APPENDIX 2(iv)

Salisbury City Consultation Responses (2009)

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
Salisbury Civic Society	1	Splitting the CA into four seems a reasonable approach; the documents cover a good range of details; the quality of the photographs and maps is to be commended.	N/A	N/A
	2	Suggest need a general map that clearly locates the chequers.	Agree and actioned.	Map of Salisbury to be produced which shows the chequers in context of whole city.
	3	Suggest that more information should be contained within the tables attached to the chequers, e.g. more description of the condition, impact or benefit of the buildings in each chequer, in order to provide better guidance to applicants, officers, etc.	Agree and actioned.	Consultants to provide further text.
	4	Unsure that the chequer approach to analysing the CA is best (not sure that one perceives the chequer character on the ground). Concern that this has resulted in missing out on characterising the wider picture, e.g. views and vistas, which need to be described rather than only marked on maps.	Agree that some further characterisation based on key routes would be beneficial.	Further survey work and characterisation to be carried out.
	5	Guidance for redevelopment should be general, and to include drawings and plans might be seen as prescriptive.	Agree and actioned	Remove sketches showing suggested proposals.
Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Society	6	The redrawing of boundaries to exclude modern developments appears sensible.	N/A	N/A
Salisbury Vision Board	7	The board considers that the proposed changes are consistent with the stated objectives of the Vision, and broadly welcomes the proposals.	N/A	N/A
	8	The proposal shown for the bus station site in Endless Street (Fig 173) is contrary to the objectives of the Vision, and would place unacceptable constraints on the council's ability to bring forward the comprehensive redevelopment of the Maltings. Accordingly the board would request that the plan and supporting text are removed from the document.	Agree and actioned	Remove sketch proposals for Bus Station site.

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
Gerald Steer	9	P8, 5.1.8 – the plague killed local people, but population was maintained by immigrants from the villages.	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.
	10	P10, 5.3.3 – the buildings around the Market Sq almost all had semi-basements.	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.
	11	P11, 5.4.1 – there are also a no. of high quality Victorian buildings, especially around the Market Sq.	Agree.	Add these buildings to the list.
	13	P13, 6.4.1 – Winchester St could also be mentioned, along with Fisherton St, as being a small centre of locally-owned businesses that are generally successful.	Agree.	Add to document.
	14	P14, 6.5.1 – more mention should be made of the tree-lined horizon around Salisbury, particularly to the south and around Leehurst Swan School.	Agree.	Amend document accordingly.
	15	P16, 6.6.1 – disagree that most of the chequers are given over to parking. Some remain 'green lungs'.	Disagree – there is a significant amount of parking within the chequers.	N/A
	16	P21 – note that 51 Blue Boar Row is definitely from the 1480s, as proved by contract sale from County Records. It is NOT 14th century as stated.	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.
	17	P23 – in Cross Keys Chequer, Queen St actually faces EAST.	Don't understand this comment.	-
	18	P73 – more emphasis should be placed on the importance of the trees in the Market Place.	Disagree – feel this has been covered adequately (see p105).	N/A
	19	P76 – note that in Exeter Street there are at least two buildings that dates from late 15th century.	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.
	20	P76 – the Close Wall is made of stone, largely brought down from Old Sarum, hence carved stones. Wall also contains some Hurdcott and Chicksgrove stone.	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
	21	P77 – Says The Green CRAFT by mistake.	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.
	22	P81 – there are a number of buildings in Fisherton St that date from the 15th century, e.g. the Teed Tools building.	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.
	23	P82 – no mention is made of the appalling quality of the north side of the buildings on the north of Fisherton St that back onto the side of the City Hall and face the Playhouse.	Discuss whether we should add something about this.	Add paragraph regarding opportunities for redevelopment or enhancement.
	24	P98 – note that mathematical tiles are also often, more commonly, fixed to continuous butted pine boards nailed to framed buildings behind.	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.
	25	P99 – Victorian influences are not always modest. Ref. The Lloyds Bank (corner of Castle St/Blue Boar Row) and Portland BS (Queen St/Winchester St).	Noted.	Amend document to emphasise that the residential ones are modest.
	26	P100 – should 'Poultry cross' be 'Poultry Cross'?	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.
	27	P101 – ref. Comment 20 regarding mix of stones.	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.
	28	P103, 9.11.1 – there are a no. of slate-hung buildings – Silver St, Crane St, Butcher Row.	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.
	29	P103, 9.12.1 – frames survive from all the centuries between 13th – mid-16th centuries. They are not normally referred to as 'box timber frames', just 'timber frames'.	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.
	30	P104 – the serrated ridge tiles in Salisbury are 'thumb ridges' NOT 'hog backs' (they were made by pinching the ridge between thumb and forefinger). Several examples can be seen in the museum.	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.
	31	P105 – see comment 14 RE: trees.	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
	32	P122 – Need more discussions and recommendation for streetscape, surface design and signage. Also suggest comment regarding the chosen design for the Market Place and further pedestrianisation should be mentioned.	The council's public realm strategy will be making recommendations. Noted.	N/A
	33	General – concern over specific plans and axonometrics – too prescriptive. Suggest would be more appropriate to have text only which identifies potential redevelopment sites, and suggest materials, density, heights, but not illustrate.	Agree.	Remove sketch proposals.
	34	Support proposals for inclusion of the terraces in Harnham and the omission of the Grasmere House Hotel and sheltered housing scheme.	N/A	N/A
Salisbury Conservation Advisory Panel	35	Panel happy with the proposed changes to the boundary.	N/A	N/A
	36	The use of chequers as the basis of the appraisals, whilst understandable, has its limitations, and requires a better map showing relationship to surrounding streets.	See comment on Issue 2	N/A
	37	P76 Exeter St – the importance of retaining the complete circuit of the Close wall, particularly its southern section, should be emphasised, to militate against any possible revival of proposals for creating new entrance through it. NB. the materials of the wall are not restricted to solely Chilmark.	Disagree – feel importance of wall is adequately covered.	N/A
	38	6.4.1. Fisherton St – the suggestion that this is 'a successful urban quarter, unlike the central retail area' is highly contentious and needs amending.	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.
	39	Brown St – reference needs to be made to the visual contribution of the unlisted Baptist church.	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.
	40	7.4.9 – the reference to 'modest Victorian influence' underplays the contribution made by Victorian buildings to the city, particularly to the centre.	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
	41	14.1 – The Cathedral Hotel, Milford St, should be removed from the BAR list.	Noted.	Remove Cathedral Hotel from BAR list.
	42	The section relating to the bus station in Central car Park should be removed in its entirety, as it is quite unrealistic in the light of the proposed Vision.	Agree.	Remove sketch proposals for bus station.
	43	All references to redevelopment of specific sites should be restricted to written material, with drawings removed (too prescriptive).	Agree.	Remove sketch proposals.
	44	The section dealing with the Market Place needs to be updated to reflect the recent appointment of architects and the particular design approach.	Disagree.	N/A
	45	Further analysis of sites which make a negative contribution to the townscape would be useful. Possible sites include the back gardens of houses on the N side of Fisherton St, which face towards the Playhouse and City Hall, and the small WC-owned car park on the N side of Salt Lane (at its E end, near The Greencroft).	Noted.	Do not consider that it is feasible to go into further detail on individual sites.
	46	21.3.1 – refers to civic society's 'Streetscape – Streets for All' survey document. A reference could also be usefully inserted at some point to the civic society's 'Salisbury in Detail' book, for its portrayal of individual features of value within the CA.	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.
Richard Deane	47	5.2.1 – final sentence unclear.	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.
	48	6.6.1 (Character area 1: historic core, including chequers) says 'most of the chequers are given over to parking in the centre'. Is this not an exaggeration?	Disagree – see issue 15.	N/A
	49	6.6.5 (St Edmund's Ch etc.) 1st para – after 'demolished in 1865' add 'and replaced by the present chancel'?	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.
	50	6.6.5 townscape summary – update on swimming pool building (2nd para), and add reference to new Bourne Hill extension?	Noted.	Remove the reference to the swimming pool building and update on extension to Bourne Hill.

