

Henley on Thames Conservation Area Appraisal and Boundary Review

Consultation Statement

Introduction

1. The purpose of this statement is to provide a summary of the representations received during the public consultation on the Henley on Thames Conservation Area Appraisal and Boundary Reviews held between Wednesday 30 March and Wednesday 25 May 2022.

Background

Purpose of the Conservation Area Appraisal and Boundary Review

2. Under Sections 69 & 71 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 local authorities have a duty to designate conservation areas and from time to time to review the boundaries. The Conservation Area Appraisal Document is the mechanism by which the local authority defines the special interest of these areas and they form part of the Local Authority Development Plan evidence base.
3. Under Section 71 of the above act, we have exercised our duty to formulate and produce proposals for the preservation and enhancement of the conservation area.
4. The appraisal document forms part of the evidence base for the Development Plan. It should be used in the development management process to manage positive change within the designated conservation area or its setting to minimise harm and encourage preservation or enhancement.

Summary of the Appraisal Document and alterations to the Proposed Boundary

5. The document provides a summary of the history of Henley on Thames's development, an assessment of its historic and architectural interest by character area, a gazetteer of local interest buildings (non-listed structures) and a series of illustrative maps showing various details of spatial analysis.
6. The Conservation and Design Team proposed revisions to the existing boundaries. These include rationalisation of the boundary where it crosses through a building plot and the addition of areas considered to contribute to the significance of the area.

Summary of consultation responses received

7. In total, 35 responses were received during the public consultation period.
8. Overall, the responses received were generally supportive of the content of the document but the removal of areas to the south-west of the Fairmile were not favourable. The Conservation and Design Team recommended to Henley Town Council that Leicester Close, Badgemore Lane and Pearce's Orchard, although modern, made a positive contribution to the character of the area and should remain in the designated conservation area. Henley Town Council confirmed that

they would be happy for these areas to remain and would additionally like to see Bowling Court remain.

9. Detailed comments on how the Conservation Team have responded to all the comments received can be found in the table below.

Responses

10. The table below outlines all the responses received during the consultation with the Conservation Team's response and relevant actions.
11. Names have been removed. Respondents were invited to provide a partial postcode when responding in order to capture the geographical extent of comments on this localised consultation; postcodes have been removed from the table provided below.

Conclusion

12. Overall, the level of response was broadly as expected on this localised consultation.
13. The questions asked provided specific opportunities to comment on the proposed boundary revisions and on the appraisal document itself. The comments received were useful to the team in finalising the document and boundary review.

Rep	Name of you are representing:	How far do you agree or disagree with the proposed extension of the full length of Fair Mile?	How far do you agree or disagree with the proposed addition of the buildings between Greys Road and Reading Road?	How far do you agree or disagree with the proposed addition of the eastern end of St Andrew's Road?	How far do you agree or disagree with the proposal to remove Bowling Court and Pearce's Orchard?	How far do you agree or disagree to remove Leicester Court and Badgemore Lane?	How far do you agree or disagree with the proposal to remove Dry Leas Sports Ground?	How far do you agree or disagree with the proposal to remove Hanover House?	How far do you agree or disagree with the proposal to remove 33a St Andrew's Road?	Overall comments	Conservation and Design Team response
1	-	Strongly agree	-	-	Agree - I am happy that 1 to 13 Pearces Orchard are to be removed from the conservation area but do not understand why you have not included Edmond Gate No. 2A Pearce's Orchard nor the new house directly opposite. Shown in red on the attached image. Both properties are newer than the rest.	-	-	-	-	-	The development was designed with consistent appearance and layout which has remain well preserved and makes a positive contribution to the conservation area as an example of C20 development of high quality. We recommend it remains in the designated area. This will not change the existing PD rights of residents and further consultation is not deemed necessary.
2	-	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	-	-	Strongly disagree	-	-	Being in a conservation area should not prevent appropriate upgrading, in particular to provide better insulation and environmental improvements.	Agreed. The document encourages best practice in this respect. No specific changes to the document are required.
3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	n/a

