

**PLAISTOW CONSERVATION AREA
CHARACTER APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PLAN
RESULT OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

APPENDIX 1

Draft # 1 12 November 2012.

No	Name	Comment	Response	Action
1	Peter Luttmann-Johnston	(i) Does not support the inclusion of the Mission Hall in the CA. (ii) The Appraisal is repetitive and at times erroneous.	Noted - one of many such comments. This comment was discussed at the exhibition and relates mainly to the mapping - this will be corrected.	Change recommendation. Change CA boundary map.
2	R A Wyatt	(i) Agrees with Key Characteristics in principle. (ii) Does not agree with recommendation to extend the CA - concerned that extensions will restrict the way land is used in the future.	Noted. Noted - but CA designation is not a static process and change can take place albeit in a more controlled way.	No further action (NFA) NFA
3	Anon	(i) Agrees with Key Characteristics in principle. (ii) Does not agree with recommendation to extend the CA - concerned that extensions will restrict the way land is used in the future.	Noted. Noted - but CA designation is not a static process and change can take place albeit in a more controlled way.	NFA NFA
4	Brian Smart	(i) Does not agree with the inclusion of the Mission Hall.	Noted - one of many such comments.	Change recommendation.
5	Mrs Wendy Baddeley	(i) Does not agree that the Mission Hall and St Edmund's Hill Cottage should be added to the CA.	Noted.	Still consider that Edmund's Hill Cottage should be added, as it is a 'positive' historic building.
6	Anon`	(i) Agrees with Key Characteristics but would like to see the village pond added.	Agree.	Add the Village Pond as a Key Characteristic.

		(ii) Agrees with recommendations for boundary changes apart from the Mission Hall (exclude) and the small barn in front of Brackenhurst (include).	The barn in front of Brackenhurst is already in the CA and is a 'positive' historic building which could be considered to be curtilage listed -so it is already well protected.	NFA
7	Paul Reynolds	(i) Does not agree with the inclusion of the Mission Hall. (ii) Agrees with inclusion of St Edmund's Hill Cottage.	Noted - one of many such comments. Noted.	Change recommendation. Leave existing recommendation.
8	G R Powell	(i) Agrees with key Characteristics and Recommendations.	noted.	NFA
9	David Morgan	(i) Does not agree with the inclusion of the Mission Hall - the building is an eyesore and the extension would block any possible access between the road and the field beyond it.	Noted - one of many such comments.	Change recommendation.
10	Anon	(i) Wants Nell Ball Hill in CA.	Whilst this is an attractive landscape feature it is a little distance from the centre of the village and it is not considered to be of sufficient 'architectural or historic interest' to merit inclusion.	NFA
		(ii) Does not want the Mission Hall in the CA - out of keeping and would block access to land behind.	Noted - one of many such comments.	Change recommendation.
11	Anon	(i) Agrees with Key Characteristics. (ii) Does not agree with recommendation to extend the CA to include the Mission Hall	Noted Noted - one of many such comments.	NFA Change recommendation.
		(iii) Considers that Nell Ball Hill should be in CA.	Whilst this is an attractive landscape feature it is a little distance from the centre of the village and it is not considered to be of sufficient 'architectural or historic interest' to merit inclusion.	NFA

12	Margaret Hibbard	(i) Considers that Nell Ball Hill should be in CA - used by local community, and was a look-out point in WW2. Also the summit is used for a beacon.	Whilst this is an attractive landscape feature it is a little distance from the centre of the village and it is not considered to be of sufficient 'architectural or historic interest' to merit inclusion.	NFA
		(ii) A footpath is needed from the houses in Shillinglee Road (Dunsfold Road?) into the village for pedestrian safety.	Dunsfold Road is only partly within the CA and the part closest to the village centre does have a pavement on one side.	Mention road/pedestrian safety generally in 'Issues'.
13	Wendy Novelle	(i) Agrees with Key Characteristics but would like to add Nell Ball Hill to CA.	Whilst this is an attractive landscape feature it is a little distance from the centre of the village and it is not considered to be of sufficient 'architectural or historic interest' to merit inclusion.	NFA
		(ii) Would like to have the large field to the east of southern section of The Street added to CA.	This was considered during the stakeholders' walkabout - generally it was felt that this field did not link visually with the centre of the village and therefore there seems no justification for its inclusion.	NFA
		(iii) Would like to see the provision of a footpath just within the field on the west side of the road leading to Plaistow Place to provide a safe route for villages accessing Plaistow from Lyons Green.	This lies outside the CA boundary but pedestrian safety as a general topic will be added to the 'Issues' section.	Add to 'Issues'.
14	Anon	(i) Does not agree with the addition of land to the south to the CA as it will block access to the field beyond, which has been identified as a potential housing site. Also queries the timing of the Appraisal document - should have waited for the Community's final deliberations on new housing sites to be agreed.	Noted but the Appraisal is needed to safeguard the special architectural and historic interest of the area.	NFA
15	Derek Martin	(i) Does not support the inclusion of The Mission Hall in the CA.	Noted - one of many such comments.	Change recommendation.

