

Annex 3: Queen Charlton Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan consultation (June - July 2017)

Consultation response log

The Ward councillor and the Parish Council representing the area concerned were specifically consulted, together with B&NES council officers.

The consultation was widely publicised and a public drop-in event was held at Queen Charlton Village Hall on 8 June 2017 which had 22 visitors. This included an exhibition and information about the proposals and Officers were available to answer questions. Similar information was made available on the council's web site and in a hard-copy format at Keynsham library.

A questionnaire was prepared to seek individual's views. Responses received are analysed below:

Hard copy and on-line responses to questions 1, 2, 3 and 5 if answered ('yes' or 'no')	yes	no
1: Do you support the proposed changes to the conservation area boundary?	13	1
2: Do you consider the Queen Charlton Conservation Area Appraisal describes the conservation area adequately?	12	2
3: Do you consider the Queen Charlton Conservation Area should be improved and enhanced?	14	0
5: Do you support the proposals in the Queen Charlton Conservation Area Management plan?	13	1

Hard copy responses received

Comment	Recommended change
Compton Dando Parish Council Extract from the Parish Council minutes – Item 7.9 20 th June 2016:TO CONSIDER THE DRAFT QUEEN CHARLTON CONSERVATION AREA CHARATER APPRAISAL POPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGES AND MANANGEMENT PROPOSALS PREPARED BY THE PLANNING SERVICES AT B&NES COUNCIL It was reported that the Draft Queen Charlton Conservation Area Character	 Noted: no change required

<p>Appraisal day was successful with a very good display. There was a steady flow of people visiting throughout the day. The Parish Council SUPPORT the draft Queen Charlton conservation Area Character Appraisal.</p>	
<p>Councillor Sally Davis (Farmborough Ward)</p> <p>“Residents are really pleased with the work....at Parish Council meeting last week everyone felt it was good. I’ve no further comments to add”</p>	<p>Noted: no change required</p>
<p>Local resident</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 1 - Area 7 - Ivy Cottage was built in approx. 1963, not the early 20C. You say it is situated on Queen Charlton Lane - interesting point, as I was not aware that the road had a name at that point. I always assumed that 'QC Lane' finished at the church. • Page 6 - 3.0 - There is no history prior to 1293, and as the village is not mentioned in the Domesday Book, it was probably not in existence, as such, and was still part of Keynsham. There is a view that the present church was built on the site of a Saxon chapel, but who knows. The spelling of the village name has changed several times, but I believe that it was 'Cherleton' in the Tax document you refer to. • Page 7 - The Court House was demolished ca. 1840, when it probably fell down! Pevsner got it wrong, in my view. The arch was probably brought here when Keynsham Abbey was demolished, as the entrance for the Court House, to which the last Abbot had retired. • The cross is probably constructed from the original stones, but was rebuilt in 1897. The cross on the top was probably added at this time, or even later. • The name was changed to Queen Charlton in the 16C and nobody knows why. However, I have found no reference to QC prior to 1574, when QE1 is alleged to have passed through the village and granted 	<p>The gentleman has provided extremely useful historic information. Paragraph 3 (Archaeology and historic development) will be amended where appropriate based on the information provided to ensure accuracy. Further responses follow below.</p>

a charter for an annual fair. So I go with that explanation.

