

## **Conservation areas – Brockenhurst, Sway Tower, Keyhaven and Ashlett Creek**

### **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 15 January 2009 at Brockenhurst Village Hall (for Brockenhurst and Sway Tower proposals) and at Keyhaven Sailing Club on 14 January 2009 with an exhibition, information about the proposals and officers available to answer questions. Letters were sent to all properties directly affected by the proposals. Full details of the proposals and copies of the character appraisal were sent to all properties in Ashlett Creek conservation area.

Similar information in relation to all four areas was made available on the National Park Authority's web site.

A questionnaire was prepared to seek individuals' views.

The responses received in respect of Brockenhurst, Keyhaven and Ashlett Creek are summarised below. No written responses were received in respect of Sway Tower (individuals did visit the exhibition to look at the proposals and discussed them with officers).

## Brockenhurst

**Questionnaire respondents** – 13 respondents completed questionnaires.

**Other respondents** – 24 responses were received (three of these also completed questionnaires).

### Questionnaire analysis

#### Question 1:

**Do you think that the character appraisal covers all important characteristics of the conservation area?**

**Please circle either YES or NO.**

Covers all important characteristics	
Yes – Number of respondents	No – Number of respondents
6	6
1 respondent did not answer yes or no.	

Comments	NFPA comments
Include Black Knoll, Rhinefield Road and North and South Weirs.	The proposed conservation area relates to the central core of the village. These areas are outside this area and separated from it by modern development. These are more rural Forest settlements as other conservation areas previously designated and they will be considered separately in the future.
Surprised that Broadlands Road, Knowle Road areas not included. Contain interesting 19th /early 20th century buildings.	The proposed conservation area relates to the central core of the village. These areas are outside this area and separated from it by more modern development, even though it is acknowledged that they include some buildings of historic interest.
No mention of New Zealand war memorials in St Nicholas	Character appraisal amended to refer to war memorials.

Comments	NFNPA comments
<p>church yard. No mention of Morant Park House, built 17<sup>th</sup> century, demolished 1936. Site of field hospital adjacent to Tile Barn (used by New Zealand forces 1914-18).</p>	<p>Brockenhurst Park is mentioned in the character appraisal but it is not described in detail as the land is outside the proposed conservation area.</p>
<p>Character of area E greatly enhanced by open area of bowling green which provides vistas to many properties. Recommend its inclusion in conservation area.</p> <p>Inclusion of tree lined stream and walk way connecting E with B (Angel Valley) also recommended. Greatly adds to character of area and stream is an artificial channel of historical note associated with Brookley Mill.</p>	<p>The bowling club is a valuable open space on the edge of the proposed conservation area. It is logical if this space is included, to include the car park too. The proposed boundary has been amended accordingly.</p> <p>Angel Valley is already protected by Tree Preservation Orders, however it is a valuable feature in the area, originally the leat for the former mill in Rhinefield Road. It is therefore considered to be of historic value and worth of inclusion.</p>
<p>New boundary should take in car park/bowling green, Fibbards Road, Angel Valley, Careys Cottages, Fathers Field, football club, Chestnut Road, Brookside Road, Brockenhurst College, Butts Lawn.</p>	<p>The bowling club is a valuable open space on the edge of the proposed conservation area. It is logical if this space is included, to include the car park too. The proposed boundary has been amended accordingly.</p> <p>Angel Valley is already protected by Tree Preservation Orders, however it is a valuable feature in the area, originally the leat for the former mill in Rhinefield Road. It is therefore considered to be of historic value and worth of inclusion.</p> <p>It is not considered that the football club meets the necessary criteria for inclusion. There is no building of architectural or historic merit and the setting is compromised by the associated boundary treatments. It is surrounded by modern development which similarly does not.</p> <p>Unfortunately all of Careys Cottages have been significantly altered (windows, doors, roof materials, additions) and their inclusion could not therefore be justified.</p>

Comments	NFNPA comments
	<p>It is not considered that Fathers Field meets the necessary criteria for inclusion. The buildings are not considered to be sufficient architectural or historic merit and most have been altered from their original form.</p> <p>The buildings on Fibbards Road and Chestnut Road are not considered to be of historic or architectural value and do not therefore meet the necessary criteria for inclusion.</p> <p>The buildings on Brookside Road are circa 1906 but have been heavily altered and are not therefore considered to meet the necessary criteria for inclusion.</p> <p>Brockenhurst College is not considered to be of sufficient architectural or historic merit for inclusion.</p> <p>Butts Lawn is an area of open Forest.</p>
Inevitable there is probably more history and archaeology to be added.	The consultation has provided more information for inclusion.
Church never been isolated. Refuge for old village.	The church is separate from the village as the latter developed in the 18th and 19th centuries.
Many areas not included e.g. North Weirs, but as proposal not supported not of concern.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The areas of North and South Weirs etc. are more rural Forest settlements as other conservation areas previously designated and they will be considered separately in the future.</p>
Would like to see recognition of green fingers of grazing land that reach into village.	Green areas, e.g. historic funnels, wide verges and residual commons, are referenced through the appraisal text.

Comments	NFNPA comments
Appraisal does not include buildings younger than 1915. More modern buildings should be included e.g. 1960s fire station, 1938 Grammar school, fine example of social housing in Culverley Close, World War 2 Council houses Sway Road/Grigg Lane.	These more modern buildings do not meet the criteria for designation as buildings of architectural or historic interest.

**Question 2:**

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

**Please circle either YES or NO.**

Other important characteristics not mentioned	
Yes – Number of respondents	No – Number of respondents
4	7
2 respondents did not answer yes or no.	

Characteristics listed	NFNPA comments
Inappropriate overhead lines.	In future management of a conservation area, opportunities for the removal of overhead lines would be encouraged.
No mention of street names and how they evolved. eg. Meerut Road named by Indian forces here in 1914-1918 war. Auckland xxxx named after New Zealand forces.	Whilst this is interesting the content of the character appraisal cannot be a full history of the locality.
South and North Weirs originally occupied by tenant commoners.	These areas are not within the proposed conservation area boundary.
Gates 'old' garage showrooms, school, war memorial, cottage hotel, Brookley Farm house.	These areas are not within the proposed conservation area boundary.

**Question 3:**

**Do you have any additional information which you would like to see included in the character appraisal? Please outline below:**

<b>Additional information</b>	<b>NFPA Comments</b>
4.7.16 Forest Park Hotel. Fail to mention visual amenities provided by the extensive grounds and contained trees.	It is agreed that this is important and it is mentioned but at point 4.7.9.
Mill Lane B3055 carries far more traffic than Church Lane – used to get to waterside parishes.	Character appraisal amended.
Court at North Weirs.	Not within proposed conservation area boundary.
Loss of visual amenity by excessive car parking, damage to verges	Traffic management 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.

**Question 4:**

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

Please tick all those that you feel detract.

<b>Number of respondents selecting feature</b>	<b>Feature</b>
5	Appearance of some properties
2	Loss of original details from buildings, such as windows
2	Condition of some properties
5	Inappropriate property boundaries

<b>Number of respondents selecting feature</b>	<b>Feature</b>
7	Inappropriate modern development
5	Overhead lines
4	Street furniture (e.g. bins, bus shelters, seats)
4	Road signs
6	Loss of trees and hedgerows
1	Other

**If you ticked 'Other', please explain below:**

<b>Explanation</b>	<b>NFNPA Comments</b>
Road signs above needs to include excessive road marking such as outside Lloyds Bank.	Traffic management is not a matter which conservation area designation can address directly but the design of any proposals for traffic management would be influenced.

### **NFNPA Comments**

The local planning 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 planning 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.

Trees and hedgerows are key features in a rural conservation area and this is recognised in both the exercise of powers in relation to new development and specifically tree works proposals.

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 planning authorities to draw up a management strategy for their conservation areas and therefore helpful to understand, the sort of issues that are arising in the area. A management strategy may consider issues such as traffic management, street furniture and overhead lines.

**Question 5:**

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

Please circle either YES or NO.

