

Romsey Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (CAAMP)

List of Respondents

Number	Respondent
001	Romsey Ward Councillor
002	Romsey Resident
003	Romsey Resident
004	Romsey Resident
005	Romsey Resident
006	Romsey Resident
007	Romsey Resident
008	Romsey Resident
009	Romsey Resident
010	Romsey Town Council
011	LTVAS
012	Historic England
013	Romsey Town Councillor
014	Romsey Resident

List of Questionnaires

Number	Respondent
015	Romsey Resident
016	Romsey Resident
017	Romsey Resident
018	Romsey Resident

Romsey Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan

Schedule of Responses

In addition to the responses to the questionnaire the following were also received:

- Respondents picked up various typos & minor errors, these have been rectified by the consultants.
- A wealth of background information, particularly relating to Romsey's history and architecture, was received. Where relevant this was used to frame the appraisal. Some of the information, however, fell outside of the scope of the study and was not included.

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>Agree additions A, B, C, and D to the Conservation Area see pages 102 to 104. (001) Agree the exclusions of E, F, H, I, and J see page 105. (001)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>None required (NB – references are to the consultation draft, not the final version/boundary amendment document. These are now areas B, C, D, E and F, G, I & K)</p>
<p>Change</p> <p>None required</p>

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>Do not agree to the exclusion of G. This area is in the CA and should remain so because its open character is inherited from its past use as a cattle holding area. There are also some fine character buildings around its periphery, especially on the west side and their context needs to be preserved and protected. (001)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>This area has been reviewed, with the LPA and it has been agreed for the car park and buildings along its western edge to be retained in the conservation area. See page 8 of the Boundary Amendment report (NB – referred to as area 'H' in this document, not 'G').</p>
<p>Change</p> <p>Amendment to the proposed exclusion to the conservation area boundary to just omit Nos. 3-25 Newton Lane. Justification also updated (see Boundary Amendment report).</p>

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>Comment on of the town's historic development is described (eg only the 3 western bays of the Abbey are of Chilmark Stone; the bulk of the Abbey's structure is of stones from Quarr and Binstead in the Isle of Wight), it appears to cover modern issues pretty thoroughly. (002)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>Types of stone within the Abbey acknowledged, this will be updated.</p>
<p>Change</p>

Add Quarr and Binstead stone where Chilmark is mentioned in relation to the Abbey (2 instances).

Summary of Comment

Agree with the report's main criticisms of current practices (eg some garish shop fronts, poor street furniture, pavements, signage). The proposed changes to the current CA boundary appear sensible. (002)

Response

None required

Change

None required

Summary of Comment

If the recommendations are put into practice, it should significantly enhance the attraction of Romsey as a tourist and local shopping/business centre, so improving economic growth and sustainability. (002)

Response

None required

Change

None required

Summary of Comment

One of Romsey's key historic features is the river Test, but unfortunately most of it has very poor public access. Only a tiny section of the main river flows through the extremity of the CA. Only small sections of the Fishlake (a Saxon canal which historically was the main source of water for the town centre) and Tadburn streams run through the CA. Whilst the remaining mill buildings are in private ownership, I think the town should do much more to signpost their historic interest, much like the noticeboards and artwork along the old 19th century canal to the east of the centre. There are many other buildings of historic interest which could benefit from small plaques summarising past uses (eg the NatWest Bank building was the main post office and drapery in Victorian times). (002)

Response

Agreed, this is identified in the opportunities in section 4 relating to raising awareness of the town's significance.

Change

None required

Summary of Comment

<p>Oppose the review of the conservation area boundary at 55 Winchester Road</p> <p>Review is not founded on anything specific, and the changes to potential planning permissions that would be invoked on our property seem unnecessary. (003)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>The houses along Winchester Road are similar in age, settlement pattern and style to those further west on Winchester Road, The Hundred and other approach roads to the town centre that are currently within the conservation area. The current boundary is relatively arbitrary in this regard and extension to include these properties is considered would strengthen the special interest of the conservation area due to their appearance and character. Guidance on when consent is required for change to properties in a conservation area is included in section 5 of the document. The properties are proposed for inclusion based on their current appearance.</p>
<p>Change</p> <p>None required</p>

