

Consultation on proposed Conservation Area Western Escarpment – Analysis of consultation responses and copies of correspondence

County and District Councillors and Parish Councils representing the areas concerned were consulted together with the New Forest Consultative Panel, local landowners and representatives from other organisations including Ninth Centenary Trust, New Forest District Council (officers) and English Heritage.

Open afternoons and evenings were held on 5 and 6 February 2008 at Hyde Memorial Hall and Woodgreen Village Hall respectively, with an exhibition, information about the proposals and officers available to answer questions. Similar information was made available on the National Park Authority's web site.

A questionnaire was prepared to seek individuals' views.

Questionnaire Respondents – 34 respondents completed questionnaires

Other respondents – 16 responses were received by the National Park Authority about the proposal

Questionnaire analysis

Question1:

What do you feel are the most important characteristics of the proposed conservation area?

Please tick all those that you feel are important.

Number of respondents selecting characteristic	Characteristic
29 (85%)	The history of the area
33 (97%)	Traditions of the area (e.g. grazing of animals on the forest)
22 (65%)	The location of settlements on the edge of the forest
27 (79%)	Traditional small cottages
27 (79%)	Quiet narrow country lanes
25 (74%)	Trees and hedgerows
23 (68%)	The views out of the area
26 (76%)	Views within the area
24 (71%)	Attractive buildings

NFNPA Comments

It is the traditions of this area, through their complexities and peculiarities, that have led to its character and the importance of these traditions is clearly recognised by respondents; then the more specific characteristics. This is important as it is the quality and interest of the area, rather than that of individual buildings, which is the prime consideration in designating a conservation area.

Question 2:

Do you consider that there are other important characteristics of the proposed conservation area not mentioned in question 1? If so, please list below:

Number of respondents	Characteristic suggested	NFNP Comments
1	Byways, bridleways and footways.	These are not matters which can immediately be influenced directly but designation does recognise the importance of trees, hedgerows and other landscape features. In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence in management of footways and traffic management proposals in consultation with other statutory authorities such as Hampshire County Council.
1	Traditions particularly include commoning and its continuity.	Agreed, it is the traditions of this area that have led to its character.
1	Farming to modern rules and standards without interference.	Conservation area designation should not affect this.
1	Back up grazing and paddocks; protection from the west.	Back up grazing and paddocks are not matters which can be influenced directly but designation does recognise the importance of trees, landscape features.
1	Absence of main roads therefore comparative lack of heavy traffic.	This settlement pattern has led to the character.
2	Flora and fauna	Whilst this type of conservation area is not directly concerned with the conservation of flora and fauna, it does recognise the importance of trees, hedgerows and open

Number of respondents	Characteristic suggested	NFNPA Comments
		spaces.
1	Roadside/house boundaries of hedges and/or post and rail/wire with low wooden gates should be protected and not replaced with brick walls, high fences and gates,	Where control exists through the need for planning permission the Authority will seek the retention or introduction of traditional boundary treatments. If the loss of traditional boundaries through the implementation of permitted development rights becomes a concern the Authority may consider the use of an Article 4(2) direction to remove relevant permitted development rights.
1	History of the area to the west of the proposed conservation area.	Noted; any relevant aspects would be added to the Character Appraisal if it were decided to change the boundary.
2	Working forest.	The designation would not affect the working of the forest; which indeed has led to the character of the area.
3	Wildlife.	Not a matter which can be directly influenced but defining and protecting what exists such as buildings their layout can help sustain other aspects of the area.
1	Freedom to walk on open forest	Defining and protecting what exists such as buildings their layout can help sustain other aspects of the area.
4	Tranquillity.	Defining and protecting what exists such as buildings their layout can help sustain other aspects of the area.
1	Protection of an area with increasing pressure from urbanisation.	A key reason for conservation area designation is to avoid inappropriate suburban development.
1	Evolution of building styles and purposes over time, leading to rich diversity in built environment.	A key characteristic of all parts of the proposed conservation area.
1	Happy socially mixed population living in harmony with modest scale built	One of the keys influences of conservation area designation is ensuring the appropriateness, in scale,

