

**APPENDIX 2
Dodford CAAMP Consultation Comments**

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
1	DJ and PA Barford	We strongly support the extension of the conservation area in Dodford as proposed in the draft plan	Noted
2		We also support most of the management proposals including the inclusion of our cottage, "Greenfields", in the local heritage list	Noted. The list of potential candidates for the Local Heritage detailed in the CAAMP are only suggestions and they will still have to be benchmarked against the criteria in the Local Heritage List Strategy before being formally included within the list.
3		<p>Have concerns regarding the article 4 in the respect of windows.</p> <p>Consider that design of upvc windows and doors is indistinguishable from wood at a distance. It is the design of windows that is important not the material.</p> <p>The cost of maintaining wooden windows makes them an impractical choice.</p>	<p>The detailing of upvc windows is not as good as the detailing on timber windows. Glazing bars are often more chunky. Would agree that the design of the windows is important but this is rarely replicated well in upvc.</p> <p>Although there is a cost associated with maintaining timber windows, in terms of both time and money, upvc is not maintenance free and does not last for ever.</p> <p>The Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (CAAMP) is only proposing to investigate the possibility of introducing an Article 4. If it was decided to pursue this course of action there would be a separate consultation process.</p>

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
4	Derek Edward Davis	<p>I am opposed to the proposed boundary changes. Dodford Conservation Area was designated to preserve as far as possible the remaining features of the Chartist settlement developed by Feargus O'Connor and his National Land Company. The Conservation Area includes most of the Great Dodford Estate which he purchased for his scheme except for the following areas.</p> <p>Three small parcels of land on the North East boundary which I assume were included so that Warbage Lane and Niblets Hill make a clear boundary.</p> <p>To the South the steep and wooded southerly side of Dodford Dingle is included and forms a natural visual edge to the area.</p> <p>It also includes the parish church and its curtilage probably because of its outstanding quality in the 'Arts and Crafts' style, although as it is Listed is curtilage would be protected. Oddly some parcels of land on the South side at the end of Woodland road were not included.</p>	<p>The Chartist settlement was the primary reason for the Conservation designation but from the start it has included the group of ecclesiastical buildings to the south of the settlement. The Priory pre dates the Chartists and is listed Grade II*, the Church of Holy Trinity and St Mary dates from 1908 and is also listed Grade II*. The neighbouring property, The Tower House, originally the vicarage, now a private house by the same architect and also Arts and Crafts in design, is unlisted. These buildings are strongly connected with the development of the settlement, and considering the historical and architectural interest and connection with the settlement it would seem reasonable to maintain their inclusion within the boundary.</p> <p>I am unclear as to the areas on the north east boundary referred to here. The boundary of the Conservation Area (CA) in this location follows the boundary of the plots, as detailed on Map 2.</p> <p>Some Auction lots at the southern end of Woodland Road were excluded and these are now proposed for inclusion.</p>
5		<p>It is my belief that as the Conservation Area was created for Historical reasons rather than outstanding Visual quality any extension beyond the Historic area would reduce its significance.</p>	<p>The CA already includes non chartist buildings but buildings connected to the settlement and its historic development. Reviewing the boundary of the CA forms part of the Appraisal This follows best practice guidance provided by Historic England. Including other buildings connected to the settlement is not unreasonable.</p>
6	Judy and Tony Grove	<p>We believe there is no special reason to include Priory Road properties in the conservation area as Priory Road has been adequately controlled by regulations to produce a greatly improved environment.</p>	<p>Reviewing a boundary of a conservation area is part of the appraisal process. Further areas maybe suggested for inclusion if it is considered that they are of sufficient special interest in relation to the rest of the conservation area to warrant inclusion.</p> <p>The additional planning controls that come about as a result of designation are there to preserve that special interest.</p>
7		<p>The summary of issues (Page 22 para 3.2.1. Dodford Conservation Area Appraisal 2018) are listed as problems in the existing Dodford Conservation area. None of the issues relate to the proposed extension to Priory Road properties all of which have been improved</p>	<p>See response 6 regarding why additional areas may be included within a conservation area. It is possible that the problems highlighted on page 22, are not as significant along this stretch of Priory Road, as they maybe within parts of the existing Conservation Area.</p>

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
8		<p>The Dodford Conservation Area Appraisal 2014 stated that you recommended that Priory Road to the School House should NOT be included in the Dodford Conservation Area. You noted that it did NOT form part of the original Dodford Chartist settlement 'and therefore this area did NOT contribute to the special character of the conservation area' (Page 14 para 6.0 Dodford Conservation Area Appraisal 2014) and would NOT be included.</p> <p>There was much support by residents for no boundary change.</p>	<p>A number of people who made comments following the last consultation suggested that the Conservation Area should be extended to include the southern end of Priory Road, There was a general feeling that there were buildings of architectural and historic interest along this stretch of the road which related to the later Victorian development of the settlement. In light of these comments it was recommended to Cabinet that the boundary to the Conservation Area was re-examined. The proposed boundary changes and reasons for them are set out in section 6 on pages 18 and 19 of the CAAMP.</p> <p>There is no doubt that there are a number of buildings of historical and architectural interest along the southern stretch of Priory Road. These buildings relate to pre-Chartist and post Chartist development. The CA currently contains buildings which are pre and post Chartists. It is considered that a lack of significance was attached to these properties in terms of the character of the CA when the boundary was last considered in 2014. The post Chartist buildings along this road including the Church and the Old Vicarage, which are both early 20th century, and within the CA, illustrate the later development of the settlement, and like other non-Chartist buildings contribute to the later history of the village. The earlier buildings illustrate the pre- Chartist history. For these reasons it is now considered this stretch of Priory Road contributes to the character and special interest of Dodford CA and the boundary should therefore be extended to include this section.</p>
9		<p>You acknowledge that the facts regarding the extension of the conservation area along Priory Road to include the Primary School have not changed 'and were NOT part of the original chartist settlement' (Page 18 para 6 Dodford Conservation Area Appraisal 2018) and therefore do NOT contribute to the special character of the conservation area</p>	<p>See comment in 8 above</p>
10		<p>The present conservation area boundary has existed for many years and is fully accepted by the community without problem. There is no special reason for change.</p> <p>There is still much support for no boundary change.</p>	<p>See comment at 8 above</p> <p>There have been comments for and against</p>