**YES / NO**

Character of proposed conservation area could be enhanced	
Yes – Number of respondents	No – Number of respondents
7	2
3 respondents did not answer yes or no	

**If yes, how?**

<b>Suggestion</b>	<b>NFPA comments</b>
By more traditional development.	Where works take place in the future requiring planning permission the Authority would seek to ensure that development is of a character and appearance appropriate to the area.
Strict and consistent control of new development.	Where works take place in the future requiring planning permission the Authority would seek to ensure that development is of a character and appearance appropriate to the area.
Speed and traffic regulation enforced on A337 especially around the railway crossing barrier.	This is not a matter which conservation area designation can address.
Refers to answers under questions 1 and 2 – include bowling green and Angel Valley.	See above.
Some minor additions could be made to the coloured area and other parts of the village need to be looked at.	The conservation area boundary has resulted from desk and field survey of the historic development of the village. There will however be changes as a result of the consultation.
Landscaping to hide inappropriate developments e.g. Vinney's Close off Mill Lane.	Appropriate landscaping can be sought as part of any new development in a conservation area (it is important too that the development itself is appropriate). Landscaping in relation to existing development cannot generally be sought.
The church yard area is badly covered.	Whilst the church yard is of course interesting the content of the character appraisal cannot be a full history of the locality, particularly in respect of areas which are not likely to be subject to development..
Seeking removal of panel fencing especially in Grigg Lane/ football ground.	Conservation area control/ management cannot require alterations to properties but where works take place in the future requiring planning permission the Authority would seek to ensure that boundaries are appropriately designed.

**Question 6:**

**Do you agree with the proposed changes to the conservation area boundary?**

Please circle either YES or NO:

Agree with the proposed boundary	
Yes – Number of respondents	No – Number of respondents
4	7
2 respondents did not answer yes or no.	

**If NO, what changes would you like to see?**

<b>Changes suggested</b>	<b>NFPA Comments</b>
Include bowling green and football ground.	<p>The bowling club is a valuable open space on the edge of the proposed conservation area. It is logical if this space is included, to include the car park too. The proposed boundary has been amended accordingly.</p> <p>It is not considered that the football club meets the necessary criteria for inclusion. There is no building of architectural or historic merit and the setting is compromised by the associated boundary treatments. It is surrounded by modern development which similarly does not.</p>
Include Black Knoll, Rhinefield Road and North and South Weirs.	The areas of North and South Weirs etc. are more rural Forest settlements as other conservation areas previously designated and they will be considered separately in the future.

Changes suggested	NFNPA Comments
Include bowling green and Angel Valley.	<p>The bowling club is a valuable open space on the edge of the proposed conservation area. It is logical if this space is included, to include the car park too. The proposed boundary has been amended accordingly.</p> <p>Angel Valley is already protected by Tree Preservation Orders, however it is a valuable feature in the area, originally the leat for the former mill in Rhinefield Road. It is therefore considered to be of historic value and worth of inclusion.</p>
New boundary should take in car park/bowling green, Fibbards Road, Angel Valley, Careys Cottages, Fathers Field, football club, Chestnut Road, Brookside Road, Brockenhurst College, Butts Lawn.	This comment was also made in relation to question 1; comments are not repeated here as a lengthy answer is provided above.
Some minor additions could be made to the coloured area and other parts of the village need to be looked at.	The conservation area boundary has resulted from desk and field survey of the historic development of the village. There will however be changes as a result of the consultation.
No mention of the Weirs.	The areas of North and South Weirs etc. are more rural Forest settlements as other conservation areas previously designated and they will be considered separately in the future.
Include Sway Road, from Brookley Farm to Grigg Lane; North Road, Hurlingham, September Cottage; Close the gap in Meerut Road.	<p>The proposed conservation area relates to the central core of the village. The area of Sway Road is outside this area and separated from it by more modern development, even though it is acknowledged that they include some buildings of historic interest.</p> <p>The only intact older building in North Road is Hurlingham which is a relatively unspoilt cottage. The other older buildings in the road have all suffered from alterations such as plastic windows and there is an area of new development between the</p>

Changes suggested	NFNPA Comments
	<p>Rose and Crown and the older cottages near the railway line. North Road is not therefore considered to merit inclusion.</p> <p>Continuation of frontage along Meerut Road in conservation area would enable management of the area fronting the open Forest. Its inclusion is therefore proposed.</p>

**Question 7:**

**Do you have any other comments about the character appraisal or proposed boundary changes? Please outline below:**

Comments	NFNPA Comments
The proposal is certainly needed and overdue.	Support welcomed.
New Forest Villa, 4.3.26 and 4.3.31 – Numbers 6 and 8 are in Brookley Road, not Lyndhurst Road. No 6 goes back at least to the early 18th century but was extended and reroofed in mid 18th century.	Character appraisal amended.
Please ensure that proposed new development at Brockenhurst College is in keeping with adjacent buildings.	A key reason for conservation area designation is to influence the design of new development. This includes development which affects views into and out of the conservation area.
An interesting report which hopefully will help to maintain character of whole of Brockenhurst.	Support welcomed.
Greater consultation before putting pen to paper would have been a good investment, giving greater knowledge and credibility.	Noted, but experience has shown that more input gained if an initial draft of proposals is presented for comment.
The consultants know little about Brockenhurst and the Forest.	The consultants are experienced in carrying out this work and have thoroughly researched the area in the preparation of the character appraisal and presenting

Comments	NFNPA Comments
	the proposed conservation area boundary.
Regrettably unable to support the proposal – too costly, bureaucratic and intrusive.	A conservation area is a special designation recognising an area of special historic or architectural interest. Local planning authorities have a duty to review their areas and consider designation of conservation areas.
Could consideration be given to making the area subject to special advertisement control.	Any works which require advertisement consent would be carefully considered in the context of the conservation area.

**Other respondents - letters/e-mail/ telephone**

From	Summary of view	NFNPA comments
Member of public	<p>Welcome main thrust of proposals.</p> <p>In preface, in description of properties in Mill lane/St Nicholas Church area omitted to mention Mulberry Cottage.</p> <p>3.6.5 Welcome statement that begins "...any further development..."</p> <p>4.4.17 Agree that buildings mentioned enhance character of area. Unfortunate that area ruined by inappropriate development to north. Hope that policies outlined will not permit any further development on remainder of site.</p>	<p>The preface will not form part of the final document. It set out areas for inclusion in broad terms. Mulberry Cottage is described in the main appraisal document.</p> <p>A key reason for conservation area designation is to influence the design of new development so that it is appropriate to and fits in with the locality.</p> <p>Traffic management is not a matter which conservation area designation can address directly but the design of any proposals for traffic management would be influenced.</p>

<b>From</b>	<b>Summary of view</b>	<b>NFNP comments</b>
	<p>4.4.18 Attention drawn to amount of vehicular traffic using Mill Lane; welcome any move to reduce traffic in future.</p> <p>7.2 and 7.6 Consider that affordable housing complex north of mill Lane of non-traditional scale and massing and hope that there will be no further high density development on that site.</p>	
Member of public	<p>Community not consulted from the beginning.</p> <p>No commons in the New Forest within the Perambulation – land is either open Forest, inclosures or Manorial waste.</p> <p>Previous conservation area was called Waters Green which the proposal hardly changes.</p> <p>Large scale proposals by County Council in front of Brockenhurst College ignored.</p> <p>Character area B badly explained – present Norman church replaced older Saxon church. Church was built on a hill as a refuge for Saxon villagers. It was isolated on purpose. Old Yew tree, 1000 years old, is oldest in Forest.</p>	<p>A draft character appraisal and proposed conservation area boundary has been prepared for the purpose of consultation.</p> <p>For simplicity the word common has been used in the general sense to describe unfenced grazed land.</p> <p>The document is not intended to address future proposals.</p> <p>Not aware of documentary evidence for the church being Saxon. The present building dates for 12th century and later. Difficult to prove the age of the tree as it is hollow.</p> <p>Whilst this is interesting the content of the character appraisal cannot be a full history of the locality.</p> <p>The consultants have used the Drivers' map in the preparation of the document and it is referenced.</p> <p>The proposed conservation area relates to the central core of the village. The areas of North and South Weirs</p>

<b>From</b>	<b>Summary of view</b>	<b>NFNPA comments</b>
	<p>From latter part of 19th century up to World War 2, Morant family were lords of manor. Golf club and 16 grass tennis courts were owned by them. Tennis club was second only to Wimbledon.</p> <p>Morants provided village hall opposite Rose and Crown. Brockenhurst football club bought the football field from them in 1950. Family ran the village until Brockenhurst Park crippled by double death duties.</p> <p>Consultants do not mention Drivers' map.</p> <p>Surprised conservation area so limited. Large part of population, still today, commoners. They were largely on the edge of the village in North and South Weirs, Balmer Lawn Road, Mill Lane, so why have these areas not been included?</p> <p>Apart from mentioning roofing tiles locally produced, no mention of 'tilery'</p>	<p>etc. are outside this area and separated from it by modern development. These are more rural Forest settlements as other conservation areas previously designated and they will be considered separately in the future.</p>
Member of public	<p>Intention may be fine but detail hides a host of hidden costs, bureaucracy and intrusion. Appraisal subjective and idiosyncratic.</p>	<p>The National Park Authority is the planning authority for the area operating essentially the processes operated previously by NFDC.</p> <p>All local planning authorities have a duty to review their</p>

