

Belbroughton Draft Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan

Name	Support	Oppose	Comment	Para No.	Response	Officer Response
Natural England					Natural England is grateful to you for the opportunity to advise on your consultation but on this occasion has no comments to make.	Noted
English Heritage	Yes				While we cannot provide detailed comments on this occasion, it is good news that the programme of appraisals is continuing and English Heritage is highly supportive of the progress being made.	Noted
Belbroughton Parish Council	Yes		Yes		Thank you for inviting the Parish Council to comment on the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan. The Council considers that the Conservation Area appraisal has been well done and that the report is a well researched and useful document. The Council notes that the management plan and proposed photographic record of properties in the Conservation Area will provide very useful monitoring tools to enable the Parish Council to identify and raise concerns about the potential loss of local features.	Noted and welcomed
					The Council generally supports the proposed extensions to the Conservation Area, which are well thought through, and it welcomes the inclusion of a number of additional listed buildings. However, in relation to the proposed extension along Hartle Lane (proposal no. 7), the Council considers that it would be sufficient to draw the boundary to include No 3 Hartle Lane (the Edwardian House) but that nos 5 and 7 Hartle Lane have no intrinsic architectural merit and could be excluded.	Noted. Please refer to comments below

				<p>Points of detail on the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No 7, Hartle Lane is wrongly described as 'The Recreation Community Centre, Hartle Lane'. This will be confused with Belbroughton Recreation Centre further up Hartle Lane. No 7 should be described as the parish room or parish council meeting room, Hartle Lane. The list of properties within the revised Conservation Area boundary in Appendix 1 is not entirely logical or consistent. Could properties be listed together in their street order, eg properties 5-7 in Holy Cross Lane and 3-7 Hartle Lane- at present they are in different places in the list. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted and amended Noted. Property details arrived in this format from an electronic source. They will be re-sorted for the final draft.
Jaswant Kaur	Part	Part	Yes	<p>Although generally supportive of a comprehensive, detailed document, there are notable omissions in Part 1 section 6 - Summary of Issues (Page 26) and Part 2 - Draft Management Proposals (Page 28 onwards) regarding traffic problems within the conservation area.</p> <p>The intention of protecting the character, heritage and environmental integrity of the conservation area is currently seriously undermined by the detracting and detrimental effects of through traffic on the High Street and Queens Hill parts of the Conservation area.</p> <p>As this part of the village has gradually been allowed to be used as a short cut to the motorway (Junction 4), the peace and character of the area is diminished, safety of pedestrians is affected and</p>	<p>Noted. A district-wide issue harming the amenity value of numerous villages.</p>

					<p>damage is caused to property frontages, street furniture and road edges/kerbs.</p> <p>Particular problems are the speed of traffic, volume of traffic, use by HGV vehicles and peak-hour congestion.</p>	
					<p>Additions should be made to the document to highlight the detrimental effect of traffic problems (Page 26) and management proposals should be added (Page 28 onwards) to help protect the area by including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit speed on Queens Hill and High Street to 20mph • Introduce a width restriction (2m/6ft 6in) through the village • Ensure current weight limits are adequately signed and enforced • Provide marked resident parking spaces on Queens Hill/High Street • Improve pedestrian safety as narrow parts of Queens Hill/High Street have limited pavements for pedestrian access. The road here is also barely wide enough for two vehicles to safely pass each other. <p>I note that the document also makes reference to S43 - Traffic Calming Measures but contains no specific proposals for their usage in the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>Noted and agreed. S43 Traffic Calming Schemes and the need to fully address traffic issues are areas for continuing discussion between Belbroughton Parish Council Bromsgrove District Council and Worcestershire County Council.</p>
Rowena Jones	Yes		Yes		<p>I agree that Belbroughton still has a wealth of historical features and every effort should be made to keep existing properties and public spaces in</p>	<p>Noted and welcomed.</p>

					original condition and to ensure any new development is appropriate and sympathetic. Belbroughton is a popular place for visitors and you can always see people rambling, cycling etc. It thus has significant positive impact on the local conurbations. It is important therefore for the sake of many others than just local residents to keep the village in authentic condition.	
Sarah Bradley	Yes		Yes		Overall I think this an extremely thorough and impressive document, so most of my comments are minor.	Noted and welcomed.
					Could reference be made to the Village Design Statement, which although not formally adopted, is referred to in planning matters, and is quoted extensively in this document.	Noted. A bibliography section will be included in final draft.
				1.1	Slightly puzzled by the reference to 9 Drayton Road, as in 1975 it was bought by the owners of 11 Drayton Road and converted to a single dwelling now referred to as 11 Drayton Road and now inside the conservation area.	Noted. Property number changed accordingly.
				1.3	Mention that part of the Nash Works site remains undeveloped. Also, be consistent over whether it is Nash Works or Forge Works.	Noted. "Nash Works" adopted throughout.
				1.3	Is the "small tree-lined village park" the Village Green? Consistency over naming. Could mention Sylvester's Corner by junction of Church Road and Queen's Hill.	Noted and appraisal amended. All green/open spaces to be marked on Map 3.
				3.1 & 4.1	Dates of church are inconsistent. It is mainly 14 th century, significantly extended in the 19 th ncentury.	Noted and updated.
				3.3	There was also agricultural employment in the past.	Noted and updated.
				3.4	Yew Tree Avenue is just a row of houses, not really an estate.	Noted and updated.
				3.5	Could mention the heavily restored Norman chapel	Noted and text amended

