
■	Chapter	
1	Introduction	2
2	SWOT Analysis	3
3	Archaeology	5
4	Roofscape	6
5	Walls	7
6	Joinery	9
7	Action Plan	10

1 Introduction

1.1 This Conservation Area Management Plan for Putsborough follows on from the Conservation Area Character Appraisal for the hamlet that was adopted in May 2010.

1.2 The management plan document will act as a reference and guide for all those who make decisions which may impact on the special character of Putsborough – the Council, property owners, tenants, planners, developers, designers, and statutory undertakers and service providers.

1.3 The policy context for this management plan is set out in the Planning Acts – particularly the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

1.4 The special character of Putsborough is identified in the preceding character appraisal. It is the purpose of this document to lay down what actions will be taken in the future to safeguard and enhance that character. Part of this process is to inform and advise local residents and businesses so that they better understand how their actions can affect the historic character of the area.

1.5 It is of fundamental importance that owners and contractors recognise that their actions can, and do, have a significant impact on the character and appearance of Putsborough. Good decisions and sympathetic works do take more thought and can often cost more; but the rewards are great and will be appreciated in years to come by future generations. All actions, good and bad, form part of the legacy we leave.

2 SWOT Analysis

Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
Unspoilt and largely unaltered over the past 200 years giving the hamlet a distinctive and attractive historic character.	Isolated location with few facilities. (could be seen as a strength in that it has helped keep the hamlet 'unaltered')	Enhancement and sympathetic re-use of existing buildings, such as the stable range now in use as a laundry / ablutions facility at Manor Farm.	Increased risk of flooding in the future may lead to pressure for highways improvements at the Ford.
Rural setting in an isolated location, with relatively little through traffic.	Little scope for new development.		
Sympathetic property owners with a positive and commendable attitude towards their hamlet.			
Large proportion of listed buildings giving a high degree of control over future development and alterations to existing properties.			
Positive land management schemes, such as the replanting of an orchard and the creation of a, now mature, woodland to the south of the conservation area.			
Caravan park is successful, relatively low impact and provides			

Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
a facility in an attractive rural setting within easy reach of local visitor destinations.			

3 Archaeology

3.1 As the hamlet appears to have remained almost unchanged since the 19th-century, and possibly since its founding, the potential for the survival of medieval remains or deposits must be considered reasonably high throughout much of the modern settlement.

3.2 Where work is subject to the planning process it will be considered within the context of PPG 16 and may be subject to relevant conditions such as a period of professional quality archaeological investigation and recording.

3.3 When work not requiring consent is being carried out by private owners they should be on the look-out for features; from artifacts and wall footings to changes in colour of the earth. If anything is found people are requested to contact the Council for advice. Significant finds ought to be recorded to add to our understanding of the history of Putsborough, and even relatively small finds that could at first glance be considered insignificant can add to our understanding of the history of the settlement.

3.4 Statutory undertakers doing trench work ought to seek advice before starting and agree an archaeological watching brief where appropriate.

4 Roofscape

4.1 Slate is the dominant roof covering within the Putsborough Conservation Area, although several buildings do retain thatched roofs and these add to the variety of the roofscape within the conservation area.

4.2 Due to the relatively low density dispersed nature of the settlement, views within the area are never dominated by the built environment and as such the roofscape is a fairly low key element of the character of the conservation area.

5 Walls

5.1 The two major issues relating to walls are repointing and rendering. Strangely as the majority of the houses are at least partially constructed of cob it is rendering which is an issue, while many of the associated farm buildings are built entirely of stone and here repointing is the greater issue.

Repointing

5.2 Repointing of historic masonry is a process that needs to be carried out over the period of a building's history. The major risk this poses to historic buildings is when an ill-informed owner or contractor elects to use modern Portland cement to repoint historic masonry.

5.3 Traditional buildings were designed to be porous. The thickness of their walls ensured that the inner surface would not get wet and that when dry weather returned the wall could dry out again. As the traditional lime mortar was softer than the surrounding brick much of the evaporation of moisture occurred through the mortar joints. In this way the mortar itself was sacrificial, slowly weathering away and eventually needing to be replaced by the process of repointing.

5.4 When modern cement is used the method of moisture transfer is altered. The Portland cement is harder and impermeable and as such moisture transfer is forced to occur through the face of the brick or stone, eventually causing the decay of the masonry itself. Portland cement is also brittle and inflexible and while lime mortar will allow a degree of movement with a structure, cement will crack at the slightest movement allowing moisture to further penetrate into a building.

Rendering

5.5 Render was traditionally applied to buildings for a variety of reasons, either to cover up a poor quality building material which was visually unpleasant, or to protect a particularly porous building material against damp ingress, a particular issue with cob buildings where moisture can cause significant problems. Traditionally render was lime based, in the same way that mortars were lime based. Re-rendering a building in modern cement based renders or applying modern barrier paints can cause similar problems to repointing in modern cement mortars.

5.6 Movement within a building almost invariably leads to cracking of the brittle cement render allowing moisture to get in through the cracks, the impervious nature of the cement render will trap this moisture within the wall and force it deeper into the building causing internal damp problems. This can often cause major problems where the ends of beams and joists bedded into the wall become damp and begin to rot and decay.

5.7 Unrendered buildings should not typically be rendered for purely aesthetic reasons. Instead render should be applied only where there would be a technical advantage to doing so and when this is necessary materials must be compatible with the construction of the building. For historic buildings this invariably means the use of lime based materials.

6 Joinery

6.1 Much of the traditional and historic joinery within Putsborough survives, which is largely a reflection of the high percentage of listed buildings within the settlement.

6.2 Features such as the Jacobean door through the boundary wall surrounding Putsborough Manor are rare and fascinating survivals, which could all too easily be lost and have been lost in other places around the country. The mixture of joinery of a wide variety of dates and styles, from sash windows to side hung casements and leaded lights, provides a great deal of variety within such a small settlement.

6.3 Unless badly neglected over a long period of time, traditional joinery is rarely beyond repair. In many cases the timber used was so well sourced and seasoned that it is far more durable than any modern alternative. If repair is not possible, replica replacement is the next best thing; though replacement requires the use of primary resources and energy that makes it a less sustainable option. The use of imported hardwood from unsustainable sources ought to be avoided and uPVC has significant ecological issues associated with its production process and later disposal. The use of uPVC or 'off the shelf' joinery will not be permitted on listed buildings.

6.4 From a sustainability standpoint timber windows made from managed sources of timber are more environmentally sound than uPVC which does not decompose in landfill, cannot be effectively recycled, and produces chlorine based by-products and gases during manufacture. Timber frames in good repair are no less efficient or effective at preventing draughts and heat loss than uPVC frames.

6.5 There is no product that is maintenance free. Timber needs painting every few years, but each time the result looks fresh and new. After a hundred years or more sash cords or hinges may need renewal; this is quite easily done and gives the unit a new lease of life. When modern opening mechanisms or double glazed units breakdown the answer is replacement of the whole unit – hence the piles of uPVC windows accumulating at recycling centres in the absence of satisfactory means of disposal.

7 Action Plan

Action	Timescale	Lead Agency
Continue to monitor changes made within the conservation area under permitted development rights to ensure the character of the area is not being eroded by inappropriate alterations.	Ongoing	NDC
Use the character appraisal & management plan as material considerations in determining planning applications within and adjoining the Putsborough Conservation Area.	Ongoing	NDC