4	-	-	-	-	-	-	Disagree - I over look the the sports ground and there are many birds and wildlife around the area my son loves to spot all the wildlife. My concern that this decision will have a negative impact in the future for the residents who overlook the site. Such the potential for larger stadia and seating to do so tree removal will have to take place thus damage habitats for wildlife. The floodlights are already on past 10pm most nights which exceeds any other sports ground in	-	-	-	The Conservation Area designation can only manage change not wholly prevent it in the manner referred to. However, the existing trees on the Sports Ground site are considered to be a postive contributor to the character of the area and benefit from being within the designated area. As such it is recommended the boundary is not altered here as had been proposed.
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--	---	---	---	---

							the area including the likes of Phyllis court & Tennis club. I would welcome changes to those sites as there is no difference. Sport for all!				
5	Mark Coram	Agree - This area should be widened to include the field areas to the Sout-West of Fairmile (between Badegmore End and Beechwood) as these areas directly impact on Fairmile. They over look the area and any development on them would have a profound and detrimental impact on the charatcer of Henley as you enter along the Fairmile (as stated in your justification for	-	-	Disagree - These should remain, they have a direct impact on the character of Henley and the Fairmile - an area you are currently expanding and therefore this all needs protecting.	-	-	-	-	<p>The housing development to the west of Fairmile must not be allowed to happen. Although it sits outside the geographical bounds of the CA, it overlooks the area and would have an irreversible detrimental effect on the character of Henley as you enter the town and the landscape of the valley that Fairmile sits in.</p> <p>The council need to do their part in maintaining the Conservation area, for example, the Henley Bridge (that forms our towns logo) still has a temporary unsightly tarmac repair on the paved walkways; the bins along fairmile (and the town) regularly are left over flowing, and general area maintenance needs improving.</p>	<p>1. The allocated site on the west of the Fairmile cannot be prevented by adoption of this appraisal and boundary review - the impact of it was considered when the NP was made. This appraisal should hold new development to a higher standard based on the elements identified as locally distinct.</p> <p>2. Pearce's Orchard will be retained as an example of C20 development that makes a positive contribution. Bowling Court is less well defined in terms of consistency of character, layout or pattern of development and could be removed.</p>

		extending the current area).									
6	Oxfordshire Architectural & Historical Society (OAHS)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this CA appraisal document. Our caseworkers have examined the documentation and we have the following comments:</p> <p>This is an excellent document and there is nothing in it which we would disagree with. We support the proposed additions, and the proposed removals, from the conservation areas. The review is thorough, well-researched and convincingly argued; we consider it to be a model of its kind.</p>	n/a

7	-	-	-	-	<p>Strongly disagree - Pearce's Orchard was built of uniform character, as were the terraces of Victorian and Edwardian houses in Henley, and retains the original wooden windows and front doors. Just because it was built in the 1980s doesn't mean this character shouldn't be preserved and, as such, should remain in the conservation area. The 13 houses have a restrictive covenant in place for 80 years to maintain this uniformity of character. Removing it from the conservation area would mean windows and doors could be replaced with unsightly coloured uPVC windows and doors, rendering, fences to the fronts of the properties etc. Had the conservation areas in Henley been in place in the 1960s & 70s, the uniform character of the Victorian terraced housing</p>	-	-	-	-	-	<p>Recommended that Pearce's Orchard be retained as an example of C20 development that makes a positive contribution.</p>
---	---	---	---	---	--	---	---	---	---	---	---

					would've been maintained, instead of having to now encourage residents to restore it when applying to make changes to their appearance							
8	-	-	-	Strongly agree - Very happy to see the conservation area extended to include the eastern end of St Andrews Road. The house at 4 St Andrews Road is of immense character. I am not sure why this building has not also been included.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	No.4 is broadly consistent in design but not as closely linked as other properties. We do not recommend further extension at this time.

9	-	Strongly agree - The Fairmile is an iconic entry to a small market town and deserves the highest conservation and ecological protection. Given this recognition, It is hoped that SODC also recognizes the irreparable harm that the proposed development of a housing estate off the Fairmile will do to the Fairmile conservation area and will look again at further mitigation measures.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	n/a
10	-	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly agree	Strongly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	-	n/a
11	-	-	Strongly agree - The buildings on the south side of Greys Road are a blight on the area / surrounding properties. By ensuring that their use and	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	n/a