From	Summary of view	NFNPA comments
	<p>Implications for managing trees, boundaries, minor additions, extensions and external decoration are significant and plain daft. Preference would be to leave these processes with pre-existing planning processes of NFDC.</p> <p>Interested to know the cost of these proposals and how they will be met.</p>	<p>areas and consider designation of conservation areas. In previous years conservation areas have been centred around nucleated historic centres; today the value of the wider historic environment is better recognised in designation.</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>Reference is made to the use of Article 4(2) Directions which enable the adoption of extra planning controls within a conservation area. The Directions remove the normal Permitted Development Rights from dwelling houses, meaning that planning permission is required for certain specified works. A Direction would be selective both between and within the types of development listed in <b>Annex 1</b>. A Direction would, therefore, relate to specific work areas which are cause for concern in respect of the character and appearance of the conservation area, and also would relate to selected properties.</p> <p>Consultants have been employed to review the boundaries of and produce character appraisals for all existing conservation areas in the National Park over a 12 month period at a cost of £25 650.</p>

<b>From</b>	<b>Summary of view</b>	<b>NFNPA comments</b>
Member of public	A number of helpful amendments to character appraisal provided.	Grateful for input; amendments made to document.
Member of public	Concern about inclusion of a particular property in conservation area; other properties adjoining not included; implications if postal address were to change; implications for forming new access and building garage.	<p>If property included in conservation area this would not be affected by a future change in postal address. The proposed conservation area boundary has been drawn to reflect the historic development of Brockenhurst. In establishing boundary in an area such as this, where new development sits closely alongside older buildings, inevitably there are properties which adjoin both inside and outside the area.</p> <p>Planning controls over what householders can do on their properties in a conservation area are effectively identical to those applying within a National Park. The Authority would however be considering, as well as normal planning matters, the impact of any proposal on the special character or appearance of the conservation area. With regard to forming a new access and garage, in terms of impact on the character and appearance of the area, the Authority would need to consider the loss of the existing boundary treatment and the design of the proposed building. There may of course be other planning issues too.</p>
Member of public	Concern about carrying out regular work to trees; concern about opportunities for proposed changes to building; would work to fruit trees require consent?	Trees in a conservation area generally have the same protection as those covered by Tree Preservation Orders. Necessary to write to the Authority giving 6 weeks notice of intention to carry out work to trees. Intention is to ensure that important trees are not lost prematurely and the regulations give an opportunity for prior discussion. Reasonable maintenance work is

<b>From</b>	<b>Summary of view</b>	<b>NFNPA comments</b>
		<p>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> <p>Planning controls over what householders can do on their properties in a conservation area are effectively identical to those applying within a National Park. The Authority will however be considering, as well as normal planning matters, the impact of any proposal on the special character or appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>Pruning of fruit trees in accordance with good horticultural practice is exempt from notification.</p>
Member of public	Understood that St Nicholas church was only church mentioned in Domesday Book. Appraisal says two churches mentioned.	St Nicholas church is the only one specifically mentioned in the New Forest section of the Domesday Book. There is also mention of the land of the church at Milford.
Member of public (two letters received)	Requests the exclusion of 14 Noel Close (planning permission 92924). All other properties on Noel Close excluded. No justifiable argument for property's inclusion; imposes additional restrictions for no reason, only of benefit if all houses included.	The boundary has been amended to exclude this site which has planning permission for a new dwelling and is to be separated from and would not therefore in future relate to the historic core of the village.
Member of public	Requests the exclusion of properties on south side of Ober Road, a private gravelled track which cannot be seen from Butts Lawn or Rhinefield Road.	Properties on south side of Ober Road are of historic and architectural interest and merit inclusion. Many buildings in conservation areas cannot be readily seen from principal highways.

<b>From</b>	<b>Summary of view</b>	<b>NFNP comments</b>
	<p>Suggests inclusion of excluded properties fronting Butts Lawn, properties adjacent to Rhinefield Close and Forest Park Road which front Butts lawn, and next two properties along Rhinefield Road after Forest Park Road; properties at the end of the Rise, Armstrong Road, Armstrong Close and Broadlands Road which front Burley Road.</p>	<p>Continuation of frontage along Meerut Road in conservation area would enable management of the area fronting the open Forest. This is now proposed for inclusion.</p> <p>The properties adjacent to Rhinefield Close and Forest Park Road are very altered and do not meet the necessary criteria for inclusion.</p> <p>The properties at the end of The Rise are not of historic or architectural interest.</p> <p>The proposed conservation area relates to the central core of the village. The other buildings in the vicinity of Armstrong Road are not part of this.</p>
<p>Member of public</p>	<p>Requests the following additions: grazing land adjacent to the ford, Waters Green, contributes to character and setting of stream; Careys Cottages, important group of vernacular buildings which contribute to the character of the area.</p>	<p>The grazing land is now proposed to be included as part of Angel Valley.</p> <p>Unfortunately all of Careys Cottages have been significantly altered (windows, doors, roof materials, additions) and their inclusion could not therefore be justified.</p>
<p>Member of public</p>	<p>Prompted by the questionnaire would say that 'inappropriate new development' is one of the main detractors and particularly with reference to Meerut road 'overhead lines' are another.</p>	<p>A key reason for conservation area designation is to influence the design of new development so that it is appropriate to and fits in with the locality.</p> <p>Point noted regarding overhead wires. Any opportunity to address this through partnership work in conservation area management would be taken.</p>

<b>From</b>	<b>Summary of view</b>	<b>NFNPA comments</b>
	All authorities have up to now said that St Nicholas church is the oldest in the new Forest as it is the only one listed in the Domesday Book. Appraisal says that it is one of two listed.	St Nicholas church is the only one specifically mentioned in the New Forest section of the Domesday Book. There is also mention of the land of the church at Milford.
Member of public	Fully support proposals in order to ensure future development contributes to the enhancement and preservation of the area.	Support welcomed.
Member of public	<p>Property built in 1920 included whereas older properties left out. Wrong some properties picked out and not others. Why is station not included? Include whole village or better still none of it.</p> <p>Need to accept change. Ask that proposals do not go ahead or exclude 13 Brookley Road.</p>	<p>The proposed conservation area relates to the central core of the village, inevitably this excludes single buildings beyond which might be considered to be of historic interest. The station has been much altered in the 20th century and does not include any historic buildings of merit.</p> <p>13 Brookley Road is a particularly good example of an unaltered shop of 1927.</p>
Member of public	<p>Support proposals. Suggest inclusion of Hurlingham, North Road.</p> <p>Also provide corrections and additional information in relation to the character appraisal.</p> <p>Support Parish Council's suggestions.</p>	Support welcomed and grateful for corrections and additional information in relation to the character appraisal.
Member of public	Concerned about descriptions/titles of Character Area A Linear historic development off Lymington Road and	The two areas as described are different in character. Area A is much more dispersed commercial development interspersed with residential. Area D is a concentrated

<b>From</b>	<b>Summary of view</b>	<b>NFNPA comments</b>
	<p>part of Brookley Road and Character area D Commercial part of Brookley Road. Questions why area A is not part of the “Commercial part of Brookley Road” given business premises which exist here.</p> <p>Proposals will result in additional costs and more bureaucracy.</p> <p>Area chosen arbitrary, more interesting properties worthy of preservation.</p> <p>Derogatory references to close boarded fencing. Commercial area and what might be suitable for isolated cottage may not be suitable for commercial premises.</p> <p>Putting a ban on demolition in a commercial area does not allow for natural development.</p> <p>Proposed areas should not be designated as conservation areas.</p>	<p>area of commercial development mainly from one period and in a similar style.</p> <p>It is important that any proposed development is appropriate in a conservation area and for example, that appropriate materials are used which may not be the cheapest alternatives. This could however be considered a positive investment in terms of longevity and maintaining the character of the area as an area people would like to visit.</p> <p>The proposed conservation area relates to the central core of the village.</p> <p>Close boarded fencing is a modern boundary treatment and at odds with the character of traditional rural boundaries.</p> <p>Conservation area consent is intended to ensure that the case for demolition is carefully considered and buildings which contribute to the special character of the area are not unnecessarily lost.</p>
Member of Public	<p>Initial reaction not unfavourable if conservation rather than preservation, in favour of retaining character of village.</p> <p>Questions logic for boundary – excluding much of village.</p>	<p>Intention of conservation area designation is to “preserve or enhance “the special character of the area and therefore to ensure that change is carefully considered in that context.</p> <p>The proposed conservation area relates to the central core of the village.</p>