(ii) Include the large field facing the cricket pitch and bordering the Street.	This was considered during the stakeholders' walkabout - generally it was felt that this field did not link visually with the centre of the village and therefore there seems no justification for its inclusion.	NFA
(iii) Include the large field behind Back Lane and abutting the more recent housing developments. Also the tree group to the west of Todhurst Farm barns.	This is a well treed area which is used as an informal nature reserve. It is surrounded by trees which create a backdrop to the listed properties in The Street and Back Lane. There might be some advantages in including at least the tree belt on the east side so that the setting of Back Lane is protected.	Belt of trees along west side of Back Lane do contribute to character agree to include this but not the whole field.
(iv) Include the large field below Common House.	This was considered and rejected during the stakeholders' walkabout - generally it was felt that although the field provides attractive views up to Common House and some trees, it does not link visually with the village itself and cannot be seen from the triangle of roads which form the core of the village. The inclusion of 'Important Views' on the Townscape Appraisal Map also draws attention to this area and makes it sensitive to proposals for change which will be taken into account by CDC.	NFA
(v) Include football pitch off Dunsfold Road.	Whilst this is an important community facility, it sits slightly separate from the core of the village and is hidden from it by a hedge. It does not retain any features which makes it of special interest and its inclusion is not justifiable.	NFA
(vi) Notes that a new extension to a property in Dunsfold Road is poorly designed and asks if this has planning permission?	This is not within the CA so whilst regrettable is not a matter for this Appraisal.	NFA

		(vii) Traffic speeds along The Street and suggests a speed limit of 20 mph with an occasional police presence to enforce.	Noted - agree.	Add to Issues and Recommendations.
16	G A Robb	(i) Agrees with Key Characteristics. (ii) Wants to add the following areas to the CA - playing field to NW of village; woodland/wildlife field to west of Back Lane; field to north of church; whole field to north of village stores; field to SE of the village, shown on map with views towards the village (marked up map enclosed). Sees no point in extending the boundary to the south .	Agree addition of woodland/field to north of church; agree the addition of the whole field to the north of the village stores as a continuation of proposed boundary and to protect setting of pond. Don't agree the others - these three areas are not part of the historic settlement and do not make a contribution to its setting or the setting of historic buildings (though part of the woodland to the west of Back Lane may be included - see 15) .	Make additions as suggested.
17	Clarisa Bushell	Agrees with recommendations generally apart from inclusion of The Mission Hall.	Agree	This will be deleted from proposals.
18	Mrs A Fox	Agrees with Key Characteristics. Wants the hillock known as Nell Ball Hill added to CA.	Do not agree - see previous comments - this may have significance as a village asset but is not part of the historic settlement and does not contribute to its immediate setting or the setting of historic buildings.	NFA
19	Anon	Agrees with Key Characteristics. Issues include the need for more control of through traffic, which travels too fast; also the parked cars outside the village school which take the road dangerous for both passing cars and pedestrians trying to cross the road safely.	Agreed - these will be emphasised in the Management Plan	Amend text accordingly.
20	Anon	(i) Agrees with Key Characteristics and with proposed changes to CA boundary. Concerned with new traffic measures could detract from the character of the village. Is specifically against street lighting and raised footpaths.	noted	NFA

21	Anon	(i) Wants to see the first part of the field 'opposite the playing field' included in the CA; does not want The Mission Hall in the CA.	Not sure where this is - map not included.	NFA
22	Margaret Hibbard	Agrees with Key Characteristics and Recommendations (though see her additional comments at 12). No further Issues.		
23	Anon	Agrees with Key Characteristics. Does not agree with proposed extension to include St Edmund Hill Cottage and The Mission Hall.	Noted.	CA boundary may be amended slightly to include St Edmund Hill Cottage only.
24	Mark Raeside	Outcome of village meeting on 22 November 2012 - (i) add both fields behind the village pond and whole of school playing field (ii) add St Edmund Hill Cottage but not The Mission Hall (iii) generally, the Council should not allow the construction of new houses in existing gardens in the CA.	Agreed.	Amend text/map accordingly.
General note: 34 people attended the public consultation event on 28.9.12		Verbal issues raised included: speeding traffic a problem, particularly between the church and school; small barn to right of pond - is it listed? (No); support for field to back of village pond being included in CA; parked cars outside school a safety hazard though usually gone by late pm (teachers usually use school car park); need for village car park but where? Include whole of garden to Old Barkfold in CA; the 'positive' barn shown in field to easterly CA extension is a modern rebuild; exclude woodland to north of Loxwood Road?		