Forward Planning and Transportation
Salisbury District Council, Planning Office,
Salisbury, Wiltshire SP1 3AH

contact: Elaine Milton
direct line**:** 01722 434313
email**:** emilton@salisbury.gov.uk
web: www.salisbury.gov.uk

Report

Report subject:	Broad Chalke, Dinton, Hindon and Tisbury Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans
Report to:	Western Area Committee
Date:	19 February 2009
Author:	Elaine Milton

CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISALS AND MANAGEMENT PLANS FOR BROAD CHALKE, DINTON, HINDON, AND TISBURY

Report Summary

This report sets out the background to the task of carrying out conservation area appraisals and management plans by the conservation team, the process that has been undertaken, and presents the final draft of the Broad Chalke, Dinton, Hindon and Tisbury Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans with a request that the Western Area Committee support a recommendation to Cabinet to approve the documents.

Background to the Appraisals and Management Plans

There are 70 conservation areas in Salisbury District covering historic settlements and small villages. A conservation area is described in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as “an area of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance”.

Conservation areas are designated by the local authority and designation is the recognition of an area’s special qualities, which the council intends to safeguard as an important part of the district’s heritage. It is the accumulation of an area’s positive architectural or historic attributes, rather than the quality of its individual buildings, which makes it worthy of conservation area status. The attributes might include: the landscape setting of the area; the grouping of traditional buildings and the resultant spaces and sense of enclosure; the scale, design, type and materials of the buildings; historic boundaries; public realm; landmarks, views and vistas; and the present and former pattern of activities or land uses.

Conservation area designation allows for strengthened planning controls, gives protection to trees, and provides control over the demolition of unlisted buildings.

Planning Policy Context

The local planning authority is required by the legislation to periodically review their existing conservation areas. An appraisal of each area is therefore required in order to identify the particular attributes that make each conservation area special. Guidance is provided to the local authority in carrying out this task in the English Heritage publication *Guidance on Conservation Area Appraisals* and its companion document *Guidance on the Management of Conservation Areas*, both published in August 2005.

There is also guidance from central government in *Planning Policy Guidance Note 15: Planning and the Historic Environment (1994)*, which advises that the local authority should formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of its conservation areas. This is achieved by producing management plans for each conservation area.

Salisbury District Council has encapsulated the broad principles of the government guidance in its existing local plan policies (policies CN8-CN17). This will shortly be reviewed as the council starts to produce new policies through the local development framework. Planning applications that affect the character of the conservation area should be considered on their individual merits, in the light of the Local Plan policies, and taking into account all other material considerations. The appraisals and management plans are used to guide and inform the decision-making process.

Conservation area appraisals and management plans and are seen as the first steps in a dynamic process, the aim of which is to seek the preservation and enhancement of the character and appearance of conservation areas and to provide a basis for making decisions about their future management.

Purpose and Scope of the Documents

Each appraisal and management plan aims to:

- Identify those elements of the conservation area which contribute to its character;
- Identify elements which detract from the character;
- Propose measures to maintain or improve the positive character, local distinctiveness and sense of place of the conservation area.

So far Salisbury District has no published appraisal or management plans. The first batch of nine conservation area appraisals and management plans are currently being presented to the relevant area committees.

The process that has been undertaken in producing these final documents is outlined later in the report. It has been a lengthy process of preparation, consultation and redrafting. Whilst the draft documents have carried some weight to date to assist with the determination of planning applications and for use in appeals, it is hoped that the reports will obtain the committee's approval, and enable them to become a material consideration as part of the planning process.

Methodology and Public Consultation

Conservation consultants were employed by the council to produce draft conservation area appraisal and management plans, and began carrying out surveys of twelve conservation areas across the district from September 2005 onwards. The survey work was carried out in accordance with the guidance mentioned above. The draft documents, once presented by the consultants, were reformatted and illustrated in-house in preparation for public consultation.

It is central government advice that conservation area appraisals and management plans should form part of the evidence base of the Local Development Framework, therefore, the consultation exercise followed the procedure for evidence base as set out in the approved Statement of Community Involvement.

The first stage of the public consultation exercise, involving four conservation area appraisals and management plans (Amesbury, Dinton, Steeple Langford and Hindon), was undertaken in July/August 2007, and ran for six weeks. Letters and cds, containing copies of the documents were sent to a number of people, including the chair and vice chair of the area committee, ward members, portfolio and deputy portfolio holder, parish and town councils, and local organisations. Copies of the documents were placed on the council's website. An advert was placed in the Salisbury Journal and site notices were displayed in the conservation areas. A presentation was made to the parish and town councils, and exhibition panels were produced.

A second consultation exercise was carried out in February 2008 for a further five conservation area appraisals and management plans (Broad Chalke, Wylye, Durrington, Tisbury and Downton).

Following the main consultation exercise, a further consultation was carried out directly with owners/occupiers affected by the proposed changes to the boundaries of the conservation areas. This process, which has involved further amendments to the boundaries, finished on 25 September 2008.

A summary of the responses received for the consultation on the four Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans being presented can be found in Appendix 5. Officers examined all of the responses received in conjunction with the consultants, and amended the document as necessary. The tables in Appendix 5 show the actions that were taken to address the issues that were raised.

The Completed Documents

Nine conservation area appraisals and management plans have been through the consultation process and have been produced in a finished format. Each document contains an executive summary at the beginning. The first part of the document contains the appraisal, which attempts to explain the character of the conservation area, and identifies such things as the architectural qualities of the buildings, prevalent local materials, the importance of open spaces and views, as well as the negative elements that exist.

The second part of the document contains the management plan, and this identifies such things as buildings at risk, proposals for enhancement, and suggested changes to the boundaries of the conservation areas (NB. Most of the conservation areas were designated more than 20 years ago, and it was necessary to propose changes to the boundaries to take account of the changes that had taken place over the intervening period).

Summary of Recommendations for Broad Chalke Conservation Area

The summary of recommendations arising out of the Broad Chalke Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan includes:

- Amendments to the boundary of the conservation area to remove areas in New Town and Howgare Road and to include the outbuildings at Gurston Manor;
- The identification of buildings at risk;
- The highlighting of trees that should be considered for tree preservation orders;
- Suggestions for the improvement of the public realm.