Number of respondents	Characteristic suggested	NFNPA Comments
	environment which is in scale with natural environment. Should be no more unsympathetic buildings.	form, materials of new design.
1	Magnificent walking in all directions and for all distances. Unspoilt country.	These are not matters which can immediately be influenced directly but designation does recognise the importance of trees, hedgerows and other landscape features.
1	Absence of street lights.	This is not a matter which can be influenced directly by designation but in any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence in management matters such as street lighting.
1	Proper control of existing industrial and commercial premises.	This should still take place whether or not a conservation area is designated. The National Park Authority Enforcement team should be notified of concerns.
1	Population – size and make up.	This is not a matter which can be influenced by designation.
1	No – well covered.	Support noted.

NFNPA Comments

Some respondents made comments about the area which do not relate to matters that conservation area designation can address directly, but they do show that the respondents recognise the distinctiveness of the area. Distinctiveness derives from more than just the appearance of the area, but also from elements of character that can be identified but not directly protected or controlled. Defining and protecting what exists such as buildings their layout can help sustain the other aspects which contribute to the special character. Other respondents noted the importance of historic buildings and the character of new development in the area which are keys reasons for designation.

Question 3:

Do you agree with the proposed boundary of the Conservation Area?

Please circle either YES or NO:

Agree with the proposed boundary	
Yes – Number of respondents	No – Number of respondents
22	8 (amendment suggested). 1 (did not support a conservation area)
1 respondent did not answer yes or no but suggested extension of the area. 1 respondent did not answer yes or no and did not consider that a conservation area was appropriate. 1 respondent did not answer yes or no, said they were pleased about steps to protect buildings but expressed concern about tree controls.	

65% of respondents agreed with the proposed boundary.

26% of respondents queried the boundary (see below).

6% of respondents thought there should not be a conservation area.

If NO, what changes would you like to see?

Number of respondents	Changes suggested	NFNPA Comments
1	Seems well chosen	Support welcomed.
1	No conservation area. Abolishment of NPA.	Noted.
4	Area to west outside the Park but in NFDC area to be included (Suggestions: arbitrary line provided on map showing inclusion of a limited area from Stuckton to Mockbeggar; up to Avon; to A338 north of Fordingbridge, to River Avon south of Fordingbridge; include all Avon Valley.	The proposed conservation area is focussed specifically on the valley eastern escarpment and its associated settlements. The water meadows and the flood plain although seen from the escarpment are more closely associated with the valley floor settlements such as Breamore. Extension of this proposed conservation area to include land to the west could not therefore be justified.
1	Western boundary from North Gorley south to Rockford should be less confusing.	The boundary has been drawn to follow the National Park boundary or the eastern side of Gorley Road (where the Park boundary continues down the centre of the road) with the exception of the modern New Road estate at Mockbeggar which is in the National Park but excluded from the conservation area.
1	Reservations over the inclusion of the semi-rural residential area of Cowpitts Lane, Hangersley Hill and the SW end of Linwood Road – suggest redefine southern boundary of conservation area commencing at Gorley Road/Cowpitts Lane junction, running along Cowpitts Lane and across to the junction with Hangersley Hill then up the hill to the junction with	This area of land suggested for exclusion is an integral part of the southernmost character area (J). It is part of the early scattered encroachment and agricultural settlement in this part of the Forest. The built development is predominantly linear roadside settlement, with a mixture of vernacular buildings dating from the 18 th and 19 th centuries, with some examples of