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
	51	6.6.8 title Water Lane NOT Street.	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.
	52	6.6.10 Watermeadows, townscape summary, 2nd para – Should be Town Path NOT Walk (mentioned 3 times).	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.
	53	7.4.8 Final point – mathematical tiles on many buildings, but tuck only on a few?	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.
	54	7.7.1 – Point 4 on train station is inaccurate, both by confusing two buildings and getting the listed status wrong (though the latter is corrected later).	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.
	55	Post office is of Chilmark Stone NOT Portland/Purbeck.	Noted.	Amend document accordingly.
Jim Humberstone	56	Opening stages of document – should place greater emphasis on what is so special about the city and its origins. Significance of cathedral being raison d'être for plan of city. This should guide philosophies for the protection of the city.	It is considered that sufficient weight has been given to the origins of the city, for the purpose of this document.	N/A
	57	Historic background – should emphasise the role of bishops as developers and urban entrepreneurs. Important urban design exercise.	It is considered that sufficient weight has been given to the origins of the city, for the purpose of this document.	N/A
	58	Phased development of the city should be mentioned, and how this is identifiable in the street pattern, layout and grain.	Do not consider that this is necessary here.	N/A
	59	Townscape – should place greater emphasis on townscape characteristics as an outcome – not just buildings, design and materials – but the 3-D relationships of spaces and enclosure (in the manner of Gordon Cullen).	Consider that further analysis would be beneficial.	Additional text to be produced based on key routes.
	60	Bibliography – could add 'Salisbury – the Changing City', Breedon Books, 2003 (written by the local studies' librarian), and also 'Understanding Place', EH, 2009.	Agree.	Add to bibliography.

Respondent	Issue No.	Issues Raised	Officer Comment	Action
Network Rail	61	Object to the inclusion of the railway station within the conservation area. Cannot see any reason for doing this, given that the station is a listed building. Furthermore, Network Rail is concerned that CA designation could impact on its ability to operate, manage and improve the railway.	Conservation areas and listed buildings are two separate, sometimes overlapping, forms of designation. Operational issues are not grounds for objecting to CA designation. Can only object on grounds that are is not of special architectural or historic interest.	N/A