Summary of Recommendations for Dinton Conservation Area

The summary of recommendations arising out of the Dinton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan includes:

- Amendments to the boundary of the conservation area to remove the parkland to Philipps House, late 20th century development adjacent to Snowhill Cottage, and to include Kiln Mead and Wright's Manor;
- The highlighting of a number of unlisted buildings of local importance;
- Proposals for the improvement of the space in front of the Post Office;
- The highlighting of the need for traffic calming and improvements for pedestrians at key junctions.

Summary of Recommendations for Hindon Conservation Area

The summary of recommendations arising out of the Hindon Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan includes:

- Amendments to the boundary of the conservation area including proposals to add the cottages in the Dene;
- The potential for enhancement of the former garage site on School Lane;
- Suggestions for the improvement of the public realm and traffic management inn the High Street, B3089 and Angel Lane.

Summary of Recommendations for Tisbury Conservation Area

The summary of recommendations arising out of the Tisbury Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan includes:

- Amendments to the boundary of the conservation area;
- The identification of buildings at risk;
- The suggestion that better management of the floodplains could result in an enhancement of the conservation area;
- Suggestions for the improvement of the public realm, including the areas around The Square, The Cross and the potential traffic claming in Hindon Lane.

Article 4 Directions

The management plans also include proposals for Article 4 Directions, i.e. the removal of certain householders' permitted development rights. At present, there are a number of alterations that householders can make to their properties without the need for planning permission, even in conservation areas, for example replacement windows. The character of conservation areas can be completely eroded by piecemeal, uncontrolled changes to domestic properties. Each conservation area has been assessed to determine what the potential threats are, and whether the conservation area would benefit from such alterations being controlled.

It should be noted that the proposals for Article 4 Directions must undergo a separate, legally-prescribed consultation with individual landowners, which needs to take place within a six-month period. Due to current resource issues and changes brought about by local government reform, it is not being proposed to take this part of the document forward at present.

Recommendation

That the Broad Chalke, Dinton, Hindon and Tisbury Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans be presented to Cabinet with a recommendation to approve the documents, including the proposed boundary changes to the conservation areas.

Background Papers:

None.

Appendices:

Appendix 1: Broad Chalke Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan
Appendix 2: Dinton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan
Appendix 3: Hindon Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan
Appendix 4: Tisbury Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan
Appendix 5:Tables showing consultation responses

Implications:

- **Financial:** There are no financial implications in respect of this report. All the work has been completed, and the costs already contained within existing budgets.
- **Legal:** A further report would need to be brought before committee and cabinet in respect of the Article 4 directions which have their own statutory procedures (and human rights implications).
- **Human Rights:** Consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the Council's own consultation procedures.
- **Personnel:** N/A.
- **Community Safety:** N/A.
- **Environmental implications:** N/A.
- **Council's Core Values:** Being environmentally conscientious.
- **Wards Affected:** Broad Chalke, Dinton, Hindon, Tisbury.

Broad Chalke Consultation Responses

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
Helena Cave-Penney, Archaeologist, WCC	1	No comments.	N/A	N/A
Judith Howles DC Team Leader Salisbury Planning	2			
Capt. O'Reilly	3	Unsure of the impact of boundary changes		
	4	Questions justification of expense of producing document	Periodical review is required by the P(LBCA)Act 1990	N/A
Michael Seymour	5	Concerned about removal of Church Bottom from CA – wants open farmland between Rest Harrow & Church Bottom preserved – allows important view from Church & war memorial through to the downs, and also views into the village when approached from the south.		The natural boundary is the roadside and the housing to the south is not related to the settlement core.
David Foster	5	Concern that removal of Church Bottom fails to conserve most scenic vista within the village – could result in significant damage to village.		
	6	Trees are extremely important in Howgare Rd & Church Bottom and CA should be enlarged to include these.		The trees are important to the setting but are not threatened.
Diana Barber	5	Concerned about removal of Church Bottom and that this will lead to housing plans and loss of trees.		
Dominic Hall	5	Concerned about removal of Church Bottom and increased threat of future development and loss of views.		
Mr & Mrs Lofts	7	Concerned about removal of Vikings Corner, specifically Mead House, as there are important views across to the church from here.		The views are across the water meadows which are undevelopable.
JDD Burrough	8	P3 Settlement Plan, Bow Lane should be Low Lane.	Noted	

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
	9	P10 figs 9 & 10 are not Newtown but repeats of figs 3 & 4	Noted, will correct	Replace with correct photos
	10	Concern that the water meadow south of Penny Cottage is excluded from CA as this is important archaeological feature.	Noted but the county archaeologist is not concerned and there is no potential for development on this land due to Env Agency restrictions.	
	11	P28 improvements to green – narrowing the road would be impractical as is one of a very few passing places for the large lorries which traverse the village. A tree planting would spoil setting of the green and views of several cottages would be ruined.	Agree re the road but not the tree. Any action from the mgmt plan would be subject to further consultation.	
Broad Chalke Parish Council	12	The proposed removal of large areas on [the CA's] edge was viewed very negatively by all members of the PC.	Noted	
	5	Church Bottom needs to remain in the CA to preserve the views. Note that the view isn't marked on the views map. (Strongly object to removal)	The views are identified in the appraisal and sufficient controls exist to preserve it.	
	7	Strongly object to removal of eastern approach and its impact on the setting of the CA.	Seems to have been misunderstood.	
	9	P10 photos are wrong	Noted	Amended document
	13	Temporary classrooms have been removed.	Noted	Amended document
	14	Chalk Pyt bungalow no longer exists (fig 43 p25)	Permission for partial demo granted under S/2006/1372	Unauthorised demolition. Amended document.
	15	Several buildings in Appendix 3 already have upvc replacement windows	Noted, will need to check before pursuing Art 4 directions	
Judy Howles (DC)	16	Broadchalke [sic] is a spring line village which governs its location, settlement pattern and watercress beds, but this isn't mentioned – should be at start of part 2 as this is what makes it special. See sheet for more info.		