From	Summary of view	NFNPA comments
	<p>Questions nature of Article 4 (2) directions, checks and balances.</p> <p>Use of accredited contractor for works to trees surely avoids need for applying for permission.</p> <p>TV aerial on a post could not be replaced like for like in the event of damage.</p>	<p>An Article 4 (2) Direction would be selective both between and within the types of development listed in <b>Annex 1</b>. A Direction would, therefore, relate to specific work areas which are cause for concern in respect of the character and appearance of the conservation area, and also would relate to selected properties. Such a Direction would only be used where a particular alteration is cumulatively of notable concern. The process for service of such Directions allows for consultation with those affected and the public before confirmation.</p> <p>Conservation area designation does introduce additional control over work to trees with a trunk diameter greater than three inches, 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>TV aerial on post may require planning permission in the first instance, whether or not in a conservation area. Replacement like for like in the event of damage would not need further permission.</p>
Brockenhurst Parish Church	Objects to inclusion of both Anglican churches as both buildings and their environs already sufficiently governed by Ecclesiastical and other regulation.	The proposed conservation area relates to the historic development of the settlement. St Nicholas Church and St Saviours Church are fundamental components of this development and are of special architectural and historic

From	Summary of view	NFNPA comments
		interest. There inclusion is therefore considered justified.
Diocese of Portsmouth	Objects to proposals. Does not seem to have been a proper assessment of buildings likely to be caught by extension. Objects to inclusion of St Anne's Catholic church on grounds that it is relatively architecturally unimportant and 'not considered to be a candidate for listing'. Inclusion might have impact on ability to consider potential future uses.	The proposed conservation area relates to the central core of the village.  St Anne's Catholic church is a good example of its period the exterior displaying many late Arts and Crafts features. If alternative future uses were proposed these would be subject to planning permission whether or not in a conservation area.
New Forest Association	Supports the inclusion of the additional areas proposed. Also recommends the following areas be included:  Extend character area A northwards to the bridge over Lymington River, covering the fields from Bridge Farm to the river and extending to Balmer Lawn Road, including the car park. Important gateway which warrants careful conservation to manage its appearance and use and prevent excessive erosion.  Carry designation across frontage development between areas C and E to give continuity to the protection of open Forest frontage. (Do not consider Careys Cottages should be included.)  Include defined strip of land containing	These areas have been reassessed.  The extension of character area A to the north to provide a gateway to the conservation area is considered appropriate.  Continuation of frontage along Meerut Road in conservation area would enable management of the area fronting the open Forest.  The history of the strip of land containing Whitecroft and Thorn is interesting and it is considered it merits inclusion.  Angel Valley is already protected by Tree Preservation Orders, however it is a valuable feature in the area, originally the leat for the former mill in Rhinefield Road. It is therefore considered to be of historic value and worth of inclusion.

<b>From</b>	<b>Summary of view</b>	<b>NFNP comments</b>
	<p>properties Whitecroft and Thorn, behind cottages to west side of Butts Lawn track. Probably a medieval site. In the 17th century contained oldest property in area dating to 13th century. The 17th century boundary of the village was an extension of the existing track across Butts Lawn to the allotments including this plot.</p> <p>With reference to debate at public exhibition, Do not consider that Fathers Field merits inclusion. Would not object to inclusion of Angel Valley.</p>	<p>The proposed boundary has been amended accordingly.</p>
<p>Brockenhurst Parish Council</p>	<p>Support proposals and put forward additional areas for inclusion:</p> <p>Angel Valley, both sides, for whole length including open area near Butt Lawn Water Splash.</p> <p>Careys Cottages.</p> <p>Village bowling club.</p> <p>Firestation which would connect up with properties further along A337 past Noel Close.</p> <p>Cottages in North Road (September, Waterman's and Willow, Hurlingham).</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Angel Valley is already protected by Tree Preservation Orders, however it is a valuable feature in the area, originally the leat for the former mill in Rhinefield Road. It is therefore considered to be of historic value and worth of inclusion.</p> <p>Unfortunately all of Careys Cottages have been significantly altered (windows, doors, roof materials, additions) and their inclusion could not therefore be justified.</p> <p>The bowling club is a valuable open space on the edge of the proposed conservation area. It is logical if this space is included, to include the car park too. The proposed boundary has been amended accordingly.</p>

From	Summary of view	NFNPA comments
	<p>Area in Sway Road near school to include Brookley Farmhouse, Primary School, Culverley Close and the original showroom building of Gates garage.</p> <p>Also in the future consider area of North and South Weirs, including cottages on Burley Road; Beachern Wood, Black Knoll and Ober Farm.</p> <p>At same would also like to discuss the possibility of including the Football Club and some surrounding properties.</p>	<p>It is not considered that the fired station meets the necessary criteria for inclusion and other sites of similar standard along the A337 have also not been included. The buildings are not of any special historic or architectural value and do not enhance the proposed area.</p> <p>The only intact older building in North Road is Hurlingham which is a relatively unspoilt cottage. The other older buildings in the road have all suffered from alterations such as plastic windows etc. and there is an area of new development between the Rose and Crown and the older cottages near the railway line. North Road is not therefore considered to merit inclusion.</p> <p>The proposed conservation area relates to the central core of the village. The areas in Sway Road are outside this area and separated from it by more modern development, even though it is acknowledged that they include some buildings of historic interest.</p> <p>The areas of North and South Weirs etc. are more rural Forest settlements as other conservation areas previously designated and they will be considered separately in the future.</p> <p>It is not considered that the football club meets the necessary criteria for inclusion. There is no building of architectural or historic merit and the setting is compromised by the associated boundary treatments. It is surrounded by modern development which similarly</p>

<b>From</b>	<b>Summary of view</b>	<b>NFNP comments</b>
		does not.
Brockenhurst Business Association	<p>Concerned about proposals, fear they would add another burden. If alterations to shops were necessary or proposed there may be stumbling blocks including high costs.</p> <p>Too late to preserve appearance of Brookley Road.</p> <p>Added costs may lead to empty shops.</p>	<p>It is important that any proposed development is appropriate in a conservation area and for example, that appropriate materials are used which may not be the cheapest alternatives. This could however be considered a positive investment in terms of longevity and maintaining the character of the area as an area people would like to visit.</p> <p>The character and appearance of Brookley Road is considered to be of sufficient special interest to merit designation (described as character area D in character appraisal).</p>
The Friends of Brockenhurst	<p>On balance support extensions.</p> <p>Would like to see further extension to include Angel Valley/Fathersfield (detailed case prepared).</p> <p>Note that approach to village along A337 has been included. Would also like approaches from Burley Road and Rhinefield Road included. This would probably cover North and South Weirs and Black Knoll. Appreciate this would be a separate study and request it be carried out in the future.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Grateful for detailed case prepared in respect of suggested inclusion.</p> <p>Angel Valley is already protected by Tree Preservation Orders, however it is a valuable feature in the area, originally the leat for the former mill in Rhinefield Road. It is therefore considered to be of historic value and worth of inclusion.</p> <p>It is not considered that Fathers Field meets the necessary criteria for inclusion. The buildings are not considered to be sufficient architectural or historic merit and most have been altered from their original form.</p>

<b>From</b>	<b>Summary of view</b>	<b>NFNPA comments</b>
		The areas of North and South Weirs etc. are more rural Forest settlements as other conservation areas previously designated and they will be considered separately in the future.

## Keyhaven

**Questionnaire respondents** – 17 respondents completed questionnaires.

**Other respondents** – 10 responses were received (three of these also completed questionnaires).

### Questionnaire analysis

#### Question 1:

**Do you think that the character appraisal covers all important characteristics of the conservation area?**

**Please circle either YES or NO.**

Covers all important characteristics	
Yes – Number of respondents	No – Number of respondents
8	8
1 respondent did not answer yes or no.	

