

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON WERRINGTON CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PLAN (November 2007 – February 2008)

- Resident

Support proposals, important to guard valuable features of our environment

Response

Comment noted.

- Resident

1. Agree with the Appraisal and support suggestions.
2. Existing traffic calming layout encourages speeding through restricted sections of highway - worse on the 'school run' due to on-street parking.
3. Exit from Canterbury Road into Church Street is awkward.
4. Horse chestnut trees on The Green cause concern especially during 'conker' season with attention from children. Sewage blockages are affected by tree roots, causing permanent damage to long established underground pipes.
6. Several incidents of anti social behaviour since licensing laws extended and increase in persons, noise and traffic at night.

Response

1. Comments noted.
- 2/3. Transportation issues are not tackled directly through the Character Appraisal. The comments made have been passed on to and will be discussed further with the Highways Authority. A re-evaluation of the environmental works to Church Street would take the opportunity to examine all aspects of road traffic impact, including issues such as through traffic / 'rat running'.
4. Comments noted. No record of drainage problems are recorded in Highways (Drainage) who are now aware of a potential issue. Further information to be sought from respondent / Anglia Water.
6. The behaviour of users of the area is not an issue which can be specifically addressed through the Character Appraisal.

- Resident

Concern at amount of traffic in Church Street. Exacerbated by double decker busses with a 10 minute frequency. Creates an impression to other road users that this is now a main road – and that traffic has increased. Buses are largely empty, why not use shuttle busses? Property affected by vibration from large vehicles. Should aim to return Church Street to a quite place in which to live.

Response

Comments noted, although the appraisal has not been altered to accommodate the above comments. Transportation issues are not tackled through the Character Appraisal, however the comments made have been passed on and will be discussed further with Highways Authority. Although it is agreed that the volume of traffic does affect the visual appearance of a conservation area and vibration from heavy vehicles can affect buildings, there are few powers that the Council can enforce to reduce traffic volume and impact. A re-evaluation of the environmental works to Church Street would take the opportunity to examine all aspects of road traffic impact, including issues such as through traffic / 'rat running'. The use of a shuttle bus service is outside the control of the council. Increase in traffic volume is experienced in other streets in the city, and if a large proportion is attributed to through traffic measures can be brought forward to seek a reduction for local environmental benefit. Church Street provides a school, shops etc and access to other

residential areas. The original street enhancement scheme was in part measure an attempt to discourage through traffic and control vehicle speeds. Possible review of street enhancement works / traffic measures may assist

- Resident

1. Insufficient time for public consultation. Consultation letter dated 29th Nov. only received on 6th January.
2. Lack of information concerning the consequences of the proposals. Should have been an executive summary outlining the consequences of the proposals on properties directly affected.
3. All but two properties in the extended Conservation Area have little or no architectural or historical value or interest. Those that do will already be covered by being listed.
4. An illogical argument put forward for the proposed conservation area extension - that the current boundary does not relate to historic features

Response

1. This is the second report of delayed consultation letters. As a result, the consultation period was extended, by letter dated 11th January, to 18th February.
2. Comment noted and will be taken forward in future consultation work. The consultation leaflet sets out the principle proposals of the draft Management Plan. Properties affected by proposed conservation area boundary extension are specifically identified. Copies of the Appraisal are posted on request. The Appraisal is viewable and can be downloaded from the council's web page.
3. Conservation areas can and do include properties which do not have architectural or historic character in their own right to justify inclusion. The non-listed properties in the proposed extended conservation area are themselves integral to Werrington village's historic development.
4. The case for extending the conservation area boundary is acknowledged in the Appraisal. Many conservation area boundaries were drawn too tightly on designation in the 1970 / 80's. The original boundaries generally concentrated on the built form. In Werrington the buildings and settlement pattern to the Cock Inn junction is part of the historic character of the settlement.

The properties in the proposed extended conservation area are of varied style, age and material. Of significance is the land / street pattern on which they are built and the contribution made to village history and character. Opportunities exist to improve the public realm in this location. Designation would demonstrate a commitment to positive action to enhance the appearance of the area.

