

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:** Durrington, Wylde and Steeple Langford Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans

**Report to:** Northern Area Committee

**Date:** 29<sup>th</sup> January 2009

**Author:** Elaine Milton

---

## CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISALS AND MANAGEMENT PLANS FOR DURRINGTON, WYLDE AND STEEPLE LANGFORD

### 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 Durrington, Wylde and Steeple Langford Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans with a request that the Northern 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.

The importance of conservation area appraisals and their associated management plans is expressed in Central Government Best Value Performance Indicators BVPI 219a, b and c. These indicators measure the number of conservation areas, the number of conservation areas that have published appraisals, and the number of conservation areas that have published management plans respectively.

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, Wylde, 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 three Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans being presented can be found in Appendix 4. Officers examined all of the responses received in conjunction with the consultants, and amended the document as necessary. The tables in Appendix 4 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 Durrington Conservation Area**

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

- Removal of part of the water meadows from the conservation area;
- Inclusion of a number of buildings that form 'gateways' into the village;
- Identification of some vulnerable cob walls;
- Provides guidance for sites that could potentially be developed.

### **Summary of Recommendations for Wylde Conservation Area**

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

- Some amendment to the boundary of the conservation area;
- Identification of a number of buildings at risk;
- Suggestions for enhancement of highway surfaces;
- Suggestions for the removal of unsightly overhead wires.

## Summary of Recommendations for Steeple Langford Conservation Area

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

- Identification of buildings at risk from deterioration;
- Suggestions for tree preservation orders;
- Some amendment to the boundary of the conservation area;
- Guidelines for two sites in the conservation area that could potentially be developed;
- The suggested removal/replacement of the roadside barrier outside Widdershins, Salisbury Road.

### 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 Durrington, Wylde, and Steeple Langford 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: Durrington Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, September 2008

Appendix 2: Wylde Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, September 2008

Appendix 3: Steeple Langford Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, September 2008

Appendix 4: 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:** Durrington, Wylde and Steeple Langford.

## Appendix 4 – Conservation Area Consultation Responses

### Durrington Consultation Responses

<b><u>Respondent</u></b>	<b><u>Issue No.</u></b>	<b><u>Issues Raised</u></b>	<b><u>Officer Comment</u></b>	<b><u>Action</u></b>
Mr R Hannant	1	Comment regarding 'High Street setting and 'Gateway'. Does not consider that the gardens and boundaries of the houses should be included in the CA as proposed, on the grounds that the properties are of insufficient quality to merit inclusion and so neither should the gardens/walls be included.	Following best practise guidelines regarding the importance of gateways and entrances to CAs – propose to keep boundaries in. Protection applies primarily to the walls rather than foliage/trees within the gardens.	Text amended to reflect importance of boundary walls rather than trees per se.
Mrs H Cate	2	Comment regarding 'High Street setting and 'Gateway'. Owner of Cherry Tree Cottage and supports its inclusion.		N/A
	3	Suggests the inclusion of Willow Cottage (rear of 31 and 33 High Street). A thatched new build.	This is an attractive modern thatched property, however, it is considered that it does not contribute to the character of the conservation area.	No action.
	4	Expresses concern about the nature of development on the MOD site. Hopes that it is of high quality otherwise could be potentially damaging to CA.	Noted	N/A
Mr and Mrs J M Stone	5	Agree to the proposed changes to the CA boundary.	None	None
Mr Martin Francis Murphy	6	Strongly objects to the inclusion of the boundary wall to his property – No 28 High Street, within the CA. Does not want the additional bureaucracy of necessary tree applications or planning permissions.	As comments to 1. Trees will not be included within revised boundary but may need consent for boundary changes.	See issue No.1.
Mr D Maytum	7	Comment regarding Nos 9 and 10 The Ham. Welcomes their inclusion. Expresses grave concerns about planning permission S/2005/511 for permission for two bungalows.	Noted but can't revisit previous application.	N/A
Member of the public (unnamed)	8	Notes that Bethany Cottage, College Road is not marked as a Listed Building on the maps.	Noted	Map amended
Mrs H R Jones	9	A comment regarding the proposed inclusion of 202 Bulford Road (Bulford Road 'Gateway'). Does not appear to be objecting to the inclusion of this building	Noted	None