Number of respondents	Changes suggested	NFNPA Comments
	Forest Corner at the A31.	20 th century development set back within woodland clearings. Trees and hedgerows line the edges to roads and trees also form larger areas of copses, dotted through the wider landscape. As part of this character area there is no logical reason for its exclusion.
1	As part of the National Park it should automatically be conserved. In any case consider that the boundary should be at least to the river but desirably even further west.	The proposed conservation area is focussed specifically on the valley escarpment and its associated settlements. The water meadows and the flood plain although seen from the escarpment are more closely associated with the valley floor settlements such as Breamore. Extension of the conservation area to include land to the west could not therefore be justified.
1	Extend to western boundary of National Park.	The proposed conservation area is focussed specifically on the valley escarpment and its associated settlements - the historic settlement pattern is the basis for designation. Extension of the proposed conservation area to include land to the west could not therefore be justified.
1	Extend to west side of Gorley Road to encompass hedgerow characteristics.	Both sides of the road are included wherever within the National Park.

Question 4:

Do you feel that the character of the proposed conservation area could be enhanced?

Please circle either YES or NO.

Character of the proposed conservation area could be enhanced	
Yes – Number of respondents	No – Number of respondents
21	4
1 respondent did not answer yes or no. but noted they are against the proposal. 8 respondents did not answer yes or no.	

62% of respondents thought that the area could be enhanced.

12% of respondents thought that the area could not be enhanced.

Question 5:

What features do you feel detract from the character of the proposed conservation area?

Please tick all those that you feel detract.

Number of respondents selecting feature	Feature
18 (53%)	Loss of original details from buildings
20 (59%)	Appearance of some properties
26 (76%)	Inappropriate modern development
15 (44%)	Street furniture (e.g. bins, bus shelters, seats)
12 (35%)	Road signs
12 (35%)	Traffic management
14 (41%)	Parking
23 (68%)	Overhead lines
16 (47%)	Other

If you ticked 'Other', please explain below:

Number of respondents	Explanation
1	Pavements; street lights and external house lights; urban gates.
1	Development of pubs/restaurants and other tourist attractions.
1	NFDC feeble in preventing "pop ups" and demolition and new houses which are too big for the site and usually badly designed.
1	Unnecessary; planning controls provided by National Park over and above District Council area adequate. Irony in protecting a snapshot of development created by illegal encroachment and preventing further development. Unnecessary wasteful tier of local government.
1	Loss of smaller modest homes either through extension or replacement.
1	Road signs – too many/out of character.
1	Some properties surrounded by inappropriately high hedges.
1	Turning paddocks into gardens or just not using them for grazing.
1	Loss of holdings on the Forest suitable for commoning to outsiders with little or no interest in the Forest.
2	Demolition and rebuilding of houses, character forest cottages.
3	Inappropriate/suburban new fencing.
1	Growth of Sandy Balls holiday park.
1	Redundant "Kango" bus stops. Painting on road is better than upright signs.
2	Dog fouling.
1	Litter; traffic.
1	Inappropriate hard landscaping and boundary wall fencing.
1	Unauthorised advertising by roadsides. Country Lanes.
1	Inappropriate hedge management leading to habitat loss. Unnecessary tree felling/pollarding.
1	Light pollution and inappropriate breaking up of field systems turned over to pony paddocks and shelters.
1	Storage outside properties (logs, blocks etc.). Car parking off gravel tracks. PVCu conservatories on cob

Number of respondents	Explanation
	buildings.

NFNPA Comments

The local authority is required to pay special attention in the exercise of planning functions to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. This requirement extends to all powers under the Planning Acts and not only those which relate directly to historic buildings (such as demolition). It also extends to developments which affect the setting of the conservation area and views in or out of it. New development should aspire to a quality of design and execution related to its context. Issues such as inappropriate new development which was the most noted feature to detract from the character of the area, together appearance of some properties and loss of detailing, are a focus of conservation area designation.

A local authority's reasoning for designating a conservation area, as set out in the formal character appraisal, is taken account in the determination of planning appeals.