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
	17	Only one terrace (Wilton estate type) at Newtown, the rest are semis.		Amended text.
	18	Defends the white building at Pelham Court as converted industrial.	Maybe, but this doesn't improve its contribution to the CA	
	19	Doesn't think that Butlers Yard or Pelham Court are negative	Noted	
	20	Criticises the comments about the wall at Kings Old Rectory as there were some complaints about it when built	Disagree	
	21	The appraisal is quite subjective and should be more positive in approach to the negative elements		
	22	Concerns about proposals for new development in a CAA, surely this isn't the right document and could provide false hopes.	…and presumably false fears too!	
	23	The section on new buildings could be omitted as is covered by Creating Places	Disagree as CP is not site or CA specific enough	
	24	Not enough about landscape setting and how to conserve it. CA includes lots of open land and this merits more attention.		
	25	Art 4s – would widen the CA to include all of Newtown to include the new houses at Manor Fm Close.	Doesn't follow in the spirit of CA designation.	
	26	Specific mention should be made of Dove's Meadow on the Art 4s as some original windows & porches remain. These are well detailed rural council houses (except the brick).	Disagree (strongly)	
AONB		Settlement plan describes evolution but not the current situation	Disagree, the character areas and maps cover this.	None
		There are areas within the CA which are not described within the character areas.	The areas which aren't specifically described had less clearly identifiable unique character but were still worthy of inclusion within the CA.	None

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
		Plan with photo locations would be helpful	Would be too onerous to produce and the photos are now annotated and placed adjacent to relevant text.	None
		Plan with names of buildings mentioned in text would be helpful	A map with this info couldn't be reproduced legibly at A4.	None.
		Townscape map doesn't show open/green spaces	It does clearly show green landscape elements, important trees and tree cover.	None
		The term 'planned landscape' to the south of Howgare Rd is confusing as it implies planned parkland.	Consider that the text makes it clear enough on p22.	None
		The HLC indicates the fields to s of Howgare Rd are intimately related to the settlement and are of pre-1800 in origin, could be argument for extending CA rather than reducing.	Disagree as this is undeveloped farmland and is a landscape rather than CA matter. The impact of new development affecting views into and out of CAs is always considered.	None
		Character areas map shows large areas not covered, and areas overlap.	The map shows approximate area 'blobs' rather than defined boundaries. This is standard practice in CAAs and doesn't pose problems of interpretation – a corner building, for instance, forms part of more than one streetscene.	None
		Chalk Pyt Farm area isn't described	The farm is separated from the village core and is entirely self-contained – there are no other properties nearby and so its character is clearly visible on the site and needs little description for the purposes of this document.	None

Dinton Consultation Responses

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
Parker	1	That the *whole* of Dinton should be a Conservation Area	Not put forward an argument for inclusion of whole.	No action proposed as do not consider it appropriate or justified.
David Richards	2	Very supportive.		
	3	Retain Philipps House and Dinton Park in CA	No justification of why it should be retained.	Discussed in detail. Still proposing to exclude Park and House on basis that it is protected by its listing status and status of Park; that there is no visual link with village; that the village developed independently of the House and that the current CA boundary oddly doesn't take in all of the Park and is presently arbitrary in its designation. This would need to be amended and considered inconsistent to extend boundary to include whole of park.
	4	Suggests extension of CA boundary to	Based on the school being good example of the work	Amend text with reference to Butterfield and amend boundary of CA to include school.

		include school and milestone.	of nineteenth century architect William Butterfield.	Milestone already listed and therefore protected. No action at present.
	5	Creation of a separate CA around Manor Farm and East End Farm and the Chapel.	For future consideration by Salisbury District Council when reviewing potential new CAs.	
Justin Fry	6	Archaeological Potential. Feels map suggests this is exhaustive but does not include Manor Farm/East Farm (medieval).	Comment required to confirm the status of the maps and that they relate only to archaeological potential within the CA.	Amend text
	7	Pg5 use of term "the triangular green" misleading. Area known as "The Green" is the area in front of the post office.	Justified comment that needs serious consideration.	Amend text and use 'triangular island' for land near to church.
	8	Pg7 picking up on comments that all Snow Hill properties make a positive contribution to the CA. Says at least 5 are modern and at best have a 'neutral' impact.	Consider rewording this section.	Change text to "the majority of buildings….."
	9	Pg8 "unfortunate alterations to windows and doors". Suggests rewording to say 'non-uniform'.	Change discussed but felt that amending as suggested would not convey the key message intended in the text	No Action proposed.
	10	Pg11. "Cricket pavilion" should read "sports pavilion".	Accepted	Amend text.
	11	Pgs 11-12. Statement that key unlisted buildings are evenly distributed throughout CA at odds with townscape map. Tend to be in Northwest of village.	Noted. Map is incorrect - revised map shows the distribution described	Revise map.

	12	Thinks Dinton Stores, Our Lady of Pity and thatched stables should be included as key unlisted buildings. Reconsider inclusion of St Mary's Close in section relating to key unlisted buildings.	Noted. Map is incorrect - Should show these buildings as making a positive contribution Inclusion in this section has been re-considered	Revise map.
	13	Pg16. Comments about visual relationship between village and Philipps House.	Agree that there is no direct visual link hence proposal to exclude Park	Move text to 'views and vistas' section to better explain the importance of the enclosure function of the terrace.
	14	Pg17. Re conclusion. Have been more than 2-3 new dwellings built as infill Most significant infill was executive-style housing known as Lovegrove Acre.	Accepted	No action proposed.
	15	Boundary Revisions. Doesn't understand why 4 houses are proposed for removing whilst retaining other modern properties.		Agree and amend text – suggest "There have been a number of…"
	16	Concerned about roadside outhouse in Snowhill being left outside CA as result of boundary change. Traffic management/street improvements. Need to discourage speeding but get rid of barriers.	Considered but these 4 buildings stand out at being at odds with the character of the Conservation Area. Map incorrect	Leave text unamended.
	17		Considered but we think the document does address	Revise plan to show outbuilding remaining within CA

	18		this so no change proposed.	No action
P L Rabbetts (Dinton Historical Society)	19	Issue re redrawing of boundary in respect of Phillips House and Park. Detailed argument that the house and park are very important to the village and that they want to have a say in future developments.	See previous comments (in response to Mr David Richards). Still proposing to exclude Park and House from CA.	No action
	20	Consider extending CA boundary to include school.	Review (see above).	Amend boundary to include school.
	21	Consider new CAs for Manor House and also St Edith's church and houses in Baverstock.	Noted	For SDC to consider in the future
	22	Section 8 relating to Methodist chapel. The part of the pound wall is embedded in the north wall of the chapel (ie away from the road) not south as stated.	Noted. Methodist Chapel well outside CA.	Amend text if necessary
	23	Consideration of a separate Conservation Area around Manor Farm.	Noted.	For SDC to consider in the future
	24	Comment about views. Asks whether "field to the north of Snow Hill" should be included in CA in view of important views.	The field is part of the setting of the CA and does not need to be included to have relevance to the CA	No Action.
	25	Under "pattern of activities…" questions whether comment should be made on water meadows and their historic importance.	Refer to importance of valley in document otherwise too remote or tenuous to include within CA.	

