

Appendix 7: Summary of Consultation Feedback

Clifftown Conservation Area Appraisal

36 responses received.

Majority of responses received from residents/property owners.

Majority of respondents agreed that the Appraisal had adequately identified the area's special architectural/historic interest. In regard to any other aspects of special interest that should be included within the appraisal, most respondents didn't think anything else needed to be included. However, in terms of what else could be included, respondents highlighted elements such as the park, church, shops, university, seafront, avenue of trees and bowling green (*note: the bowling green, Prittlewell Square gardens, areas of green space on Clifftown Parade and The Shrubbery, Clifftown Theatre and Studios (former church), are all part of the Conservation Area. The university buildings, to the north of Southend Central station are not within the context area and have not been considered to be an element that should be included, not being immediately associated with the Conservation Area's historic growth*). The majority of respondents felt that the appraisal had identified the good and the harmful features of the conservation area, however some respondents felt there were other aspects to be addressed including: the amount of the signage for parking (*note: this is not immediately within the scope of the conservation area appraisal, however the management plan includes recommendations in regard to street furniture*); one respondent noted that sign writing in Nelson Mews (*note: reference to this is added to the appraisal*); a number of respondents were supportive of the extension of the Article 4 Direction to ensure the character and appearance of the conservation area is retained.

When asked how the appearance of the Conservation Area could best be improved, responses included better maintenance of properties from residents, maintenance of trees and pavements (*note: the conservation area appraisal includes a management plan, although maintenance is outside the scope of the appraisal it is encouraged*), control conversions to flats (*note: this is outside the scope of a conservation area appraisal, planning permission is required, but the wider implications of this can be considered on a case by case basis*), replace street lighting with historic columns, restrictions on replacing windows with upvc (*note: there is an Article 4 Direction within the area which restricts permitted development rights, including replacing windows, and it is proposed to extend this Article 4 Direction to include more properties*). In terms of the boundary, most respondents were happy with the area's boundary, however one felt parts of the High Street and other parts of Alexandra Street should be included (*note: the boundary was considered as part of the production of the appraisal and it was not considered that it necessitated extension*). In regard to planning controls, the majority of respondents agreed that permitted development rights should be controlled, including windows, chimneys, driveways, boundaries, front doors, porches (*note: the appraisal recommended that the Article 4 Direction was modified to include front doors and chimneys, features such as windows, porches, hardstanding and enclosures are already included in the Article 4 Direction*).

Leigh Conservation Area Appraisal

20 responses received.

All responses were received from residents and property owners.

The majority of respondents considered that the appraisal had adequately identified the area's special architectural or historic interest, of those respondents who didn't, comments included: too many similar new businesses, not looking after the historical and original side of the town (*note: types of businesses are not within the scope of a conservation area appraisal. The appraisal has been produced to provide a detailed review of the historic character of the conservation area, including a management plan to ensure its historic character and appearance is conserved and enhanced*). The majority of respondents commented that the appraisal had adequately identified the good and harmful features, although one respondent commented that original bricks should be preserved (*note: the current Article 4 Direction in Leigh restricts a number of permitted development rights to dwellinghouses covered by the Direction, including the rendering of brickwork*). When asked how best the appearance of the Conservation Area could be improved, responses included traffic restrictions (*note: this is outside the scope of a conservation area appraisal*), upholding conservation planning rules, and respecting the history and existing small businesses of the area. In regard to the boundary, the majority of respondents felt that the boundary was appropriate. A response from Leigh Town Council suggested that other streets could be included – all of Broadway West, Rectory Grove, Leigh Road, part of Elm Road specifically up to Pall Mall to incorporate the school (*note: the boundary was reviewed as part of this process and representations considered, however it was determined that the current boundaries did not require amendment at this time*). The majority of respondents considered that planning controls are needed for certain type of permitted development – including windows, doors, roofs, shop fronts

Leigh Cliff Conservation Area Appraisal

17 responses received.

Majority of responses received from residents / property owners.

All respondents considered that, in general, the Appraisal adequately identified the area's special architectural/historic interest and most considered that there weren't any other aspects of special interest that should be included. A small number of respondents considered there were other elements to consider, including Undercliff Gardens (*note: while relatively close to the south-eastern edge of the Conservation Area this has a very different character and context, and is separated by the road*). The boundary of the Conservation Area was reviewed as part of the production of the appraisal but it wasn't considered that an extension to include Undercliff Gardens was appropriate). All respondents considered that the Appraisals had adequately identified the good and the harmful features of the area. In regard

to improving the appearance of the Conservation Area, responses included inappropriate shopfronts and unsympathetic changes to residential properties including to windows, how people use the area – including leaving litter and busy, heavy traffic using Cliff Parade (note: management of this is outside the scope of the Conservation Area Appraisal although elements such as the busyness of certain roads and the potential impact on the setting of the Conservation Area are noted). When asked about the boundary of the Conservation Area, the majority of respondents agreed with this. One respondent considered that Cliff Gardens should be included within the Conservation Area (note: the gardens have a very different character to the Conservation Area, being an open space rather than an urban built up area, and are separated from the Conservation Area by the road. They also comprise a protected green space in the Council's existing adopted development plan for the Borough and are recognised as such in the early iterations of the new Southend Local Plan). Most respondents considered that planning controls are needed for minor types of permitted development – including support for restricting permitted development rights for change of windows, boundaries, roofs, replacing like for like. When asked what could conserve or enhance the area, responses included: preventing anti-social behaviour (note: this is outside the scope of the Conservation Area Appraisal), buildings maintained and built with consideration for the area. Other issues raised included- creating residents parking (note: not within the scope of the appraisal), and preventing parking on verges/pavements.

