

APPENDIX C: 2013 CONSULTATION RESPONSES ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO AND CHARACTER APPRAISALS FOR GAINFORD CONSERVATION AREA

CONSULTEE	COMMENTS MADE	RESPONSE FROM HLD TEAM
<p>Public meetings held on 12th June and 5th July in Gainford Village Hall</p>	<p>Approximately 80 local residents attended the meetings.</p> <p>General support expressed for conservation area designation and aims of the appraisal document but majority of residents were concerned about the proposed inclusion of the St. Peters School site within the conservation area boundary and that this would prohibit future housing redevelopment.</p> <p>Issues raised regarding relationship to forthcoming Neighbourhood Plan, and current housing allocations within the village.</p>	<p>Support for designation and appraisal document noted.</p> <p>See response below to proposed inclusion of St. Peters site.</p> <p>Comments regarding the neighbourhood plan process and housing allocations within the village have been passed to the Spatial Policy Team for consideration as these issues are not directly related to the scope of the conservation area consultation or review process.</p>
<p>Gainford and Langton Parish Council</p>	<p>Email correspondence received from Parish Clerk and Chairperson, meeting attended by Vice Chair, and members of the Parish Clerk attended the public information sessions on 12th June and 2nd July. Formal written comments were</p>	

	<p>received on 1st August.</p> <p>The Parish Council objects to the inclusion of the St. Peters School site within the conservation area boundary which they feel will prevent future redevelopment of the site.</p> <p>Comments made regarding the condition of the buildings, gateway role for the village, the future responsibilities of DCC if the site is not developed, and three direct quotes made from a report by heritage consultants Purcell.</p>	<p>Our intention behind this proposed extension is to promote the retention and reuse of the main school building to the north of the site which dates from 1900 and has clear architectural interest, rather than to prevent or hinder any options for redevelopment in this location.</p> <p>DCC have previously served a s215 notice on the landowner to improve the appearance of the site, and continue to monitor the condition of the site. However DCC is not able to assume financial responsibility for the upkeep of private land or property.</p> <p>HLD staff already provide support on a daily basis to developers across the county and have already made contact with both landowners at the St. Peters site as part of our proactive approach to conservation.</p> <p>The HLD Team have requested a copy of the Purcell report, so that a full balanced assessment of its conclusions can be made. Unfortunately only a few sentences have been forwarded to date.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>No objection raised to proposed northern and western extensions to the boundary.</p> <p>Concerns also raised regarding the impact of the conservation area review on preparation of a neighbourhood plan, housing allocations within the village, and the timing and scope of the conservation area consultation process.</p>	<p>Support for northern and western boundary amendments noted.</p> <p>Comments regarding the neighbourhood plan process, housing allocations within the village and the progression of the Durham Plan have been passed to the Spatial Policy Team for consideration as these issues are not directly related to the scope of the conservation area consultation or review process.</p> <p>Unfortunately the Heritage Landscape and Design Team have not previously been consulted by the Parish Council regarding the neighbourhood plan for Gainford. However as the character appraisal has no formal status as a Supplementary Planning Guidance it will have little direct influence on the neighbourhood plan but will of course provide useful research on the special character of the village. The neighbourhood plan process is directly supported by the DCC Spatial Policy Team, but the HLD Team would welcome the opportunity to become involved in this process as we have offered in other</p>
--	--	--

		<p>conservation areas.</p> <p>The County Council has a statutory duty to review conservation area designations from time to time and to produce management proposals for those areas. This process includes a review of the conservation area boundary and has been undertaken fully in accordance with best practice guidance published by English Heritage. Consultation letters were sent to all residents and landowners who could be directly affected by the proposed boundary changes, and emails and letters sent to local elected members, the Area Action Partnership and the Parish Council on the 4th and 5th June. Posters were also erected around the village on 4th June with additional posters added on 6th June. and a press release issued. A public information session was held on 12th June, and an additional session held on 2nd July which was advertised by local posters and on the Council website from 12th June. Approximately 80 residents attended the two public sessions. The consultation period was also extended by two weeks until 26th July, allowing residents almost 8 weeks to comment on the proposals.</p>
--	--	---