		"The Green" welcome proposals but need to consider good access and safety.	Agree, reword text to reflect this .	No Action
	26	Make mention of needing to limit speed along B3089.	Agree	Reword text where necessary.
	27	Positive contribution buildings – want to know how these buildings are decided. Want buildings adjacent to Post Office included.	Map is incorrect - Should show these buildings as making a positive contribution	Amend text
	28	Lists number of historically important buildings outside the CA boundary.		Revise map
	29	Wants mention made of these in the text: Methodist chapel; Dalwood Farm; former station and house; Field Barn House, Wick Ball Camp (iron-age); milestones; boundary stone and other marking stones.	Noted but buildings fall outside the CA so inclusion within this document would be confusing.	No Action
Michael Glover	30	The Green is in control of County Highways and should remain an open space. Car parking is essential for shop.	Noted	no action
	31	Management section. Consider 'squeeze points' and removal of barriers.	Noted and considered amending text.	Amend text.
Howard Plant	32	Re Dinton Lodge. Comments that his house is included within appraisal and potential for Article 4.	Checked but not in Article 4 list as grade II listed.	No action required.

Salisbury Civic Society (comments seem to be by resident David Richards)	33	Generally supportive.		
	34	Suggests development brief should include whole village;	Inpractical and unnecessary.	No action
	35	Traffic management of B3089 and The Green long overdue.	Noted.	No action
	36	Wirescape – supports but sceptical.	Noted	No action
	37	Wants Philipps House and Park retained.	See previous comments on this matter.	No action.
	38	Wants school and Turnpike milestone included.	See comments above . Turnpike milestone is Grade II listed so already protected.	Agreed to include school with CA.
	39	Wants separate CA at Manor Farm.	On basis of historical importance and in relation to Shaftesbury Abbey. For SDC to consider in future.	For future consideration (subject to resources)
Cllr Josie Green	40	Considers there are too many photos (particularly of Dinton Lodge).	There are a lot of repetitive photos (including Dinton Lodge).	Agreed to reduce number of photographs.
	41	Would like appendix of list decriptions for the list properties	Considered but we haven't done this for the other appraisals because it would be difficult to manage (sometimes far too many) and could be misleading (ie wouldn't cover curtilage listed structures or new listings).	Agreed not to include.
AONB Group	42	P1 – the other CAAs mention 70 CAs, not 69	Dinton was drafted before Old Sarum was formerly adopted.	Text amended.
	43	P2 – the parkland around Philipps House should be retained within the CA in view of the setting it provides for Dinton.	Disagree on basis that there is no visual link between the two (village and house) and that the village developed independently of the house. The current	No action.

			parkland is only partially included in the CA, which is anomalous – so a decision has to be taken whether to include all or none. On the basis of the above information, and the fact that the park has some degree of statutory protection, it is proposed to exclude the parkland and house.	
	44	P3 – the settlement section relates to the evolution of the settlement and does not cover adequately the current description of it.	The settlement section provides the historic background to the development of the village. The current character of the settlement is described later in the document.	
	45	P5 – 'Brief Overview' seems to be understated and would be better placed earlier in the document.	Do not agree and position accords with other docuements and guidance.	No action.
	46	P6 The figures do not have captions; this limits their usefulness	Have added captions where we are able (although not to all figures).	Text amended.
	47	It would be helpful to have photo positions (and the extent of the view covered) marked on a plan.	Do not consider that this is necessary.	No action.
	48	It would be helpful to have all buildings named in the text marked on a plan.	Do not consider that this is necessary.	No action.
	49	P8 The description of the 'Recreation Ground' does not indicate that it is, of itself, of any historic or architectural value.	Text clearly refers to the importance of this space within the CA. It is not historic (created from fields) but has an important role in contemporary Dinton.	Not considered necessary to amend text.
	50	P12 The roofs and materials sections are particularly useful and would be improved by captions to the figures.	Agreed to add captions where possible.	Text amended.

		P15 The Townscape map does not indication open/green spaces.	No it doesn't but the areas have been decribed clearly within the document under their own heading.	No action.
	51	P15 Are the trees indicated actual or just symbolic?	The trees indicated are actual. It is not intended as a comprehensive list but to identify key trees or groups that positively contribute to the CA.	
	52	What are the critera for including hedges? Are they genuinely historic or do they just appear substantial whilst being of recent origin?	The document looks at boundary treatments (existing). The hedges are included because hedge boundaries pre-dominate in areas of Dinton. No judgement is made about their relative age.	Amend map to include group of trees known as 'The Hanging'.
	53	P18 – considers the removal of Philipps House and park to be illogical.	See response to issue raised at 43.	No action.
	54	P21 Concern that the suggested road improvements would conflict with AONB approaches to restoring the rural character to rural roads.	Comments noted. Text has been amended to be less prescriptive and to open a dialogue. Document makes suggestions only to prompt consideration of issue.	No action.
	55	P22 Wirescape recommendation does not appear to be based on any earlier scription or assessment of a problem.	Disagree. Issue is raised on page p17 (negative elements).	Text amended slightly.
	56			No action

Dinton Boundary Consultation Responses

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
Mr Smith	1	If the historic building at the entrance to Longridge (next to Hillview Cottage) is proposed to be excluded from the conservation area, then do not agree with this proposal as this contributes to the character of the conservation area.	This building is not being proposed to be excluded, so will remain in the CA.	No action.