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>83 Winchester Road should be included within review. The draft document only references 51-81. (004)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>Correct, this was an error, No. 83 is proposed for inclusion.</p>
<p>Change</p> <p>Wording amended to include No. 83 Winchester Road.</p>

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>No objection to the inclusion of Nos. 51-81 Winchester Road (005)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>None required</p>
<p>Change</p> <p>None required</p>

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>Proposal should include properties on both sides of the road, extending from RAODS Theatre to the Botley Road rail bridge, particularly given the terrace houses (7 No) and the shops (5 No) of a conforming design, and the number of substantial houses on the North side of the road. (005)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>There is greater diversity of building age, appearance and massing on the north side of Winchester Road, beyond the Theatre and is less consistent with the character further west on Winchester Road (within the conservation area). The buildings on this side have generally</p>

been built later than those on the south side, mainly in the 20th century except those closest to the railway line and therefore do not follow the Georgian villa and Victorian terraced infill pattern of those parts of this street that are in the conservation area, or are proposed for inclusion. The buildings beyond No. 83 on the south side are later 20th century and do not merit inclusion for this reason.

Change

None required

Summary of Comment

The provision of landscaping to the general paved area outside ROADS Theatre, and the placing of pavement bollards fronting property Nos 51-75, to discourage pavement parking, would be welcome. (005)

Response

This issue is broadly covered by boundary treatments (see section 4.3 and 5.5.8). It is not proposed to include specific guidance for this site within the document.

Change

None required

Summary of Comment

Object to inclusion of 51-81 Winchester Rd. Will add more restrictions which will make the property harder to sell and reduce its value. (006)

Response

It is acknowledged that the conservation area boundary has not been reviewed for many years. The properties on the south side of Winchester Road are proposed for inclusion as they are similar in age, settlement pattern and style to those further west on Winchester Road, namely Georgian villas with Victorian terraced infill. The current boundary is relatively arbitrary in this regard and extension to include these properties is considered would strengthen the special interest of the conservation area due to their appearance and character. There is good evidence that conservation area designation increased property values – see research conducted annually by Historic England (<https://historicengland.org.uk/research/heritage-counts/>)
Further where changes are proposed these should be judged on the merits of the scheme and whether they will preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. Property values are not a planning matter, and not a reason to include/exclude areas from designation.

Change

None required

Summary of Comment

Exercise has more to do with the exclusions than the new inclusions, as all the exclusions happen to be the areas that Test Valley want to develop and this will make planning much simpler for them. (006)

Response

Purcell have been commissioned to undertake an independent review with exclusions based on expert judgement and in consultation with the Council and public. The areas proposed for exclusion do not contribute to the special interest of the conservation area, and in some instances harm this special interest. Future change on these areas will be required to consider the conservation area, as they will be within its very close setting. The setting of heritage assets is protected through national and local planning policy.

Change

None required

Summary of Comment

Comment TVBC 'selective' in approach to conservation e.g. shop fronts have been changed but others refused costing hundreds of pounds in upkeep and wasted heating. (007)

Response

The document is the first full conservation area appraisal and management plan for Romsey since it was designated. The document contains guidance, including in relation to shop front design, on how the appearance and character of the conservation area can be preserved and enhanced. This document will be approved by the Council's cabinet making it a material consideration in decision-taking.

Change

None required

Summary of Comment

Station Road has different styles of windows and doors because people upgrade with what they can afford. If TVBC restricts this it will prevent people from maintaining their houses. Restrictions will drive down the house prices. (007)

Response

This Victorian terrace was developed, at the same time as the National School (now County Library) opposite, following the arrival of the railway in the 1860s. Collectively, they demonstrate this important event in the evolution of the town, the first suburban expansion happening as a direct result of the railway and the necessary amenities (school) required for the growing population. It is acknowledged that changes have been undertaken, legitimately, to the properties in this street, however they are still considered to contribute to the character and appearance of the area to a sufficient degree to merit inclusion in the conservation area. Conservation Area designation is not designed to restrict change, but to ensure it is managed to preserve what is special. There is good evidence that conservation area designation increased property values – see research conducted annually by Historic England (<https://historicengland.org.uk/research/heritage-counts/>) Property values are not a planning matter, and not a reason to include/exclude areas from designation.