- Tolley House was mentioned in 1549 as part of the largest holding in the village. In 1584, it was owned by a Bristol merchant trying to escape the plagues in Bristol, at that time. I don't have any evidence for your 14C date.
- Vickris Dickinson did arrange for works to be carried out on the church, but these were mainly taking bits of it down! His grand-daughter Frances carried out a full-scale remodelling in ca 1860.
- Page 8 - You mention that one modern building of traditional design was built - but that should be three - Appleacre (ca1952), Pear Tree Cottage (1958) and Ivy Cottage (ca 1963)
- Page 9 - The large grassed private garden is part of the Manor House, and not Manor Farmhouse. It was never part of the Manor Farm holding.
- The grassed area in front of the village school was not the school playground. The two playgrounds, one for girls and one for boys, were behind the building. The area in front of the building had no specific use.
- One other tree that is worthy of note is a yew tree, just to the south of The Brow. It is probably the oldest tree in the village, dating from around 1600.
- Page 10 - Obviously 'key focal buildings' is a matter of opinion and I would question the inclusion of The Gables and Rose Cottage. However, if you accept these, then you should also include Cross Cottage and Manor Farm Cottage, as they contribute at least as much to the value of the group.
- Page 11 - There is actually ONE street light - does that constitute 'street lighting' or not?
- The main road does have a 20mph sign, but this is only advisory, due to the sharp bend. We would very much like to have an enforceable speed limit of 20mph - with cameras!
- Page 12 - The 'packhorse bridge' is mentioned - I assume the bridge in Charlton Bottom. The existing structure is a footbridge. I doubt that there was ever a packhorse bridge as the stream is only a few inches deep at this point.
- I would not describe The Gables as one of the grander buildings in the village. It was a labourer's house and was probably built a little later than other nearby houses. You also give Ford's Farmhouse as

Amend: include all three properties

Amend: correct the text

Amend: correct the text

Amend: include the yew tree south of The Brow

Amend: identify Cross Cottage and Manor Farm Cottage as 'key' buildings

Amend: refer to there being just one street lamp

Noted: a matter for the highway authority to address

Noted: however the bridge is outside the conservation area

No change: The Gables has a strong visual presence notwithstanding its later date

<p>an example of a humbler two-storey building. This house is three storeys and was a farmhouse for much of its long life.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The only houses that are earlier than 1670 are parts of The Manor and the front part of Tolsey House. • Page 13 - The Village Hall (old School) was completed in 1858, as was School Cottage. • Page 13 - 5.3 - List dates need changing and 'modern detached housing needs addition of Pear Tree Cottage and Ivy Cottage • Page 14 - The former school is now the Village Hall, which does not include School Cottage. 	<p>Amend: text to be corrected</p> <p>Amend: add to the text</p>
<p>Local resident:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detrimental impact of travellers site(s) “to both ends of Queen Charlton”. 	<p>No change: the site to the east of the village is already referred to (para 6.1) as it can be seen from the conservation area.</p>
<p>Verbal request from local resident at the drop-in session:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to alterations to Monks Court is “too severe”. 	<p>Amend: remove reference to design of conversion works in paragraph 5.4</p>

