

## EXETER CITY COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE  
7 APRIL 2009

### RESULTS OF CONSULTATION ON MONT LE GRAND CONSERVATION AREA BOUNDARY CHANGES AND MANAGEMENT PLAN

#### 1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To consider representations received in relation to the draft Mont le Grand Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (CAAMP) and proposed amendments to the document to be recommended for adoption.

#### 2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 On 16 September 2008 Executive agreed the draft Mont Le Grand Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan for public consultation.
- 2.2 Copies of the document were made available from the Civic Centre and on the Council website. Due to the lack of any suitable community facility in the area in which to hold a public exhibition, each household within the existing conservation area and the proposed additions was sent a letter with details of where the document could be viewed, a consultation form and an extract of the document outlining the proposed boundary alterations. A period of six weeks was allowed for comments.
- 2.3 Fourteen responses were received; 7 were in favour of the boundary amendments, 4 were partially in favour and 2 were opposed and 1 asked some questions but did not comment.
- 2.4 The main issues raised were:
- General agreement with the inclusion of Polsloe Road properties.
  - Differences of opinion on the merits of including North and South Avenue, the Occupational Health building on Heavitree Road and the terraces adjacent to Bicton Park.
  - Appearance and signage of the Costcutter store should be improved.
- 2.5 Officers considered that the boundary should remain as initially proposed with no further changes. These amendments will also affect the boundaries of Heavitree and Belmont Conservation Areas. A plan of each boundary is attached.
- 2.6 A proposed amended version of the draft CAAMP for adoption is in the Members' Room.

#### 3 PLANNING MEMBER WORKING GROUP

- 3.1 In answer to a Member's question, the Conservation Officer stated the inclusion of Ladysmith School had been considered and whilst the school was interesting in terms of the social history of the area, the later buildings and extensions had altered its character substantially. However, a paragraph had been added to the appraisal to outline the history.

3.2 Members supported the adoption of the amended conservation area, the appraisal and management plan and the amended boundaries for Belmont and Heavitree Conservation Areas.

#### **4 RECOMMENDATION**

- 4.1
- i) That the amended Mont le Grand Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan be adopted and the boundary altered in accordance with the attached plan;
  - ii) That the amended boundaries for Belmont and Heavitree Conservation Areas be adopted and authority delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control to update the documents to reflect these changes.

**RICHARD SHORT**  
**HEAD OF PLANNING AND BUILDING CONTROL**

**ECONOMY AND DEVELOPMENT DIRECTORATE**

**Background papers used in compiling this report:**  
None

## APPENDIX I

### SCHEDULE OF COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION, MONT LE GRAND CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL & MANAGEMENT PLAN

*Proposed response in italics*

Address	Comments
1. no address given	Agrees with proposed boundary amendments, houses in Polsloe Road deserve more care, as do houses to south of Baring Crescent. <i>No comments.</i>
2. 67 Polsloe Road	Proposed amendments give integrity to a refined neighbourhood. Pleased to see inclusion of Occupational Health Building on Heavitree Road. The new Jury's Inn Hotel on Western Way obscures views of Polsloe Road Ridge from Paris Street. Signage and advertisements at Costcutter on Polsloe Road are detrimental to the conservation area. <i>Comments noted. The Council considers carefully the impact on views as part of the decision process on all applications. However, in considering an application it must take a balanced view on all the issues raised by a proposal. Scope for improvements to signage at the Costcutter Store will be investigated</i>
3. 14 Grendon Road	Agrees that proposed amendments more fully reflect the historic area. The buildings and features are suitably covered in the appraisal document. It is important to conserve the many historic buildings in Exeter in this way. <i>Comments noted.</i>
4. 7 South Avenue	Proposed boundary amendments more fully reflect the historic area. Notes a house behind No. 1 South Avenue that appears to have been built without consent and subject to an enforcement case. Impressed by detail and comments within the appraisal and agrees with aspects of an Article 4 Direction (control over conversion of front gardens to parking). Notes that conservation area status would not necessarily prevent development. <i>The Enforcement case has been closed due to the property being over 4 years old and no evidence of it being a separate dwelling. Other comments noted</i>
5. By email, no address given	Supports boundary amendments but suggests conservation area be extended to include the open grassed area on the SW side of Gladstone Road/Polsloe Road junction and also the planting along the west side of Polsloe Road to the north of Gladstone Road. Notes that the appraisal does not go into as much detail on the areas proposed for inclusion as it does for the existing conservation area and suggests further analysis should be included. Points out two examples of local interest within the proposed inclusions; another Garlanded lamp column on South Avenue and the dark bricks that are used in many of the Victorian properties that came form the local brickworks. Comments that when finalising the