Change

None required

Summary of Comment

<p>Comment that permission has been granted to convert shops in Latimer Street but not The Hundred and view the approach is inconsistent. (007)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>There is nothing within the document which restricts this in any particular location within the conservation area. Where changes are proposed these should be judged on the merits of the scheme and whether they will preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p>
<p>Change</p> <p>None required</p>

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>Suggestion there should be grants to help people maintain houses in conservation areas. Comment on stringency of listed building controls. (007)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>It is acknowledged that grant funding is not currently available. Listed Building controls are governed by national planning legislation, and are different to Conservation Area controls</p>
<p>Change</p> <p>None required</p>

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>Object to Station Rd being included. (007)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>This Victorian terrace was developed, at the same time as the National School (now County Library) opposite, following the arrival of the railway in the 1860s. Collectively, they demonstrate this important event in the evolution of the town, the first suburban expansion happening as a direct result of the railway and the necessary amenities (school) required for the growing population. It is acknowledged that changes have been undertaken, legitimately, to the properties in this street, however they are still considered to contribute to the character and appearance of the area to a sufficient degree to merit inclusion in the conservation area.</p>
<p>Change</p> <p>None required</p>

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>Query inclusion of 81 to 87 Station Road and the block of apartments in conservation area, as they are a row of 4 modern terraced town houses.</p> <p>Query that opposite on the north side of Station Road some detached period properties are not included.</p> <p>(008)</p>
--

<p>Response</p> <p>This proposed extension has been reviewed and it has been agreed that No. 79 (Ashdene Court), Nos. 81-87 and Fleming House on Alma Road will no longer be included in the proposed extension. Fleming House is of historic and architectural value but it is acknowledged that the intervening buildings are not. The houses on the north side of Station Road are more varied and mainly date from the inter-war period, their inclusion would not strengthen the special interest of the conservation area.</p>
<p>Change</p> <p>Amend the proposed extension to the conservation area boundary to end at No. 77 Station Road on the south side (see Boundary Amendment Report map and p. 6)</p>

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>Agree with the proposal and hope that it will be actioned in the very near future - soon enough - to stop any visibly offensive changes from being made in the immediate future, prior to its proposal being approved. So the sooner it comes into being the better! (009)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>None required</p>
<p>Change</p> <p>None required</p>

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>RTC supports the addition of areas A and B to the current Conservation Area as shown on the diagram on page 101. (010)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>None required (NB – the references are to the consultation document. In the Boundary Amendment Report they are referred to as areas B & C)</p>
<p>Change</p> <p>None required</p>

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>RTC supports the inclusion of area C but notes that the modern buildings at either end of Station Road should be excluded. (010)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>This proposed extension has been reviewed and it has been agreed that No. 79 (Ashdene Court), Nos. 81-87 and Fleming House on Alma Road will no longer be included in the proposed extension. Fleming House is of historic and architectural value but it is acknowledged that the intervening buildings are not. Not including the modern semi-detached pair of houses at the southern end would result in a convoluted boundary, which is not desirable, therefore these remain proposed for inclusion. However the specific contribution any building makes is considered as part of any application proposals which come forward. (NB area C has become area D in the final version)</p>

Change

Amend the proposed extension to the conservation area boundary to end at No. 77 Station Road on the south side (see map in Boundary Amendment Report)

Summary of Comment

RTC also recommends Albany Road be included within area C. (010)

Response

It is not desirable to extend conservation area designation too far as this could dilute the reasons why it is special. Whilst inclusion of Station Road is considered justifiable to demonstrate the nature of Victorian expansion following the arrival of the railways, it would not be desirable to include all streets where this expansion took place. Therefore, it is not proposed to include Albany Road in the conservation area as part of the current review.