<p>Agent for Kebbell Development Ltd</p>	<p>Supports proposed extension to include St. Peter's site within the conservation area.</p> <p>Commented that owner of site recognises that this will not preclude development and would like to promote an integrated development for the site based on a detailed development brief.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The Council welcomes the opportunity to develop an integrated scheme for the site and would be prepared to undertake a development brief for the site to that end.</p>
<p>Agent for Ruttle Plant (North East) Ltd</p>	<p>Objects to proposed extension to include St. Peter's site within the conservation area</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The Council would welcome the opportunity to develop an integrated scheme for the site with both landowners and has arranged a site visit to discuss redevelopment proposals.</p>
<p>Resident of Academy Gardens</p>	<p>Supports conservation area designation, reservations expressed about inclusion of St. Peter's site, delays to any redevelopment and costs of adaptation.</p> <p>The extension to include Riverside Millennium Green should reflect the whole area to the centre of the river.</p>	<p>Support for designation and concerns regarding inclusion of the St. Peter's site noted. (See comments above for detailed response to the St. Peter's extension)</p> <p>A further extension to the west has now been included in light of public comments received which follows the edge of the river more consistently.</p>

Resident of Academy Gardens	Opposes proposed extension to include the St. Peters site within the conservation area	Objection to St. Peter's extension noted (See comments above for detailed response to the St. Peter's extension)
Resident of Balmer Hill	<p>Supports proposed extension to the west of the conservation area, opposes inclusion of the St. Peter's site.</p> <p>Text changes to correct grammatical and building/street name errors highlighted</p>	<p>Support for western extension and objection to St. Peter's extension noted. (See comments above for detailed response to the St. Peter's extension)</p> <p>Minor text changes made as suggested.</p>
Resident of Balmer Hill	Supports conservation area designation, opposes any extensions to the boundary, suggested that the main St. Peter's building should be listed rather than added to the conservation area.	<p>Support for designation and opposition to any boundary extensions noted. (See comments above for detailed response to the St. Peter's extension)</p> <p>The St. Peter's building is not currently being considered for national listing which is assessed by English Heritage rather than DCC. However this would impose greater restrictions on the conversion of the buildings than conservation area status, and the HLD team considers that the buildings would be unlikely to meet the national principles of selection for listing given the partial demolition and level of internal alterations which have</p>

	<p>Commented that any new development within the village should be on the St. Peter's site</p>	<p>taken place.</p> <p>Comments on housing allocations within the village have been passed to the Spatial Policy Team for consideration.</p>
Resident of Eden Lane	<p>Supports conservation area designation but doubt expressed over proposed inclusion of St. Peter's site.</p> <p>Comments made regarding traffic on Main Road.</p>	<p>Support for designation and doubts regarding inclusion of St. Peter's site within the boundary noted. (See comments above for detailed response to the St. Peter's extension)</p> <p>Comments regarding traffic have been passed to the Highways section for consideration.</p>
Resident of Eden Park	<p>Reservations expressed about conservation area designation, supports conversion of some of the St. Peter's buildings to apartments and stated that any new housing development should be south of the main road.</p>	<p>Concerns regarding conservation area designation and support for conversion of some of the St. Peters buildings noted. (See comments above for detailed response to the St. Peter's extension)</p> <p>Comments regarding future housing development within the village have been passed to the Spatial Policy Team.</p>
Resident of Gainford	<p>Supports conservation area designation and opposes inclusion of the St. Peter's site within the boundary.</p>	<p>Support for designation and opposition to inclusion of St. Peter's site within the boundary noted. (See comments above for detailed response to the St. Peter's</p>