Hindon Consultation Responses

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
Stephen White	1	The Beeches is proposed to be included in the CA, however: • The view of it across the valley is not significant • Property is not visible from views from the main part of the CA • Makes no contribution to the identified key characteristics of the conservation area – relatively recent and constructed in Gillingham brick, not stone or mellow brick • Stands alone from the main body of the village, and not part of the historic form or layout • The trees are not any more special than those between School Lane and the High Street, and this is not being proposed to be included in the CA. • The trees that have been highlighted at The Beeches are relatively minor specimens (apple, hazel) and Leylandii.	This is an attractive building in the landscape with significant views from Stops Hill. This is outside the Housing Policy Boundary.	EM/AM/JS to check the significance of this building to the character of the conservation area.
Development Services (Judy Howles)	2	Character Areas – Suggest should be just 2 char areas: The Dene (rural feel) and the rest (planned town, wide main street, burgage plots)	Disagree text clearly explains justification for character areas identified	N/A
	3	P16 – Green space is pub garden. The Lamb should be encouraged to improve it.	Agree.	N/A
	4	P18. New House should be kept in the CA as it forms backdrop to High St	Agree provides backdrop despite of at least neutral value.	Amend boundary of proposed CA to include entire garden of this property.
	5	Any paving left under the tarmac? Resin-bonded gravel not good for wheelchairs. Gravel too yellow for Hindon?	Acknowledge that some forms of floor surfacing could be detrimental.	Amend appraisal to say that tarmac could be replaced with something more sympathetic.
	6	P21 – The bend in the B3089 is due to the founders diverting the main road through the village. This and other sharp bend provide good traffic calming. Parking could be demarcated by change in surface materials.	Noted.	N/A
	7	Maps Boundary changes – Extend CA to take in New House and take out bungalows in East St.	Noted.	N/A
	8	Char areas – see above about reducing to 2.	Agree. See previous comments.	

		Management Issues:-	See previous comments.	N/A
	9	Public Realm – bust stop should be resurfaced to deter parking there. Enhancements to Lamb car park.	Agree.	N/A
	10	Break up large areas of tarmac with porous paving.	Agree.	N/A
	11	Replace lighting columns with lights attached to buildings or more slender columns.	Agree.	N/A
	12	Development Briefs – Garage site is too small for brief without first carrying out contaminated land study. Also what about PS3 (change of use from retail)?	Unclear about the requirement for a contaminated land study. This is a sensitive site, and it is suggested that a development brief would be helpful.	N/A
	13			Appraisal to be amended to mention enhancement of street lighting.
	14	Art 4 – Because most buildings listed, and village is in AONB, would only suggest restrictions on painting and roof alterations and cover the whole village with it.		N/A
	15	Townscape – key views are from the south – top Stops Hill, Whitehill and road to E Knoyle. Roofscape v impt.	Do not agree. There are a number of important unlisted buildings with original windows and doors and their replacement should be controlled.	N/A
	16		Agree.	N/A
Richard Dewhurst, author of 'Crosstracks to Hindon'	17	P22 – refer to 'Crosstracks to Hindon' as secondary source	Noted.	Amend appraisal to mention this reference.
	18	P3. Hist Devel and Arch – Borough and chapel foundations should be given a date of c 1220.	Noted.	Amend appraisal accordingly.
	19	Suggest delete 2nd and 3rd sentences in 2nd para. (see comments for reason)	Agree.	Amend appraisal accordingly.
	20	Mention that there was a fair by Royal Charter annually from 1219, and biannually from 1332, and survide for 695 years.	Agree.	Amend appraisal accordingly.
	21	Para 3, 2nd sentence – amend (see comments). P9 – The 'back lane' has historically been called Back Way.	Agree.	Amend appraisal accordingly.

	22 23 24 25 26	P11 – Salters Arch = Bakers Arch, and Victoria Terraces = Victoria Cottages P13 – The 'hall on the B3089' = Hindon Fellowship Club. Earlier roof material was thatch. P14 – Lettering on the Angel Inn is 19th century NOT 18th. The former Angel Inn was bought by Lord Grosevnor in 1830s. P16 & 19 – Integrity of former burgage plots is over-emphsasised. Some have expanded into large gardens. West side of lower High St - there has been much infilling and subdivision, and some of the houses have become separated from their small gardens. Some are overgrown and neglected.	Noted. Noted. Noted. Note the concerns. The importance of the burgage plots cannot be over-emphasised, and the response indicates how vulnerable they are to being harmed.	Amend appraisal accordingly. Amend appraisal accordingly. Amend appraisal accordingly. N/A
Chris Maycock	27 28	List of locally important buildings – Don't think Fern Cottage should be on the list. Position, finish and fenestration is untypical, and situation will be worsened by implementation of the planning permission. Development south of PO – Confusion with demo of houses to north of PO when church built? (see also Hindon PC comments below)	Disagree. The historic building is still legible despite the alterations. Noted.	N/A P2 of the appraisal needs to be updated to remove reference to development of this site.
Hindon Parish Council	 29 30 31 32 33	Roofscape Issue:- There is no analysis of the character of the roofscape. 2 distinct groups of cottage types in High St: a) cottages with low roof lines and dormers in attics ('estate style' cottages); b) cottages with first floor windows just under eaves. Majority of dormers are wall dormers. Sections of unbroken roofslopes. Where dormers are to be permitted these should be hipped and should give onto habitable space. Unbroken sweeps of roofs should be preserved.	 Noted.	 Need to revisit this issue, and amend appraisal to provide greater assessment of existing roofscape.
Hindon Parish Council Planning Committee	 34	Comprehensive document and well-presented. Boundary Revisions – In agreement, except reservations about removing	– Do not agree. These cottages do not make	N/A No Action

		Ithaca, Cricketers and Dene End.	any positive contribution to the conservation area. There is no reason why they should remain in the CA	
	35	Application for TPO at New House (now Juniper House) supported.	Noted.	
	36	CA Boundary Review Map – proposed amendment to western boundary to Stops Hill inaccurate.	Comment unclear and not substantiated .	Seek clarification?
		Enhancement:		
	37	Pavement and road surfacing – changes proposed would not be supported. May actually detract from character.	Agree.	Appraisal to be amended. Omit reference to resin-bonded gravel.
	38	Safeguarding burgage plots – development unacceptable because backland dev (H16 Local Plan). Some tidying up if the burg plots in SW corner of Char Areas plan welcomed.	Noted.	N/A
	39	Potential Development Sites – redevelopment of garage site welcomed.	Noted.	
		Policies for New Buildings – Need to safeguard char of burg plots		N/A
	40	Traffic Management/street improvements – Junction of B3089 – No particularly dangerous given that cars must slow down. Impt facilities for parking for shop/pub and space for turning buses, passenger waiting. Cost of enhancement would be prohibitive.	Noted, although the potentially high cost of enhancement is not a reason not to aspire to it.	P2 of appraisal to be amended.
	41	Street lighting – Changes to street lights could result in enhancement.	Agree.	Amend Street Improvements section of appraisal.
	42	Enclosure – Concerns and fears over erosion to roofscape. P11 Para 2 – Salters Arch = Bakers Arch	Acknowledge concerns.	Amend appraisal to reflect importance.
	43	P12 Para 3 – amend:...“although the modest former Methodist Church and the Village Hall”.	Noted.	
	44	P13 Line 1 – amend: “Community facilities include the Parish Church and the Village Hall” (former Meth Ch now dwelling).	Agree.	Amend text.
	45	P13 Line 6 – Mention the Fellowship Club on the B3089 which provides facilities for local community.	Agree.	Amend text.
	46	P15 Para 3 Line 2 – amend to:”…terminated by the inn at the corner (delete former)”.		Amend text.