On-line comments received (no name/address)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These are positive proposals but in order to maintain both the character of the village and the views that are considered to be so important in the assessment we propose that the boundaries are widened further to take in the fields down to the stream on the south side, continuing round to Engine House Lane on the north east side by including fields beyond the houses, and includes the very important triangle of land with its major tree and the pack horse bridge on the north side. 	<p>Amend: the village has a very distinct compact built form which the proposed boundary respects. Including fields around the village would dilute this recognised high value. However, the fields form the direct setting for the conservation area and their value would be recognised should any development proposal affecting them come forward, with the relevant ‘setting’ policy applied (Placemaking Plan policy HE1). It is proposed to amend the text to further emphasise the value of the surrounding fields/landscape in terms of their valued contribution to the setting of the</p>
---	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly, the use of positive and negative to describe residences is unnecessary, after all many of the conversions in the village have brought derelict structures back into habitable use, using natural materials even though the design may be more modern; conservation doesn't just mean that everything has to conform to a 19th century template. It could be argued that some of those called positive don't deserve that designation whilst some that are classed as negative have been more carefully regenerated and do in fact enhance the village's assets considerably. The differentiation between positive and negative is actually artificial and does not in any way boost the argument for extended Conservation area boundaries, so we suggest that this part of the report is amended. • Various corrections to names were made at the exhibition. Just an added point on the text in section 4.1 on page 8 - the triangular area of land is opposite Church Farmhouse not Monks Court. Also, given our comments in Q1above, the 'triangle' with tree by the pack horse bridge should be included as an important and distinct public space in 4.2. • The assessment is wrong about parking. There are difficulties when the village hall is in use during the day and large vehicles wish to go down that road, e.g. refuse collection. The road has a pinch point which makes it too narrow for both. However, we don't wish to stop parking as that would mean the hall couldn't be used. • Mainly the traffic - volume particularly at peak times, and speed at all times. Although the report suggests that having no pavement is an attribute it is in fact too dangerous to walk along the roads due to the level of unsafe and inconsiderate driving. 	<p>conservation area.</p> <p>Amend: remove reference to design of conversion works in paragraph 5.4</p> <p>No change: the triangle is outside the proposed boundary</p> <p>Amend: refer to issues of parking arising when the village hall is in use</p> <p>Amend: refer to potential danger caused to pedestrians</p>
---	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poorly maintained roads, likewise hedges on the way into the village particularly on the entrance from Keynsham. • Flooding in the winter due to blocked waterways. • Permanent epidemic of flytipping and litter thrown out of passing vehicles. • Lack of proper landscaping around, and an inappropriate entrance to, the travellers' site. • Expanded boundaries as described above in Q1. • Decent village signage at the main entrances to promote its Conservation Area status. • Different road surface - NOT rumble strips!! - or road layout which make traffic slow down, e.g. use of planters to make the road more of a chicane, narrowing pack horse bridge so that only one direction of traffic can use it at a time. • Proper traffic management at Whitchurch that reduces the attractiveness of Queen Charlton Lane as a short-cut. • Protection of the triangle by the pack horse bridge to stop its destruction by off-road vehicles and scramble bikes. • Protection of major trees. • Recommendations to be adjusted in the light of the comments in 	<p>Amend text: refer to condition of some roads and hedges</p> <p>Noted: not within the remit of this study</p> <p>Noted: as above</p> <p>Amend: although the site is beyond the conservation area insert a reference to the impact of the unattractive entrance within its setting</p> <p>No change: as above</p> <p>No change: use of such signage is not council policy</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted: not within the remit of this study, but a matter for consideration by the highway authority as part of any future development proposals in the vicinity</p> <p>Noted: not within the remit of this study</p> <p>Amend: refer further to tree protection and the 'notification' process regarding works to trees in the conservation area.</p>
---	---

<p>this and other comments received on the plan. It needs impetus not just a fine set of words!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designation of people to take responsibility for aspects of management and a timescale for implementation. 	<p>Noted: in response to the comments received changes to the appraisal and management plan are proposed</p> <p>No change: the documents will be published and used by the appropriate authorities, including B&NES Council and the Parish Council, as and when relevant proposals are introduced.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It recognises the importance of protecting a historic village against developments and significant changes. • It is a historic country village and the land and privacy of the village needs to be protected, planning permission must only be given with care and new developments should not be ignored. • ...a historic village that needs to be protected from any development changes that would alter its character and importance historically. The outlook to and from the village are important to its charm and tranquility, therefore it would be best preserved and looked after if the fields and roads around it are protected from any major developments. • Make an effort to reduce traffic through and along the village lane at all times. 	<p>Noted</p> <p>No change: one of the key purposes of the documents is its use when development proposals are being considered and assessed.</p> <p>Amend: the village has a very distinct compact built form which the proposed boundary respects. Including fields around the village would dilute this recognised high value. However, the fields form the direct setting for the conservation area and their value would be recognised should any development proposal affecting them come forward, with the relevant 'setting' policy applied (Placemaking Plan policy HE1). Amend the text to further emphasise the value of the surrounding fields/landscape in terms of their valued contribution to the setting of the conservation area.</p> <p>Noted: reference to traffic volumes is already included in the documents as an issue to be addressed by the Highway Authority</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The surrounding greenery of the villages that characterises it best and the fear of urban sprawl that would damage the essence of our historic village, should mean that the enhancement of the conservation area is the correct decision. • .. emphasis must be stressed on the importance of the control of 	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted: not within the remit of this study, but a matter for consideration by the highway authority as part of any future development proposals in the</p>