Comments	NFNP comments
In principle agree with the appraisal.	Noted.
Some of the agricultural land on the periphery of the conservation area is important to the setting and should be included.	Amendments made to boundary to include fields south of Vidle Van, between Keyhaven Road Saltgrass Lane and east of Aubrey Farm.
Appraisal fails to acknowledge character created by hotch-potch development over years. Far too much emphasis on the importance/relevance of particular buildings/features	Acknowledged in key characteristics.
Some of the claims made on buildings are incorrect.	No specific information given for comment.
In principle but includes list of suggested amendments: 4.3.8 Fields plural. 7.1 Redrafted paragraph.	Some amendments made to character appraisal.  This issues noted in relation to conservation area management

<b>Comments</b>	<b>NFNPA comments</b>
<p>7.5 Text added drawing attention to the problem of car parking.  8.1.4 Before last word add many.  8.1 Make reference to Milford on Sea Village Design Statement.</p> <p>Also includes issues to be considered in future management plan:  Measures to calm traffic passing green.  Removal of overhead lines.  Tree planting.  Opportunities for footpaths.  Removal of unwanted signs.  Replacement of public toilet with a more sensitive design.</p>	<p>are all valid matters for consideration by either the National Park Authority or partner organisations. In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence these.</p>
<p>Except for listed buildings nothing particularly lovely about buildings in area. The loveliness of Keyhaven is the complete village in a very special setting.</p>	<p>The range of different building types which make up the character has been further emphasised in the key characteristics. Designation as a conservation area and the extensions proposed to the area recognises the special character</p>
<p>3.3.3 There are deep water moorings further down the river and the small boat traffic to and from the moorings is a large part of the water traffic which gives the river and beach its character.</p> <p>4.1 Sounds and smells include fishing.</p>	<p>Amendments made to character appraisal (4.3.6 and key features section).</p>
<p>Trees around Salt Grass. Gravel drives and roads key surface material and locally sources – visual aspect.</p>	<p>Amendments made to character appraisal.</p>
<p>Date and detail inaccuracies:</p> <p>4.3.5 Aubrey spelt incorrectly.  4.3.15 Vidle Van House older than C18 in parts.  4.3.29 Iley Point Cottage not Pond.</p>	<p>Amendments made to character appraisal (except 3.5.3).</p>

Comments	NFNPA comments
3.5.3 Filled with rubbish in about 1920s?	

**Question 2:**

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

**Please circle either YES or NO.**

Other important characteristics not mentioned	
Yes – Number of respondents	No – Number of respondents
10	5
2 respondents did not answer yes or no.	

Characteristics listed	NFNPA comments
NFDC notices banning the use of jet skis etc in the river are apparently legally unenforceable. Can NFNPA help to rectify this as the proposed conservation area covers the hard and the sailing club.	Enforcement of rules and regulations on river not within control of National Park Authority.
Overhead wires and utility poles should be removed especially in Lymore Lane.  Unsightly farm buildings unused or underused should be removed.	In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence removal of overhead wires and utility poles and opportunities for improvement of buildings.
Delightful hotchpotch nature of the hamlet which creates its character, not specific buildings/features.	The range of different building types which make up the character has been further emphasised in the key characteristics. Designation as a conservation area and the

Characteristics listed	NFNPA comments
	extensions proposed to the area recognises the special character
Agriculture was always the principal employment with fishing adding to the family income. As agricultural buildings are outside boundary are we to think they had no part in development. Salt and agriculture provided funding for several buildings mentioned.	Modern agricultural buildings have not been included as these do not contribute to the special character of the area.
All buildings should be included and fields behind Aubrey Farm, east of Lymore Lane and between Aubrey House and Keyhaven House.	Modern agricultural buildings have not been included as these do not contribute to the special character of the area. Amendments made to boundary to include fields south of Vidle Van, between Keyhaven Road Saltgrass Lane and east of Aubrey Farm.
<p>3.2.2 There are still 12 active fishing boats working from the river and quay.</p> <p>4.1 In addition views of deep water moorings.</p> <p>Building materials: add yellow brick: Coast Guards Cottages and Forfiets before rendering.</p> <p>Characteristics of village: is variety of building styles, dates and materials.</p>	<p>Amendments made to character appraisal.</p> <p>Polychromatic brick is mentioned at 5.2.2.</p> <p>The range of different building types which make up the character has been further emphasised in the key characteristics.</p>
Negative impact of car park tarmac and layout. Need for additional trees/hedgrows to soften impact.	In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence the design and management of the car park.

**Question 3:**

**Do you have any additional information which you would like to see included in the character appraisal? Please outline below:**

<b>Additional information</b>	<b>NFNPA Comments</b>
Reduction and removal of several obtrusive and superfluous signs in the conservation area.	In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence the management of signage.
Note that New Road remains a private road.	Added to character appraisal.
A policy to continue hotch-potch development/architecture so as not to finish up with a vernacular pastiche.	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. New development should aspire to a quality of design and execution related to its context.
Description of Hawkers Cottage, a key building in the history of the village - add to Annex 2 Colonel Hawkers Diaries by Peter Hawker and Eric Parker.	Added to Annex 2.
Some of historical facts relating to houses are inaccurate (letter sent – contents summarised below).	Addressed below.

**Question 4:**

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

Please tick all those that you feel detract.

<b>Number of respondents selecting feature</b>	<b>Feature</b>
4	Appearance of some properties

<b>Number of respondents selecting feature</b>	<b>Feature</b>
4	Loss of original details from buildings, such as windows
3	Condition of some properties
3	Inappropriate property boundaries
5	Inappropriate modern development
10	Overhead lines
3	Street furniture (e.g. bins, bus shelters, seats)
9	Road signs
5	Loss of trees and hedgerows
7	Other

**If you ticked 'Other', please explain below:**

<b>Explanation</b>	<b>NFNP Comments</b>
Use of helicopter. Noise a nuisance to residents.	The National Park Authority will work with partners to maintain, extend and enhance the tranquillity of the National Park.

Unused or under-used unsightly farm buildings clearly visible from Lymore Lane.	In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence improvement of buildings.
30mph signs on road leading to ancient highway. Anti-parking posts on verges need to be replaced.	In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence appropriate signage.
Yellow lines. On street parking. Failure by authorities to maintain public trees and grass verges both essential to character.	In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence highway management.
Loss of original roof material.	In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence roof repairs and where works require planning permission would seek the retention of original roof material.
Tarmac in car park.	In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence the design and management of the car park.
Ecology and maintenance of marsh to south; hedgerows have been mismanaged and killed off.	This is not a matter which conservation area management can address.
Intrusive noise from helicopters and jet skis. Derelict and prominent buildings Gorselands. Destruction of garden Wigeon Cottage.	The National Park Authority will work with partners to maintain, extend and enhance the tranquillity of the National Park. Any works carried out without but requiring planning permission will be investigated by the National Park Authority's planning enforcement team.

### **NFNPA Comments**

The local planning 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.

A local planning 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.

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 planning authorities to draw up a management strategy for their conservation areas and therefore helpful to understand, 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 overhead lines.

**Question 5:**

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

Please circle either YES or NO.

**YES / NO**

Character of proposed conservation area could be enhanced	
Yes – Number of respondents	No – Number of respondents
10	1
6 respondents did not answer yes or no	

**If yes, how?**

<b>Suggestion</b>	<b>NFPA comments</b>
Sleeping policemen by Fishers Mead to slow traffic on a narrow and dangerous corner.	In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence highway management.
Removal of overhead wires, telegraph poles and unsightly farm buildings.	In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence removal of overhead wires and utility poles and opportunities for improvement of buildings.

<b>Suggestion</b>	<b>NFNP comments</b>
Car park and traffic management. Could Saltgrass Lane be made one way so that traffic going to the shingle bank was not directed through the village.	In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence highway management.
Yellow lines. On street parking. Failure by authorities to maintain public trees and grass verges both essential to character.	In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence highway management.
Issues to be considered in a Management Plan might for example include: traffic calming passing green, environmental improvement projects such as for tree planting and maintenance, removal of overhead lines, footpath at eastern end of road to Milford, removal of unwanted signs, replacement public toilet.	In any future conservation area management proposals these are all matters which the Authority would seek influence.
Control of traffic: some parking is charges for, some free leading to a lot of driving to find free parking. All should be charged for.	This is not a matter which conservation area management can address.
Plant hedges, trees, shrubs in south corner of main car park. Resurface with softer material.	In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence the design and management of the car park.
Hedgerow replacement around field margins.	In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence hedgerow management and appropriate planting.

**Question 6:**

**Do you agree with the proposed changes to the conservation area boundary?**

Please circle either YES or NO:

Agree with the proposed boundary	
Yes – Number of respondents	No – Number of respondents
1	13
3 respondents did not answer yes or no.	