					at Bell Hall.	
				4.7	Brook is a feature by Yew Tree House at Ram Alley. It emerges again at the Drayton Road exit.	Noted and text amended
				4.8	Consistency over whether 22-26 Church Hill is former alms-houses or workhouse.	Noted. Workhouse adopted throughout text.
				4.10	Reference to public garden should be to Village Green. Could also include reference to gates on the village green which were made by a local craftsmen and the village sign, the original one of which was erected in the 1930s, at Holy Cross exit to village.	Noted and amended accordingly.
				4.10	History Soc thinks our plaques enhance the village! Also have plaques at stream by Queen's, on the village green where there is also a Bradley forge hammer, at Ram Alley and by the church.	Noted. Reference to black plaques as an enhancement added to text. Other plaques briefly referred to.
					On the proposed extensions, no comment except:	
				5	Consider extending to include Little Bell Hall Cottages and the stream to 11 Drayton Road (but excluding substation and pumping station) to preserve the attractive entrance to the village.	Noted. This area and Pinchers Close were both considered as boundary extensions but neither seemed to attain satisfactorily the criteria set out in section 5 of the appraisal.
				6	Consider including Nash Works because it is a site of historic importance, to ensure that development is sympathetic to its history	Noted. Any new development on this site will be sympathetic to its history, especially the remaining red brick buildings. Protection is afforded by inclusion within the setting of the conservation area.
				7	Stop at Coronation House as the next door house and Parish Room are of little merit.	Noted. There is disagreement here. Although

						the next door house may be regarded as neutral the Parish Room is considered to make a positive contribution. To draw the boundary around the road margin seems a logical procedure.
				Management Plan 1.3	Is traffic also an issue particularly along the narrow High Street?	Noted and agreed. Please refer to comments above
				Management Plan 2.1	Include a reference to encouraging good modern design as per Design Statement.	Noted. It is felt that the proposed actions in their sum encourage good modern design.
				Management Plan 2.2	Proposed action at Nash Works should include a reference to ensuring any development reflects (or at least does not ignore) its historic importance.	Noted. It is felt that the proposed actions reflect this point.
				Management Plan 2.3	A plot survey is a good idea: who should fund it?	Noted. A photographic survey will be carried out in due course by council officers.
				Management Plan 2.5	Village Green is not formally designated as a village green. Could this be done to protect it from development?	Noted. Measures to formally designate the village green will be subject to a review.
				Management Plan 2.6	Encourage increased visibility of stream.	Noted. Measures to re-landscape the brook will increase visibility.
James Bradley	Yes		Yes		I think you have produced an excellent document, and I add my thanks to those of others. I agree with nearly all your proposals for extensions, which will add to the benefits I am sure the existence of the Conservation Area brings to the village.	Noted and welcomed.
					Sarah has suggested adding to Extension 4, by adding Little Bell Hall Cottages, in Drayton Rd nearly	Noted. Please refer to earlier comment on the suggestion

				<p>opposite our house at 11 Drayton Rd. I can see the merits of including the "end of the village", to help protect the approach to the village and to encourage good quality in any future changes. On the other hand, that approach risks including buildings that are not up to the standard of others in the Conservation Area, and so diluting it. In the case of Little Bell Hall Cottages they are reasonably attractive and I can also see the benefit of adding a length of stream. It is quite balanced, but for myself I would exclude the Cottages. I feel more strongly about the similar arguments that apply to Extension 1, Church Farm, and to Extension 7, including the Parish Room in Hartle Lane. At Church Farm it is particularly the inclusion of the very ordinary house in their grounds, the last house in the village, that I do not believe is justified, and Church Farm itself is not distinguished even if the farm buildings are of interest. In Hartle Lane, I do not believe the Parish Room justifies any special status, having spent quite a lot of hours inside it. Its building standard is low, and although the gable end facing Hartle Lane is OK the rest of the building is in my view poor. The house between it and Coronation House is only average. Coronation House is, in my view, out of place. Edwardian buildings can be attractive, but it seems to me to jar with its surroundings rather than complementing them. For example its "building line" strikes me as aggressive by comparison with others set further back. As you point out, it is not representative of other Edwardian building in the village.</p>	<p>to widen the proposed boundary change No. 4.</p> <p>Comments to boundary change No. 1 noted. It should be understood that generally conservation area boundaries are not drawn to weave in and out around meritorious or negative buildings. The last house in the village is rich in subtle historic detail and largely unaltered, a worthy example of thirties architecture.</p> <p>Re: Hartle Lane, please refer to comments above.</p>
				<p>My second main point is to support including the</p>	<p>The Nash Works site was</p>

				<p>Nash Works Site in the Area. This would have two purposes - to strengthen the protection afforded to the remaining buildings on the site, and to encourage good design for the prospective redevelopment - and is, I think, justified by the great importance of the site in the village's history.</p> <p>Barteak, the current developers, have been very co-operative in planning for the retention of the main building, but it cannot be guaranteed that they will complete the redevelopment. I think the site could be made to join up with the proposed/existing Conservation Area at both ends, leaving Nash Lane as an excluded "island"</p>	<p>excluded from the proposed boundary extension in that it now contains few historic buildings of merit. Those that are extant are afforded protection by virtue of being included within the setting of a conservation area.</p>
				<p>Finally, I support anything you think you can say to improve the value of the Belne Brook in and around Belbroughton. I have been in touch with the Wildlife Trust. I quote from an e-mail from their "Wetlands Officer", Peter Case. "We hope to deliver benefits to the Belne Brook to improve water quality using the Environment Agency's Catchment Restoration Fund (CRF) which we will be applying for in March 2013. Should we be successful in our bid for funding a three year program to address diffuse pollution on the river Stour and its tributaries, will be lead by the Trust. This would possibly involve works in the immediate area and if we can factor the mill pools into our proposal then I will! It would be great to see more made of the watercourses in and around the village both in terms of biodiversity and their amenity value."</p>	<p>Noted. We will seek to contribute to any dialogue between Belbroughton Parish Council and the Wildlife Trust.</p>