded lights of no immediate architectural interest. The Tudor Style arch in the doorway that you refer to is probably the most interesting part of the building, but unfortunately when it was built onto the Cottage the foundations were inadequate and the whole porch is gradually falling forward.	The building has been considerably altered, and on closer inspection has lost much of its original charm and character through alterations. Recommend remove from Local List.
Mrs S Withers	The future of the empty shop which has ground floor and first floor living accommodation is currently under consideration. However, now that it is no longer a post-office the post box in its current position will have a detrimental effect upon the amenities of occupiers of the	Whilst understanding and appreciating the concerns, and agree that the surround for the post-box is of no architectural or historic merit, as well

	<p>property and also upon highway safety. The post box has a painted modern brick surround which is neither particularly attractive or in particularly good condition. We are currently in discussion with Royal Mail to have the post box removed. We would hope that the post box can be retained in the village if desired by re-siting it in a safer and more convenient position to all.</p>	<p>as realising that the box is not in its original position, it is felt that the box itself is none-the-less and interesting element to the village, as well as being a relatively rare example of this date. In terms of relocation, this would not be an issue, but would like to see the box retained in the village in a more suitable location. Officers are of the opinion that the box should remain on the Local List, whilst recognising that the position of the box is likely to change.</p>
<p>DG Jones, Countryside Access Team Leader, Worcestershire County Council</p>	<p>Caunsall Bridge, which although it is a road bridge, I understand may be owned by the Canal Trust rather than the County Council. The kissing gate in Wolverley Village does not exist at the location suggested, and indeed would be unlawful if it did.</p>	<p>No response from County Council with regards to the bridge, or with regards to other bridges and highways structures. Apropos the kissing gate, having checked on site, I can confirm that the location of the kissing gate identified was not as per the consultation. Whilst the gate is still of interest, this should be looked at during any review of the Local List, and included on a Draft List for consultation at a later date. Recommend retain Caunsall Bridge on Local List, and reserve kissing gate for future addition.</p>
<p>Mrs CA Higley, Cookley Post Office, 2 Bridge Road, Cookley</p>	<p>I feel this is totally unnecessary, as the planning laws that have been in place and served us well for many years are perfectly adequate. Old buildings are usually loved and cherished by their owners and by their nature, old buildings are quite difficult to change radically. I don't think a new raft of rules and regulations costing time and money are</p>	<p>One of the principal reasons of the Local List is to encourage sympathetic design to alterations to unprotected buildings of note throughout the District, and is part of the raft of</p>

	<p>needed, just sensible planners who understand the environment and can deliver what the public need.</p>	<p>measures to ensure that quality of development, and an improved environment is at the heart of the planning system within this District. As no contradiction to the reason for looking at putting the Post Office on the Local List has been supplied, it is Officers recommendation that this building remain on the Local List.</p>
--	--	--