**If NO, what changes would you like to see?**

<b>Changes suggested</b>	<b>NFNP Comments</b>
<p>Whole hamlet should be in conservation area, in particular:</p> <p>Field belonging to Keyhaven Lodge behind 1-7 Harewood Green, as an extension of Vidle Van field. Wildlife here listed.</p> <p>Field between Lymore Lane and Edgars farm building. An integral part of village's character.</p> <p>Harewood Green, although built in 1970, has architectural integrity, views of it softened by trees and hedges, exteriors unaltered.</p> <p>Cottages to north side of Keyhaven Road. For completeness.</p>	<p>Amendments made to boundary to include fields south of Vidle Van, between Keyhaven Road Saltgrass Lane and east of Aubrey Farm.</p> <p>The field to the south of Lymore Lane as it leaves the village has not been included as it is not in the National Park.</p> <p>Harewood Green although unaltered is of a form that would it is considered dilute the quality of the area as an area of special historic and architectural interest. It is not therefore proposed to be included.</p> <p>The cottages to the north side of Keyhaven Road have unfortunately been significantly altered and the remaining buildings are a mixture of bungalows and more recent housing. Their inclusion could not therefore be justified.</p>
<p>Extend proposed area south of Vidle Van to existing boundary in area of Keyhaven Lodge and to the west of this area shown on map as Aubrey Farm.</p>	<p>Amendments made to boundary to include fields south of Vidle Van, between Keyhaven Road Saltgrass Lane and east of Aubrey Farm.</p>
<p>Include:</p> <p>Field belonging to Keyhaven Lodge behind 1-7 Harewood Green, as an extension of Vidle Van field. Wildlife here listed.</p> <p>Field between Lymore Lane and Edgars farm building. An integral part of village's character.</p>	<p>Amendments made to boundary to include fields south of Vidle Van, between Keyhaven Road Saltgrass Lane and east of Aubrey Farm.</p> <p>The field to the south of Lymore Lane as it leaves the village has not been included as it is not in the National Park.</p> <p>Harewood Green although unaltered is of a form that would it is</p>

<b>Changes suggested</b>	<b>NFNP Comments</b>
<p>Harewood Green, although built in 1970, has architectural integrity, views of it softened by trees and hedges, exteriors unaltered.</p>	<p>considered dilute the quality of the area as an area of special historic and architectural interest. It is not therefore proposed to be included.</p> <p>The cottages to the north side of Keyhaven Road have unfortunately been significantly altered and the remaining buildings are a mixture of bungalows and more recent housing. Their inclusion could not therefore be justified.</p>
<p>Include: field south of Lymore Lane, field east of Aubrey Farm, field south of Vidle Van, two fields west of properties and between Saltgrass and Aubrey House, cottages on Keyhaven Road.</p>	<p>Amendments made to boundary to include fields south of Vidle Van, between Keyhaven Road Saltgrass Lane and east of Aubrey Farm.</p> <p>The field to the south of Lymore Lane as it leaves the village has not been included as it is not in the National Park.</p> <p>The cottages to the north side of Keyhaven Road have unfortunately been significantly altered and the remaining buildings are a mixture of bungalows and more recent housing. Their inclusion could not therefore be justified.</p>
<p>Fields east of Aubrey Farm and south of Vidle Van should be included.</p>	<p>Amendments made to boundary to include fields south of Vidle Van and east of Aubrey Farm.</p>
<p>Field east of Aubrey Farm, two fields west of properties and between Saltgrass and Aubrey House, cottages on Keyhaven Road.</p>	<p>Amendments made to boundary to include fields between Keyhaven Road Saltgrass Lane and east of Aubrey Farm.</p> <p>The cottages to the north side of Keyhaven Road have unfortunately been significantly altered and the remaining buildings are a mixture of bungalows and more recent housing. Their inclusion could not therefore be justified.</p>

<b>Changes suggested</b>	<b>NFPA Comments</b>
Extend boundaries to include the whole of Keyhaven.	<p>Modern agricultural buildings have not been included as these do not contribute to the special character of the area.</p> <p>The cottages to the north side of Keyhaven Road have unfortunately been significantly altered and the remaining buildings are a mixture of bungalows and more recent housing. Their inclusion could not therefore be justified.</p> <p>Harewood Green although unaltered is of a form that would it is considered dilute the quality of the area as an area of special historic and architectural interest. It is not therefore proposed to be included.</p>
Include Harewood Green.	<p>Harewood Green although unaltered is of a form that would it is considered dilute the quality of the area as an area of special historic and architectural interest. It is not therefore proposed to be included.</p>
Include river and marshes by drawing a line between two points of proposed additions.	<p>This would not introduce any additional control on this land and there is no definitive boundary to the north, although it is acknowledged that the area is important to the setting of the conservation area.</p>
All buildings should be included and fields behind Aubrey Farm, east of Lymore Lane and between Aubrey House and Keyhaven House.	<p>Modern agricultural buildings have not been included as these do not contribute to the special character of the area.</p> <p>The cottages to the north side of Keyhaven Road have unfortunately been significantly altered and the remaining buildings are a mixture of bungalows and more recent housing. Their inclusion could not therefore be justified.</p> <p>Harewood Green although unaltered is of a form that would it is</p>

Changes suggested	NFNPA Comments
	<p>considered dilute the quality of the area as an area of special historic and architectural interest. It is not therefore proposed to be included.</p> <p>Amendments made to boundary to include fields south of Vidle Van, between Keyhaven Road Saltgrass Lane and east of Aubrey Farm.</p>
<p>Add field south of Vidle Van Farm and fields behind Fishers Mead, Aubrey House and Keyhaven House.</p>	<p>Amendments made to boundary to include fields south of Vidle Van, between Keyhaven Road Saltgrass Lane and east of Aubrey Farm.</p>
<p>Include fields between Saltgrass and New Road, including old hedgerows.</p>	<p>Amendments made to boundary to include fields south of Vidle Van, between Keyhaven Road Saltgrass Lane and east of Aubrey Farm.</p>
<p>Include: fields north and east of Aubrey Farm, field south of Vidle Van, fields between Saltgrass Lane and Keyhaven Road, triangle field south of Saltgrass stables.</p>	<p>Amendments made to boundary to include fields south of Vidle Van, between Keyhaven Road Saltgrass Lane and east of Aubrey Farm.</p> <p>The triangular field south of Salt Grass stables has not been included as it is not in the National Park.</p>

**Question 7:**

**Do you have any other comments about the character appraisal or proposed boundary changes? Please outline below:**

Comments	NFNPA Comments
More emphasis could be given to the areas wildlife, particularly birds.	These are not matters which conservation area designation can address.
Ideally include all fields around the village.	Amendments made to boundary to include fields south of Vidle Van, between Keyhaven Road Saltgrass Lane and east of Aubrey Farm.
Any measure to encourage a reduction in speed of vehicles would be worthwhile. Opportunity for 20mph limit?	This is not a matter which conservation area designation can address.
Appraisal is too blinkered in that it fails to understand the whole not the parts. Be more generous towards the unlisted buildings for they have a greater value than the whole that is unrecognised.	The range of different building types which make up the character has been further emphasised in the key characteristics. Designation as a conservation area and the extensions proposed to the area recognises the special character
Boundaries appear to be chosen on personal ideas. Lymore Lane Cottage 1950s are in but Aubrey Farm omitted. Farms were the principal source of income and should be incorporated.	Modern agricultural buildings have not been included as these do not contribute to the special character of the area.
Village is small and interconnected. Any bad features would affect it all. Only area inappropriate to include is Harewood Green.	<p>Agreed Harewood Green is of a form that would it is considered dilute the quality of the area as an area of special historic and architectural interest. It is not therefore proposed to be included.</p> <p>Modern agricultural buildings have not been included as these do not contribute to the special character of the area.</p> <p>The cottages to the north side of Keyhaven Road have unfortunately been significantly altered and the remaining buildings are a mixture of bungalows and more recent housing. Their inclusion could not therefore be justified.</p>
Add to reference list – The Diary of Colonel Peter Hawker Richmond Publishing Co Limited 1975.	Added to Annex 2.

<b>Comments</b>	<b>NFPA Comments</b>
The important thing is to keep Keyhaven a small simple place. You have done well so far except for new house on side of green.	Noted.
It is important to keep the separation from Milford and Lymore.	Development can only take place in accordance with planning policies.
Some alterations to plastic windows, fascias, etc have occurred. May be conservation policies not being enforced.	Some alterations are permitted development, particularly building in single residential use. The use of Article 4(2) directions could be used to manage alterations such as this but none are in place at present.
Numerous annotations to character appraisal.	Grateful for input.
Greater emphasis on yacht clubs to manage their expansion/alteration with reference to visual environment. Too much tidying up resulting in eyesores.	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. New development should aspire to a quality of design and execution related to its context.