	47		Agree.	
	48	Art 4 – What does the heading "Painting" mean? Why are some properties omitted?	This related to the painting of external walls. The properties not on the list have already been painted.	Amend text.
	49	List of Bldgs of Local Importance – should include Village Hall and 4 The Dene as on P13 & 18.	Agree regarding the Village Hall. Need to check in respect of 4 The Dene.	N/A
	50	Back Lane = Back Way	Noted.	Amend text to include Village Hall on list of buildings of local importance. JW to check 4 The Dene. – this should be included in my view
	51	Townscape Views Map – View at Fern Cottage will soon be closed as Salisbury District Council has given approval for extension to the front.	Noted.	N/A
	52	There are some additional sources of reference (refer to comments).	Do not agree. The single-storey extension approved would not obscure the views to Fern Cottage.	Amend document accordingly.
	53		Noted.	N/A
AONB Group	54	The fields to the east, north and west were enclosed prior to AD 1800 and are intimately associated with the development of the village.	Noted, although it is not considered that it is necessary to mention this in this document as this is not in the CA.	
	55	The larger fields in the wider landscape are more recent, reflecting the enclosure of the formerly open downland, and contain evidence of ancient field systems.	Noted, although it is not considered that it is necessary to mention this in this document as this is not in the CA.	
	56	The village is bounded to the south by the 19th century woodland belt. The approach from this direction is very distinctive.	Noted.	
	57	To the north, the village has been divorced from the wider downland landscape by the creation of the A303.	Noted, although it is not considered that it is necessary to mention this in this	

		P4 – Settlement section relates to evolution , but relies on reader knowing the area well.	document as this is not in the CA.	
	58	P5 – The 'General Overview' section should be placed earlier in the document.	Do not agree that this is an issue.	
	59	P6 onwards – It would have been helpful to have photo positions marked on plans, and all buildings mentioned in text marked on the plan.	Do not agree.	
	60	P15 – The pollarded limes should be mentioned early in the document as key feature of conservation area.	Do not feel that this is necessary given size of conservation area.	
	61	The width of pavements and spaces between rows of dwellings is significant characteristic that does not appear to have been mentioned.	Agree.	Document amended accordingly.
	62	Townscape map does not indicate open/green spaces.	Disagree. Feel that the key characteristic of the conservation area have been covered.	
	63	Are the trees actual or symbolic?	There are no open/green spaces of any real significance in the CA	
	64	P18 – The garden of Juniper House should be included in the CA, and would provide more realistic level of protection than TPOs.	The trees are actual. They indicate key groups of trees that contribute to the character of the conservation area.	
	65	P18 - The roofscape issue is too important to be left until this stage of the document.	Neither the garden nor the house are considered meritorious of being included in the conservation area.	
	66	P20 – It would be helpful if the AONB's Light Position Statement could be mentioned in the section on street lighting.	Agree.	Amend text so mentioned earlier in document.
	67	P21 – The box giving guidance on appraising surrounding built form is particularly useful.	Do not feel that this needs to receive special mention in this particular document.	
	68		Noted.	

Hindon Boundary Consultation Responses

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
Paul Marsh	1	The New House is now called Juniper House.	Noted	EM to get text amended
	2	The numbers 4 and 5 are mixed up on the plan sent through with the consultation leaflet	Noted	No action
	3	Apart from factual errors, agree with proposed changes.	Noted	No action
Mrs Susan Peckham	4	Same as issue 2	Noted	No action
	5	Agree with proposed changes.	Noted	No action
Dr Jim Caughey	6	No objections to the inclusion of Steeple Close in the CA.	Noted	No action
	7	Feel that for consistency, the part of the graveyard currently not in the CA should also be included as this contributes to the setting of the church.	The churchyard is an important part of the setting of the listed church. Protection is afforded by the listing. The further protection afforded by inclusion in CA would not be merited.	No action
Mr and Mrs D J Roberston	8	Take exception to the scathing and in some cases, insulting references to the properties proposed for removal from the conservation area. Seems a pointless and time consuming exercise, after the horse has bolted, and there are concerns that removing these properties might open the door for damaging changes in the future in these parts.	Disagree – these properties do not make any positive contribution to the character or appearance of the area. Some protection to this area will be afforded under the issue of setting of conservation area.	No action
Hindon PC (Miss Davies)	9	The whole of the churchyard should be brought into the CA- current boundary is anomalous.	The churchyard is an important part of the setting of the listed church. Protection is afforded by the listing. The further protection afforded by inclusion in CA would not be merited.	No action

Tisbury Consultation Responses

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
Cyril Lee	1	Comment regarding the approval of five houses (3-7 Snows Hill) on such a dominant site.	None	No action
	2	1 Snows Hill (Fossil Mount) has been enlarged from bungalow to large two-storey house and dormers in last 12 months, thereby making it dominant on the skyline and contradicting the character assessment in the document regarding the attractive skyline from distant views.	EM still to check	
	3	Seems strange not to exclude no.1 and no.11 Snows Hill as well as the suggested 3-10.	No.s 1 and 11 form part of the character and setting of the CA. On the other hand, 3-10 form a group that contribute neither individually nor collectively to the CA.	No action
Debbie and Andrew Carter	4	There is an ancient quarry at the bottom of the garden of Rosebank, Hindon Lane (ref. 1769 map). Should this be included in the CA?	This is not visible from general views and does not make any contribution to the character or appearance of the area, therefore, do not consider that the CA boundary should be extended to include this.	No action
	5	3&4 Alexandra Cottages should be included in the CA (semi-detached stone cottages, shown on 1901 map).	EM still to check	
Ros King	6	Parts of the collapsed Fonthill Abbey Tower were reused in a number of buildings in Tisbury (e.g. carvings and windows reused in cottages).	Noted	Text amended
Mrs M Kent	7	58 Church Street is wrongly described in the group 'Modern development in Church Street Close' which is proposed for removal form the CA. It is 1940s, not 'modern'.	Mistake in text	Text amended
David Rear	8	Suggest include quarry in CA (see Issue 4)	See above	See above
Salisbury Civic Society		No comments	N/A	N/A
Josephine Ings	9	Concern expressed regarding the lack of integration between planning policy (housing growth) and conservation aims (e.g. effect of approving more houses with associated traffic on character of conservation area).	Development control policies must have regard to the character and appearance of the CA in determining planning applications.	No action
Judy Howles, Development Services	10	Disagrees with the statement on p3 that Tisbury lies on a greensand spur – it's in a Jurassic area. This is important, as this is what makes Tisbury so special. There are a lot of old quarries locally, and this was important to its economy, rather than just agriculture. It has also shaped its settlement pattern *(N.B. she doesn't say how).* Therefore,	The local Tisbury stone is in fact a limestone from the Jurassic period rather than greensand (which is found at Chicksgrove, Hurdcott and around Shaftesbury).	Text amended