Milton Conservation Area Appraisal

33 responses received.

Responses were largely received from residents and property owners and the majority of respondents considered that, in general, the appraisal had adequately identified the area's special architectural or historic interest. Most respondents didn't think there were other aspects of special interest which should be included in the Appraisal, those who did identified residents parking (note: this isn't within the scope of the appraisal). A detailed response was submitted by the Milton Conservation Society, and points made have been addressed within the appraisal as appropriate, including – reference to the coach house, reference to Prittlewell, reference to Acres, text regarding St Vincent Mews, time period of Miltons development. Overall, most respondents considered that the appraisal had identified the good and harmful features, although one responses considered that residents parking needed to be considered (note: as above, this is outside the scope of the appraisal), one respondent thought a wider area should be included, such as the cliff lift and promenade (note: this is located within the Clifftown Conservation Area and is not immediately in the context of Milton Conservation Area). When asked how the conservation area could best be improved, responses included, parking restrictions, replacing fences with railings, public realm enhancements, more tree planting, renovating park road church, reinstating original features. The majority of respondents agreed with the boundary, one respondent considered areas of the London Road and Hamlet Court Road should be included (note: Hamlet Court Road is not in the immediate context of the Milton Conservation Area. A Conservation Area was recently designated at Hamlet Court Road in September 2021). In their response, the Milton

Conservation Society highlighted that they considered properties on Avenue Road should be included (note: this was taken into consideration when reviewing the appraisal, however no changes to the boundary are proposed – these properties were considered to have been subject to more alteration to windows and driveways as those to the south). There was a mix of views as to whether planning controls were needed for minor types of permitted development – those who considered that controls were needed thought that windows, doors, boundaries, materials, roofs should be controlled. The Milton Conservation Society considered that the Article 4 should be extended to include properties on Park Terrace, and modified to include works to roofs, chimneys and party wall parapets, alterations to front doors, and alterations to front boundary walls (note: this has been reviewed and considered as part of the production of the Appraisal, which includes recommendations to extend the Article 4 to include: 2-12 and 16-30 (even) Park Terrace and 1-15 (odd) Park Terrace, and to modify the Article 4 to include: the alteration of any door which fronts highway, works to chimneys and to party wall parapets, the alteration, construction or demolition of a means of enclosure which fronts a highway (walls, gates, fences etc) and the installation of hardstanding for vehicles. Article 4 Directions will be dealt with separately from the appraisal).

Shoebury Garrison Conservation Area Appraisal

32 responses received.

The majority of responses were received from residents/ property owners and most agreed that the area's special architectural or historic interest had been adequately identified. One respondent raised concerns regarding traffic in the conservation area, generated by businesses (note: this is a matter dealt with outside the scope of this appraisal). Most respondents didn't think there were any other aspects of special interest that should be included. However, some respondents thought other aspects should be included, such as: the heritage centre (note: this is included in the conservation area, although at the time of writing was not open); The Garrison Church (note: this is within the conservation area and reference to it included), the original gates (note further reference has been added to these), further reference to the regiments occupying the garrison (note: further reference added), Horseshoe Crescent and their design (note: this is within the conservation area and included within the appraisal). Most respondents didn't think there was anything else that should not be included, however one respondent considered that the Carriage and Wagon Shed should be removed from the appraisal (note: this structure is Grade II listed, it is located within the conservation area and remains as such). When asked if all the good and harmful features had been identified, most respondents answered 'yes'. Some respondents raised concern with dog mess, the number of visitors being attracted to the area and trucks/lorries associated within deliveries to local businesses (note: these are matters that are outside the scope of the appraisal. Site specific matters are dealt with by relevant Officers as appropriate), boundary fence to southern boundary adjacent to the boat house (note: it is understood that the erection of this fence is part of a coastal defence scheme and has been erected to address anti-social behaviour). In terms of improving the appearance of the conservation area,

responses included, providing more bins, securing car parks, bringing empty buildings back to use, protecting garrison church, enhancing the High Street, more information boards. There was support for controls to minor forms of permitted development, including windows, brickwork, boundaries, extensions (note: an Article 4 Direction is proposed to some areas of the conservation area that do not already benefit from the covenant in place that restricts some permitted development rights). In regard to other aspects of special interest that should be included in the appraisal, most respondents didn't consider there was anything else to add, however one respondent considered there should be mention of the 'domed' roofing on some of the buildings.

The Leas Conservation Area Appraisal

17 responses were received.

The majority of respondents were residents, property owners and businesses also responded. Most respondents considered that, in general, the Appraisal has identified the area's special architectural/historic interest. One respondent considered that the appraisal was too brief, and one thought areas of little/no value were included, one response considered that the domed roofing on some buildings should be referenced (note: where there is a corner/domed/turret room feature this is included in the property descriptions). One respondent commented that there considered there was little in the conservation area that was really worth conservation status, although agreed with some properties including the leas and Shorefield Road in parts. Some respondents raised concern regarding conversions of properties to HMOs, while another raised concern with anti social behaviour and litter, residents parking was also highlighted as was the public realm. In regard to the boundary, comments included some areas that respondents felt could be excluded including manor road, clifton road and the sun shelter, while others felt that the boundary should remain as it is, and another respondent considered that the area should be made wider (note: the boundary has been reviewed as part of the production of the appraisal and in light of comments received during the consultation process. A very minor amendment to the boundary is proposed, to include 22 Pembury Road, no further changes are now proposed). The majority of respondents did not think that planning controls were needed for minor types of development, of those respondents who did, aspects of development they considered should be controlled included minor extensions, boundaries, materials, windows.