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
11		<p>There was much support by residents for your recommendation of 'no boundary change in Priory Road.' When it became public knowledge you and the Council do not appear to have taken into account that the local residents did not have to confirm their support for your recommendation in writing.</p> <p>There is no special reason to extend the original conservation area which has been accepted for many years by the community. It will degrade and devalue the original Chartist conservation area. There may be a case for the removal of the Church from the Conservation area and continue listing separately to include The Tower House as well.</p>	<p>We responded to comments received</p> <p>Please see response to 8 above. These buildings have been included within the CA since it was designated and contribute to the character and special interest of the settlement, even though are part of the post Chartist history. The Tower House, or old vicarage is not a listed building and has no statutory protection, except for the protection it gains from being located within a CA.</p>
12		<p>The 'Locally Listable Heritage Buildings' has only just been activated therefore is not a problem as stated in the Appraisal 2018. Three buildings within the proposed Priory Road area are separately listed which will reinforce regulations and ensure the maintenance of high standards in the area.</p>	<p>In terms of Local Listing the appraisal is acknowledging that in addition to the listed properties within the CA there are a number of other properties of local importance. In advance of the Local Heritage List the appraisal has suggested some properties which may qualify for the list. These buildings will not have the protection that statutory listed buildings have. The fact that they are on a Local Heritage List, or are considered to be a non-designated heritage asset, would be a consideration in the planning process.</p>

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
13	Richard H Lambert	<p>I am against the proposal because it would bring my house into the conservation area for no compelling reason.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My house is a modern conversion of a Victorian farm building of no particular architectural merit. 2. Being within the area is likely to add to costs of insurance and possibly increase restrictions on minor changes we may wish to make to our property in future, yet it has no connection with the Chartist settlement other than proximity. 3. Drawing the boundary to the West of my house, rather than the East would not result in a zig-zag, since mine is the last house on the South side of Priory Road. Just as in Warbage Lane, there could be Conservation area on one side of the road but not the other. 	<p>Please the comments in 8 above</p> <p>The Victorian farm buildings contribute to our understanding of the later development of Dodford in this area. They may not have the same level of architectural importance as the Church for example, but they are still of historic interest.</p> <p>The claim regarding the cost of insurance has not been substantiated.</p> <p>The permitted development rights have been removed from this barn conversion so the level of restriction on future changes is higher than with buildings within conservation areas.</p> <p>This property has been identified as having a neutral impact on the CA, and forms a group with the main farmhouse, and therefore contributes to the character of the CA as part of the farmstead, so should therefore be included. The buildings on the north west side of Warbage Lane are all modern bungalows and make no contribution to the character of the CA, and hence the decision to draw the boundary down the middle of the road.</p> <p>This property has been identified as having a neutral impact on the CA, and forms a group with the main farmhouse, and therefore contributes to the character of the CA as part of the farmstead, so should therefore be included. The buildings on the north west side of Warbage Lane are all modern bungalows and make no contribution to the character of the CA, and hence the decision to draw the boundary down the middle of the road.</p>
14		<p>4 It was suggested to me in the consultation with the Conservation Officer that “there is support for this boundary change”. If that is the case, I suspect that support comes from those for whom the extension has no consequence, in which case, why wouldn’t they support it? I propose that greater weight should be given to the views of those directly affected by such a change (those in Little Dodford), than those for whom the change has no impact.</p>	<p>There is support for the boundary change from people who considered that this section of the road contributes to the special interest of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Please see the response at 8 above</p>

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
15		<p>If the proposal is to go ahead, then I cannot see the logic of excluding the field (directly opposite School House) between my house and Fockbury Road. While that field is presently Green Belt, that could change and development there would adversely affect the sightlines of School House. Some time ago there was a proposal to create a car park on that field, opposite the school, but at that time it was rejected. If such a car park were to be proposed again and for it to be useful for after-school clubs, late pick-ups from nursery, etc, no doubt lighting poles would be incorporated. This would have a very negative impact on the surroundings of the school.</p> <p>Including that field within the conservation area would prevent such effects.</p>	<p>These field would form part of the rural setting of the CA if this stretch of Priory Road is included. Historic England in the guidance on Conservation Areas (Conservation Area Designation. Appraisal and Management, Historic England Advice Note 1) make the point in paragraph 12 that 'Conservation area designation is not generally an appropriate means of protecting the wider landscape'.</p> <p>If a planning application ever came forward in respect of these fields the impact on the setting of the CA would be considered as part of the decision making process. Location in a CA does not prevent future development.</p>

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
16	Ian Fitzpatrick	<p>I refer to the proposals to extend the conversation area to include the school, nursery and other properties along Priory Road.</p> <p>Chelwood in Priory Road, is a modern detached bungalow, of no particular architectural merit.</p> <p>There is insufficient information to decide whether this will be good for the area and why a number of local people are in support of it. Therefore, I CANNOT at this stage, support the proposal.</p> <p>My reasons are as follows:</p> <p>1, no one seems to be able to tell me if this will increase the value of my property or devalue it,</p> <p>2, the proposed changes ignore the field opposite, currently green belt, but if built on would spoil, the beautiful views from the school, school house and other properties along Priory Road. Please explain the reasons for its exclusion.</p> <p>3, our property includes UPVC windows and is gated, which goes against the physical landscape the plan purports to be protecting. Please confirm that there will be no retrospective action?</p>	<p>See 8 above in respect of comments raised in respect of the 2014 Appraisal</p> <p>A number of things can influence property values, so it is difficult to pin down the impact of various different factors. Research by the LSE, available at https://historicengland.org.uk/research/current/social-and-economic-research/value-and-impact-of-heritage/value-conservation-areas/, suggests that properties in conservations areas more than hold their value.</p> <p>Mr Fitzpatrick has been supplied with a link to this report</p> <p>See response 15 above</p> <p>No retrospective action can be taken. Without an Article 4 Direction permitted development rights in respect of changes to windows and doors would remain. And even if an Article 4 direction was in place it would only apply to future changes and could not be retrospectively applied.</p>
		<p>4, no one I have spoken to, who is affected by the proposals, seems in favour of making these changes although I understand that the Council are on record as saying it meets with local approval?</p>	<p>The Council have not said that these proposals meet with local approval. A number of comments were made in respect of a previous appraisal, see 8 above, which asked for the decision to exclude the southern section of Priory Road from the CA to be reviewed, as it was considered that this section did contribute to the character of the CA.</p>