The additional controls on householders as a result of conservation designation are recognised and this must be balanced against the wider public gain. In practice this is expected to be limited and not place an undue burden on residents. As now, extensions would be expected to be in scale and proportion, and in matching materials. No extra costs should be incurred by residents in relation to the design or appearance of an extension to their property. Maintenance of property does not require planning permission. An extended conservation area recognises the historical significance of the junction area with the village and provides an opportunity for environmental enhancement.

- Resident

1. Support all the issues raised and the extension of the conservation area boundary
2. In reviewing the street enhancement scheme should be noted there has been a considerable increase in the volume of traffic in Church Street over last 20 years because of development in the "new" areas and will further increase when Werrington is expanded. Traffic impact is detrimental – damage to buildings; increase in pollution

/ noise; danger to residents, particularly school children. Need to prevent Church Street being used as a 'rat run'; slow traffic speed; enhance character and appearance of the conservation area.

Response

1. Comments noted.
2. See previous comments on review of environmental / traffic scheme.

• Resident

1. Support appraisal and interesting plan
2. Welcome a re-evaluation of traffic calming and use of Church Street as a 'rat run' between Park ways and Fulbridge Road. Speed limit seems to be ignored, important from a safety perspective for school children.
3. Pavements in Werrington are being resurfaced in black asphalt. Not in keeping with desired look and feel for Appraisal.

Response

1. Comments noted
2. Comments noted. See also previous comments
3. Comments noted. Agree that re-surfacing in asphalt can be visually intrusive. No resources presently available for resurfacing in enhanced material. However, the Character Appraisal will assist in helping to achieve this.

• Resident

Proposed re-look at re-instating traditional grass verges – 101-109 Church Street – this area used as overflow parking for parents of school children, for adjacent house owners and Pharmacy users. If the area is grassed then no place to park and would need to be protected to prevent area becoming a mess in winter.

Response

Comments noted. Initial discussions on appropriateness of such works would be held with affected residents / business / Neighbourhood Council / Police etc.

• Resident

1. Preserving or enhancing the character of the area is welcomed but possibly too late after the period of infill and extension within the C.A. Further infill in gardens and block paving would be undesirable from increased flood risk.
2. Use of Article 4 Directions must take account of the significant changes / extensions / alterations to 53/63 Church Street e.g.
3. Nos. 53-63 accessed by un-adopted private lane. Maintenance is costly, would the Council pay for it?
4. Correction to 2.2 Roof materials (55 and 57-63)

Response

1. Comments noted. Development Control guidelines allied to this Appraisal will strengthen the control of development throughout the conservation area. Hard surfacing of front gardens is 'permitted development' under the planning acts. The hard surfacing of front gardens for parking is recognised as a contributor to increased rate of rainwater run off in urban areas. At a city wide level guidance raising these consequences and promoting environmental / diversity benefits of retaining 'soft' front gardens is being developed.
2. Comment noted.

3. This request has been passed on the Highway Authority. As policy, the Highway Authority does not adopt un-adopted roads for cost reasons.
4. The Appendix has been amended accordingly.

- Resident

1. Support scheme to extend the conservation area and retain atmosphere of village.
2. Support re-examination of traffic calming measures. The bollards by the church are dangerous, heading towards the Cock Inn, when sun is low in sky. Difficulty of large vehicles turning into Church Street from Canterbury Road. Several 'near misses'.

Response

1. Comment noted
2. Comment noted. See also previous comments

- Resident

Objects to extension of the conservation area as this relates to land containing the village centre and the field behind the village centre. Would wish for some assurances that the conservation designation would not hinder the development of the property should we decide to build on the property.

Response

The site adjoins the existing conservation area and Policy CBE3 of the Local Plan applies. Any proposal for re-development – if in the future within the proposed extended conservation area – would, as now, be assessed on the same policy - impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. I.e. does the proposal preserve or enhance the existing character? Is it sympathetic and compatible with its surroundings - the character of the area - being compatible in terms of design, density, layout, massing, height and building materials? Does the proposal create or reinforce a sense of place? A conservation area does not seek to restrict development, but manage change to 'preserve' and/or 'enhance' the 'character' or an area in terms of its appearance and usage.