

Conservation areas – Beaulieu, Bucklers Hard and Exbury

Consultation on character appraisals and proposed boundary changes - 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.

An open afternoon and evening was held on 9 October 2008 at Beaulieu Abbey Church Hall 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.

Letters were sent to all properties directly affected by the proposals.

A questionnaire was prepared to seek individuals' views.

As a result of the first consultation further changes to the boundary of Beaulieu Conservation Area were proposed. The above organisations were again consulted, letters sent to all properties affected by the revised proposals and information was again made available on the National Park Authority's web site.

First Consultation 18 September – 31 October 2008

Questionnaire respondents – 1 respondent completed a questionnaire.

Other respondents – 8 responses were received.

Questionnaire respondent

Summary of view	NFNPA comments
Comments relate to Beaulieu conservation area	
Character appraisal covers all important characteristics of the conservation area	Noted.
Increasing heavy traffic through village	In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence the management of traffic through any physical measures proposed.
Appraisal should include details of footpath access to the village.	Footpaths are mentioned in the character appraisal as part of the topography but it is not the intention of the character appraisal document to provide a comprehensive summary of public access.
Traffic detracts from the character of the conservation area.	In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence the management of traffic through any physical measures proposed.
Character of conservation area could be enhanced by reduction of the speed and volume of traffic.	In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence the management of traffic through any physical measures proposed.
Agrees with boundary changes in part (<i>no further detail</i>). Is it possible that there are too many authorities dealing with conservation.	Noted. The first purpose of the National Park Authority is the conservation and enhancement of the special qualities of the National Park. It is considered positive that there are other bodies and partners with similar interests.

Other respondents - letters/e-mail/ telephone

From	Summary of view	NFNPA comments
Member of public	In favour of proposed inclusion with exception the Three Dials, Palace Lane (new building not considered appropriate).	Support welcomed. It is accepted that the Three Dials is a new building but it is located within the core of the proposed extension to the conservation area.
Member of public	<p>Papers excellent and historically interesting.</p> <p>Bucklers Hard – no apostrophe; captions to photos needed; traffic speed and blind bends (from west entrance to Ropewalk to High Street north end dangerous); fine acacia next to chocolate shop; page numbering should begin at preface; why is Three Dials not included; Haytes Mead 1611, not C18; 4.8.13 Old Dairy not included; 3.5.8 historical information supplied (see letter); why is Exbury House not included?; Tenancies of some cottage at Bucklers Hard – the chapel, Harbour Master's House.</p>	<p>The name Buckler's Hard is derived from the personal name of the Buckler family, and hard meaning firm landing place. It is therefore considered the name should be spelt with an apostrophe.</p> <p>Comments noted regarding traffic.</p> <p>The acacia is highlighted on the conservation area character features map.</p> <p>The preface will not form part of the final document (it provides details of proposed changes to the conservation area for the purposes of consultation.</p> <p>Three dials not mentions as it is a new building with no special interest.</p> <p>Haytes Mead dated from external appearance; now noted in character appraisal possibly earlier.</p> <p>Re. Old Dairy - individual buildings are not mentioned in the text here.</p>

From	Summary of view	NFNPA comments
		<p>In relation to dates relating to the Abbey, as there are a number of discrepancies in published information, definitive information has now been supplied from the Beaulieu Estate Archivist and the character appraisal amended.</p> <p>Exbury conservation area relates to the village and not the house and its grounds</p> <p>The chapel is mentioned at 4.3.3. General descriptions are given of the eastern and western terraces. These are listed buildings and general convention in the appraisals is not to include more detail where buildings are listed.</p>
Councillor T K Thornber	No great reservations about changes. Imagine exclusion areas could conceivably become areas for development. Would like to understand what sort of development is envisage by the generic term development to more fully appraise significance of proposals.	<p>Glad no great reservations about the proposed changes to the conservation area boundaries. Development in the exclusion areas would only be possible where planning policies allow, whether or not they are in the conservation area.</p> <p>Reference to development implies any work which would require planning permission. Character appraisals are intended to provide a framework within which individual planning applications can be assessed.</p>

