

## Milford Hill Consultation Responses

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
Mrs B Cook	1	Argues that St Martin's School and surrounding land together with trees lining Fowler Hill should be conserved. Concerned that Wiltshire Council is not maintaining these trees.	Agree that trees on the edge of school line, which is clearly a historic route, and have significant townscape value.	Agree to amend CA boundary to take in this line of trees.  Will need to <b>re-consult</b> .
Tim Foat	2	<p>a. Disagrees that no 49 Elm Grove Road should be removed from the CA. Thinks this will result in further erosion of the character of the area.</p> <p>b. Suggests introducing a grant scheme.</p>	<p>We consider character eroded in this area.</p> <p>Not being proposed (no funds)</p>	No further action required
Eileen Pennell	3	Objects to the proposed removal of the Crescent from the CA. Considers the houses are of a distinct character, retaining some of their historic features and with remnants of an orchard. Also would like to see Beckingsale House retained in the CA.	Agree that Crescent has certain arcadian qualities (though few surviving historic features).	Amend boundary to leave The Crescent in the conservation area.  Will need to <b>re-consult</b> .
Mrs S A Kerrod	4	Argues that the Crescent and Beckingsale House have a different character to Tollgate and Rampart Road. They have a more arcadian quality – because of the grounds and trees. Could argue that they are an extension to Milford Hill House. Also that the houses retain some historic features.	See previous comments (3).	Amend boundary to leave The Crescent in the conservation area.  Will need to <b>re-consult</b> .
Simon Bailey and Amanda Pocock	5	Argues that the Crescent is secluded and of a unique character and that the properties have retained significant original features.	See previous comments (3)	Amend boundary to leave The Crescent in the conservation area.  Will need to <b>re-consult</b> .
Mrs Maureen Moore	6	Argues that the town houses in Courtwood Close contribute to the character of the CA, in particular because of their relationship with Shady Bower, The Hollow and Godolphin School. Would wish to see Courtwood Close remain within CA.	Do not agree that houses contribute to character of Milford Hill Conservation Area but do think trees make an important contribution and merit protection.	Revise boundary to leave Courtwood Close in the conservation area.  Will need to <b>re-consult</b> .

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
John Gould	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Argues that Courtwood Close should be retained within CA in order to preserve its distinctive character, and also the selection of mature trees that front the area.</li> <li>b. Suggests that the Consultation Draft is unclear about whether the area is within, or outside, the CA.</li> </ul>	<p>See previous comments (6)</p> <p>Not raised by anyone else so don't consider it needs amending.</p>	<p>Revise boundary to leave Courtwood Close in the conservation area.</p> <p>Will need to <b>re-consult</b>.</p>
Shirley Gould	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Argues that Courtwood Close is a good example of 1970s architecture and would not wish to see ad hoc changes that would spoil the appearance of the Close.</li> <li>b. Also concerned about the line of trees and the historic relationship with Milford Hollow and Godolphin School (potentially weakened).</li> </ul>	<p>Disagree good example of 1970s architecture but appreciate point concerning ad hoc changes.</p> <p>Agree trees (although not individual specimens) along roadside important feature of area.</p>	<p>Revise boundary to leave Courtwood Close in the conservation area.</p> <p>Will need to <b>re-consult</b>.</p>
Mrs P Cogswell	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Disagrees with removal of Close from CA and gives three reasons. Firstly that area not included until 1980s when development had been built and area has not significantly changed since that date.</li> <li>b. Secondly that appraisal ignores contribution made by trees along roadside.</li> <li>c. Thirdly because of the historic relationship with Milford Hollow on one side, and Shady Bower on the other.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted although think previous officers might have been more pragmatic/relaxed and decided to leave boundary alone ie not a positive affirmation of quality of development.</p> <p>See comments above (8).</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Revise boundary to leave Courtwood Close in the conservation area.</p> <p>Will need to <b>re-consult</b>.</p>
Gerald Steer	10	<p>Objects to the removal of Rampart Road on the basis that the omission of this road would result in a further lowering of the quality of the terraces.</p>	<p>Actually don't think the quality could be lowered further as very little survival of historic windows, doors, roofs, proliferation of very large dormers etc. However do</p>	<p>Leave Rampart Road in Conservation Area.</p> <p>Will need to <b>re-consult</b>.</p>