		geology has influenced the settlement pattern, location and appearance of the village.		
	11	There was also textile industry (ref. Tuckingmill), a brewery and a glove factory beside the church.	Noted	Text amended
	12	The brick buildings in the village were probably constructed using Dinton or Gillingham bricks, brought in in the 19th century by rail.	Conjecture, although noted.	Text amended
	13	North west approach – the estate cottages are in fact council houses (SDC still owns two of them).	Noted	No action
	14	Character Area of The Quarry – the one-and-a-half storey cottage is a converted chapel.	Noted, but consultee has mis-interpreted figure text.	Text for figure 5 amended.
	15	Character Area of the High Street should be divided between upper and lower. Upper: raised pavements and stone mullioned cottages. Lower: Victorian, buildings end-on to road, render, roofs stepping up the hill, brick and stone dressings on the Benet Arms.	Noted	This distinction is already reflected in the text. No Action
	16	Arch and Hist Qualities p15 – The shops are limestone not greensand. Neither is the brewery.	(Actually this is mentioned on p17). The shops and brewery seem to have been constructed of the locally quarried Tisbury stone, i.e. limestone.	Text amended.
	17	Coaching inns are not that important in Tisbury as is had no main roads through it. The railway has been more influential on the development of the village.	Part agree. Consultants don't emphasise Coach Inns?	Text amended to reflect the importance of the railway to the development of Tisbury.
	18	The flagstones are probably local limestone. Place farm used to have locally quarried stone slates.	Noted	Text amended.
	19	Negative elements – are between village and station is floodplain, therefore unlikely to ever be developed. Should probably be excluded from the CA.	There are a sequence of buildings that are important to Tisbury, such as the SW Hotel. The railway bridge appears as the natural gateway to the village from the south, along with the railway building. Not just a setting issue, the individual buildings warrant the protection afforded by being in a CA.	No action
Helena Cave-Penney, Archaeologist, WCC		No comments	N/A	N/A
Stephen Sykes	20	CA status has not prevented harmful developments in the past. Must exert greater control in the CA over new development. Would accept the argument for greater control over changes by introducing Article 4 directions, however there would seem to be little point if new development is allowed to continue unfettered.	Noted	No action

Cllr Beattie		Executive summary –		
	21	Tisbury is a not a town, so the use of the word 'townscape' should not be used.	This is technical terminology. The generic term applies to both towns and villages. Townscape is defined in the appraisal glossary.	No action
	22	Re: 'recent development of indifferent quality'. The boundary of CA should not merely be adjusted, but need to sharpen up planning policy to ensure that there is not more of the same.	Noted	No action
	23	P5 – Coalyard development is taking place in area close to church, described as being of 'high archaeological potential'. But was there a survey?	The county archaeologist is likely to have commented on this application, and may or may not have requested an archaeological evaluation to have been carried out.	No action
	24	P6 – Description of Hindon Lane omits mention of traffic impact on this narrow road with no footways. Should be constraint to future development here.	Noted	No changes required to document
	25	P7 – The poor development in Duck St/Cuffs lane was approved by SDC. What comfort for the future?	Noted	No changes required to document
	26	P8 – Should mention the threat posed by creation of parking spaces on the stone boundary walls in the Quarry.	Noted	Text amended
	27	P13 – The area around the station should be described more brutally. Wasteland, eyesore, etc. Flood risk is not preventing the building of new houses next to the SW Hotel.	It is considered that the document sufficiently describes any negative elements.	No changes required to document
	28	P14 – Place farm is no longer a farm complex – its high quality conversion to offices should be acknowledged.	Noted	Text amended
	29	P16 – Should mention the Old House opp. The Boot Inn.	This is mentioned in the document already, although not described by name.	No changes required to document
	30	P16 – Gaston Manor dates from 1385, therefore not 16th/17th century.	The external appearance is that of a 16th/17th century building. No evidence of 14th century appearance on the outside, which is the critical factor in describing the character of the CA.	No changes required to document
	31	P16 – should mention the ornate Victorian Arundell House just north of the Boot Inn.	Noted	Text amended
	32	P16 – 20th century section should mention the 1920s motor repair garage, which looks unusual and has ugly signage.	Noted	Text amended
	33	P18 – Local details – should mention war memorial and RAF memorial gate further up High St.	Noted	Text amended
	34	P19 – No mention of trees half way up High St.	Noted	Text amended
	35	P20 – the 2 buildings mentioned at risk have progressed: work has begun at building adjacent to SW hotel; the other building might be the one that has been demolished (?).	The Becket Street shed does in fact appear to have been demolished.	Reference to building and photograph removed.