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
17	Peter Boland Historic Areas Adviser Historic England	Historic England recognize that the local planning authority is responsible for conservation area designation but make the following observations. The Appraisal follows a format that is fully in line with national guidance and there is a clear articulation of the conservation areas special interest and a succinct and insightful analysis as to how this currently contributes to the areas character and appearance. Both positive aspects of the conservation area and a range of negative changes to its condition are carefully itemized and clear prescriptions for management are suggested.	Comments noted and welcome
18		Historic England supports the making of an Article 4 Direction as being the only realistic way to control damaging future incremental changes	Comments noted and welcome
19		A number of conservation area boundary changes are suggested which are well evidenced after thoughtful analysis and these are also supported by Historic England.	Comments noted and welcome
20	Julia Sen	None of the problems referenced in the Dodford Conservation Area Appraisal 2018 (p22: 3.2.1) relate to the proposed extension to Priory Road properties. Furthermore, this area was not part of the original Chartist settlement and therefore had no influence on the character of the conservation area, which I understand was your conclusion following the last appraisal in 2014 (p14: 6.0). I am unclear as to why this exercise is being repeated so soon without any apparent necessity Wishes to object to the boundary change	See response to 8 above

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
21	C Thomas	Any restrictions, etc, placed on alterations to properties within the Conservation area ought to be reasonable and fair. Consistency in decisions in planning would ensure fairness. Common sense also ought to prevail at the end of the day, though. Also, if any property were to break the rules of the conservation area, they should be seen to be enforced and not drag on for years with no clear result. These indecisions, or long-drawn out processes adds fuel to those within the area to consider breaking the rules. It is important to set any rules down clearly in writing so that everyone knows exactly what is allowed, at the moment it's very difficult for people to work them out easily or understand why.	Noted BDC Action - Draft an information sheet for residents explaining the planning restrictions in the Conservation Area and sign post them to further advice
22		In respect of the boundary changes, whilst it is a good thing to protect this area, it ought not to penalise those being drawn into the area of conservation. That is, current permitted planning may become planning required and therefore a charge may now be incurred by those wishing to alter properties sympathetically. Consistency is paramount in planning decisions.	This is only likely happen if an Article 4 Direction was introduced. This would be subject to a separate consultation process. Restrictions applied as a result of designation are minimal see section 2 of the CAAMP. Planning applications required as a result of an Article 4 do not incur a fee
23	Derek Clark Girl Guiding	The Property Committee of Girl Guiding Birmingham have viewed the associated documents and are content with the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, Local Heritage List	Comments Noted and welcomed
24		No comments in respect of the boundary changes	Noted

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
25	Tim Bridges Caseworker Birmingham and West Midlands The Victorian Society	Thank you for consulting the Victorian Society. We are very pleased to see this excellent and thorough Appraisal and Management Plan which we trust will significantly assist in preserving and enhancing the distinctive character of this village, unique in Worcestershire.	Comments noted and welcomed
26		We welcome and support the proposed addition of the two portions of land to the conservation area as set out in the appraisal, noting particularly the inclusion of the school and school house from our period of interest. It also makes great sense to include the further units of Chartist interest within the conservation area.	Comments noted and welcomed
27	Janet Plaister	I am at a loss to know why the above is being extended. The original Chartist village is of historical interest and should be preserved, however, other than the school, I cannot see why it would be of any benefit to extend the Area. I live on the curtilage of the proposed extension and I own the dingle, which is already in the conservation area. My family have lived in Dodford for over 100 years and appreciate the historical value of the area, but I believe an appraisal was done in 2014 and they were not in favour of such an extension. Perhaps you could explain why this is now necessary after such a short time?	See response to 8 above

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
28	Richard Evans	The tall hedges and wooded nature of the village play a large part in its character, as do the large plots of land for the dwellings, and you acknowledge this. The adjacent woods - including High Wood and Nutnells Wood - must be protected from simply felling without replanting and I therefore urge you to oppose the 8-year management plan as recently presented by the woods owners. The current form of the woods is beautiful all year, changing with the seasons, and folk visit from miles around, especially to see the bluebells when in blossom. Wide rides and increased light dramatically alter woodlands and natural regeneration will not occur for hundreds of years	On the basis that the works to the trees in Nutnells Wood is not a planning matter, they would be beyond the remit of the Conservation Officer. I understand the Local Authority tree officers are dealing with this matter.
29		Maps 1 and 2 of the May 2018 document graphically compliment the text. This text implies your ideal Dodford would simply be the original Chartist dwellings, unmodified since being built, in their original plots, comprising Greater Dodford. The classification of buildings and features as to making a positive contribution, or having a neutral or negative impact shows most buildings in the village have a negative impact!	The document attempts to describe where we are today. Conservation is about the management of change rather than taking buildings back to some ideal past. It is recognised that buildings have to be updated to allow for modern living. Sympathetic extensions have to be balanced against losing the character of what we are trying to protect. Map 3 shows that the vast majority of buildings a have a positive or neutral impact on the character of the CA.
30		Map 2 shows clearly how the Chartist village boundaries were formed from lanes to the northeast, Warbage Lane and Nibbletts Hill, and by two streams, one to the west/northwest and one to the south. These form a rather triangular shape. A third stream roughly follows the course of Priory Road and joins the southerly stream near Rose Lane. The westerly and southern streams converge close to the rear of Little Dodford Farm and north of this confluence is a white zone which should also be included in the conservation area if Little Dodford is to be. The wooded valley from Alfred's Well along the stream to Rose Lane, on both its steep banks, must stay in the conservation area.	It was considered that the stream formed a defined boundary at this point There are no plans to amend the boundary in this area