<p>traffic along Queen Charlton Lane. By doing this noise pollution can be greatly reduced and the safety of those running or cycling along the village lane must be paramount in the consideration of reviewing this.</p>	<p>vicinity</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • more should be done to protect the rural landscape and setting • long rural vistas and medieval field patterns; should these not also be include in the boundary?..other features including the horse trough also seem to have been excluded. • more needs to be done to address the increasing traffic levels and speed of vehicles. • huge increase in the number of houses surrounding Queen Charlton (e.g. Bilbie Green, The Meadows, White Church Court, Chocolate Quarter) will significantly increase the volume of traffic. This must be considered, especially given the narrow lanes and blind corners within the village of Queen Charlton • gypsy settlement entering the village from Charlton Road and Queen Charlton Lane. • vehicles passing through the village and driving over grass verges to get past one another. In particular, damage to the verges by the 	<p>Amend: the village has a very distinct compact built form which the proposed boundary respects. Including fields around the village would dilute this recognised high value. However, the fields form the direct setting for the conservation area and their value would be recognised should any development proposal affecting them come forward, with the relevant 'setting' policy applied (Placemaking Plan policy HE1). Amend the text to further emphasise the value of the surrounding fields/landscape in terms of their valued contribution to the setting of the conservation area.</p> <p>Amend the proposed boundary to include the horse trough (hidden from view by vegetation when the area was originally surveyed) Noted: as above</p> <p>Noted: reference to traffic volumes is already included in the documents as an issue to be addressed by the Highway Authority</p> <p>Noted: reference to traffic volumes is already included in the documents as an issue to be addressed by the Highway Authority</p> <p>Amend text: make reference to this issue</p> <p>Amend text: make reference to this issue</p>