			character is improved over time it will only improve their current lack of aesthetic appeal.								
12	-	Agree	Agree	Agree - I am saddened to see the removal of individual properties and the intensification of building , multiple properties on small sites, random enlargements, filling of green spaces and removal of trees, which change the character of the town.	-	-	-	-	-	Please try to the limit the height of new developments to protect the views and privacy of the neighbours. We know that the redevelopment of small cramped sites will continue and we deplore it. As the number of cars increases, the quality of life diminishes.	The Conservation Area designation can only manage change not wholly prevent it. Comments noted.
13	Henley-on-Thames Archaeological & Historical Group	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	With regard to the page which deals with references I would like to point out that the guide, 'A walk round Henley-on-Thames' written by A.Cottingham has now been produced in its 7th edition, which contains a number of changes and additions, especially with regard of dendro dating historic buildings. This is available on our web site. Ruth Gibson BA hon. Hist. & Arch.	Noted.
14	-	-	-	-	Strongly agree - As a resident in this area I would like to see it taken out of the conservation area	-	-	-	-	-	Recommended that Pearce's Orchard be retained as an example of C20 development that makes a positive contribution.
15	-	-	-	-	Strongly agree	-	-	-	-	-	Recommended that Pearce's Orchard be retained as an example of C20 development

											that makes a positive contribution.	
16	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>I would like to know why houses on Reading road are unable to have full loft conversions/dormers? We live a on a main road which has not one heritage feature, such as pavements, conservation lampposts etc, but we are provided with uneven tarmac pavements, concrete lampposts, pot holes sunken drains, that are damaging our houses as the HGV's roll past day and night.</p> <p>Yet we are not allowed to have full width dormers to create more space for our families.</p> <p>I'd also like to add that people who live on nice leafy quiet back streets can and do have full width dormers on their houses that we can see from our own houses!</p> <p>I would like all of the above taken into consideration when deciding planning laws on conservation areas, especially as the the council do not provide 1 tiny piece of 'conservation' On Reading Road!! And tell us home owners we aren't allowed to have a full width dormer!??</p> <p>Regards, from a disgruntled Reading Road resident!</p>	The document should help to manage change in the conservation area. Individual planning applications have to be considered case-by-case based on an informed understanding of context which this document should help to define.
17	-	-	-	-	Disagree - I am not sure what the proposed removal of conservation area status for specifically Pearce's Orchard serves to accomplish. You state that conservation area status confers advantages in this residential area and their removal would	-	-	-	-	-	Recommended that Pearce's Orchard be retained as an example of C20 development that makes a positive contribution.	

					presumably allow for infilling, removal of trees etc. and general reduction in amenity value. What is the advantage for SODC?						
18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	My name is Mr M dinarvand and I am the landlord for properties 13 and 17 greys road In Henley on Thames I've received a letter about the conservation I should say I am not interested to put my properties in a conversation area Please consider my comment Thank you	Noted. The buildings on Greys Road, whilst more modern, follow a pattern of Town Centre development and inclusion within the Conservation Area would not diminish its interest and ensure development preserves or enhances local character.
19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>I am a resident of Leicester Close and I am responding to your letter dated 30th March. I am strongly of the opinion that Leicester Close should NOT be removed from the conservation area for the reasons set out below.</p> <p>Leicester Close has been part of the conservation area from inception.</p> <p>Leicester Close consists of 14 identical houses built in 1968 with two further matching houses facing Northfield End. The original planning application "blended in with the 18th century core areas of Henley". The Close is clearly visible from Northfield End.</p> <p>The houses are built in a Neo-Georgian style which was in vogue in the period 1960 to 1970. Leicester Close is a particularly good example of a development of that era. The exteriors of the houses seen from the road are identical and none have been altered in the 55 years of existence. This is due to their positioning in the conservation area aided by some restrictive covenants. To remove it after 55 years appears illogical.</p> <p>The Close needs to be considered as a</p>	Recommended that Leicester Close be retained as an example of C20 development that makes a positive contribution.

										<p>whole. The houses were thoughtfully positioned to make the development attractive, to provide privacy between neighbours and to provide a pleasant landscaped environment. Each was provided with a small planted area in front to soften the area. There are small public islands of planting to further enhance the environment and there are several trees with TPOs throughout the whole plot.</p> <p>The whole has a a pleasing appearance and was innovative in its time.</p> <p>I disagree with the report conclusion that Leicester Close "is of no heritage interest". Historic England's heritage definition does not specify age. Leicester Close is only 55 years old but I believe that within the next generation Leicester Close will come to be appreciated along with Henley's Tudor buildings, Victorian villas and Edwardian cottages as an excellent and interesting example of a complete mid 20th century Neo-Georgian development and the only one of its kind in Henley. I also disagree with the conclusion that Leicester Close "does not contribute to the special interest of the conservation area". The trees and planting soften the area of Henley and provide a transition from the open land at the north of Henley to the fully developed centre of the town. It would be a huge loss to Henley if all this was lost by inadequate protection.</p>	
20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>My wife and I are joint owners and residents of 11 Leicester Close. We wish to remain in the Henley Conservation Area and we are confident that all (or very nearly all) the owner-occupiers of Leicester Close have the same view. The reasons are as follows:</p> <p>1. Leicester Close houses were all built in 1968 following the demolition of the original property, Leicester House. All the houses are visible from the main road. As such the development cannot properly be described as "back land infill" as is claimed in the latest survey.</p> <p>2. The 14 houses were identical when built in the Georgian style, replicating many of the properties at the north end</p>	<p>Recommended that Leicester Close be retained as an example of C20 development that makes a positive contribution.</p>