The designation of a conservation area brings about control over demolition of all or the very substantial majority of any building with a total cubic content exceeding 115 cu m. Consent is also needed for the entire removal of any gate, wall, fence or railing more than 1 metre high abutting a highway, public footpath or open space, or more than 2 metres high elsewhere.

Following designation, local planning authorities have a duty, from time to time, to draw up and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of conservation areas in their area and to consult the local community about these proposals. It is considered good practice for local authorities to draw up a management strategy for their conservation areas and therefore helpful to understand at this stage, should the conservation area be designated, the sort of issues that are arising in the area. A management strategy may consider the introduction of further planning controls, for example to control the erection or demolition of a gate, fence, wall or other means of enclosure within the curtilage of a dwelling house (through the use of Article 4 (2) see Annex 1), and issues such as traffic management, street lighting, overhead lines and such matters related to statutory undertakers.

Question 6:

Do you have any comments about the proposed conservation area? If yes, please outline below:

Comments	NFNPA Comments
Tighter planning controls are to be welcomed.	Support welcomed.
Well done. Thank you for display. Good display and staff who were well informed, friendly and helpful.	Support welcomed.
Waste of tax payer's money.	Noted.
It is very welcomed.	Support welcomed.
20-30mph speed limit would be safer for other road users and would give drivers more time to avoid verges. Exhibition at Hyde was very well done. Look forward to a conservation area in which the simple working forest atmosphere and commoning are protected.	Traffic speed is not a matter which conservation area designation can address directly but the design of any proposals for traffic management would be influenced. In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence in management of verges. Support welcomed.
Historically Forest extended westwards to the Avon. Conservation area should be extended westwards to include the terrace between Fordingbridge and Ibsley bridge and include Bickton.	The proposed conservation area is focussed specifically on the valley eastern escarpment and its associated settlements. The water meadows and the flood plain although seen from the escarpment are more closely associated with the valley floor settlements such as Breamore. Extension of this proposed conservation area to include land to the west could not therefore be justified.
Should be more done to encourage people into commoning. Stop people	Encouragement of commoning is not an area which

Comments	NFNPA Comments
<p>buying forest cottages to knock down and build inappropriate large unaffordable houses.</p>	<p>conservation area designation can directly address but defining and protecting what exists such as buildings and their layout can help sustain other aspects of the area. Conservation area consent would be required for the demolition of buildings and retention of those which make a positive contribution to the area would be required. Any new development would need to be sensitive and appropriate to the area and existing buildings.</p>
<p>Proposed conservation area can if made workable be an asset. Consider greatest threat to the future of the whole area is the losing the continuation of commoning. NFNPA to take suitable properties into their ownership and rent back to young commoners.</p>	<p>Encouragement of commoning is not an area which conservation area designation can directly address but defining and protecting what exists such as buildings and their layout can help sustain other aspects of the area.</p>
<p>Good appraisal of Western Escarpment. Hope proposed conservation area goes ahead. The threat of the spread of Ringwood towards the forest is real.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p>
<p>Welcome the protection of the area as since living here (over 20 years) have seen area becoming urbanised. Increase in traffic a problem and litter.</p>	<p>Support welcomed. A key reason for conservation area designation is to avoid inappropriate suburban development.</p>
<p>Strongly in favour. Present population and many visitors enjoy the area as it is and have mourned the demolition of historic cottages and their replacement with quite inappropriate buildings. Conservation area is the only way this beautiful area can be preserved.</p>	<p>Conservation area consent would be required for the demolition of unlisted buildings and the principle of designation is to preserve and enhance the character of the area.</p>
<p>Hope that the conservation area will stop creeping urbanisation of the villages and even ameliorate some of the worst features that have got in. A lot of attractive cottages do not warrant listing but they do contribute</p>	<p>A key reason for conservation area designation is to avoid inappropriate suburban development. Conservation area consent would be required for</p>