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
31		<p>I note that neither the Church nor the Tower House were part of the original Chartist village. As a consequence, regarding the Conservation Area boundaries I propose either the Church, the Tower House and Vicarage Lodge are removed from the Conservation area, Little Dodford is left out of the area, and the area simply extended to incorporate the three properties at the south end of Woodland Road or the conservation area is extended to include what you propose plus the white area on Map 2 between the two boundary streams.</p> <p>I favour the former as it conforms better to Greater Dodford, the <i>raison d'être</i> for any conservation area in this locality.</p>	See response to 4 and 8 above
32		<p>Regarding Section 4, erosion of historic features and details, your comment on the use of UPVC double glazed windows and frames is only partly right. Whilst traditional wooden frames usually look better than plastic ones some carefully designed UPVC frames are very aesthetic. The thermal quality of double, or even triple, glazed windows is superior to single glazing. Wooden frames need costly, regular maintenance and are not good in our temperate climate. Many people want the durability of UPVC and most new/modern houses have plastic windows, weather boards and doors. Wood is a renewable resource; UPVC is an indestructible plastic with negative environmental impacts as have wood preservatives and paints.</p>	<p>I would agree that there are some expensive upvc windows that replicate historic casement windows reasonably well. They are rarely installed, and most upvc windows are poor quality in terms of historic detailing. Timber windows can be double glazed.</p> <p>Comments in respect of the environmental impacts of upvc are noted</p>

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
33		<p>Regarding 4.5.1 There is a longstanding problem of speeding traffic in the village, both motorised vehicles and groups of inconsiderate cyclists, especially along Priory Road. Entrance splays enhance vision and room for vehicles exiting gateways and give road and pavement users better warning of such movements. Entrance splays make our village safer especially when hedges are overgrown towards the end of summer. I fully agree with your comments on gates <i>per se</i>.</p>	<p>It is agreed that entrance splays aid traffic safety, however some thoughts needs to be given to their design, particularly surface materials, in a rural area.</p>
34		<p>Despite a recent upgrade of internet facilities Dodford is still poorly serviced by internet speed and 4G telephone connectivity. Businesses and house sales have suffered. The village is at risk of again becoming a technological backwater in these respects and section 2.7 should be changed to allow the installation of ordinary, domestic antennae and satellite dishes without any need for approval. Tall, unsightly masts, or excessively large antennae and dishes, should require permission.</p>	<p>The restrictions on antennae and satellite dishes are national restrictions and require planning applications to be made. Planning permission should be achievable for a thoughtfully located satellite dish.</p>

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
35	Kay Stone Dodford Parish Council	<p>The purpose of any Conservation Area is to retain the best characteristics of the location being considered, an aspiration to which the Council is firmly committed. Evidence suggests that the Conservation label adds to the standing of a locality, with improvement to self-image, civic pride, and probably house prices too.</p> <p>Where Dodford is concerned, we do not see 'Conservation' as meaning stasis, but rather a means of retaining and strengthening the best aspects of this beautiful village of significant historical importance (being one of only five Chartist settlements in the Country), without restricting (appropriate) development, and without the divisiveness that may so easily be engendered in situations where arbitrary geographical boundaries are created.</p> <p>Thus, whilst the Parish Council acknowledges some residents' misgivings about changes to the Conservation Area, we believe that the essence of the village would be better conserved by the extension of the Conservation Area to the whole of Greater Dodford. Such a move would allow the size and shape of the conservation area to be defined more naturally by green fields rather than by streets that create artificial boundaries between those who are 'in' and those who are 'out'.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted and agreed</p>

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
36	Mrs Ann Sargison	<p>We are opposed to the extension of the conservation area to include Priory Road. As with the 2014 proposal, this stretch of land and buildings is not linked to, or connected with the Chartist Movement.</p> <p>Current regulations are entirely sufficient to protect and prevent undesirable new buildings being erected and those buildings which have been converted to residential dwellings, in the past have done so under the scrutiny of the local council. We feel this is unnecessary and indeed detrimental to us personally and is more likely to put off future purchasers. We have every intention of preserving our property in the style in keeping with its age.</p>	<p>See response to point 8</p> <p>Planning legislation does protect against unsympathetic new buildings within CAs. However existing buildings can be altered unsympathetically without planning permission being required, and hence the suggestion that an Article 4 Direction might be implemented.</p>

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
37	Peter Smith	<p>I would begin by saying that I recognise the need for rules and legislation to ensure our society works smoothly, fairly , ethically and we do not fall into anarchy, but I believe there should be as light a touch as possible from the state/local authority. I feel we should be looking to reduce red tape and bureaucracy where possible and not add to the existing burden and taxpayer costs.</p> <p>Materials and Construction:</p> <p>The plan recognises that many Chartist properties have been modernised over the past 150+ years, for better or worse and are now unrecognisable as Chartist cottages. So choice of window is perhaps immaterial. Building materials and practices have changed considerably since the Chartists and often for the better.</p> <p>There is certainly an argument for conserving what historical features remain of the original Chartist buildings but talk of “reinstatement of historic detailing” is ridiculous and unnecessary on a modernised property.</p>	<p>In terms of windows it is the detailing and resulting character that we are attempting to protect, and this is best achieved with timber windows. Such a level of protection would only come about via an Article 4 Direction and at present we are trying to gain the views of residents on such a measure. If it was decided to pursue this course of action there would have to be a separate consultation process, it would only apply to historic properties. Likewise the reinstatement of historic detailing would be encouraged where the opportunity arises, for example if major works were being proposed.</p>

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
38		There seems to be a desire that all properties should have wooden 5 bar gates as that was the case in the past, but I have no issues with other gate styles and have never felt it detracted from the village. Many people are also security conscious and would not feel as safe or secure with a low-lying wooden gate. Conservation efforts should be concentrated where we can “conserve” and not try to restore some supposed Victorian rural idyll	The proposal in respect of gates has arisen due to the installation of gates more suitable in a suburban environment, and which detract from the character of a rural CA. Conservation is about managing change rather than preventing change.
39		Photographic Survey of all properties, “aid future enforcement situations”. I have nothing to hide but I find this idea an invasion of privacy and too much like “Big Brother” (Orwell not Channel 5). I am not sure how you would plan to do this and under what legal framework but I suspect you will find a lot of resistance. This seems like a step too far.	A photographic survey would provide a baseline record so that changes to the CA can be monitored and enforcement action taken if required. The survey is carried out from the road, or other public vantage points, no one will be entering on to private properties <u>BDC Action</u> - Amend section 5 of the Management Plan to clarify this point.