										<p>of Bell Street and Northfield End. The development can therefore be stated to be fully sympathetic with the Preservation Area of Henley</p> <p>3. Whilst most of the houses have been extended to the rear, they have been done sympathetically and more importantly the frontages have not changed in any way. All the properties have white front doors, white garage doors, and white sash windows. The uniformity of the houses is part of the charm and character of Leicester Close.</p> <p>4. Being in the Conservation Area provides essential help maintaining this character</p> <p>5. There are a number of trees in the road which help to maintain its character but only 2 of these are known to have TPO's on them</p> <p>6. We believe that this development will come to be seen as a classic example of how a modern development can be reconciled with the character of a Conservation Area and as such an area of architectural and heritage interest suitable for inclusion within such a Conservation Area</p> <p>7. We take the view that items 2 to 7 in the list of Specific Management Principles on page 131 of the Review should be applied to Leicester Close</p> <p>On the assumption that you do indeed receive similar comments from the vast majority of Leicester Close residents, it is hard to see on what basis the Council could refuse our request and we look forward to a positive response.</p>	
21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>Thank you for your letter of 30th March.</p> <p>My wife and I have lived in Henley since 1969 in houses both within and outside the Henley Conservation area.</p> <p>We moved to 2 Leicester Close RG9 2LD specifically because it was in the Henley Conservation Area and we both wish it to remain within such designated area .</p> <p>We can not see a rational reason for a change and would object strongly to any alteration to the uniformity of the buildings within the Close.</p>	<p>Recommended that Leicester Close be retained as an example of C20 development that makes a positive contribution.</p>

											"The town's conservation area exists to protect the features that make Henley a historic, unique and distinctive place".	
22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>I am writing in support of the letter that you have received from some or all of my neighbours in the Close (Tony May and Peter Lloyd).</p> <p>My main point is that I can see no benefit to anyone, residents or town of removing the status. Please would you explain who would benefit from this change?</p> <p>All the houses sit on modest plots (little if no scope for demolishing or enlarging) and have maintained the homogenous design over the 55 years of existence. We have all worked within these constraints during this time and respected the rules to the benefit of the aesthetics visible from the kerbside. Disturbing this now seems pointless and only likely to foment needless challenges in the future, unless this is all a scheme to create planning disputes?</p>	Recommended that Leicester Close be retained as an example of C20 development that makes a positive contribution.

23	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>I am resident of Leicester Close</p> <p>In response to your letter dated the 30th March 2022, I would like to state that I believe that Leicester Close should definitely NOT be removed from the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The reasons why I believe this are as follows:</p> <p>Leicester Close has been part of the Conservation Area since inception.</p> <p>All 14 houses in Leicester Close are identical (built in Neo-Georgian style with white front doors, white garage doors and white sash windows. Being in a Conservation area has provided the benefit of increased planning controls thereby protecting the setting and providing control over inappropriate work over inter alia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the level of permitted development (b) the restrictions on size and location of any alterations such as two storeys etc (c) ensuring that materials, colours, bricks, fencing etc are in keeping with the existing <p>This overall control has worked well and as result, the character of the Close has been maintained.</p> <p>Owners in similar type developments in other locations have increasingly taken to alterations of the above nature leading to a change in the uniformity and character of that development. Free of Conservation control, it is highly likely that such work would increasingly take place in Leicester Close and would gradually diminish its character and be detrimental to Henley. Surely it must be in the interest of Henley to maintain the character of this part of the town.</p> <p>To remove the Conservation Area therefore does not seem to make sense. All the houses can be seen from the main road and the development is fully sympathetic with the Preservation Area of Henley.</p> <p>I believe that the majority of the</p>	<p>Recommended that Leicester Close be retained as an example of C20 development that makes a positive contribution.</p>
----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