	<p>Suggested that the fields to the west of school lane are included in the boundary.</p> <p>Commented on need to emphasise community and continued development.</p>	<p>extension)</p> <p>A further extension to the west has now been included in light of public comments received.</p> <p>Conservation area status is not used as a way of preventing development, which is a common misconception, it is a tool used to manage change in historic areas in a positive and proactive way.</p>
Resident of Gainford	Supports conservation area designation and supports inclusion of the St. Peter's site within the boundary.	Support for designation and inclusion of St. Peter's site within the boundary noted. (See comments above for detailed response to the St. Peter's extension)
Resident of High Row	Supports proposed extensions to conservation area boundary to north and west, opposes inclusion of the St. Peter's site within the boundary which would prevent redevelopment.	<p>Support for designation and concerns regarding inclusion of the St. Peter's site noted. (See comments above for detailed response to the St. Peter's extension).</p> <p>A further extension to the west has now been included in light of public comments received.</p>
Resident of Low Green	No comments made on designation or proposed extensions.	

	Text changes to correct grammatical and building/street name errors highlighted	Minor text changes made as suggested.
Resident of Low Green	Supports the conservation area designation partly, supports the proposed extension to the north, supports proposed extension to the west which should be extended to include the Riverside Walk, opposes proposed extension to include the St. Peter's site.	Partial support for designation and opposition to inclusion of St. Peter's site within the boundary noted. (See comments above for detailed response to the St. Peter's extension). A further extension to the west has now been included in light of public comments received.
Resident of Main Road	Supports the conservation area designation, concerns raised regarding the proposed St. Peters extension. Commented that conservation area status should not prevent development, more should be made of the tourism officer and local business support. Suggested that a further extension to include a group of farm buildings to the east of the A167 is included.	Support for designation and concerns regarding St. Peters extension noted (See comments above for detailed response to the St. Peter's extension). The farm house and buildings are set some distance from the A67 and are not considered to form a fundamental part of the approach to the village. The land is not subject to development pressure and as such is adequately protected by other

		planning policies
Resident of Neville Close	<p>Opposes inclusion of St. Peter's site within the conservation area, supports proposed extensions to the north and west.</p> <p>Commented that conservation area status should not cover whole village, only areas that add to character.</p> <p>Highlighted scruffy appearance of the main road.</p>	<p>Support for northern and western boundary extensions, and objection to inclusion of the St. Peter's site noted. (See comments above for detailed response to the St. Peter's extension)</p> <p>The conservation area review process did consider whether the conservation area status was still warranted, as well as more detailed assessments of the character of parts of the village. The HLD Team are satisfied that the designation of the existing boundary is sound as an 'area of architectural or historic interest', and that the further extensions proposed will not dilute the value of the conservation area.</p> <p>Comments regarding the condition of Main Road have been passed to the Clean and Green West Team for consideration.</p>
Resident of North Rise	<p>Opposes conservation area designation and objects to proposed boundary amendments.</p> <p>Disagrees with the value of preserving</p>	<p>Objection to conservation area status and all of the proposed boundary amendments. (See comments above on review of designation status)</p> <p>The specific reference to opposition to</p>

	St. Peter's and criticised consultation process.	inclusion of St. Peter's site within the boundary noted. (See comments above for detailed response to the St. Peter's extension and summary of public consultation undertaken).
Resident of North Terrace	<p>Opposes conservation area designation and proposed boundary amendments.</p> <p>Requested a 215 notice be placed on St. Peter's</p>	<p>Objection to conservation area designation and the proposed boundary amendments noted.</p> <p>DCC have previously served a s215 notice on the landowner to improve the appearance of the site, and continue to monitor the condition of the site.</p>
Resident of Queens Court	<p>Supports conservation area designation and proposed extension to the north of the area.</p> <p>Supports conversion of some of the St. Peter's site but would not support large scale development on the site.</p> <p>The boundary should include the open area between the school and the bridge.</p>	<p>Support for designation and proposed northern extension noted.</p> <p>Opposition to large scale development on St. Peter's site noted. (See comments above for detailed response to the St. Peter's extension and housing allocations within the village).</p> <p>A further extension to the west has now been included in light of public comments received.</p>