Comments	NFNP Comments
greatly to the built environment and it would be a sin if any more were to be destroyed.	the demolition of unlisted buildings.
Whilst ideal for pony traps and carts in late C19/earlyC20 country lanes are unsuited to modern day traffic. Tarmac is too narrow for two cars to pass – results in verges worn and unsightly. Request for rumble strips each side of roads to stop tyres being damaged by edges,	In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence the management of traffic calming and verges.
Good idea.	Support welcomed.
Comments on appraisal document: paragraph 194 - Linbrook Park should read Linford Park, never a military establishment. Building started 1938 for Bournemouth Corporation as a TB sanatorium, stopped in 1940 and never finished. Should have been a 4 storey building. Sold in 1957-8 by NHS. Para 163 - Heywood not Haywood. Para 159 – Vennard's not Vernard's. Para 161 - Alice Lisle was Rockford school in 1900.	Points noted and amendments made (Linbrook retained as this is name on OS map).
Hope it will prevent encroachment - cumulative extension and addition to properties have been carried out until they bear no resemblance to the original structure, in spite of safeguards already in place.	Key reason for conservation area designation is to prevent inappropriate development which will result in loss of the special character of buildings.
The additional powers granted to the National Park Authority as a result of designation should be appropriately enforced.	Noted
Given planning controls in conservation area are effectively same as in within National Park, not sure of implications- need to be clarified. Subject to this, support proposal but area must not become a museum. Paragraph 81 – believe the flints are sourced locally – stream at bottom of garden of Flintstones is full.	Whilst the need for planning permission in a conservation area is effectively the same as in a National Park, designation, conservation area consent would be required for demolition of unlisted buildings and for work to trees with a trunk diameter greater than 3". The scale, form and design of any new development can also be influenced by conservation area designation.

Comments	NFPA Comments
<p>Please National Park taking steps to protect buildings and prevent inappropriate development but concerned about the extra bureaucracy that will impact on woodland, hedge and tree management. In a wooded area six week notification impractical and unnecessary. E.g. crown raising in a copse – often unclear which branches are to be removed on one tree until work done to its neighbour.</p>	<p>Conservation area designation does introduce additional control but the intention is to ensure that important trees are not lost prematurely and the regulations give an opportunity for prior discussion. Reasonable maintenance work is always considered favourably and there is no cost for the service for inspection. Woodland management can be covered by a suitable terminology for the site e.g. lift crowns to give three metres clearance above ground level, as appropriate.</p>
<p>A favourable proposal as it addresses important historic landscape characteristics of the area and seeks to preserve and enhance them.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p>

Other respondents - letters/e-mail/ telephone

From	Summary of view	NFNPA comments
Hale Parish Council	Supports the proposal and considers it will give worthwhile improvements of conservation and control to help protect the area.	Support welcomed.
Hyde Parish Council	Give the creation of the new conservation area their full backing.	Support welcomed.
Godshill Parish Council	<p>Important features of the area are dark skies and the magnificent, dark, wooded escarpment as it is seen from outside the proposed conservation area - from the Avon Valley and beyond.</p> <p>Members have expressed opposite views on the proposal, one considering that there are at present sufficient safeguards for the area at the moment and this appears to be one more unnecessary layer of bureaucracy. However, others consider that the escarpment is such a special place that it would be worth putting up with the extra rules and regulations of a conservation area in order to protect it from further undesirable development.</p>	<p>Views into the conservation area are an important characteristic.</p> <p>Conservation area designation does introduce additional control but the intention is to ensure that important buildings and trees are not lost. If the Authority chose to make use of Article 4(2) directions to bring about additional controls this would be in relation to specific work areas (where they are clearly cause for concern in respect of the character and appearance of the area) and in relation to specific properties.</p>
Ringwood Town Council	Objects to the proposals to include the area which falls within the parish of Ringwood – North Poulner, Hangersley and Linwood. Do not	This area of land suggested for exclusion is an integral part of the southernmost character area (J). It is part of the early scattered