**Other respondents - letters/e-mail/ telephone**

<b>From</b>	<b>Summary of view</b>	<b>NFPA comments</b>
Member of public	<p>Welcome draft document and consultative process.</p> <p>Suggests inclusion of more land to west of village.</p> <p>Suggests more emphasis in character appraisal on ecological issues. Importance of gravel as a surfacing</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Amendments made to boundary to include fields to the west between Keyhaven Road and Saltgrass Lane.</p> <p>The character appraisal does not focus on ecological matters as these are not matters which conservation area management can address.</p>

<b>From</b>	<b>Summary of view</b>	<b>NFNPA comments</b>
	<p>material not mentioned.</p> <p>Mentions: impact of/damage due to flood defences on fauna to marsh; development of commercial fishing; impact of changes to water management on the landscape; pressures on river by road trailed boat traffic; negative impact of character and appearance of sailing clubs (more than “neutral”); gravel to be recognised as a significant material in materials section; trees at Saltgrass to be mentioned and importance of planting indigenous species to biodiversity; need for closer consideration of hedge trimming; car park, shape and surface, out of character; need for mention of traffic issues.</p>	<p>If the sailing clubs propose works which require planning permission then 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.</p> <p>Gravel has been mentioned in the materials section.</p> <p>In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence the design and management of the car park.</p>
Member of public	<p>Support proposed additional areas but consider that Harewood Green should be included. Well maintained estate which boasts a totally homogenous design. Remarkable as a piece of unaltered 1970s architecture. Exclusion results in worst kind of piecemeal conservation policy.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given to inclusion of housing on north side of Keyhaven Road.</p>	<p>Harewood Green is of a form that would it is considered dilute the quality of the area as an area of special historic and architectural interest. It is not therefore proposed to be included.</p> <p>The cottages to the north side of Keyhaven Road have unfortunately been significantly altered and the remaining buildings are a mixture of bungalows and more recent housing. Their inclusion could not therefore be justified.</p> <p>The boundary has been amended to include the field south of Vidle Van.</p>

From	Summary of view	NFNPA comments
	Also include field immediately north of Harewood Green.	
Member of public	<p>Historical details provided on Old Salt Grass (4.3.21) – development of building and name.</p> <p>Interested in 4.3.23 indicating building behind Fishers Mead formerly stable and coach house. Believed it to have been a footman’s cottage attached to Fishers Mead.</p> <p>Include field south of Vidle Van, two small fields bordering Aubrey farm/Wigeon Cottage.</p> <p>Include field between Saltgrass Lane and Keyhaven Road.</p> <p>Include Aubrey Farm and row of cottage opposite Aubrey House.</p> <p>Some of recommendations in draft restrictive – if someone has space for a swimming pool why not if screened; post and rail and picket fencing attractive but do not offer security and privacy sometimes needed.</p>	<p>Some amendments made to character appraisal.</p> <p>The boundary has been amended to include the fields south of Vidle Van, bordering Aubrey farm/Wigeon Cottage and between Saltgrass Lane and Keyhaven Road.</p> <p>Modern agricultural buildings have not been included as these do not contribute to the special character of the area.</p> <p>The cottages to the north side of Keyhaven Road have unfortunately been significantly altered and the remaining buildings are a mixture of bungalows and more recent housing. Their inclusion could not therefore be justified.</p> <p>An Article 4(2) Direction would be selective both between and within the types of development listed in <b>Annex 1</b>. A Direction would, therefore, relate to specific work areas which are cause for concern in respect of the character and appearance of the conservation area, and also would relate to selected properties.</p>
Member of public	Para 4.3.6 Limit reached for number of moorings in river. Would be a mistake to enlarge launching facilities as this	This is not a matter which conservation area management can address. However In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority

<b>From</b>	<b>Summary of view</b>	<b>NFNPA comments</b>
	<p>would draw more traffic and affect character of conservation area.</p> <p>Include: two fields north of Aubrey Farm, field south of Vidle Van, field between Saltgrass Lane and Keyhaven Road, marsh and reed bed area between Harewood Green, river and Vidle Van.</p> <p>Attention drawn to detrimental impact on views from conservation area of recycling shed at New Milton Sand and Ballast.</p>	<p>would seek influence the highway management.</p> <p>Amendments made to boundary to include fields south of Vidle Van, between Keyhaven Road Saltgrass Lane and east of Aubrey Farm.</p> <p>Inclusion of the marsh and reed bed area would not introduce any additional control on this land and there is no definitive boundary to the north, although it is acknowledged that the area is important to the setting of the conservation area.</p> <p>The recycling shed at New Milton Sand and Ballast. The buildings have conditional planning permission from Hampshire County Council.</p>
Member of public	<p>3.2.3 Include scout hut.</p> <p>Part 4:</p> <p>Some wide verges – being destroyed by lorries, concerns with entrance to Aubrey farm.</p> <p>Large individual mature tree specimens – oak trees in field behind Sedge End need more protection.</p> <p>Sounds, smells – Jet skis and large ribs launched. Intrusive helicopter noise and noise from other low flying aircraft.</p> <p>4.3.5 Spelling of Aubrey.</p>	<p>Some amendments made to character appraisal.</p> <p>This is not a matter which conservation area management can address. However In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence the highway management.</p> <p>The trees at Sedge End are within the existing conservation area and therefore protected.</p> <p>Amendments made to boundary to include fields south of Vidle Van, between Keyhaven Road Saltgrass Lane and east of Aubrey Farm.</p> <p>The National Park Authority will work with partners to maintain, extend and enhance the tranquillity of the National Park. Any works carried out without but</p>

<b>From</b>	<b>Summary of view</b>	<b>NFNPA comments</b>
	<p>4.3.6 Spelling of medieval.</p> <p>4.3.8 Suggestions for inclusion: fields north and east of Aubrey Farm, field south of Vidle Van, fields between Saltgrass Lane and Keyhaven Road, triangle field south of Saltgrass stables.</p> <p>4.3.11 Mixed hedging using 50% hawthorn planted around field to south of Aubrey House.</p> <p>4.3.15 Thought Vidle Van dated from 1650.</p> <p>4.3.17 Aubrey House built 1780. Has classical south facing Georgian façade, unusually main entrance door is on north side.</p> <p>4.3.21 Early 19th century eastern extension; mostly a modern replacement.</p> <p>4.3.23 Old stable block to Aubrey House in now garage to Aubrey Lodge which was built in the walled garden of Aubrey House 1980's.</p> <p>4.3.31 Visitor activity at Hurst Castle should be encouraged and supported by National Park.</p> <p>What is National Park Authority policy on helicopters, jet skis and large ribs?</p>	<p>requiring planning permission will be investigated by the National Park Authority's planning enforcement team.</p>
<p>Member of public</p>	<p>Strange that only mention of Hawkers Cottage is in 4.3.13 since one of the oldest houses in Keyhaven and has particular interest to many on account of</p>	<p>Hawkers Cottage has now been further mentioned. Coastguard Cottages mentioned at 5.2.2.</p>

<b>From</b>	<b>Summary of view</b>	<b>NFNP comments</b>
	its association with Colonel Hawker who arranged for building 6 April 1815. Also no mention of Old Coastguard Cottages.	
Member of public	In support of concept of National Park but area between built up areas of Lymington and Milford should be included.	The consultation relates to Keyhaven conservation area and cannot address the National Park boundary.
Milford-on-Sea Parish Council	<p>Include: field south of Vidle Van, field south of Aubrey house, field between Saltgrass Lane and Keyhaven Road, marsh and reed bed area between Harwood Green, river and Vidle Van.</p> <p>Consider including: dilapidated farm buildings along side Vidle Van Farm House, westerly properties north of Keyhaven Road.</p> <p>Some residents would like to see Harwood Green included but Parish Council has reservations (notes these not of architectural merit but nor are other buildings in conservation area).</p> <p>Mention pressure of car parking on hamlet.</p> <p>Clear away dead trees in wide verge between Basket's Field and road.</p>	<p>Amendments made to boundary to include fields south of Vidle Van, between Keyhaven Road Saltgrass Lane and east of Aubrey Farm.</p> <p>Inclusion of the marsh and reed bed area would not introduce any additional control on this land and there is no definitive boundary to the north, although it is acknowledged that the area is important to the setting of the conservation area.</p> <p>Modern agricultural buildings have not been included as these do not contribute to the special character of the area.</p> <p>The cottages to the north side of Keyhaven Road have unfortunately been significantly altered and the remaining buildings are a mixture of bungalows and more recent housing. Their inclusion could not therefore be justified.</p> <p>Dead trees in verge – point forwarded to Hampshire County Council Highways and New Forest District Council Tree Officer</p>

<b>From</b>	<b>Summary of view</b>	<b>NFNPA comments</b>
	Appreciate informative presentation and consultation.	
New Forest Association	Supports inclusion of additional areas. Revised boundary better relates the conservation area to the waterside and saltmarsh but remains tightly drawn and fragmented. Recommends fields east of Aubrey Farm, south of Vidle Van and between Keyhaven Road and Saltgrass Lane are included.	Support welcomed.  Amendments made to boundary to include fields south of Vidle Van, between Keyhaven Road Saltgrass Lane and east of Aubrey Farm.

