

Old Manor Hospital Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation Responses

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
Adam Madge	1	New award-winning courts building dominates its surroundings but little is said about it, and photos would be useful.	The courts building wasn't under construction at the time of the main survey.	Document updated briefly.
	2	Apparent contradiction between text and maps re inclusion of the Courts.	This has been amended during the consultation process.	Done.
	3	Kennet Lodge is now under repair.	...and extension. The external repair works have now (June 2010) been completed.	Updated doc to reflect improvements
	4	Llangarren damaged by fire – photo reflecting current condition would be helpful; appraisal could explore what might be acceptable reuse of this site.	Potential development proposals have already been discussed pre-disposal of the site; the 2000 Development Brief forms a starting point.	Include post-fire photo.
	5	Apparently unauthorised gates at the Lodge.	It is anticipated that these will be replaced by the developer who has recently acquired the site. The gates have been inspected and are not affixed to the brick piers. In the meantime, any security is welcome.	Monitor situation.
	6	Minor grammatical errors in 6.2, 6.7.1, "up to 670", "Fountain Way"	Accepted	Corrected
	7	Disagrees that the upvc windows at Montague House necessarily the worst examples in the CA.	No other examples are known.	No action
	8	Shapland Close isn't correctly shown on the maps	Agree.	JW to amend maps
	9	Applauds desire to improve the Fountain Way junction but considers this probably unrealistic.	Am inclined to agree but with enough support and negotiation it's not impossible.	No action
Robert Stern	10	No obj to removal of The Maples and gardens from CA but concerned about environmental protection of the woodland and bat habitat between the houses and The Foyer.	Environmental concerns, not CA specific.	No action
John Medhurst	10	Resident of The Maples (formerly Nelson Terr). Objects to removal – benefits from tree protection, and is a 'small island of serenity'.	The large beech tree is potentially worthy of a TPO, giving it better protection than afforded by the CA.	Passed to Arb. Officer for consideration.

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
Irene Kohler	10	Resident of The Maples. The woodland to the south is valuable for tawny owls, sparrowhawks, woodpeckers and bats. Surprised that planners considering removing their protection. Essential that the area is protected for the benefit of the city.	Entirely focused on wildlife/environmental concerns rather than built environment. The trees are therefore the only factor within the LPA's potential control under CA designation.	No action
Mr & Mrs R Douglas	10	Resident of The Maples. Concerned that boundary change would reduce protection of habitat for bats. Lists wildlife seen (as Kohler) on daily basis but suggests copse could be better managed.	CA designation in itself provides no protection for wildlife; it does, indirectly, through the protection of trees, enable limited preservation of habitats, although known habitats of bats are already protected by other environmental legislation.	No action
R Deane	11	Notes that Nelson Terr now known as The Maples	Indeed it is.	Amended doc to cross-reference the two, then use The Maples throughout.
	12	The timber framed glazed link referred to in 7.3.1 is actually a cover to a tunnel entrance	Agree.	Text updatead
	13	Considers that the Ballroom is a 'remarkably late instance of quite pure Georgian style' and could be better described.	Need to consider the EH listing report and possibly use more detail.	Added ref to rifle range, otherwise little from the report of great import. The report is of course available for inspection.
Salisbury Conservation Advisory Panel	14	Panel considered that removal of the green space on the NW side would be a mistake.	Have revisited the site for this reason; when standing at the corner (to rear of courts) and viewing this site, it appears to have little homogeneous character and is largely developed with modern buildings and the school play area. A panoramic view is on file for reference.	No action.
	1	Further assessment of the courts' building would be helpful to assess its impact and implications for future devt in the vicinity.	Without further consultation such work could be contentious.	Have slightly amended references to the courts building.

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
	3	The management plan should be updated to reflect the recent activity on the Kennet and Paragon sites.	There has been no activity on the Paragon site, but Kennet Lodge has been refurbished since the report was written.	Removed Kennet Lodge from BAR section.
	15	Further analysis of the unlisted buildings of local importance could help determine whether there are any whose loss might be acceptable with suitable replacements.	Some work has been done on this for the whole site with a view to informing discussion of potential developments within the CA. This has been dealt with elsewhere and wouldn't necessarily be best placed within this document.	No action.
	16	38 Wilton Rd should be added to the Article 4 schedule.	At the time of survey, timber (prob original) windows and chimneys survived but not the roofslates.	Add to the Article 4 list.
	17	Questions whether Article 4 directions for Llangarren would be enforceable as historic windows and doors largely destroyed.	Some windows survive, and the character of the area is broadly intact as it mostly comprises listed buildings, so an Article 4 could be beneficial to the CA.	Add Llangarren to Article 4 list.
Turley Associates (Peter Lawson) for NHS Wiltshire	18	Paras 6.5 and 6.6 contain duplication	True.	Reworded.
	19	7.2.2 refers to magnificent trees. Question whether arboricultural assessment carried out.	Formal Arb. Assessment has not been carried out. The contribution of trees to CAs is on the basis of visual amenity, not their health or potential longevity, and this document should help inform the arb. officer of the LPA's principal concerns re trees in a CA.	No action.