<p>church and triangle of land lead</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are parts of the village that should be included • Certain locations in the village are excluded, but should be included. This beautiful village is generally being surrounded by new houses. The existing conservation area should be expanded, and further restrictions placed upon property within the conservation area. • Insufficient open space between the village and encroaching house development • More consultation is needed, on a group basis at a well-advertised time, giving plenty of notice 	<p>Noted</p> <p>Amend: the village has a very distinct compact built form which the proposed boundary respects. Including fields around the village would dilute this recognised high value. However, the fields form the direct setting for the conservation area and their value would be recognised should any development proposal affecting them come forward, with the relevant 'setting' policy applied (Placemaking Plan policy HE1). Amend the text to further emphasise the value of the surrounding fields/landscape in terms of their valued contribution to the setting of the conservation area.</p> <p>The relevant planning legislation does not allow for any further restrictions</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted: prior to the consultation it was widely promoted and advertised locally.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • rat run traffic through the village is a major issue - it travels too fast and makes it dangerous for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders 	<p>Noted: reference to traffic volumes is already included in the documents as an issue to be addressed by the Highway Authority</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant number of houses being built near Keynsham and remarkably via Queen Charlton lane....this has and will have a meaningful impact on traffic flow through the village increasing congestion, pollution and hampering the safety of those on foot/bike. 	<p>Noted: the study will be a significant planning consideration should any major (or other) developments be proposed</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume of traffic, traffic exceeding speed limit, poorly maintained roads 	<p>Noted: reference to traffic volumes is already included in the documents as an issue to be addressed by the Highway Authority</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • keeping the perimeter of the village intact would appear important. • The conservation area would surely benefit long-term by controlling design, materials, landscaping and resisting inappropriate or undesirable development. • fast moving traffic through the village. • Use of non-traditional materials in some of the conversion projects. Some of the converted properties end up like a protected fortress with high walls and gates. • sympathetic and firm control of all kinds of development or change should be maintained by the Planning Authorities. 	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted: this is one of the key purposes of the appraisal</p> <p>Noted: reference to traffic volumes is already included in the documents as an issue to be addressed by the Highway Authority</p> <p>Noted: the adopted appraisal will require a greater degree of protection for and respect of local character in any development proposals</p> <p>Noted: this is one of the key purposes of the appraisal</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fully support • more of the surrounding farmland should be included in order to protect and preserve the village and it's appearance. • this is an important historic village and more needs to be done to improve and enhance it. 	<p>Amend: the village has a very distinct compact built form which the proposed boundary respects. Including fields around the village would dilute this recognised high value. However, the fields form the direct setting for the conservation area and their value would be recognised should any development proposal affecting them come forward, with the relevant 'setting' policy applied (Placemaking Plan policy HE1). Amend the text to further emphasise the value of the surrounding fields/landscape in terms of their valued contribution to the setting of the conservation area.</p> <p>Noted: having an adopted conservation area character appraisal and management plan in place addresses this need</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • attention needs to be given to the approach of the village and how this is protected and better looked after. Especially, as the large number of surrounding housing estates means traffic will increase through the village. • a method for reduced traffic access, or residents only access is needed. • traffic also induces damage to the grass verges and litter is a definite problem. • better care of road signs is also required. • gypsy settlement traffic and increasing volume of traffic? 	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted: further consideration of traffic management measures is already referred to in the documents</p> <p>Amend text: make reference to this issue</p> <p>No change</p> <p>Noted: but not within the remit of this study</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not know whether the Conservation Area is capable of being expanded further, to include some of the fields/areas immediately around the village, in order to protect its character further, but if so I would support that too. Farmers and landowners around the village have been approached by developers asking for options on fields for some years, and it would be sensible to protect them if possible, in order to safeguard the Conservation Area. • There are other details which may be worth mentioning - the old horse drinking troughs opposite Orchard Cottages, for example. 	<p>Amend: the village has a very distinct compact built form which the proposed boundary respects. Including fields around the village would dilute this recognised high value. However, the fields form the direct setting for the conservation area and their value would be recognised should any development proposal affecting them come forward, with the relevant 'setting' policy applied (Placemaking Plan policy HE1). Amend the text to further emphasise the value of the surrounding fields/landscape in terms of their valued contribution to the setting of the conservation area.</p> <p>The farm buildings themselves are proposed for inclusion within the boundary to ensure a higher degree of planning control over any future development proposals should they come forward</p> <p>Amend the proposed boundary to include the horse trough (hidden from view by vegetation when the area was originally surveyed)</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I strongly agree with the approach taken in the Proposal. Queen Charlton is a small village of some historic significance and integrity which will face considerable pressure from development over the coming decades unless it is properly protected. This is why the Proposal is so important. • The centre of the village/Conservation Area has changed little over generations, and requires to be preserved. Threats to the integrity come from the edges - the permission recently given for residential developments at or near the ends to Queen Charlton Lane provide an indication of the pressures which the surrounding Green Belt will face; the permission to remain given to the travellers' site on the outskirts of the village affects the aspects on that side of the Conservation Area, and the barns/farm buildings provide obvious targets for further development. It is important that the periphery is properly protected to prevent the character of the Conservation Area from being compromised. 	<p>Noted</p> <p>Amend: the village has a very distinct compact built form which the proposed boundary respects. Including fields around the village would dilute this recognised high value. However, the fields form the direct setting for the conservation area and their value would be recognised should any development proposal affecting them come forward, with the relevant 'setting' policy applied (Placemaking Plan policy HE1). Amend the text to further emphasise the value of the surrounding fields/landscape in terms of their valued contribution to the setting of the conservation area.</p> <p>The farm buildings themselves are proposed for inclusion within the boundary to ensure a higher degree of planning control over any future development proposals should they come forward. The green belt setting of the conservation area is addressed in the documents</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rat running through the village • Housing estates closer and closer 	<p>Noted: further consideration of traffic management measures is already referred to in the documents</p> <p>Noted</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The boundary behind section 7 should be extended down to the stream to include the paddocks behind all houses from Diamond Cottage to Orchard Cottages. • The boundary to the side of sections 2 & 3 should be extended to Engine House Lane. 	<p>Amend: the village has a very distinct compact built form which the proposed boundary respects. Including fields around the village would dilute this recognised high value. However, the fields form the direct setting for the conservation area and their value would be recognised should any development proposal affecting them come forward, with the relevant 'setting' policy applied (Placemaking Plan policy HE1). Amend the text to further emphasise the value of the surrounding fields/landscape in terms of their valued contribution to the setting of the conservation area.</p>

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The small section behind Cross Cottage & Rose Cottage should be included. | |
|---|--|