Change

None required

Summary of Comment

RTC supports the inclusion of area D but would like to see the area between the Plaza Theatre and Plaza Parade included as well numbers 51 to 83 Winchester Road. (010)

Response

There is greater diversity of building age, appearance and massing on the north side of Winchester Road, beyond the Theatre and is less consistent with the character further west on Winchester Road (within the conservation area). The buildings on this side have generally been built later than those on the south side, mainly in the 20th century except those closest to the railway line and therefore do not follow the Georgian villa and Victorian terraced infill pattern of those parts of this street that are in the conservation area, or are proposed for inclusion. The Theatre is a specific building, of communal and aesthetic value which will contribute to the character of the conservation area in a specific way, demonstrating the inter-war period evolution and cinema building-type not found elsewhere in the conservation area. It therefore merits inclusion in isolation from the rest of the north side of the street.
(NB – Area 'D' is now area 'E')

Change

None required

Summary of Comment

RTC supports the exclusion of areas E, F, H, I, and J. (010)

Response

None required
(NB these are all the areas proposed for exclusion. They are now referred to as 'F, G, H, I, J, K')

Change

None required

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>RTC does not agree with the exclusion of Newton Lane Car Park, which should be included due to its historical usage as a cattle market, its proximity to Romsey's town centre and the quality of many of the buildings on the west, north and east side of the car park. (010)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>This area has been reviewed, and it has been agreed for the car park and buildings along its western edge to be retained in the conservation area (see p. 8 of the Boundary Amendment Report and the map)</p>
<p>Change</p> <p>Amendment to the proposed exclusion to the conservation area boundary</p>

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>RTC suggests that there should be a statement within the CAAMP that the tighter planning restrictions within a Conservation Area should not be applied retrospectively to the newly included areas. (010)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>Agreed, this has been added to section 5.2 and the Boundary Amendment Report</p>
<p>Change</p> <p>The following sentence has been added to section 5.2 of the CAAMP and p. 2 of the Boundary Amendment Report: <i>It is acknowledged that some changes may have legitimately taken place to buildings prior to their inclusion in the conservation area. Consent will not be retrospectively required for these works however reversing inappropriate changes is welcomed.</i></p>

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>I like the thrust of the document,. (011)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>None required</p>
<p>Change</p> <p>None required</p>

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>Suggestion that Winchester Road up to the Sun Arch should be protected. (011)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>There is greater diversity of building age, appearance and massing on the north side of Winchester Road, beyond the Theatre and it is less consistent with the character further west</p>

on Winchester Road (within the conservation area). The buildings on this side have generally been built later than those on the south side, mainly in the 20th century except those closest to the railway line and therefore do not follow the Georgian villa and Victorian terraced infill pattern of those parts of this street that are in the conservation area, or are proposed for inclusion. The buildings beyond No. 83 on the south side are later 20th century and do not merit inclusion for this reason.

Change

None required

Summary of Comment

Suggestion bungalows in the Whitenap / Halterworth area need protection as important examples of their genre. (011)

Response

This is beyond the scope of the current review.

Change

None required

Summary of Comment

The general statement of significance in section 2.1 includes both descriptive elements as well as some of the elements that are considered to contribute to significance. This section should focus on those elements which contribute to significance, and be explicit about which these are. (012)

Response

Noted, we have re-drafted this section to emphasis what contributes to the special interest of the conservation area and remove unnecessary description.

Change

Redrafted text for section 2.1 of the CAAMP, content is similar but emphasis shifted to what contributes to special interest.

Summary of Comment

Section 2.2, assessment of special interest, identifies a number of key heritage assets. Feel the text should pay more attention to demarcating descriptiveness from special interest. (012)

Response

Noted, we have re-drafted this section to emphasis what contributes to the special interest of the conservation area and remove unnecessary description.

Change

Redrafted text for section 2.2 of the CAAMP, content is similar but emphasis shifted to what contributes to special interest.

Summary of Comment

Sections 3: the area section contains a detailed description of each area, but this is descriptive only and does not articulate explicitly which elements within the area contribute to the special quality of the area. Some of the subsequent sections, e.g. 3.3 and 3.4 do contain more analysis of elements that contribute to significance, however, the document should plainly state which elements are considered to contribute to significance. (012)

Response

Noted, we have added a further sub-heading to each character area – special interest

Change

Additional sub-heading for each character area in section 3 of the CAAMP

Summary of Comment

Consider both the inclusions and exclusions to the boundary have been clearly justified, in respect of why they are special and the contribution they make or do not make to the conservation area. (012)

Response

None required

Change

None required

Summary of Comment

Page 102: Inclusion of 70-84 Cherville Street. These are wrongly addressed and should be 70-84 Greatbridge Road. (013)