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
40		<p>I am against any introduction of Article 4 restrictions to permitted development. There is already restrictive legislation for permitted development which covers conservation areas and there are enforcement procedures for any breaches of the legislation so no more is required.</p> <p>Removal of permitted development rights leads to detailed scrutiny of the most minor "development" at increased costs in time and money for both the Landowner and Taxpayer. This can lead to unsatisfactory and arbitrary decisions as evidenced by a recent local application for a greenhouse which was refused. Permitted development rights had been previously removed from the property so a planning application was required. Even though it was acknowledged as being modest, in keeping with the conservation area, and would have normally qualified as permitted development it was refused. So, is this what we can expect by introduction of Article 4 restrictions? We should also not ignore the additional cost burden of regulation that this will inevitably place on the council, and no doubt increases to our council Taxes.</p>	<p>At present there are minimal restrictions on development in CAs as outlined in section 2 of the CAAMP</p> <p>The removal of permitted development rights would result in planning applications being required for alterations which have the potential to impact on the character of the CA. The LA would work with applicants to find sympathetic solutions. The recent application in respect of the greenhouse was refused due to impact on the greenbelt and not the CA</p> <p>Local authorities are required to formulate proposals to protect conservation areas, and Article 4 Directions are, as noted by Historic England in their comments at 15 above, 'as being the only realistic way to control damaging future incremental changes'.</p>
41		<p>Conservation Area Boundary</p> <p>As stated in the Plan the Chartist Settlement is the primary reason for the Conservation area to exist and as such I feel that the boundary should be as per the original settlement. Any expansion outside this area is unnecessary and confusing. The Chartist settlement is the USP of Dodford which should be celebrated and not diluted by expansion and the very real danger of a gradual but steady creep outwards with each successive review of the plan every 4 years.</p>	<p>See response to 8 above</p> <p>The boundary has been further reviewed in light of comments received at the time of the last consultation</p>

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
42	Alwyn Rea	Found draft document both accurate and comprehensive in regard to detailed character appraisal and historical descriptions. Sets out both attractive and less desirable changes.	Noted
43		Proposed boundary change Conservation Area does not have to be confined to the original Chartist settlement, although opportunity has been taken to incorporate Chartist properties currently not included. Was some public support in 2014 for extending boundary to include the whole of Priory Road, beyond Church to include school and school house together with other interesting buildings that add to overall character and attractiveness of the village.	Noted and agreed
44		Management proposals Proposals are realistic and likely to provide a basis for the continued future monitoring of the area's character. Welcome the photographic survey and initiative to reinstate historic detailing especially in the case of Chartist cottages. Article 4 designation would assist the retention of the village's character.	Noted
45		Local Heritage List Inclusion on this list falls short of formal listing and accompanying restrictions. There are a number of buildings that add character to Dodford and this exercise should identify them. Suggests school, school house, and former Baptist Chapel	Noted
46		Proposed Action Assessment of new planning proposals in accordance with the NPPF welcome and documents proposals should materially assist residents and planners in considering possible changes. Existence of appraisal gives wider publicity to the need to preserve what we have .does not seek to prevent change, but provide a framework that should achieve that	Noted

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
47	Louise Walters	Does not agree with continued legislation and tighter controls, when planning and conservation officers cannot apply common sense to simple proposals. Planning decisions made and advice given is often conflicting for different residents. On that basis more stringent controls would not benefit community. Object to paying council tax to pay for management plans like this one . Revenue should be spent on care in the community for the elderly.	Legislation is prepared by national Government, and gives local authorities the power to introduce more stringent controls in CAs if required. The preparation of a CAAMP is an essential part of this process to identify whether such controls are justified. The Council has a statutory duty to formulate and prepare proposals for the preservation and enhancement of its CAs. The preparation of a conservation appraisal informs this process, and policies are detailed in the management plan see section 2 of the CAAMP, page 4
48		Little point in extending the boundary where the Chartist cottages never existed	See response to point 8 above
49	Ken Wienczek	I am against any further incursions into permitted development rights. Would like to see the conservation district de-certified as common sense no longer seems to apply to planning decisions	Noted Noted
50		Boundary Changes Unless everyone in the new boundary desires the change then it is not acceptable.	Noted
51	ZG & EM Michaliewicz	Received consultation letter of 31st July enclosing the earlier consultation letter of 19 th June so missed the two consultation events at the Village Hall. Other residents did not receive the letters so are changes being brought in without regard to residents views.	Letter of 19 th June was sent to all residents only two were returned by the post office, and copies were delivered by hand to those addresses, which did not include Camp Hill. When the Conservation Officer was notified that some residents had not received the letter, the second letter was sent out. Both letters contained contact details for the Conservation Officer so that residents could contact her directly to discuss the contents of the CAAMP, and the consultation period was extended from 3 rd August until 30 th September.