<b><u>Respondent</u></b>	<b>Issue No.</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Action</b>
		but rather flagging up the fact that there may be a future change of use application from commercial to residential.		
Helena Cave-Penney, Archaeologist, WCC	10	No comments.	N/A	N/A
Salisbury Civic Society	11	No comments.	N/A	N/A
Judith Howles DC Team Leader Salisbury Planning	12	Refers to the H12 site (Land East of Netheravon Road). There is a brief for the site and an application has been submitted but consent has not been issued and may not (depending on the link issue with the adjoining development).	Noted.	N/A

## Steeple Langford Consultation Responses

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
D Grover	1	Objections to boundary changes (Berwick Lane) on basis of threatened views.	On careful review agreed to leave this area within existing CA.	Amend text and plans accordingly
Chris Riley	2	Factual errors – replace Nadder with Wylie (pgs 2,6,9,12).	Make necessary amendments.	Amend text accordingly.
	3	Replace A303 with A36 (pgs 12,15,22).		
	4	Factual error – trees at Montrose House. Mr Riley says if we are also including roadside trees then it should say limes and beeches.	Noted but not referring to roadside trees so leave text unamended	No action.
	5	Garages and sheds site south of the church.	Noted but felt that two separate complex issues were being confused – ie landscape issues and the rationalisation of the boundary. Considered the comments but still felt that the garages did not merit inclusion with the boundary which needed to be amended anyway (and it would be a nonsense to amend the boundary to include the garages).	No action
	6	Site to north of Church. Not happy with proposal for residential as will inhibit views of church. Questions why not a public space to facilitate views.	Site has been reviewed in the light of comments. It was considered that views were incidental rather than planned and that development would not have an adverse impact on the existing way the church is perceived. Also considered the likelihood of this land becoming a public space, whilst desirable is extremely remote.	No action
	7	Corner site of Wirr/Salisbury Rd Concerned about speeding cars and that a development here would restrict visibility. Also concerned about views from Fern Cottage and other properties. Questions whether it should be included within Management plan as outwith CA.	On review and after considering comments made, agree to removal of proposals from appraisal and management plan	Amend text accordingly

Chris Andrews	8	Picks up on factual errors ie Wylve not Nadder; A36 not A303; The Walk is The Wirr.	Noted.	Amend text accordingly.
	9	Information. Church Cottage was previously 4 thatched cottages sold in the 1950s and subsequently reroofed.	Noted. Add to text as additional background information.	Amend text accordingly.
	10	Information. Estate cottages for the Ashburton Estate. First re-inforced concrete buildings.	Noted .	Amend text to reflect additional information.
		Information. Entrance to The Wirr. Was a historic house where one is now suggested.	Noted (but see previous comments). Proposing to exclude this area following consultation so no action proposed	No action.
J M MacDougall (on behalf of Steeple Langford PC)	11	Request that Berwick Lane in its entirety is retained with the Berwick Lane Conservation Area. No reason given.	See previous comments. Despite modern buildings, it is now proposed to leave this area in for the landscape value provided by the tree-belt. Also noted is the potential for development with an impact on the village.	Amend text accordingly.
Judy Howles (DC officer)	12	Errors Pg12 Wylve not Nadder	Noted	Amend text accordingly.
	13	Pg16 Site north of church – flagged up potential loss of views of church. Thinks it should be retained as a greenspace.	See previous comments.	No action
	14	Junction at the Wirr – thinks this should be kept open as development impractical.	See previous comments.	Amend text.
	15	Pg22 could say more about street enhancements (pavement widening and trees).	Pavement enhancement noted but probably a low priority and also an issue regarding narrowness of carriageway and ‘urban’ approach. Regarding trees – formal street planting would be inappropriate to a semi-rural village.	No action