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
			consider it is an important view from ring road and a natural boundary to CA.	
D E Bate	11	“Piecemeal exclusions to the CA inevitably weaken rather than strengthen the protection afforded to Milford Hill”. Accepts that Courtwood Close is ‘architecturally undistinguished’ but that it is part of the development of Milford Hill.	Considering leaving in CA (see previous comments) in order to maintain protection to trees.	Revise boundary to leave Courtwood Close in the conservation area.  Will need to <b>re-consult</b> .
Simon H B Pearce	12	Can’t understand removal of area that was added to the CA following development of The Close. Concerned about implications for Close of deregulation.	See previous comments (8) and (9).	Revise boundary to leave Courtwood Close in the conservation area.  Will need to <b>re-consult</b> .
The Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Society	13	Seems to raise no objection to the proposal to exclude 5 areas from the Conservation Area.	Noted.	No action required.
Philip Vale	14	Flags up a number of errors in document, namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Errors in relation to the numbering of houses in Campbell Road;</li> <li>b. One of the maps (Boundary Review map) at the end of the document contains an error (excludes The Old Rectory which is proposed for inclusion in CA).</li> <li>c. Photo in leaflet incorrectly labelled (shows Campbell Road and not Fowler’s Hill).</li> <li>d. No objections to proposal to include Old Rectory into CA on basis that: doesn’t cover internal works; homeowners will not be compelled to carry out certain works; that they will be able to replace single-glazed wooden sash windows at some future point with double-glazed windows which “utilize modern materials”; does not prevent loft conversions/use of rooflights; will not have to reduce height of fences/walls.</li> </ul>	Noted and agreed.  Noted  Noted  Noted	Amend document  Amend Boundary Review map  Amend photo in leaflet and check correct in full appraisal  No action required

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
Michael Drury	15	<p>a. Welcomes Article 4 proposals but thinks that the list should not be so restrictive – but include streets rather than short runs of houses.</p> <p>b. Makes the point about the importance of Highway trees in this area and requests that reinstatement of trees should be contained within the management plan.</p> <p>c. Makes several specific points as follows:</p> <p><i>P22 para 18.1 bullet point 4 – inaccurate numbering;</i>  <i>P24 para 20.1 – rewording needed;</i>  <i>P27 Appendix 27 line 6 – numbering of houses incorrect;</i>  <i>P28 Appendix B – as above.</i></p>	<p>Noted. This could be revisited at the stage of considering an Article 4.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. JS to check.</p>	<p>No action needed.</p> <p>Consider amending document.</p> <p>Amend document (JS)  Amend document (JS)  Amend document if necessary  Consider amending document</p>
Nicola Allerton	16	Makes the point that The Crescent has a different character – more tranquil and also verdant. Shares a greater relationship with the YHA than it does with Rampart Road. Feels the area has a more ‘rural’ character and that buildings’ retain their historic character. Would like The Crescent to remain within the CA.	See previous comments (3)	<p>Amend boundary to leave The Crescent in the conservation area.</p> <p>Will need to <b>re-consult</b>.</p>
Christine Wilson	17	Objects to the removal of Courtwood Close from CA. Concerned about erosion of cohesion of area and impact on trees. Also doesn’t understand why it is now being excluded when it was consciously included.	See previous comments (8) and (9)	<p>Revise boundary to leave Courtwood Close in the conservation area.</p> <p>Will need to <b>re-consult</b>.</p>
Courtwood Close Resident’s Association	18	Objects to removal of Courtwood Close from CA. Says report is “limited” and “architecturally biased”. Doesn’t see what has changed since it was designated – thinks removal will reduce its architectural diversity. Talks about relationship with Milford Hollow and mentions significant trees on roadside edge. Makes the point that the residents take pride in their area and that it is insulting to remove the area from the	Courtwood Close is not architecturally distinguished and does not contribute positively to CA, however, the trees (although no individual specimens) do make a positive	<p>Revise boundary to leave Courtwood Close in the conservation area.</p> <p>Will need to <b>re-consult</b>.</p>

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
		Conservation Area.	contribution to the streetscene.	
Susan and Michael Rathbone	19	Object to exclusion of Courtwood Close from CA. Cites, in defence of retention of Close in CA:  Intimate relationship with Milford Hollow: Importance of trees and boundary hedges on Shady Bower and Courtwood Close in terms of contribution to street scene; Importance of trees/hedges linking Milford Hill and Fowler's Hill; No erosion of historic features in respect of Courtwood Close; Potential importance of this 1970s mews development.	See previous comments (in particular 8 and 9).	Revise boundary to leave Courtwood Close in the conservation area.  Will need to <b>re-consult</b> .
Salisbury Conservation Area Advisory Panel	20	Argue that whilst there has been an erosion of historic features, the western group should not be excluded from the CA in view of the visual prominence of the terraces. Suggested redrawing the boundary to exclude road but retain terraces within.	See comments at 10.	Revise boundary to leave in historic roads but exclude Ring Road.  Will need to <b>re-consult</b> .
Mr Jim Humberstone	21	Doesn't think enough is made of layout ie inherited elements of layout based on former routes etc. Believes passages, back lanes and alleyways are often not clearly identifiable and therefore vulnerable.	Noted but difficult to see how this could be drawn out in appraisal. Importance of certain lanes ie Milford Hollow is mentioned in text.	No further action proposed.
Mrs E S Macshane	22	Objects to removal of 41 Fowler's Road from CA on basis that it will erode the value of the property.	Dispute that exclusion from CA lowers value of property. In any case, this is not a factor that the appraisal can take into consideration.	Revising boundary to leave Byways Close in CA so will be retained in CA in any case.  Will need to <b>re-consult</b> .
Network Rail	23	No comments in relation to the Milford Hill document.		No action required.