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
52		<p>Article 4 Introduction of the Article 4 for the whole of Dodford is unreasonable and unjustified. Majority of properties are not Chartist but modern, of variable design, age and materials, so the introduction of the Article 4 would prevent unreasonable alterations or additions.</p>	<p>At this stage it is proposed to investigate the possibility of introducing an Article 4 direction to control alterations to windows and doors, on historic buildings only. See section 4.2.2 Of the Management Plan</p> <p>In addition the CAAMP has highlighted that there have been some large extensions to smaller cottages and outbuildings constructed within gardens which have been unsympathetic in terms of their scale and design, but have not required planning permission because the works amount to permitted development See section 4.4 of the Management Plan. These permitted development rights could be withdrawn, see section 4.4.2, however as this would require the approval of the Secretary of State, a substantial amount of evidence would be required to substantiate the need for this. Withdrawing permitted development rights does not mean that works are not allowed only that a planning application is required, and the impact of any scheme on the character of the CA could be assessed.</p>
53		<p>Our property is not a Chartist property, but a recent application for a minor extension was objected to on the grounds that it was not Chartist and it would make it even less Chartist if the extension was built even though it was not visible. Suggests future alterations would be objected to on similar grounds, and a smaller chance of obtaining planning permission. PD rights were also withdrawn making future alterations or enhancements more costly. So neighbours could also have these costs.</p>	<p>Difficult to comment on individual applications, although it is noted that consent was granted for an extension to this property in 2015.</p> <p>Proposals for extensions are consider in light of the character of the CA, and the statutory test is whether or not the proposal will 'preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA'.</p> <p>There is no fee in respect of Planning applications which result from the removal of PD rights due to an Article 4.</p>
54		<p>Gates and boundary treatments Appraisal deems some as in appropriate, this is subjective. Hedges are maintained, metal and timber gates enhance the CA. Introducing an Article 4 would limit future choice for residents and has no real bearing on the Chartist cottages. Extensive hedging means that gates, fences and other boundary treatments only represent a small fraction of the boundary treatments and have little or no impact on the overall look of the CA.</p>	<p>Agree that the majority of hedges are well maintained, and they are major part of the character of the CA. Fences and inappropriate hedges made from conifers etc stand out. This is a rural area and the use of more suburban style gates therefore jar with the character. See section 4.5 of the Management Plan. The Article 4 Direction if implemented in respect of gates would not stop new gates being installed but would require a planning application for gates allowing any proposals to be assessed in light of their impact on the character of the CA.</p>

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
55		<p>Is photographic survey really necessary for unlisted buildings? Object to officials coming onto our property to do this.</p>	<p>A Photographic survey provides a baseline record so that changes to the CA can be monitored and enforcement action taken if required. The survey is carried out from the road, or other public vantage points, no one will be entering on to private properties</p> <p><u>BDC Action</u> - Amend section 5 of the Management Plan to clarify this point.</p>
56	Peter Foster	<p>Quality of New Development (Section 5 of the Appraisal and 4.4 of the Management plan Consider an Article 4 unnecessary, prohibitive in terms of the modest development which takes place in Dodford. Aim of CA is to protect and enhance appearance of Chartist village road scene and other viewpoints . Only rear extensions allowed as PD, for unlisted properties, extensions to side and front and enhanced rear extensions require planning permission. Suggests that development is suitably controlled and restricted.</p>	<p>In terms of extensions in conservation areas permitted development rights only apply to extensions to the rear and not the side or front of properties. There is a view that due to the modest nature of the original cottages, existing PD rights in effect allow extensions that overwhelm the original buildings. As noted above to restrict this particular permitted development would require the approval of the Secretary of State, so we would need substantial evidence to substantiate the need for this.</p>
57		<p>Replacement of traditional boundary treatments with suburban style fences and gates (Section 5 of the Appraisal and 4.5 of the Management plan) Article 4 unnecessary , majority of gates and boundaries appropriate for properties within the greenbelt and CA. Boundaries are well kept and add to unique appearance of Chartist village.l</p>	<p>Would agree that the majority of boundaries and gates are appropriate, but the few that are suburban detract from the character and appearance of the CA. These cannot be controlled and hence the suggestion that the Article 4 is introduced which would require a planning application to be made to introduce new gates or fences instead of hedges. There would be no fee for such an application and it would allow the character of the CA to be protected, especially as the consultee rightly points out the historic boundary treatments, the hedges are a unique feature of the CA.</p>
58		<p>Monitoring (section 5 of the draft management plan) Objects to having property photographed in detail, it would be an invasion of privacy. Photographs should just be from road. Satellite images are available.</p>	<p>No mention is made in section 5 of photographing properties in detail, or coming onto properties to take photographs. It was only ever intended to take photographs of properties from the road or other public vantage points.</p> <p><u>BDC Action</u> - Clarify in Section 5 of the Management Plan that the photographic survey will only been from Road etc.</p>