	16	Boundary changes. Would retain Berwick Lane as imp backdrop to village.	See previous comments	Amend text
	17	Would include Lakes as important in terms of village setting.	Lakes do not contribute to character of CA as hidden. Confusing landscape views with character of CA.	No action
	18	Would omit Bell Inn from CA.	Discussed and agreed that although untypical, a high-quality townscape building.	No action.
	19	Article 4. Would suggest one covering walls throughout CA.	Addressed as most covered by statutory listing and also proposed Article 4 directions specifically targeting boundary walls.	No action
	20	Pembroke Cottages on Salisbury Road. Suggests excluding 14 and 16 from window alterations. Otherwise include only these in Article 4 direction as rest of SL is too diverse.	Considered comments arose out of misunderstanding of purpose of Article 4 directions. Leave text unamended	No action.
Jane Lemon	21	Windershinns – chalk block beneath render. Considers crash barrier still necessary because it is so narrow at this point. Would like to see barrier redesigned.	Noted but text does say to consider alternative designs so no change proposed.	No action
	22	Objects to suggestion of a “voluntary stop crossing with demarcation in a different material” on grounds that it is too urban an approach.	A carefully chosen design could mitigate concerns and the text says this so agreed not to amend text	No action.
	23	Would like to see site north of church opened up and grassed.	See previous comments	No action.
R M Salt	24	Errors: change Nadder to Wylve and A303 to A36.	Noted	Amend text.
	25	Pg9 – Corpus Christi Cottage is now College House.	Noted	Amend text

	26	Pg18 para 1 and fig 10. Says outbuildings on 1839 map so earlier than Victorian. Also says replacement of cracked tiles in hand.	Information noted but no further action proposed	No action.
	27	Site north of church. Objections to loss of view of church given Millenium floodlighting project for the church. Concerned that building with long axis parallel to road would reduce views of church. Concerns also about vehicles crossing the pavement as children make way to school.	See previous comments, but note views expressed on the orientation of the building – amend text to remove a preference for building orientation	Amend text accordingly
	28	Pg20 Site on west corner of the Wirr. Does not agree that a 'gateway' building is required.	See previous comments.	Amend text
	29	Pg22 Barrier outside Windershinns. Consider this a dangerous area of the road. Need something here.	Consider re-wording section about barrier in front of Windershinns	Amend text to reflect concerns.
ProVision Planning Consultancy for Mr C Fox (owner of site north of church)	30	Site north of church – objects to the comment “that the long axis of the building be orientated along Salisbury Road” and gives a number of reasons – principally that there are gable end buildings and that a building parallel to the road would block views of the church.	Note views expressed on the orientation of the building – amend text to remove a preference for building orientation	Amend text
AONB Group	31	P3 – effect of the bypass on the CA should be mentioned.	Noted, but do not feel that this needs to be mentioned in the context of this document.	No action.
	32	P4 – the settlements section relates to the evolution of the settlement and does not cover 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.	No action.
	33	P5 – 'General Overview' seems to be understated and too brief.	Do not agree.	No action.
	34	P5 – Character areas seem disjointed and sizable gaps between them not described.	Do not agree.	No action.
	35	P6 onwards – Would be helpful to mark photo positions on a plan.	Do not feel that this is necessary.	No action.
		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.

36	P6 onwards – There is no comment on the negative elements of wirescape.	Agree.	Text amended.
37	P13 – Boundary features might relate to historic parks/gardens. No mention of this.	No actual evidence to confirm this.	No action.
38	P16&17 – Repairs and repointing issues of walls could benefit from further explanation.	Agree, but feel that this would be better dealt with in another document.	No action.
39	P22 – Wirescape problems not mentioned earlier in document.	Agree.	Text amended.
40	The river does not read on the maps.	Disagree. The river is clear.	No action.

### **Steeple Langford Boundary Consultation Responses**

<b><u>Respondent</u></b>	<b><u>Issue No.</u></b>	<b><u>Issues Raised</u></b>	<b><u>Officer Comment</u></b>	<b><u>Action</u></b>
<u>Mr and Mrs Collast</u>	1	Agree with proposed changes.	Noted.	No action.