Response

Noted, this will be updated

Change

Street name changed

Summary of Comment

Properties that have been modernised and altered over recent decades and may not comply with new regulations regarding conservation areas must not be subject to retrospective requirement to comply. (013)

Response

Agreed, this has been added to section 5.2 and the Boundary Amendment Report

Change

The following sentence has been added to section 5.2 and the Boundary Amendment Report p. 2:

It is acknowledged that some changes may have legitimately taken place to buildings prior to their inclusion in the conservation area. Consent will not be retrospectively required for these works however reversing inappropriate changes is welcomed.

Summary of Comment

Surprised at proposed inclusion of the south side of Station Road. The modern properties at each end of the older terraces should not be included in this recommendation.

Many of the older properties have been modernised and altered over recent decades and may not comply with new regulations regarding conservation areas. There must be no retrospective requirement to comply. (013)

Response

This proposed extension has been reviewed and it has been agreed that No. 79 (Ashdene Court), Nos. 81-87 and Fleming House on Alma Road will no longer be included in the proposed extension. Fleming House is of historic and architectural value but it is acknowledged that the intervening buildings are not. Not including the modern semi-detached pair of houses at the southern end would result in a convoluted boundary, which is not desirable, therefore these remain proposed for inclusion. However the specific contribution any building makes is considered as part of any application proposals which come forward.

Regarding retrospective compliance, it is agreed that this should not be the case. This has been made clear in section 5.2 of the CAAMP and Boundary Amendment Report p. 2

Change

Amend the proposed extension to the conservation area boundary to end at No. 77 Station Road on the south side (see map)

The following sentence has been added to section 5.2 of the CAAMP and Boundary Amendment Report (p. 2):

It is acknowledged that some changes may have legitimately taken place to buildings prior to their inclusion in the conservation area. Consent will not be retrospectively required for these works however reversing inappropriate changes is welcomed.

Summary of Comment

Concern about potential for controls over use of rooflights as this could make it more difficult/expensive to modernise/extend. (013)

Response

The recommended Article 4 Direction would need to be implemented separately by the Council. It would not come into effect automatically with the approval of the CAAMP. Further consultation would be undertaken should the any Article 4 Directions be decided to be implemented. Such a measure would not mean that this type of change could not take place, but that planning permission would be required in order to determine whether the special interest of the conservation area would be preserved.

Change

None required

Summary of Comment
Support for position on overhead wires (013)
Response
None required
Change
None required

Summary of Comment
Page 82: boundary treatments: Some owners of properties in the town have made front gardens into parking spaces, for example Mill Lane is quoted. While recognising that this is not ideal, the alternative is street parking which would not be possible for every property and be unsightly. There must be no retrospective requirement to comply with new conditions. (013)
Response
Agreed, this has been added to section 5.2 and the Boundary Amendment Report
Change
The following sentence has been added to section 5.2 of the CAAMP and the Boundary Amendment Report p. 2: <i>It is acknowledged that some changes may have legitimately taken place to buildings prior to their inclusion in the conservation area. Consent will not be retrospectively required for these works however reversing inappropriate changes is welcomed.</i>

Summary of Comment
Environmental and energy considerations such as double glazed windows are encouraged in the wider world and uPVC, now a much improved product, has been a practical and affordable solution – concern Conservation Area controls might prevent measures to improve building efficiency. (013)
Response
Maintaining and continued use of historic buildings is inherently sustainable. However, it is acknowledged that there are likely to be pressure over the coming decades to improve the energy efficiency of Romsey’s historic building stock in order to reduce carbon emissions, particularly from heating which uses fossil fuel sources. Physical changes to buildings in this context need to be carefully considered so as to mitigate against harm to the significance of both individual buildings and the conservation area. This might include improvements to thermal efficiency and changing sources of heating. Historic England has prepared extensive advice regarding Energy Efficiency and Historic Buildings, which can be found here: https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/technical-advice/energy-efficiency-and-historic-buildings/
Change
Add the following section on climate change / sustainability to issues and opportunities section of the CAAMP (Section 4.8)

Maintaining and continued use of historic buildings is inherently sustainable. However, there is likely to be pressure over the coming decades to improve the energy efficiency of Romsey's historic building stock in order to reduce carbon emissions, particularly from heating which uses fossil fuel sources.