From	Summary of view	NFNPA comments
	<p>believe that the mix of properties make a significant contribution to the character of the National Park nor intrinsic to the uniqueness and identity of the Park as adjacent to the A31 and built up area of Ringwood. Believe existing policies are adequate. Concerned that residents would need to submit planning applications for minor works at their expense. Recommend exclusion of the part that falls within the parish of Ringwood.</p>	<p>encroachment and agricultural settlement in this part of the Forest. The built development is predominantly linear roadside settlement, with a mixture of vernacular buildings dating from the 18th and 19th centuries, with some examples of 20th century development set back within woodland clearings. Trees and hedgerows line the edges to roads and trees also form larger areas of copses, dotted through the wider landscape. As part of this character area there is no logical reason for its exclusion.</p> <p>If the Authority chose to make use of Article 4(2) directions this would be in relation to specific work areas (where they are clearly cause for concern in respect of the character and appearance of the area) and in relation to specific properties. There is no fee for planning applications in relation to Article 4(2) directions.</p>
<p>Ellingham, Harbridge and Ibsley Parish Council</p>	<p>In favour of the proposal in that it addresses the important historic and landscape characteristics of the area and seeks to preserve and enhance them.</p> <p>Would like boundary of conservation area to be</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>The boundary was proposed to extend to the west side of Gorley Road where it extends beyond the National Park boundary. New Forest District Council will not however</p>

From	Summary of view	NFNPA comments
	<p>along western boundary of Gorley Road so as to incorporate important hedgerows.</p> <p>In respect of boundary, will the odd 'islands' left out from when NFDC set up the original conservation areas will be added in this phase of designation? (There are larger and smaller areas around Black Barrow/Linwood, High Corner, Broomy Lodge, Holly Hatch, Eyeworth Lodge and Fritham amongst others).</p> <p>Is it intended that the management plan will also be put out for consultation?</p>	<p>designate as would be necessary.</p> <p>The areas listed are beyond the Western Escarpment. The conservation areas inherited from New Forest District Council are to be reviewed in 2008/9.</p> <p>The Conservation Area Management Plan will be the subject of public consultation.</p>
Woodgreen Parish Council	Support of the changes and have found being in a conservation area has worked well.	Support welcomed.
New Forest Association	Supports the proposal.	Support welcomed.
Richard Reeves, Librarian, New Forest Museum	Annotated suggestions provided throughout the appraisal document.	Noted, with thanks – amendments have been made to the Character Appraisal.
Mr Hickman, Hale Park	Proposal excellent and have no particular comments.	Support welcomed.

From	Summary of view	NFNP comments
Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society	No comment to make – passed to landscape section.	Noted.
New Forest District Council	New Forest District Council has no comment on those parts of the proposals that lie within the National Park boundary. They note the areas proposed to be designated which fall within the District Council area but cannot justify directing resources to pursuing the designations.	The boundary initially proposed included some small areas outside the National Park in the New Forest District (Searchfield Lodge and Searchfield Farm at Hale, buildings to the west of the highway at Stuckton and areas of highway and verge along Gorley Road) in order to give a consistent boundary to the character areas and for the effective future management of these areas. The National Park Authority is disappointed at this response.
English Heritage	Generally content regarding the proposals. Some helpful suggestions where additional information is considered necessary in the Character Appraisal.	Support welcomed. Some amendments made to Character Appraisal, further changes to be considered.
Diana Bricknall (e-mail)	Cottage (Greenways, Hungerford) incorrectly described in appraisal. At paragraph 136 described as brick whereas is built of cob with a brick extension added at a later date.	Character appraisal amended.