	36	P20 – Argue there are more than 3 negatives: the ugly buildings on Station Works site; the poor development on coalyard site; large areas of West Tisbury.	The comments reinforce the need for this document.	No changes required to document
	37	P20 – should mention threats of development pressure.	This is implied within the document, and it is hoped that the appraisal will assist Development Services in determining future applications in the CA.	No changes required to document
	38	P20 – Tisbury is not a 'regional retail hub'!	Noted	Text amended
	39	P20 – there is a parking problem associated with the train station.	Noted, but not within the remit of this appraisal to suggest alternatives.	No changes required to document
	40	P20 – last sentence is unintelligible. Does it mean that 'such housing' should not have been built or that since it has been built the CA boundary must be redrawn to pretend it's not there?	Noted	Text amended.
	41	Management Plan – there's no overview of what needs to be done. A professional VDS or formation of a conservation group?	Noted.	Conservation Section to give some thought to ways of improving the management of the CA.
	42	P21 – Becket St shed is mentioned as BAR but has already been demolished with approval from SDC.	Refer to comment against issue 35	Refer to action against issue 35
	43	P21 - Although identified as at risk on the Management Issues map, there is no mention of former laundry buildings in The Avenue in the text – need restoring and brought into use.	Noted	Building is described on page 21 under the heading; outbuilding fronting the southern end of the causeway
	44	P22 – The significance of an Article 4 Direction is not explained.	There is an explanation of what Article 4s are about in the glossary. It is considered to be sufficiently explained for the current purposes.	No changes required to document
	45	P23 – Proposed to remove Snows Hill and Church St Close because of poor planning decisions. Better to expand the boundary to make sure Tisbury is seen as a whole and ensure future development is of better quality?	This is beyond the scope of this study, and it is felt that it would be inappropriate to expand the CA boundaries on this basis.	No changes required to document
	46	P23 – Recommendation to improve management of flood plain is good but how achieved?	Noted	Text expanded
	47	P24 – Why were the design principles not used on the coalyard site (small box-like houses with no chimneys, etc.)	The design principles set out in this document were drafted post-decision of this scheme. Questions regarding the decision to approve the design should be addressed to Development Services.	No changes required to document
	48	P24 – why are recommendations limited to 5-8 houses? Tisbury is potentially threatened by larger developments. More of the same will result unless a sensible development boundary is defined and enforced.	Not within the scope of this document. The design principles being suggested within the document are targeted for infill rather than large-scale developments.	No changes required to document
	49	P25 – The suggested traffic calming measures in Hindon lane should not only involve consultation with SDC conservation officers, but with Parish Council and TisVis! - these bodies should be consulted on the	Noted	Text amended

		details as well as the overarching strategy.		
	50	P25 – Improvements to the Square should involve consultation with locals. Illuminated finger post would probably want to be kept.	Noted. The finger post sits under an attractive cast-iron light column.	Text amended to mention retention of special features, eg fingerpost.
	51	Appendices in general – there should be an appendix listing the listed buildings.	The list descriptions are available elsewhere, and listed buildings are identified on the Townscape map. It is not appropriate to reproduce in this document.	Add a link to Images of England Website in text.
	52	Appendix 2 – would be nice to have the maps at a larger scale.	Noted, however the scale of the maps were chosen for practicality within A4 document.	No changes required to document
Tisbury Parish Council	53	Guidance in document welcomed. Hoped that this will help to prevent future development of indifferent quality.	Noted	No changes required to document
	54	The document does not mention the potential harm which could be caused by traffic from large developments in Hindon Lane.	Noted	No changes required to document
	55	There are areas that would benefit from improvements when viewed from the highway and the railway: the area by the Railway Station on approach from Wardour and Ansty; the Station Works; the former laundry buildings in The Avenue.	Noted. The appraisal accommodates this within the text. Some of the areas mentioned are outside the CA. The former laundry is identified as a building at risk.	No changes required to document
	56	Recommend mention the following buildings of note and local landmarks: The Old House, Arundell House and Tisbury Motors.	Noted	Text amended
	57	The following information needs to be updated: Place farm has been converted; the building adjacent to SW Hotel is being developed; Gaston manor is 14th century; the Becket St shed has been demolished.	Noted	See elsewhere in comments regarding this.
	58	Would like to support some of the points already made by Cllr Beattie (ref. Issues 38, 45, 46, 49, and 50)	Noted	See elsewhere in comments regarding this.
AONB Group	59	P3 – Concern that suggested traffic calming could adversely affect rural and historic character.	Care over design of this is mentioned later in the document.	No action.
	60	P4 – The settlement section does not describe the current character.	The current character of the settlement is described in the remainder of the document.	No action.
	61	P6 – 'General Overview' section seems to be understated and too brief.	Do not agree.	No action
	62	P6 – Character areas seem disjointed and sizable gaps between them are not described.	Do not agree.	No action
	63	P6 onwards – It would be helpful to mark the photo positions on a plan.	Do not feel that this is necessary given the size of the conservation area.	No action
	64	P6 onwards –It would be helpful to have the buildings mentioned in the text marked on a plan.	Do not feel that this is necessary.	No action
	65	P8 – The Quarry is notable for its lack of street lighting and this adds to its character.	Agree.	Add to text.

	66	P10 onwards – There are a number of sub-areas that are emphasised as being different to other parts of the CA, e.g. Tucking Mill, The Square, Station Gateway, Place Farm– should Tisbury not be divided into separate CAs?	The consultants considered this in the early stages of the survey work and the matter was discussed with the conservation officers. It was felt that it was acceptable to have differing character sub-areas within a conservation area, and to subdivide these would be impractical and unjustified given their small size.	No action
	67	P12 – The churchyard contains many historic gravestones and box tombs which add to the historic interest of the area.	Agree, although do not consider that this needs to be highlighted in any greater detail.	No action
	68	Low profile comment about greensand suggests a weak knowledge base for this document.	Do not agree – it is considered that this point is adequately made.	No action
	69	P19 – Open spaces around the Nadder are arguably the most significant spaces because they are readily perceived and appreciated.	Agree that these are significant spaces, and that the document makes this point.	No action
	70	Fig 27 – refers to a fir tree – actually a cedar.	Noted.	Amend text.
	71	The Townscape map does not indicate open/green spaces.	It was not considered necessary to include this in this document.	No action.
	72	Are the trees actual or symbolic?	The trees are actual. They indicate groups of trees that make a contribution to the character of the conservation area.	No action.
	73	P20 – Negative elements also include the car-dominated space at the top of the High Street.	Not sure that this is an issue particular to this part of the CA.	No action.
	74	P22 – the range of outbuildings to the west of the South Western Public House have now been converted.	Noted.	Remove these from Vulnerable Buildings section.
	75	P25 –Agree that extra care is required in designing traffic calming in Hindon Lane.	Noted.	No action
	76	Fig 31- indicates that overhead cables are as much of an issue as the signs mentioned.	Agree.	Amend caption.
	77	Character Areas Map – indicates areas that have not been described.	The sub-areas are indicative, and have been used to assist with the characterisation process. Whilst it should also be pointed out that not every building in the conservation area will have been characterised, as this would be too great a task, and beyond the scope of what is required.	No action.
	78	Historic Maps – the first two are too small and don't have titles.	The scale of the maps adequately shows what is described in the text. The maps are titled on the preceding page.	