Physical changes to buildings in this context need to be carefully considered so as to mitigate against harm to the significance of both individual buildings and the conservation area. This might include improvements to thermal efficiency and changing sources of heating. Historic England has prepared extensive advice regarding Energy Efficiency and Historic Buildings, see Further Information for details.

Summary of Comment

Town centre streetscape:
Page 22: Quote: They are hard-landscaped and have pedestrian priority.
Page 66: Quote: The public realm has recently been upgraded providing a level and shared surface for pedestrians and vehicles.
These areas are not 'shared' as shared areas were not permitted for these upgrades. (013)

Response

Noted, these references have been amended to specify that level access has been achieved and that there has also been an increase in pedestrian priority, rather than indicating that this has been fully achieved.

Change

The following amendment have been made
Page 22: *They are hard-landscaped and level access for pedestrians.*
Page 66: *The public realm has recently been upgraded providing a level for pedestrians and increase pedestrian priority within the space.*

Summary of Comment

The CAAMP proposals right to mention the unattractive as well as the attractive. However should not conflate unattractive with modern. Stylish modern buildings can work well in historic areas and continue the progression of places into the future. The same for shop fronts. Would not support suggestion that 'old or historic styles' should be the only ones acceptable. Should allow good modern interventions. Pleased that the review also suggests that. (013)

Response

None required

Change

None required

Summary of Comment

If the conservation area rules are operated in a tight and inflexible way I am fairly confident that our great grandchildren will wonder why we stopped our advancement and architectural design progress at about 1900.
A town is a living place. Romsey is an eclectic mix and that is one of the delights, as it is in many historic areas. We must not stop now! (013)

Response
Agreed, Conservation Area designation is not designed to restrict change, but to ensure it is managed to preserve what is special.
Change
None required

Summary of Comment
<p>Comment on modern changes to Station Road, e.g. 25 of them (81%) have plastic-framed windows; 20 of them (65%) have modern front doors; 12 of them (39%) have modern fascias, and Of the 12 houses with bay windows which feature white pillars, 9 of them (75%) have lost their decorative mouldings. 3 houses near the middle of the terrace no longer have chimneys (they have been replaced with metal flues). This is most clearly seen from the Library (014)</p>
Response
<p>This Victorian terrace was developed, at the same time as the National School (now County Library) opposite, following the arrival of the railway in the 1860s. Collectively, they demonstrate this important event in the evolution of the town, the first suburban expansion happening as a direct result of the railway and the necessary amenities (school) required for the growing population. It is acknowledged that changes have been undertaken, legitimately, to the properties in this street, however they are still considered to contribute to the character and appearance of the area to a sufficient degree to merit inclusion in the conservation area.</p>
Change
None required

Summary of Comment
<p>Comment on the number of HGVs which follow Duttons Road all the way down to Station Road ('indicative of the growth' of road traffic which is confused by the road priority markings at the intersection of Duttons Road and Malmesbury Road: the markings show Duttons Road to be the major road, so truck drivers tend to stay on it rather than turn off onto the 'minor' Malmesbury Road, which is what the road sign suggests). These errant HGVs detract from the conservation merit of Station Road. (014)</p>
Response
<p>The roads noted are beyond the area of the current review and transport issues of this nature are beyond the scope of the document.</p>
Change
None required

Summary of Comment
<p>81% of the original timber-framed windows on the south side of Station Road have been replaced with energy-efficient double-glazed units in PVC frames. These units will eventually</p>

need to be replaced. The documentation suggests that residents will be required to install old-style windows (with wooden frames). Need to balance historic environment conservation with environmental conservation. (014)

Response

It is acknowledged that changes have been undertaken, legitimately, to the properties in this street. The guidance is provided to cover the whole of the conservation area, where this type of change has also taken place. Maintaining and continued use of historic buildings is inherently sustainable. However, it is acknowledged that there are likely to be pressure over the coming decades to improve the energy efficiency of Romsey's historic building stock in order to reduce carbon emissions, particularly from heating which uses fossil fuel sources. Physical changes to buildings in this context need to be carefully considered so as to mitigate against harm to the significance of both individual buildings and the conservation area. This might include improvements to thermal efficiency and changing sources of heating.