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
59		<p>Maintaining the rural/chartist appearance of Dodford is very important.</p> <p>By introducing an Article 4 and conducting photographic property surveys, the area will become a less desirable place to live.</p> <p>Permission for very minor changes to a property will have to be sought increasing the cost and time spent on planning applications.</p> <p>Could result in less maintenance and improvement works being carried out . Reasonable changes to properties and boundaries should be made allowed without the need to consult BDC.</p>	<p>Agreed, however introducing an Article 4 would help to maintain the character and appearance of the CA. The CAAMP has identified that there has been a degree of erosion of original character. Maintaining the rural/chartist character will continue to make it a desirable place to live.</p> <p>Very minor changes and basic maintenance would not require planning permission and as noted above if planning permission is required due to the Article 4 there is no fee.</p> <p>'Reasonable' changes are hard to define but the replacement of hedges with close boarded fencing and suburban gates would erode the character of Dodford, and cannot currently be controlled.</p> <p>Potential BDC Action - The Management Plan suggests investigating the possibility of an Article 4 to reduce some permitted development rights. Before the introduction of an Article 4 definitive proposals would have to be drawn up supported by a robust justification and there would have to be a period of further consultation.</p>
60	Martin Foster	<p>Quality of New Development (Section 5 of the Appraisal and 4.4 of the Management plan)</p> <p>Consider an Article 4 unnecessary, prohibitive in terms of the modest development which takes place in Dodford. Aim of CA is to protect and enhance appearance of Chartist village road scene and other viewpoints . Only rear extensions allowed as PD, for unlisted properties, extensions to side and front and enhanced rear extensions require planning permission. Suggests that development is suitably controlled and restricted.</p>	<p>In terms of extensions in conservation areas permitted development rights only apply to extensions to the rear and not the side or front of properties. There is a view that due to the modest nature of the original cottages,t existing PD rights in effect allow extensions that overwhelm the original buildings. As noted above to restrict this particular permitted development would require the approval of the Secretary of State, so we would need substantial evidence to substantiate the need for this.</p>
61		<p>Replacement of traditional boundary treatments with suburban style fences and gates (Section 5 of the Appraisal and 4.5 of the Management plan)</p> <p>Article 4 unnecessary ,, majority of gates and boundaries appropriate for properties within the greenbelt and CA.</p> <p>Boundaries are well kept and add to unique appearance of Chartist village</p>	<p>Would agree that the majority of boundaries and gates are appropriate, but the few that are suburban detract from the character and appearance of the CA. These cannot be controlled and hence the suggestion that the Article 4 is introduced which would require a planning application to be made to introduce new gates or fences instead of hedges. There would be no fee for such an application and it would allow the character of the CA to be protected, especially as the consultee rightly points out the historic boundary treatments, the hedges are a unique feature of the CA</p>
62		<p>Monitoring (section 5 of the draft management plan)</p> <p>Objects to having property photographed in detail, it would be an invasion of privacy. Photographs should just be from road. Satellite images are available</p>	<p>No mention is made in section 5 of photographing properties in detail, or coming onto properties to take photographs. It was only ever intended to take photographs of properties from the road or other public vantage points.</p> <p>BDC Action - Clarify in Section 5 of the Management Plan that the photographic survey will only been from Road etc.</p>

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
63		<p>Maintaining the rural/chartist appearance of Dodford is very important.</p> <p>By introducing an Article 4 and conducting photographic property surveys, the area will become a less desirable place to live.</p> <p>Permission for very minor changes to a property will have to be sought increasing the cost and time spent on planning applications.</p> <p>Could result in less maintenance and improvement works being carried out . Reasonable changes to properties and boundaries should be made allowed without the need to consult BDC</p>	<p>Agreed, however introducing an Article 4 would help to maintain the character and appearance of the CA. The CAAMP has identified that there has been a degree of erosion of original character. Maintaining the rural/chartist character will continue to make it a desirable place to live.</p> <p>Very minor changes and basic maintenance would not require planning permission and as noted above if planning permission is required due to the Article 4 there is no fee.</p> <p>'Reasonable' changes are hard to define but the replacement of hedges with close boarded fencing and suburban gates would erode the character of Dodford, and cannot currently be controlled.</p> <p>Potential BDC Action - The Management Plan suggests investigating the possibility of an Article 4 to reduce some permitted development rights. Before the introduction of an Article 4 definitive proposals would have to be drawn up supported by a robust justification and there would have to be a period of further consultation.</p>
64	Martin Foster	<p>Quality of New Development (Section 5 of the Appraisal and 4.4 of the Management plan</p> <p>Consider an Article 4 unnecessary, prohibitive in terms of the modest development which takes place in Dodford. Aim of CA is to protect and enhance appearance of Chartist village road scene and other viewpoints . Only rear extensions allowed as PD, for unlisted properties, extensions to side and front and enhanced rear extensions require planning permission. Suggests that development is suitably controlled and restricted.</p>	<p>In terms of extensions in conservation areas permitted development rights only apply to extensions to the rear and not the side or front of properties. There is a view that due to the modest nature of the original cottages, existing PD rights in effect allow extensions that overwhelm the original buildings. As noted above to restrict this particular permitted development would require the approval of the Secretary of State, so we would need substantial evidence to substantiate the need for this.</p>
65		<p>Replacement of traditional boundary treatments with suburban style fences and gates (Section 5 of the Appraisal and 4.5 of the Management plan)</p> <p>Article 4 unnecessary ,, majority of gates and boundaries appropriate for properties within the greenbelt and CA.</p> <p>Boundaries are well kept and add to unique appearance of Chartist village.</p>	<p>Would agree that the majority of boundaries and gates are appropriate, but the few that are suburban detract from the character and appearance of the CA. These cannot be controlled and hence the suggestion that the Article 4 is introduced which would require a planning application to be made to introduce new gates or fences instead of hedges. There would be no fee for such an application and it would allow the character of the CA to be protected, especially as the consultee rightly points out the historic boundary treatments, the hedges are a unique feature of the CA</p>

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
66		Monitoring (section 5 of the draft management plan) Objects to having property photographed in detail, it would be an invasion of privacy. Photographs should just be from road. Satellite images are available	No mention is made in section 5 of photographing properties in detail, or coming onto properties to take photographs. It was only ever intended to take photographs of properties from the road or other public vantage points. BDC Action - Clarify in Section 5 of the Management Plan that the photographic survey will only been from Road etc.
67		Maintaining the rural/chartist appearance of Dodford is very important. By introducing an Article 4 and conducting photographic property surveys, the area will become a less desirable place to live. Permission for very minor changes to a property will have to be sought increasing the cost and time spent on planning applications. Could result in less maintenance and improvement works being carried out . Reasonable changes to properties and boundaries should be made allowed without the need to consult BDC	Agreed, however introducing an Article 4 would help to maintain the character and appearance of the CA. The CAAMP has identified that there has been a degree of erosion of original character. Maintaining the rural/chartist character will continue to make it a desirable place to live. Very minor changes and basic maintenance would not require planning permission and as noted above if planning permission is required due to the Article 4 there is no fee. 'Reasonable' changes are hard to define but the replacement of hedges with close boarded fencing and suburban gates would erode the character of Dodford, and cannot currently be controlled. Potential BDC Action - The Management Plan suggests investigating the possibility of an Article 4 to reduce some permitted development rights. Before the introduction of an Article 4 definitive proposals would have to be drawn up supported by a robust justification and there would have to be a period of further consultation.
68	Keith Foster	Quality of New Development (Section 5 of the Appraisal and 4.4 of the Management plan Consider an Article 4 unnecessary, prohibitive in terms of the modest development which takes place in Dodford.Aim of CA is to protect and enhance appearance of Chartist village road scene and other viewpoints . Only rear extensions allowed as PD, for unlisted properties, extensions to side and front and enhanced rear extensions require planning permission. Suggests that development is suitably controlled and restricted.	In terms of extensions in conservation areas permitted development rights only apply to extensions to the rear and not the side or front of properties. There is a view that due to the modest nature of the original cottages, existing PD rights in effect allow extensions that overwhelm the original buildings. As noted above to restrict this particular permitted development would require the approval of the Secretary of State, so we would need substantial evidence to substantiate the need for this.