## Wylve Consultation Responses

<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Issue No.</u>	<u>Issues Raised</u>	<u>Officer Comment</u>	<u>Action</u>
Helena Cave Penney (County Archaeologist)		No comment		
Wylve PC	1	Fig20 shows Down House, not Hallam Cottage	Noted	Picture changed
	2	Fig 22 shows Elmbury Cottage not the Post Office	Noted	Picture changed
	3	Fig 23 shows the PO and pub not Elmbury Cottage	Noted	Picture changed
	4	Fig 25 shows wall between rec and Stable Cottage, not Wylve House	Noted	Picture changed to one of the correct wall
	5	The non-conformist chapel is now converted to a residence	Noted	
	6	The telephone exchange is believed to be still in use.	P19, omit 'former'	Document amended
	7	Support encouragement of owners to carry out necessary repairs		
	8	Will SDC make contact with owners of house on p21 and seek its restoration as a dwelling?	Will make contact to seek repairs.	
	9	Question the advantage of removal of S side of Townsend.		
	10	Support removal of wirescape, would appreciate further advice	This could probably only be achieved through s106 agreements. Will investigate possibility of limiting further wires in negotiation with BT.	

<b><u>Respondent</u></b>	<b>Issue No.</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Action</b>
	11	Support idea of resurfacing Teapot St, and all other highways	We welcome the support.	
	12	Welcome the constructive suggestion re Mill House carriageway	We welcome the support.	
	13	Would like advice re the poor tv/radio reception in the area as this threatens the quality of life in the village	Beyond the remit of this document.	
	14	Regret the lack of support from SDC in church maintenance despite being the most important historic building in the village.	The LA has no historic buildings grant schemes.	
	15	Insufficient/lacking mention of the churchyard and its extension which contains war memorials and is a peaceul & reflective space	Will amend text.	Added a line to the green spaces section
	16	Wyvern village hall has been upgraded recently	Noted.	
	17	Recreation ground is PC's responsibility and is subject to improvement plans	Noted.	
	18	PC would welcome advice re the roads with restricted access - the restrictions are widely ignored	Beyond the remit of this document.	
	19	Would like to know who is responsible for the allotments (which are unmentioned) as it is in a poor state	SDC's parks dept don't know but assumed it was the parish...if not, then it might be the Wilton Estate.	
	20	The CA would benefit from the inclusion of the field between Wyllye House & Mill House	Setting issues can be adequately covered under existing legislation.	
	21	The CA would benefit from the inclusion of the field between Wyllye House & Wyllye Place	Setting issues can be adequately covered under existing legislation.	
	22	Wyllye Townscape map doesn't colour 1 Church St in blue	This is an accidental omission, will amend.	Have been unable to edit the graphics, but is a LB so is still protected

<b><u>Respondent</u></b>	<b>Issue No.</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Action</b>
	23	Welcome many of the proposals but concerned as to how/whether they will be carried out		
Nicola Worrall	24	The houses to the south of Townsend were built after CA designation, hence they should by definition satisfy the requirements of the CA, and it would be inappropriate to remove them now.	Disagree	
	25	There is a diverse range of styles and ages so how can it be asserted that 1-8 Glebe Bungalows and 1-35 Townsend do not relate to the settlement of Wylie?	Argued in the text	
	26	To exclude 1-35 Townsend appears to discriminate against homes which are comparatively more affordable and gives the message that there is no place for affordable housing in CAs.	Disagree completely, proposal relates directly to design, materials and layout.	
	27	Disagrees that the 'form' of the Townsend exclusion is any more inappropriate than any other part of the village	Noted.	
	28	Believes that 1-35 Townsend should be protected against 'inappropriate' development in the future	Noted.	
	29 (by phone)	Is the term post-war appropriate for 1980s development?	Will amend to be more specific.	Changed to "late twentieth century"
	30	Leaflet refers to two groups of post-war bungalows – there is one group of bungalows and the rest are houses	Question of interpretation, is not incorrect	
Susan Dixon	31	Is unsure what the boundary changes mean. Agrees that Townsend houses of no historical interest and not attractive.	The consultation leaflet was felt to give a clear explanation.	
Parish Council meeting	32	Wheel House needs to be on Art 4 list and Buildings of local importance	It is.	
	33	Elmbury Cottage, Sheepwash Lane should be on BLI list	It's statutorily listed.	
	34	Mgmt Plan is wrong version	Unclear what this means	