From	Summary of view	NFNPA comments
Councillor F P Vickers	Has had opportunity to raise proposed changes with Exbury and Lepe parish and Beaulieu parish. No issues raised by either residents or parishes.	Comment noted.
Countryside Education Trust	Object to blanket extension of conservation area to entire Out of Town Centre site. Home Farm site logically included. Remainder of site contains newer buildings of a prosaic nature which are used in everyday running of farm and hostel.	The whole site is the Home Farm complex and the boundary has been drawn to cover the curtilage of the historic buildings. The area included is logical and visually forms a whole. There are modern structures. The inclusion of the whole site will not, it is considered, have a negative impact on the evolution of the business but it will be important that any new development respects the character and setting of the historic buildings.
Exbury Estate	Generally in favour of the amendments recommended.	Support welcomed.
The Hon Ralph Montagu	Suggested changes to boundaries of Beaulieu conservation area character areas A, B, C, F, H and Bucklers Hard conservation area. Detailed information provided in relation to character appraisals.	Grateful for time taken to look at boundary proposals. Further amendments to boundary of Beaulieu conservation area proposed (in relation to area B, but proposing a new area J incorporating the River frontages). Also amendments to area A to omit tarmac area. Grateful for detailed comments on appraisal documents; numerous amendments made.
New Forest Association	Suggested change to name of Beaulieu character area A to Medieval Abbey Precinct and Palace House.	Character area proposed to be renamed Medieval Abbey Precinct and Palace House.

From	Summary of view	NFNPA comments
	<p>Incorporate comments in relation to importance of on the ground interpretation in relation to the Abbey Precinct and the need for the visitor attraction to remain a dynamic and changing enterprise.</p> <p>Review has still not fully embraced the conservation significance of the river. Suggested changes to boundary of character area B.</p> <p>Character areas B and D should be combined and extended.</p>	<p>Changes made to character appraisal to incorporate reference to importance of on the ground interpretation and the need for the visitor attraction to remain a dynamic and changing enterprise.</p> <p>Further amendments to boundary of conservation area proposed (in relation to area B but proposing a new area J incorporating the River frontages).</p> <p>Extension proposed as noted above but not proposed to amalgamate areas B and D as they are considered to have different characters.</p>
Exbury Parish Council	<p>The proposed changes Exbury conservation area are uncontentious and no comments have been recieved since the public display in the Exbury Club. The only anomaly is the exclusion of Marise Cottage which was the village laundry.</p>	<p>Noted. Reassessment of the site of Marise Cottage was undertaken as the original conservation area cut through it and the building. It was concluded that there was no justification to extend the boundary to include this extensive site as the building itself does not make a visual contribution to the area.</p>

Second consultation 21 November – 12 December 2008

Further proposals for changes to the boundary of Beaulieu conservation area

4 responses were received

From	Summary of view	NFNPA comments
Member of public	Approves of proposals.	Support welcomed.
Councillor K Thornber CBE	Agrees with proposals.	Support welcomed.
Beaulieu Parish Council	No objection to revised proposed boundary	Support welcomed.
Member of public	Cannot agree with proposed boundary changes – what happened to English Heritage covering this area already. Concern about trees. Like natural species between eight wooded houses but need to cut for fire screen when necessary whilst maintaining privacy. 3 inches unreasonable – 10 inches then we let the new growth of 4 or 5 inches remain is reasonable. Again National Park not seeing reality.	<p>The National Park Authority is the local planning authority for the area with responsibility for conservation area designation and review.</p> <p>Conservation area designation does introduce additional control (over trees with a trunk diameter greater than 3 inches – this is not the amount to which pruning is limited) 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 inspection. In addition if the applicant seeks to undertake work on a regular basis over a number of years then the Authority can agree this.</p>