										Leicester Close residents will have the same view that I have and therefore I can't see on what basis the Council could refuse our request of keeping Leicester Close in the Conservation Area as it has always been.	
24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>We live as co-owners of 12 Leicester Close, Henley-on- Thames RG9 2LD, and I write to say that we are strongly opposed to the proposal to remove this property (and presumably the whole of Leicester Close) from the conservation area.</p> <p>1. Leicester Close is an area of urban development of 14 houses erected in the 1960's representing the then fashionable neo-Georgian architectural style. It was thoughtfully and carefully designed by the Planners and architects of the day to create an integrated community within easy reach of the town centre via Northfield End. All the houses had the same style and appearance: 14, essentially identical houses with open frontage and surrounding space making for an overall green environment, sympathetic to its position located just off, and visible from the grand Fairmile entrance to this riverside and tourist town.</p> <p>2. Since the houses were built some 55</p>	Recommended that Leicester Close be retained as an example of C20 development that makes a positive contribution.

										<p>years ago, they have been maintained with a common frontal appearance. The development still demonstrates the original vision of an integrated, communal area and as such is worthy of continuing conservation protection. This uniformity of the houses and the general layout of the development creates in Henley, an attractive example of 1960/70's good design and architectural style.</p> <p>3. The development is already a classic example of how modern development can be reconciled with appropriate environmental and conservation concerns. It would be clearly detrimental to the character of the area if any one of the houses became structurally or superficially altered at the front or replaced as might well be the case if the protection of being within the conservation area is lost. The current and all previous conservation frameworks for Henley have played a key role in maintaining the architectural integrity of the development which is so obvious and appreciated now.</p> <p>4. In our view, then, Leicester Close should remain, as a whole, within the Conservation Area for Henley to protect the unique setting and the valued architectural statement made 55 years ago.</p>	
25	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>My husband and I moved to Henley 6 years ago and one of the reasons we were keen to buy a house in Leicester Close was that it was in the Conservation area. We would be very disappointed if that was to change as indicated in your letter of 30.3.22.</p> <p>There are several reasons why Leicester Close should remain in the Conservation area,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To provide adequate protection from unsightly development. 2. To maintain the attractive appearance of the Close. 3. To protect the trees and attractive planted areas around each house. 4. To maintain the pleasing appearance of the Close in the town which adds to its heritage interest as a good example of mid 20th century development which has 	<p>Recommended that Leicester Close be retained as an example of C20 development that makes a positive contribution.</p>

											not been altered since it was built in 1968.	
26	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>My wife and I are joint owners and residents of 14 Leicester Close.</p> <p>We are writing to support other residents who want Leicester Close to remain in the conservation area for the reasons explained in Peter LLOYD's email.</p> <p>The cul-de-sac is already protected, and remains so, by restrictive covenants applied when the properties we're built 55 years ago.</p>	Recommended that Leicester Close be retained as an example of C20 development that makes a positive contribution.
27	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>I am the owner/occupier of No.4 Leicester Close and strongly believe that we should remain in the Conservation Area. I simply wish to endorse the points made in their e-mails by Peter Lloyd (No 10) and Tony May (No 11).</p>	Recommended that Leicester Close be retained as an example of C20 development that makes a positive contribution.

28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>My wife and I reside at No 1 Leicester Close which we own and I am responding to the proposal to remove the Close from the current conservation area.</p> <p>We believe this would be a retrograde step and we oppose it. The grounds for so doing are well expressed in the submissions you have received from our neighbours- Mr Tony May at not 11 and Mr Peter Lloyd at No.10. I wish to add these additional considerations:</p> <p>History Your letter of 30 March states that the conservation area "is the designated area of special architectural or historic interest which exists to protect the features and characteristics that make Henley a historic, unique and distinctive place." I submit that Leicester Close does have both architectural and historic interest.</p> <p>The 14 houses of the Close together with the two properties which front North End Road at the Close entrance (which are already recommended to remain in the C.A) are constructed on the grounds of Leicester House which in the early 1960` s was owned by Osbert Lancaster, the pocket-cartoonist for the Daily Express. Mr Lancaster was, ironically, a pioneer and pillar of conservation in Henley; until that is , he had a torrid affair with a fellow journalist, Anne-Scott James of the Daily Mail. She persuaded her lover to abandon Leicester House and to join her at her country estate elsewhere in Oxfordshire which he did- performing a moonlight flit and selling out to the developers who built Leicester Close. The Close preserves a good number of the trees that originally stood in the grounds of Leicester House and is a fine example of neo-Georgian architecture, which thanks,inter alia,to the conservation area have retained their distinctive original character for the past 54 years; and if they remain in the conservation area will remain so for the next 54 years, gaining in recognition as a fine example of its kind as they age.</p> <p>The South side of Leicester Close abuts</p>	<p>Recommended that Leicester Close be retained as an example of C20 development that makes a positive contribution.</p>
----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--

