

South Stoke Conservation Area Consultation Response Analysis

The South Stoke Conservation Area Appraisal consultation drafts were made available to the Parish Council, Bath and North East Somerset Council Planning & Transport Development department and to the wider community via the Council's public website. This consultation period was one month although an extension to this was given following a request by the Baker Associates on behalf of the Hignett Family Settlement, and the Parish Council. The preparation of the appraisal was undertaken with a significant contribution from the Parish Council which included a guided walk and meetings at and around the Conservation Area.

A separate two week consultation was undertaken regarding the proposed Conservation Area boundary changes which involved writing to the owners of properties within the proposed new boundary change. A notice was also placed within the village as a notification of the specific consultation making it clear that the boundary changes could be viewed on the Council's website.

Comment	Response	Proposed Change
<p>B&NES Council Planning Policy</p> <p>Page 3, Introduction: Amend second paragraph to correctly reflect the statutory requirement: '.....duty to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.....'</p> <p>4th paragraph – same point about community involvement as for Combe Hay.</p>	Both the preservation and enhancement of the character of a conservation area are desirable. The appraisal sought to paraphrase the wording of the Planning (Listed Building & Conservation Areas) Act 1990	None
Page 3, Summary of Special Interest, 12 th bullet point - footnote re K6 telephone kiosk?	Not necessary	None
Page 5 General Character: All 3 paragraphs use 'close proximity' – consider some rewording?	Noted	Amended

<p>Page 14, Locally Important Buildings As with Combe Hay, do we need to include a bit about the Local List and where to get further information etc or at least a cross reference to the Glossary?</p> <p>Last para – suggest changing last sentence to read: '.....as part of the Recommended Management Proposals (see page 14)'</p>	<p>The inclusion of the Local List was in error because it has been abandoned</p>	<p>Amended - all references omitted</p>
<p>Page 17, Recommended Management Proposals Paragraph 5 – whilst it is quite right to highlight the detrimental impact threat some modern materials and treatment have on the CA in general terms, is it appropriate to draw attention to specific properties e.g. Ivy Cottages?</p> <p>Paragraph 6 – Amend to 'There area large number of.....'</p>	<p>Appraisals need to be truthful and factual in order to be valuable and useful planning policy documents. Where there has been a deviation from the character in terms of materials and design etc to the detriment of the conservation area this should be highlighted in order to provide a potential catalyst for positive change</p>	
<p>Page 18, Potential CA boundary extensions <u>Brantwood House and grounds</u> It is not entirely clear from the CAA what the impetus is for extending the CAA and to include the area to the north west. As it directly abuts one of the options for the proposed urban extension to Bath, a very sensitive issue for this area, we need to bear in mind the advice in Guidance on the Management of CAs which states: <i>Whilst designation can be a legitimate response to an actual</i></p>	<p>The two areas being proposed for an extension to the existing Conservation Area boundary have been justified in both instances. The nature of an appraisal is a brief document to summarise the character and development of the village. Therefore if extensions are proposed there is not the space available to provide a lengthy justification.</p> <p>However, it is regarded that the justification given clearly and adequately defines why</p>	<p>None</p>

<p><i>or perceived threat to the character of an area, the first consideration should always be whether the area is of sufficient special interest to warrant designation, rather than whether designation would provide an additional control. Designation should never be undertaken solely in response to local pressure, or to bring the future of particular unlisted buildings under control.</i></p> <p>The existing CA is tightly drawn round the core of the village which has changed little over the years. The CA/village is characterised by its overriding sense of compactness and containment, which is emphasised by its prominent hillside location just below the skyline. Brantwood House and grounds, whilst no doubt a fine example of architectural heritage, does not appear to have any obvious intrinsic relationship with the rest of the village other than its proximity. It is located on the plateau above the village, well screened by trees and shrubs and barely visible from the road. From Hodshill the density of the tree edged skyline only allows an odd glimpse of the building.</p> <p>There needs to be stronger justification for including this property and such a large area of</p>	<p>the two areas should be included</p>	
---	---	--

