



Eden Local Development Framework

Management of Conservation Areas Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

**Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England)
Regulations 2004
Statement made under Regulation 18(4)(b)**

**Summary of representations on the Consultation Draft Management
of Conservation Areas SPD and how they have been addressed in the
adoption version of the Management of Conservation Areas SPD**

Summary of consultation under Regulation 17

An initial scoping exercise was carried out amongst key stakeholders in July - August 2010. We consulted on the Consultation Draft Management of Conservation Areas SPD over the period 13 December 2010 to 28 January 2011. Eleven consultation responses were received of whom three fully supported the SPD and one did not with the remaining comments highlighting various issues.

Summary of main issues raised in public consultation and how they were addressed in the final SPD

Name	Organisation	Support	Object	
Andrew Wilson-Holt				
Comments				EDC response
Individual conservation area character appraisals are needed to provide baseline evidence, identifying what makes a CA special & where opportunities exist to enhance.				Individual conservation area management plans, based on character appraisals, would undoubtedly provide better, more detailed information however current resources simply do not permit this. Para 1.5 sets out the reasons that we have chosen to undertake a comprehensive conservation area management plan although it is accepted that it results in the SPD being more generalised that would be ideal. All comments raised on individual conservation areas however were incorporated into the final SPD.
Suggested a local proforma akin to CABE's Design & Access Statement template where developers are required to explain their proposals against key issues derived from an individual CA character appraisal.				Included in para 4.1
Name	Organisation	Support	Object	
Ann Sandell		x		
Comments				EDC response
Questioned action on reported satellite dishes				Included in para 4.8
Name	Organisation	Support	Object	
Jeanette Clark	Kirkby Stephen Town Council	x		
Comments				EDC response
Town Council accepts and supports document				No action required.

Name	Organisation	Support	Object
Mark Brennand	Cumbria CC Historic Environment		
Comments			EDC response
Grammatical errors			Addressed
Name	Organisation	Support	Object
Chris Elphick	Orton Parish Council		
Comments			EDC response
Orton PC agreed recommendation re open nature of central fields in Orton. Whilst critical of some recent alterations in Orton the PC thought that an Article 4 Direction in the village would be too restrictive.			No action required.
Name	Organisation	Support	Object
M E Bell			
Comments			EDC response
The context of signs in town centres need to be given more thought.			Included in para 4.3
More action should be taken when buildings start to become dilapidated and Eden DC should work more closely with local councils on this issue.			Included in para Appendix D
Name	Organisation	Support	Object
Richard Morris	Friends of Settle-Carlisle Line		
Comments			EDC response
Information about the special qualities of the S-C CA. New developments alongside the railway should be sensitive to the topography and be well landscaped. The platelayers huts alongside the line make a positive contribution to its character and appearance & should not be demolished.			Included in para 5.13

Name	Company	Support	Object
Ian Campbell	Appleby-in-Westmorland Society	x	
Comments			EDC response
<p>Whilst supportive of the document there was much doubt as to whether the Council would enforce adequately. Poor quality of public realm work in market place and derelict buildings were cited as evidence.</p> <p>Lack of clarity re paras 4.4-4.6 & para 4.8</p> <p>Society happy to prepare local list of heritage assets.</p> <p>Need for published document of who does what in a CA & what living in a CA should be sent to all residents. Need clearer communication channels between town & EDC.</p> <p>Castle needs to be bought back into life of town.</p> <p>Maintain buildings, public realm and river bank</p>			<p>Noted.</p> <p>Given the comprehensive scope of the SPD it is difficult to provide detail on individual sites. EDC needs to be satisfied that any enforcement action is both legal and appropriate and that view may not concur with individuals or groups in a conservation area.</p> <p>Not appropriate to be recorded in the SPD nevertheless the Appleby society's offer is very welcome.</p> <p>Included in para 4.8</p> <p>Included in para 5.2</p> <p>Included in para 5.2</p>
Name	Company	Support	Object
Chris Johnson			
Comments			EDC response
Cobbled streets and paving flags are a feature of the town centre and should be retained and extended to footways that are currently tarmaced to achieve a co-ordinated approach.			Included in para 5.1

Name	Company	Support	Object
Gwyn Clark	Eden District Council		x
Comments			EDC response
<p data-bbox="186 384 914 457">Layout reads like a series of policies which will lead to misunderstanding.</p> <p data-bbox="186 709 841 783">SPD should expand on a Core Strategy policy specifically CS 17 & 18.</p> <p data-bbox="186 1518 857 1591">Guidance is too generalised with insufficient information on specific issues in individual CAs.</p>			<p data-bbox="954 384 1429 678">The layout of the document was substantially altered so that it read as guidance and not as policy. All highlighted texts and boxes were removed and the numbering system altered so that it did not convey that the SPD contained policies.</p> <p data-bbox="954 709 1429 1476">A SPD does not have to "hang off" a Core Strategy policy, but must be in conformity with it, which this SPD is. Some SPDs, such as Housing, are intended to amplify a CS policy, but this does not have to be the case (para 2.3). The need for future clarification of aspects of CS17 & 18 is acknowledged however this SPD is not the most appropriate vehicle for addressing this issue. The SPD relates only to conservation areas whereas the CS policies cover the entire district. Supplementary guidance notes are being produced to provide greater clarity on policies CS17 & 18 prior to the programmed Development Management DPD.</p> <p data-bbox="954 1518 1429 1833">Individual conservation area management plans, based on character appraisals, would undoubtedly provide better, more detailed information however current resources simply do not permit this. Para 1.5 sets out the reasons that we have chosen to undertake a comprehensive</p>

<p>Policy PEN2 is “nonsensical” as it has already been pedestrianised.</p>	<p>conservation area management plan although it is accepted that it results in the SPD being more generalised that would be ideal. All comments raised on individual conservation areas however were incorporated into the final SPD.</p> <p>PEN2 referred to pedestrianisation of the Narrows, Devonshire Street and Market Square, which are not currently pedestrianised. Comment is unfounded so no action necessary.</p>
--	--