From	Summary of view	NFNP comments
Mr P Totty Hyde House Hyde Fordingbridge SP6 2QH	In favour of proposals but suggests extending the area west – settlements unprotected to the west because of the loss of the former Heritage Area boundary. As former Heritage Area, area should merit designation; protection of views from the National Park is important; would comply with Section 62 Environment Act 1995 requirements.	The proposed conservation area is focussed specifically on the valley eastern escarpment and its associated settlements. The water meadows and the flood plain although seen from the escarpment are more closely associated with the valley floor settlements such as Breamore. Extension of this proposed conservation area to include land to the west could not therefore be justified.
Mr and Mrs M Parslow Fairview Cottage Pentons Hill Hyde Nr Fordingbridge SP6 2HL	<p>Concerns arising from controls:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pruning and felling an imposition; will it also apply to Commons. - Permission to repaint house, repair or replace gates etc unacceptable imposition. <p>Protection of older properties, vernacular and historic buildings can be achieved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - requiring planning permission for demolition - considering each property individually with regard to style, materials, requirements. <p>Older properties rarely unaltered – extensions part of interest.</p> <p>Also useful comments provided on detailed aspects of the Character Appraisal.</p>	<p>Conservation area designation does introduce additional control over trees but the intention is to ensure that important trees are not lost prematurely and the regulations give an opportunity for prior discussion. Reasonable maintenance work is always considered favourably and there is no cost for the service for inspection.</p> <p>The additional planning controls in respect of buildings are immediately in relation to demolition (which does not require planning permission).</p> <p>Additional controls through the use of Article 4(2) directions would be considered in relation to individual properties as are all proposals for planning permission.</p>

From	Summary of view	NFNPA comments
		Comments received with thanks and noted in final text.
<p>Councillor C Treleven Wood End House Crow Hill Ringwood BH24 3DQ</p>	<p>Reservations over the inclusion of the semi-rural residential area of Cowpitts Lane, Hangersley Hill and the south west end of Linwood Road – suggest redefine southern boundary of conservation area commencing at Gorley Road/Cowpitts Lane junction, running along Cowpitts Lane and across to the junction with Hangersley Hill then up the hill to the junction with Forest Corner at the A31.</p> <p>Important unlisted buildings could be protected by local listing.</p> <p>Concern that Article 4(2) Directions to remove permitted development rights might be applied to all householders in the area. Suggest detailing which permitted development rights might be removed.</p>	<p>This area of land suggested for exclusion is an integral part of the southernmost character area (J). It is part of the early scattered encroachment and agricultural settlement in this part of the Forest. The built development is predominantly linear roadside settlement, with a mixture of vernacular buildings dating from the 18th and 19th centuries, with some examples of 20th century development set back within woodland clearings. Trees and hedgerows line the edges to roads and trees also form larger areas of copses, dotted through the wider landscape. As part of this character area there is no logical reason for its exclusion.</p> <p>At present local listing does not give buildings enforceable protection. There would need a change in statute. A White Paper published in March 2007 suggested further control over locally designated buildings may be given to local authorities but following consultation on that paper it has still not been clarified how this might be achieved.</p>

From	Summary of view	NFNPA comments
		<p>If the Authority chose to make use of Article 4(2) Directions this would be in relation to specific work areas (where they are clearly cause for concern in respect of the character and appearance of the area) and in relation to specific properties.</p>
Carmel Broughton (e-mail)	<p>Substantial benefits to proposals for the more rural areas think that due to increasing pressure on housing and recent government housing targets there should be some greenfield site areas close to the urban areas which are not included in the proposed conservation area. Fields at Poulner which are adjacent to Poulner Junior School and flanked by the North Gorley Road will in time provide an excellent land area for future residential development, thus easing the pressure on housing in the area and supplying much needed social housing provision. This land which I own, I understand falls in the category which whilst not considered appropriate to develop at present may be land which the local council/National Park wish to bring forward at some later stage.</p>	<p>Support welcomed in respect of rural areas.</p> <p>Designation of a conservation area would not necessarily rule out opportunities for development. Opportunities for future development of land would be addressed through planning policy.</p>