<p>land as part of this CA not least a more robust explanation as to how it contributes to the existing character than is currently set out in the CAA otherwise we will open to criticism or challenge. It may be more appropriate to include this property on the Local List than the CA or consider whether it is a suitable candidate for Listing.</p> <p><u>Packhorse Lane</u> Again stronger, more robust explanation is needed to support the inclusion of these buildings in the CA. They appear to be a rather arbitrary addition as they are a bit out on a limb and arguably with no real connection to the strongly defined character of the CA. Without a more reasoned justification their inclusion could undermine the integrity of the rest of the CA.</p>		
<p>Pages 18-19, Planning Policy Context: As with the Combe Hay CAA, delete paragraphs 6-7, keep 8 and the first 2 sentences of 9 (delete rest of 9); delete 12-13 for the reasons already expressed.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Partly amended</p>
<p>Baker Associates on behalf of the Hignett Family Settlement, December 2009</p> <p>The Guidance on Conservation Area Appraisals prepared by English Heritage states that public participation should be an</p>	<p>Noted – the Conservation Appraisal was placed on the Council’s website and copies were distributed via the PC. The owners of the buildings within the proposed new boundary changes were consulted individually. Broad support was given for the appraisal and the</p>	

<p>integral part of the appraisal process. There should be a wide consultation and public debate drawing together local people, residents' groups, amenity groups, businesses, and other community organisations, in a discussion about the issues facing the area and how these might be addressed. Ideally, consultation should be undertaken generally in line with the local authority's statement of community involvement. Examples of this include the delivery of leaflets to all houses and businesses in the area, a public workshop, and press releases.</p>	<p>boundary changes (see letters below)</p>	
<p>South Stoke Parish Council Comments related to points of fact/detail for instance village history, building names, wording, grammar and typos. Notwithstanding these commendation and support was given for the appraisal.</p> <p>NB: The Parish Council were re-consulted in February 2011 but no comments were offered</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Appropriate changes made</p>

Conservation Area Boundary Changes Consultation	Response	Comments
--	-----------------	-----------------

<p>South Stoke Parish Council – letter dated 2 December 2009</p> <p>'We wholeheartedly and unanimously support in particular the well thought out proposals to extend the boundary of the old Conservation Area in the two directions, over Brantwood to the north west, and to the north east, into the area north of Packhorse Lane.'</p>	Noted	N/A
<p>D G Satow, The Priory, South Stoke, Bath – letter dated 20 March 2010</p> <p>'I was a member of the parish council when this Conservation Area was designated in 1982; my recollection is that it discussed the merits of both the areas now proposed for inclusion, and it is not now clear to me why they were then not included within the area designated. It is my view that there is an overwhelming case for the inclusion of the Brantwood estate within the Conservation Area, and a strong case also for the extension of the boundary eastwards on the north side of Packhorse Lane. I strongly support and commend these proposed boundary extensions.'</p>	Noted	N/A
<p>A E Neill & S Neill, Pound Cottage, South Stoke, Bath – letter dated 22 March 2010</p> <p>'We write in strong support of the proposed boundary extensions. South Stoke village is in the conservation area and an extension of this area would guard against any future creeping urban development and thus enhance the</p>	Noted	N/A

<p>approach and surrounding of our World Heritage city as well as preserving our historic village in its natural setting.'</p>		
<p>Peter Langkilde and Suzanne Shaw, Brantwood, South Stoke Lane, Bath – letter dated 3 December 2009</p> <p>'It has come to our attention that there are some proposed changes to the South Stoke Conservation Area. Having reviewed the consultation document which shows the proposed extension of the conservation area to include our property, we felt it appropriate to write to express our support for the changes.</p> <p>As owners and inhabitants of Brantwood, we fully support all of the aims, intentions and recommendations as set out in the South Stoke Conservation Area Appraisal. Furthermore we fully support the Parish Council in the role it will have in assisting in the management of those proposed changes.'</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Further amendments to reflect recent changes to national planning policy</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Amended</p>