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
69		<p>Replacement of traditional boundary treatments with suburban style fences and gates (Section 5 of the Appraisal and 4.5 of the Management plan) Article 4 unnecessary ,, majority of gates and boundaries appropriate for properties within the greenbelt and CA. Boundaries are well kept and add to unique appearance of Chartist village.l</p>	<p>Would agree that the majority of boundaries and gates are appropriate, but the few that are suburban detract from the character and appearance of the CA. These cannot be controlled and hence the suggestion that the Article 4 is introduced which would require a planning application to be made to introduce new gates or fences instead of hedges. There would be no fee for such an application and it would allow the character of the CA to be protected, especially as the consultee rightly points out the historic boundary treatments, the hedges are a unique feature of the CA</p>
70		<p>Monitoring (section 5 of the draft management plan) Objects to having property photographed in detail, it would be an invasion of privacy. Photographs should just be from road. Satellite images are available</p>	<p>No mention is made in section 5 of photographing properties in detail, or coming onto properties to take photographs. It was only ever intended to take photographs of properties from the road or other public vantage points.</p> <p><u>BDC Action</u> - Clarify in Section 5 of the Management Plan that the photographic survey will only been from Road etc.</p>
71		<p>Maintaining the rural/chartist appearance of Dodford is very important. By introducing an Article 4 and conducting photographic property surveys, the area will become a less desirable place to live. Permission for very minor changes to a property will have to be sought increasing the cost and time spent on planning applications. Could result in less maintenance and improvement works being carried out . Reasonable changes to properties and boundaries should be made allowed without the need to consult BDC</p>	<p>Agreed, however introducing an Article 4 would help to maintain the character and appearance of the CA. The CAAMP has identified that there has been a degree of erosion of original character. Maintaining the rural/chartist character will continue to make it a desirable place to live. Very minor changes and basic maintenance would not require planning permission and as noted above if planning permission is required due to the Article 4 there is no fee. 'Reasonable' changes are hard to define but the replacement of hedges with close boarded fencing and suburban gates would erode the character of Dodford, and cannot currently be controlled.</p> <p><u>Potential BDC Action</u> - The Management Plan suggests investigating the possibility of an Article 4 to reduce some permitted development rights. Before the introduction of an Article 4 definitive proposals would have to be drawn up supported by a robust justification and there would have to be a period of further consultation.</p>

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
72	Rory Lydon	<p>I am making the comments as a resident of Dodford for 15 years , and lived locally for further 12 years .</p> <p>I support the extension of the conservation area as I am of the opinion it is necessary for the Protection of this area of Dodford to prevent unsympathetic changes to the historical properties.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted and agreed</p>
73		<p>The Photographic Survey coupled with an Aerial Photographic Survey of the Village would provide the council with a record of development , both official and unofficial ,and assist the council in Monitoring the Conservation Area .</p>	<p>Noted and agreed</p>
74		<p>A conservation area only goes part of the way , Ideally Dodford needs an Article 4 Direction to control Alterations to Properties , and changes to Traditional Boundary Treatments as the removal of hedges , and replacement by Suburban Fences / railings would terminally affect the area .</p>	<p>Noted and agreed</p>

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
75		Permitted Developments Rights were not really intended for areas like Dodford , where one can build a Building up to 4 m Tall , and half the area behind the dwelling ... That could be a building 100m Sq or several on a Dodford 4 acre plot The Only way to protect the openness of Dodford is to Remove PD rights for Outbuildings	Although this is factually correct, to withdraw these particular permitted development rights would require the approval of the Secretary of State. We would therefore have to substantiate that these PD rights have caused harm to the character of the Dodford CA <u>BDC Action</u> - Identify how many extensions and outbuildings have been constructed as a result of these rights, and asses their impact on the character of the CA, and whether or not an Article 4 should be introduced to restrict these rights.
76	Penny Lydon	The detailed report highlights areas that are of concern to me, a Dodford resident for 15years. Until recently there has been a static population, majority of houses have not changed hands for many years, has resulted in little development/modernisation. Now a large number of houses under new ownership, may now undergo some type of "improvement" in the eyes of their new owners but maybe not from a conservation area perspective. The implementation of an Article 4 direction would halt further erosion of historical detail and may put right the wrongs that have already taken place.	An Article 4 would help reduce the erosion of character as planning permission would be required for works which are currently covered by permitted development rights.
77		One of Dodford's distinguishing features are the native hedges surrounding the individual plots, removal of these would immediately change the character of Dodford from rural to suburban, if an Article 4 Direction protects these then it should be implemented.	The Article 4 could not be used to prevent the removal of hedges. It could be used to withdraw the permitted development rights in respect of fences, requiring a planning application to be made if an owner wanted to replace a hedge with a fence.
78		The erection of outbuildings under the current PD rights is also controversial. Dodford Plots are too large for this allowing buildings to be erected without any thought to maintaining the openness of the plots. I support the investigation into an Article 4 Direction for the removal of PD rights for outbuildings.	Noted

Reference No	Name	Response	Officer response
79		<p>I support the proposal to change the boundary of the conservation area as it will include interesting historical buildings that are linked to the existing conservation area. I would also like see the re introduction of the original area names of Great Dodford and Little Dodford. These are present on historical maps and older generations still refer to the areas by these names. We receive some utility bills addressed Great Dodford</p>	<p>Noted and agreed</p> <p>This could be investigated, but it is not clear that this would something the Local Authority could introduce.</p>