<b><u>Respondent</u></b>	<b>Issue No.</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Action</b>
	35	LB and BLI colours hard to distinguish (both blue)	Noted for future reference (we agree)	
	36	Lodge at Wyllye Place is BAR and urgent works required	Agree, this is raised in the CAA.	AM to contact owners
	37	Check photo numbers (e.g. figs22/23)		Resolved as above
AONB comments 23 <sup>rd</sup> Dec 2008	38	Railway not mentioned	Has already been dealt with after previous consultation	
	39	Settlement plan describes evolution but not the current situation	Disagree, the character areas and maps cover this.	
	40	Special character/interest of the streets/plan not conveyed	Disagree, the character areas and maps cover this.	
	41	Archaeological potential has recommendation before any analysis	Disagree that the ordering of this section is inappropriate, and would add that all archaeological issues are the remit of the County Archaeologist who would use the HER for research rather than this document.	
	42	River power identified as key historic influence without comment/description or justification	Other than the mill there is no clear evidence that this has affected the development of the CA.	No change required.
	43	General overview too brief to convey character or sense of place, inadequately introducing the character areas	Disagree, the character areas are clearly described.	
	44	Figures need captions	Agree	Doc updated
	45	Character sub area descriptions 'value laden' rather than neutral description and subsequent critical analysis	The approach to CAA production is under very different guidance from landscape character assessment and has closely followed the EH guidance as required.	

<b><u>Respondent</u></b>	<b>Issue No.</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Action</b>
	46	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
	47	Plan with names of buildings mentioned in text would be helpful	A map with this info couldn't be reproduced legibly at A4.	None.
	48	Fig 4 is said to be brick but appears to be stone	It's said to be brick, flint and stone – which it is.	None
	49	Is the church tower not a key feature?	Yes, and the church is referred to in the text.	None
	50	Fig5/10 duplicates, fig 8/11 very similar	Yes	Changed 10 to correct pic, others as intended.
	51	4 <sup>th</sup> bullet point of 'Towns End' – 'distinct change' – is this historically/architecturally significant? P8	This is more of an observation than judgment, although description is given.	None
	52	Fig 12 windows/door unusual but no mention	It is mentioned.	None
	53	Church St/Church Lane – which is it?	Street	Amend p11
	54	Minimal description of church despite it being key feature	The church is mentioned, however it's design is unlikely to relate to any other past or future development.	
	55	Village/town	Village	Amend p13
	56	Are there no historic gardens or 17 <sup>th</sup> century buildings	17 <sup>th</sup> century buildings are referred to several times. Historic gardens of Wylde Place/House and Court Fmhse could get more of a mention – the setting of these LBs is protected, and walls are the significant aspect from a CA pov, and are referred to.	
	57	Public spaces aren't shown on the townscape map	This was meant to say 'significant open spaces', and wasn't intended to be on the townscape map.	Delete the reference.
	58	Fig29 gives prominence to power line over open space	The open space is the principal element, but it's pretty plain so the wire draws the eye.	None

<b><u>Respondent</u></b>	<b>Issue No.</b>	<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Action</b>
	59	The river could be more explicit in this section p17	Why? This is a CAA and consciousness of the river within the CA is very low.	
	60	The area at Towns End isn't described/considered before recommending its removal – do the plots have any historical significance, is historic landholding still a feature.	The historic layout of this area was open allotments with small cottages along the roadside (see historic maps in Appendix). The para on p23 adequately describes the reasons for removal.	None
	61	Wirescape – where is this described and identified as an issue?	p19	None
	62	Granite setts appear to be an alien material for this landscape p25	Maybe, but would be better than tarmac or concrete! All proposals within the MP would be subject to further consultation anyway.	None
	63	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.	
	64	The river doesn't 'read' on any maps	The map doesn't have coloured features so it wouldn't, however the Mill makes its location clear if in any doubt.	None