Change

None required

Summary of Comment

Originally all the houses in the Victorian terrace of Station Road had boundary walls with wrought iron gates to the road. Six of these walls have been replaced or removed. 13 properties have no gate, and six have modern gates. Some of these boundary walls are in need of repair. Issue raised that in some cases access hindered by telecoms boxes built close to the walls
(014)

Response

It is acknowledged that some changes may have legitimately taken place to buildings prior to their inclusion in the conservation area. Consent will not be retrospectively required for these works however reversing inappropriate changes would obviously be welcomed.

Change

None required

Summary of Comment

Replacing boundary walls is simple and inexpensive compared with re-installing chimneys in the three properties which now have flues. The lack of chimneys is the most obvious sign that this street has changed since Victorian days. Residents in Station Road no longer burn coal fires in four rooms. Where does the desire for "conservation" and "preservation" turn into an insistence on restoration and authenticity? (014)

Response

It is acknowledged that some changes may have legitimately taken place to buildings prior to their inclusion in the conservation area. Despite these changes they are still considered to contribute to the character and appearance of the area to a sufficient degree to merit inclusion in the conservation area. Consent will not be retrospectively required for these works however reversing inappropriate changes would obviously be welcomed.

Change

None required

Summary of Comment

The north side of Station Road is dominated by the three-storey Quoyne Court (erected in the last 25 years, and featuring a corner turret which is out of keeping with anything else nearby). Question why residents should be subject to conservation area controls compared to this. (014)

Response

This building was permitted in line with Council policy. The setting of heritage assets, including conservation areas is protected through national and local planning policy. Inclusion of Station Road in the conservation area will allow greater protection of its setting in the future. Conservation Area designation is not designed to restrict change, but to ensure it is managed to preserve what is special.

Change

None required

Summary of Comment

The report places great importance on views which people have from “the public realm”, but the term is not clearly defined. The rear roofs and first floor windows of the houses on the south side of Station Road can be seen from Waitrose’s car park, as well as from the alleyway which runs between Orchard Lane and Albany Road. Do these areas count as “the public realm”. Comment there were historically large buildings – e.g. Gas Works & Jam Factory here (014)

Response

Although this does mean anywhere that is publicly accessible, it is principally aimed at preserving front and side elevations which are visible from streets, rather than say car parks and rear alleys, which are semi-private in their nature, unless these views make an important contribution to significance. This will be made clearer within the document.

Change

Amend references to public realm in this context (4.1.3, 5.3.2 and 5.7 of the CAAMP) to include ‘*principally front and side elevations*’

Summary of Comment

The document itself is most unhelpful. The first map which shows the extent of the Boundary Review only appears on page 101. No clear summary of how inclusion would affect residents. It is not clear how much leeway will be offered to residents who wish to make changes to their properties, and how much will be down to individual Planning Officer. (014)

Response

The Review process is iterative, and the document is therefore set out as such. The character and appearance of the existing conservation area is required to be understood in order to know which areas could be added in order to enhance and reinforce that character and appearance. Once approved, the boundary review section will be omitted and the maps throughout the document updated with the new boundary. The Managing Change section of the document sets out guidance for residents wanting to make change and when consent is required. Further sources of guidance are identified in the Further Information section. Once

approved by the Council's cabinet, this document will be a material consideration in decision-taking.

Change

As intended the Boundary Amendment Report now forms a separate document. The maps of the Conservation Area boundary is included at p. 6 of the CAAMP

Summary of Comment

The maps which are included are especially unhelpful: none of the minor roads is named, even on the large-scale versions which start on page 121. Zooming in on the maps does not give more detail. This is especially important as these boundaries will affect the quality of residents' lives. (014)

Response

Including all the street names and building numbers on the maps would make them difficult to read and interpret. The maps have been included to present specific information about the conservation areas character. Some of the information will be translated onto the Council's interactive map which does contain the street names when zoomed to an appropriate scale.