## Ashlett Creek

**Questionnaire respondents** – Six respondents completed questionnaires.

**Other respondents** – Four additional responses was received (one also completed a questionnaire).

A meeting was held at Ashlett Mill attended by approximately 45 people. There was particular interest in the proposed extension of the conservation area and the reason for this. A number of individuals expressed concern about the proposal and implications for the mooring of boats.

### Questionnaire analysis

#### Question1:

**Do you think that the character appraisal covers all important characteristics of the conservation area?**

**Please circle either YES or NO.**

Covers all important characteristics	
Yes – Number of respondents	No – Number of respondents
6	0

Comments	NFPA comments
Seems all areas have been covered.	Noted.
Do not understand reason for inclusion of small area of land adjoining Ashlett Sailing Club.	This is to ensure the boundary follows a defined line and is not arbitrarily drawn.
Overly detailed and repetitive.	The appraisal follows the format recommended by English Heritage.

**Question 2:**

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

**Please circle either YES or NO.**

Other important characteristics not mentioned	
Yes – Number of respondents	No – Number of respondents
1	5

<b>Characteristics listed</b>	<b>NFPA comments</b>
The condition of the old rifle range, back of mill land.	This is outside the conservation area.
Little or no attention to how the Jolly Sailor conducts business, using Victoria Quay for picnic tables; which have then been used by individuals causing criminal damage.	This is not a matter which conservation area designation can address.

**Question 3:**

**Do you have any additional information which you would like to see included in the character appraisal? Please outline below:**

<b>Additional information</b>	<b>NFPA Comments</b>
Victoria Quay green not to be used by public house to increase business.	This is not a matter which conservation area designation can address.
Better implementation of traditional characteristics of village.	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. New development should aspire to a quality of design and execution related to its context.

**Question 4:**

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

Please tick all those that you feel detract.

<b>Number of respondents selecting feature</b>	<b>Feature</b>
2	Appearance of some properties
	Loss of original details from buildings, such as windows
4	Condition of some properties
2	Inappropriate property boundaries
	Inappropriate modern development
1	Overhead lines
1	Street furniture (e.g. bins, bus shelters, seats)
1	Road signs
2	Loss of trees and hedgerows
	Other

If you ticked 'Other', please explain below:

Explanation	NFNPA Comments
Concern expressed at condition of Jolly Sailor public house.	In any future conservation area management proposals the Authority would seek influence the appropriate repair of buildings.

**NFNPA Comments**

The local planning 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.

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 planning authorities to draw up a management strategy for their conservation areas and therefore helpful to understand, 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), issues such as signage and overhead lines and the condition of properties.

**Question 5:**

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

Please circle either YES or NO.

**YES / NO**

Character of proposed conservation area could be enhanced	
Yes – Number of respondents	No – Number of respondents
4	2

**If yes, how?**

<b>Suggestion</b>	<b>NFPA comments</b>
Some tidying up here and there.	Noted.
By better monitoring and policing by the National Park Authority.	The issues raised (unauthorised use of land, vandalism) area not matters which fall within the responsibility of the National Park Authority.
Speed control on lane as you approach the Creek.	This is not a matter which conservation area management can address.
More design consideration given to the approach to Ashlett from Fawley, especially high close boarded fences.	The Authority will seek to influence such works where they require planning permission (in the case of boarded fences, over 2 metres high generally and 1metre adjacent to a highway).

**Question 6:**

**Do you agree with the proposed changes to the conservation area boundary?**

Please circle either YES or NO:

Agree with the proposed boundary	
Yes – Number of respondents	No – Number of respondents
4	2

**If NO, what changes would you like to see?**

<b>Changes suggested</b>	<b>NFNPA Comments</b>
There is no need to extend the area to include the Creek.	The creek is an important part of the history and character of the conservation area and provides the historic and visual context for the historic buildings. The boundary is therefore proposed to be extended to include the heads of the creek.
With some reservations, namely interference with the running of the sailing club.	Conservation area designation/extension does/ would not affect the running of the sailing club.
Sufficient cover already.	The creek is an important part of the history and character of the conservation area and provides the historic and visual context for the historic buildings. The boundary is therefore proposed to be extended to include the heads of the creek.

**Question 7:**

**Do you have any other comments about the character appraisal or proposed boundary changes? Please outline below:**

<b>Comments</b>	<b>NFNPA Comments</b>
A very fair and reasoned explanation has been given and has allayed my fears as a member of Ashlett Sailing Club.	Noted.
There are sufficient controls in place already. Another layer is unnecessary.	Extension of the conservation area as proposed would not add another layer of control.
The area is furiously protected by a very active sailing club. They police the area and are very conscious of planning rules. They have planted trees around the compound. Wonder if you are giving yourself extra work.	Extension of the conservation area as proposed would not result in extra work.
The area already covered is not properly regulated and existing properties are left in an appalling state, namely the Jolly Sailor public	The authority is involved in the restoration of Ashlett House and is pursuing the condition of the Jolly Sailor

<b>Comments</b>	<b>NFNPA Comments</b>
house and Ashlett House.	public house.
Important for local council to enforce appropriate use of green. More vigorous enforcement of anti-dog fouling.	These are not matters within the control of the National Park Authority.
Entirely agree with statements contained in appraisal and boundary proposals. It is essential that the character of this area and its approaches are not only maintained, but improved and enhanced.	Support welcomed.

#### **Other respondents - letters/e-mail/ telephone**

<b>From</b>	<b>Summary of view</b>	<b>NFNPA comments</b>
Member of public	Well conceived and informative set of documents. In favour of general tenet of observations.	Support welcomed.
Fawley Parish Council	The Parish Council is interested in what happens to the area and would make comments on the rare plants, historic character and beauty of the area, use by local residents. The Council own and maintain Victoria Quay, the gravel hard and the grassed area adjacent. It provides moorings for a number of small boats. The Council is keen to maintain the character and beauty of the area.	Noted.
New Forest District Council	Agrees that the creek is part of the setting of the conservation area. Recommends that if the boundary is to be extended, then it would be better extending it to the edge of the reed beds on the salt marshes as this would provide a more clearly defined area and	Support welcomed and agree with point regarding boundary position.

<b>From</b>	<b>Summary of view</b>	<b>NFNPA comments</b>
	boundary which would be appreciated at all states of the tide.	
Shoosmiths Solicitors on behalf of Esso	<p>Objects to the designation of its land as a conservation area. The appraisal is not considered to provide adequate justification for the proposed extension of the conservation area. It is noted that part of the proposed extension is within the administrative control of New Forest District Council. The legal tests of conservation area designation are noted – to determine which parts of the Authority’s area are of special architectural or historic and to decide whether or not it is desirable to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of that interest. Reference is made to guidance in PPG15 and provided by English Heritage. It is considered that, as the proposed extension does not contain any significant buildings and does not possess any of the characteristics that conservation areas are designed to protect. It is considered that area itself should have ‘special interest’ and its importance to the setting of the conservation area is not sufficient to justify its inclusion in the designation.</p>	<p>The proposed extension to the conservation area is predominantly is mud flats at the head of the creek. It includes small piers and moorings and a small area of land adjoining the sailing club building.</p> <p>The proposed extension cannot be considered in isolation (if it were, it is agreed that it would not meet the necessary criteria for designation). It is considered to be an important area as it completes the setting for the historic buildings and is prominent in views into and out of the conservation area.</p> <p>PPG15 states “...Given the nature of conservation area controls...designation is not likely to be appropriate as a means of protecting landscape features, except where they form an integral part of the historic built environment...”.</p> <p>Extension of the area as proposed is considered appropriate as it forms an integral part of the historic built environment of Ashlett Creek conservation area.</p> <p>The proposed extension will not impact on business or value of landholding.</p>