	Text changes to correct grammatical and building/street name errors highlighted.	Minor text changes made as suggested.
Resident of West View	<p>Supports proposed western and northern extensions.</p> <p>Suggested that the northern extension also includes an area of open space opposite West View.</p> <p>Opposes proposed extension to include the St. Peters site within the conservation area.</p>	<p>Support for proposed western and northern extensions noted.</p> <p>The open space mentioned has now been included within the proposed boundary as suggested.</p> <p>Objection to St. Peter's extension noted (See comments above for detailed response to the St. Peter's extension)</p>
Anonymous resident	<p>Commented that conservation area status should not cover whole village only areas of outstanding interest</p> <p>Opposed to inclusion of St. Peters site within the conservation area.</p> <p>Expressed support more listing of buildings in the area, and commented on listed building consents and flooding issues within the village.</p>	<p>See response above regarding review of designation status</p> <p>Objection to inclusion of St. Peter's site within the boundary noted. (See comments above for detailed response to the St. Peter's extension)</p> <p>Listed buildings are assessed and designated by English Heritage at national level rather than by the Council. Any suggestions for new listings can be submitted online by any member of the</p>

		<p>public.</p> <p>It is unclear which Listed Building Consent cases this anonymous respondent is referring to. Only a small number of applications for LBC have been determined within the village (11 in 4 years) which were assessed in line with our statutory duty and best practice conservation principles.</p>
Anonymous resident	Supports conservation area designation, opposed to inclusion of St. Peter's site within the conservation area	Support for designation and opposition to inclusion of St. Peter's site within the boundary noted. (See comments above for detailed response to the St. Peter's extension)
Local planning agent	Supports proposed extensions to the conservation area and commented on positive implications of this.	Support for proposed extensions noted.
Visitor to the area	Opposes proposed extension to include the St. Peter's site within the conservation area as it may hinder redevelopment.	<p>Objection to proposed extension noted.</p> <p>Conservation area status is not used as a way of preventing development, which is a common misconception, it is a tool used to manage change in historic areas in a positive and proactive way.</p>

		(See comments above for detailed response to the St. Peter's extension)
SHERBURN HOUSE CONSERVATION AREA		
CONSULTEE	COMMENTS MADE	RESPONSE FROM HLD TEAM
Public meeting held on 26 th June in Sherburn Village Community Centre	Support expressed on the whole for conservation area and appraisal document.	Support noted
Resident of Sherburn	Opposes proposed extension to include the former Sherburn House station within the conservation area boundary.	<p>As part of the appraisal process a desk based assessment of the historical significance of the land in the context of the conservation area has been undertaken.</p> <p>The historic OS Maps demonstrate that there was a strong historical connection between the former train station and the hospital itself. The core of the existing property appears to be an adaption of the original station building constructed in 1837 as part of the Durham & Sunderland Railway line from Sunderland Town Moor to Pittington. The trees and woodland surrounding the property provide the attractive setting of the main building and</p>

	<p>Comments also made regarding security of the property and the cost of the conservation area review process.</p>	<p>have wider landscape value.</p> <p>It is felt that including the property within the conservation area would afford the building and landscape a greater degree of protection from inappropriate change, and it therefore proposed that this extension is designated.</p> <p>Any references to the current property name has been removed from the appraisal document, to address the security concerns raised by the owner. The property is still shown on the OS Map which is outside of our control, and is already publicly available information.</p> <p>The Council has a statutory duty to review conservation area designations from time to time and to prepare management proposals. This process is undertaken in a cost effective manner utilising existing staff and budgets. The only direct additional costs are the holding of a public meeting, printing of documents and the statutory advertisements of a revised boundary.</p>
--	--	---