Change

None required

Summary of Comment

Suggest inclusion of Barge Canal (015)

Response

It is acknowledged to make some contribution to the evolution of the wider town but has not shaped the expansion or development of the town sufficiently to warrant inclusion in the conservation area. A mention of the canal has been added to the historic development appendix but it there is not considered to be strong enough justification for including the canal in the conservation area.

Change

Addition of a mention of the canal to the historic development appendix.

Summary of Comment

The Plaza is not just Art Deco style, its architect is of significance: Mr Robin A. Thomas F.R.I.B.A <https://rathomascinemas.tumblr.com/> (016)

Response

Noted, however this information is not required to justify its inclusion in the conservation area so no amendment is proposed.

Change

None required

Summary of Comment

Mill Lane: if future parking in the front of houses is to be prevented in the future, what provision will be made for residents? There isn't enough on-street parking as it is. Realistically, car ownership is not going to reduce and is more likely to increase (016)

Response

It is acknowledged that some changes may have legitimately taken place to buildings prior to their inclusion in the conservation area. Consent will not be retrospectively required for these works nor will reversal be required.

Change

None required

Summary of Comment

The Brewery site needs sympathetic development, and soon. (016)

Response

Agreed, the setting of heritage assets, including conservation areas is protected through national and local planning policy. Future change on this site will be required to consider the conservation area, as it is within its very close setting.

Change

None required

Summary of Comment

Resident experienced problem switching between map and the area of text they were reading. (016)

Response

Noted, we have included the 'back' button on the map itself to assist with this

Change

Back' button to be added to each large map in appendix

Summary of Comment

The 70's houses in Cherville Street are incongruous in this setting - they belong more to the developments such as Woodley. (016)

Response

Noted, these buildings are acknowledged in the document as being out of character. There are considered opportunities for sensitive change in the future

Change

None required

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>Relocation of bins - there isn't always an alternative location (016)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>Noted, 'where possible' will be added to this section.</p>
<p>Change</p> <p>'Where possible' added to end of section 4.1.3 of CAAMP.</p>

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>Former Magistrates Court - is it really in keeping with Romsey? (016)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>The building makes an important contribution to the town both for its former and current use as civic offices. It is acknowledged that its appearance is out of character, however it would not be desirable to omit it from the conservation area. There are considered opportunities for sensitive change in the future.</p>
<p>Change</p> <p>None required</p>

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>County library, not Country library. Not the North Garth - it is the churchyard. (016)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>Noted regarding the Library, this will be amended. Garths are the historic name for these spaces, references to their being the churchyard have been added where appropriate.</p>
<p>Change</p> <p>'Forming the churchyard' has been added (sometimes in brackets) to the CAAMP where appropriate i.e. to the first reference to garths within a section. Country replaced with County in all cases.</p>

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>No mention of the Test ribboning through Romsey. This is key to the character of the town and should be given more prominence. (017)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>This is noted and additional reference to the 'braided channels' of the Test have been added where appropriate.</p>
<p>Change</p> <p>References to 'braided channels' added to the CAAMP where appropriate – 3.5.4 and 3.3.1</p>

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>Right to include Station Road south side and library. (017)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>None required</p>
<p>Change</p> <p>None required</p>

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>Should also include station itself, and buildings at top of Alma Road (Fleming Arms and 60-54) and Albany Road (017)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>The station is separated from the proposed extension by modern development and is statutorily listed in its own right. It would not be appropriate to include the intervening modern development nor have an isolated island included. The station is considered to have sufficient protection without inclusion in the conservation area.</p> <p>It is not desirable to extend conservation area designation too far as this could dilute the reasons why it is special. Whilst inclusion of Station Road is considered justifiable to demonstrate the nature of Victorian expansion following the arrival of the railways, it would not be desirable to include all streets where this expansion took place. Therefore, it is not proposed to include Albany Road in the conservation area as part of the current review.</p>
<p>Change</p> <p>None</p>

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>Proposed changes seem sensible. (018)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>None required</p>
<p>Change</p> <p>None required</p>

<p>Summary of Comment</p> <p>Include a few properties close to the Cupernham Lane / Fishlake Meadows roundabout. (018)</p>
<p>Response</p> <p>This area is some distance from the conservation area and it is therefore not possible to include it within the same designation and has not been reviewed as part of this current process.</p>

<p>Change</p> <p>None required</p>