										<p>the historically important Friends Meeting House which has occupied the site since 1658 and which borders the Leicester Close houses nos-1-6 with a sixteen century flint and brick wall and boasts on Northfield End one of the oldest, if not he oldest, inhabited dwelling in Henley. The Friends garden runs the whole length of Leicester Close South side and culminates with a cemetery the other side of the wall opposite No 6.Leicester Close. The North side of Leicester Close overlooks Freemans Meadow, an important, protected green space.</p> <p>Democracy or Bureaucracy ? We have lived in Leicester Close for 22 years. In that time it has been possessed of a friendly collegiate spirit as evidenced by all the Close residents coming together each year to share in a Christmas Luncheon and where appropriate national celebrations such as VE Day and this year a Platinum Jubilee Street Party. Thanks to the conservation area, despite many houses having received extensive alterations both internally and to the rear, the frontages and overall aspect have retained their original character and the Close remains as originally constructed visually.</p> <p>We believe it is the wish of the majority of Close residents for the conservation area to be preserved. Past success is no guarantee of future success in maintaining the character of this neo-Georgian Close, unique in Henley. If the protection of the conservation area is removed, the possibility of harmful development is increased. We ask SODC to endorse the local democratic will of those of us who live in and cherish the legacy of Leicester Close for future generations over the bureaucratic considerations of an external consultant.</p>	
29	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>I am responding to the issue of Leicester Close no longer being in the Conversation area for Henley on Thames. I am astonished that you are thinking of withdrawing the protection of this area.</p>	<p>Recommended that Leicester Close be retained as an example of C20 development that makes a positive contribution.</p>

										<p>I am a new resident of Leicester Close and one of the factors I took into consideration when buying the property was that it was in the Conservation area. I do not want this to change and agree wholeheartedly with the mails you have already received from Paul Barrett, Peter Lloyd and Tony May.</p> <p>Please look at this again and change your minds.</p>	
30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>Thank you for your letter of 30th March 2022 regarding the above review. I am the owner/occupier of No.6 Leicester Close and strongly believe that we should remain in the Conservation Area. I endorse the points made in the e-mails you have received from Paul Barrett (No.1), Peter Lloyd (No. 10) and Tony May (No. 11).</p>	<p>Recommended that Leicester Close be retained as an example of C20 development that makes a positive contribution.</p>
31	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>I have been the owner of no 3 Leicester Close since January 1983. I agree with My neighbours who have written to express their dismay at the idea of this Close losing its conservation status; and I am extremely grateful to Tony May, Peter Lloyd and Paul Barrett for putting the arguments so succinctly.</p>	<p>Recommended that Leicester Close be retained as an example of C20 development that makes a positive contribution.</p>
32	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>Further to my earlier letter asking please that you KEEP Leicester Close in the Conservation Area where it has always been since it was built. I thought this photograph well illustrated how visible it is and how harmoniously it blends with the Fairmile off which it leads. The owners of the Court House would be happy to allow you to view it from their front elevation – this shot is from the road.</p> <p>Had Leicester Close not readily followed the original conditions of the planning consent and the Conservation status and only built extensions BEHIND their property the development would not deserve the continued protection we seek to retain. Everyone would have built individual extensions over their garages, as the cheapest options, and Leicester Close would not look as it does today under the original trees which graced the Leicester House garden which it replaced.</p>	<p>Recommended that Leicester Close be retained as an example of C20 development that makes a positive contribution.</p>

33	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	<p>I would suggest that all Planning Apps within the Conservation area are required to submit a Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) plan of the proposed area. The plans to be lodged with the Land Registry. There are many subsurface facilities of which neither the MOD or County have any record.</p> <p>As an example I have recently found a WW2 Signals bunker beneath my driveway the size of a double garage. This has bourn the weight of a number of refuse carts / builders lorries / JCBs over the past 30 years to my horror!</p> <p>I would also suggest Michael Gove considers this for all Planning Applications in his new Bill</p>	This is outside of the remit of a Conservation Area Appraisal and Designation but comments noted.
34	Historic England									<p>I am happy to confirm that in Historic England's view, this provides a suitable approach to documenting and analysing the significance of the conservation area and we hope will provide a sound basis for planning and other decisions affecting the area.</p> <p>We commend the approval to the district council.</p>	n/a
35	Natural England									No specific comments	n/a