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
	20	7.3.1 ref Finch House's 'glazed link' and questions its status.	It is, and to our team's knowledge always has been, part of Finch House which is a principal listed building. Attached at one end, the 'glazed link' is actually a tunnel entrance cover; the tunnels run under and serve Finch House, and this structure was therefore very clearly a functioning part of the building.	No action.
	21	<i>"There is no evidence that a robust and methodical approach has been applied when assessing the architectural and historic merits of the buildings upon the site", and "No direct explanation or justification as to how any of the unlisted buildings make a positive contribution to the character of the CA."</i>	The assessment largely depends on the published EH advice on the appraisal of CAs, in particular the checklist to assess the contribution of a building; in addition to the substantial experience and expertise of the consultants who have been involved in production of the appraisal.	No action.
	22	Para 9.3 should refer to the 'readable group' of the AWP buildings on the southern boundary	Fair point, although proposed for exclusion.	No action
	23	10.2 refers to townscape plan in Appendix A although this is actually Appendix 1; 18.2 refers Appendix B but also appears to be Appendix 1.	They should be Appendix 1 and 4 respectively	Corrected
	24	Suggests that no site visits made in preparation of the document as a building highlighted as being of local importance was a temporary wooden cabin which was removed some time ago.	Permission for the cabin's removal was granted in 2006 however our base mapping hasn't been updated. The highlight was clearly a mistake.	Update map accordingly.

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
	25	NHS concerned that LPA's 'apparent desire' to retain all remaining buildings will hamper the 'enabling development' necessary for the repair and reuse of the 'more significant grade II listed buildings'.	It is clear that the NHS would wish to be as unconstrained as possible in disposing of or redeveloping the site. It should be equally clear that this is a document describing the characteristics of an area previously acknowledged to be worthy of being a CA, and that there is a necessary presumption that historic buildings should be retained until an argument is made for their loss against policy CN9 of the Salisbury District Local Plan (Adopted 2003). The assertion that only 'the more significant grade II listed buildings' are considered worthy of conservation efforts in a conservation area is cause for concern.	No action.
	26	No mention of the ongoing works to update the 2000 Development Brief.	No report has yet been produced and cannot therefore be quoted or referenced.	No action.
	27	Significant concerns about paras 16.1-7		No action.
	28	16.7 ref to legislative powers is inappropriate.	Agree. Whilst the para is reasonable advice to the council from its consultants, it doesn't need to form part of the management plan for the site. If necessary, the controls already exist without confirmation of this document.	Removed.
	29	16.7 wouldn't allow for phased development of the site, and this could still be adequately controlled without comprehensive redevt of the whole site in one go.	Disagree as a comprehensive scheme could be phased. Piecemeal development has already had significant impact on the character of the CA.	No action.
	30	17.1.4/17.2.3 refer to urgent works notices. This is inappropriate for this form of document.	Agree, as 29. In fact, despite having received this advice in 2006, the council has maintained a generally non-confrontational approach to the site.	Reword.

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
	31	Insufficient information re buildings at risk assessment.	This document is not the place to describe all methods and techniques employed in its production; to do so would make it repetitive, unwieldy and un-consumer-friendly. Further information on BAR is available from English Heritage's website should it be required.	None.
	32	Para 21.0 suggests relocation of facilities provided from Shapland Close elsewhere within the larger site and demolition of the vacated buildings, but this would be unviable	It is assumed that the issue of relocation is the specified destination rather than the notion itself. It is believed the NHS are considering disposing of this site and so this option may well become a possibility at a later date.	Removed 'on the former hospital site' reference
	33	The buildings of local importance should be marked on a plan in Appendix 1.	They already are, although errors identified above.	None
	34	The management plan " <i>needs to be grounded in reality, and acknowledge current economic circumstances.</i> "	The management plan is intended to be aspirational, and to last for a much longer period than the current economic conditions. Any proposals within the MP would be subject to further consultation before implementation. It would be inappropriate (and contrary to policy) to accept dramatic loss of buildings solely on the basis of the short-term economic situation. Redevelopment of the site was possible before the current recession and was still not forthcoming.	No action.