	<p>appraisal, the Council could identify some possible future priorities for small-scale improvements to the public realm. Would also like some funds to be allocated for the preparation of a leaflet for the community highlighting the history and character of the conservation area. Early OS maps should be reproduced to draw attention to local details.</p> <p><i>The areas proposed for inclusion will be more thoroughly covered within the text in the final version and the points of interested noted will be taken into account. The Management Plan section of the document identifies public realm enhancements. The appraisal document itself highlights the history and character of the conservation area in sufficient detail. Early OS maps are reproduced in the document.</i></p>
<p>6. 19 Mont le Grand</p>	<p>Agrees with the proposed boundary amendments; the current boundaries seem to be arbitrary given the nature of the proposed inclusions. Requests whether there is an opportunity to tackle the appearance of Costcutter on Polsloe Road. Asks whether there may be any material changes to the area such as to the traditional tiled street signs and the lamp posts. Will Bicton Place Park remain protected?</p> <p><i>The appearance of Costcutter has been noted within the document as having a negative impact on the conservation area and scope for improvements will be investigated. There is an enhancement project underway to restore/replace damaged Minton tiled street signs and an audit of the signs within the conservation area has been made. Bicton Place Park is an important area of open space within the conservation area and any development proposals that would damage its amenity or appearance would be resisted.</i></p>
<p>7. 1 North Avenue</p>	<p>Fully supports the extension of the conservation area. Was any consideration given to treating the boundaries of the former Polsloe Park Estate as conservation area? Asked whether consideration had been given to how to mark the extension of the area by and suggests an event with the Heavitree History Society.</p> <p><i>The former Polsloe Park Estate, bordered by Pinhoe Road, Ladysmith Road, Polsloe Road and South Avenue, takes in many typical Victorian properties which , whilst of interest, need to be considered against similar development over the whole of Exeter before designation could be proposed. The Heavitree Society will be approached after adoption of the document to see whether they wish to use it as the basis for an event.</i></p>
<p>8. 22 North Avenue</p>	<p>Objects to inclusion of properties in North and South Avenues, Bicton Place and Regents Park on the basis that they are pleasant late Victorian Houses but almost all of them have been altered in some way and therefore do not justify inclusion. Considers that there would be an additional level of bureaucracy without any real public benefit. Also objects to the inclusion of the Occupational Health Building on Heavitree Road by virtue that it is not of any merit and has no continuity with other properties on Heavitree Road. Agrees that houses on Polsloe Road should be included apart from no's. 63 – 65 which are more modern.</p> <p><i>One of the criteria by which amendments are considered is that</i></p>

	<p><i>changes in attitude to architecture and history should be addressed. There may be individual buildings that have had their character spoiled by unsuitable alterations, however, the townscape composition is still intact and therefore they are worthy of inclusion. There are additional controls placed on properties within conservation areas, however, these are not considered to outweigh the wider benefits for the community. The Occupational Health Building is similarly considered to be a building of merit due to its size, stature, detail, lack of visible intervention and its presence in the street scene. 63 – 65 Polsloe Road is a good group of 20<sup>th</sup> century buildings in terms of their scale, massing and detailing and are worthy of inclusion .</i></p>
9. 40a Polsloe Road	<p>Agrees with most of the proposed boundary amendments but comments that 39a – d and 40a Polsloe Road and 1 Sampsons Lane are modern infill and therefore should not be subject to conservation area restrictions, <i>The reason for this proposed extension is to protect the wider historic townscape and development of the ridgeline. Exclusion of individual properties would be counter to this, it is inevitable that some infill properties will be included within any conservation area.</i></p>
10. 39a Polsloe Road	<p>Boundary alterations seem to make no difference to the historic area. 39a – d and 40a Polsloe Road and 1 Sampsons Lane are modern infill and therefore should not be subject to conservation area restrictions, 36 – 39 Polsloe Road could remain in Belmont area and Mont le Grand could be extended as far as no. 40. <i>The reason for this proposed extension is to protect the wider historic townscape and development of the ridgeline. Exclusion of individual properties would be counter to this and it is inevitable that some infill properties will be included within any conservation area.</i></p>
11. 39d Polsloe Road	<p>Agrees with boundary alterations except for 39a – d and 40a Polsloe Road and 1 Sampsons Lane that are modern infill and therefore should not be subject to conservation area restrictions. 39d in particular does not have any street frontage. <i>The reason for this proposed extension is to protect the wider historic townscape and development of the ridgeline. Exclusion of individual properties would be counter to this and it is inevitable that some infill properties will be included within any conservation area.</i></p>
12. 19 South Avenue	<p>Does not welcome another layer of bureaucracy. Houses survive by allowing the owners to live in them and adapt them to their lives. Wants explanation as to what is being conserved and justification for the decisions. <i>The Council has a duty under the Planning (listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to determine which parts of their area are areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance and to designate those areas as conservation areas. Within Conservation Areas, it is the character of the area as a whole that is important and, unlike listed buildings where the decision to list lies with the Secretary of State, judgement is made by the Local Planning</i></p>

	<p><i>Authority on the basis of local and not national criteria. The City Council has set a list of criteria against which new conservation areas or alterations to existing boundaries are measured. In setting these criteria, it is essential that the “specialness”, in the local or regional context, is recognised and the City Council has sought to establish a consistent and responsible approach when considering the extent of designation and its adequacy across the whole of the city. Conservation area designation in itself is not a block to development and progression, it simply indicates that the area has architectural or historic value that should be carefully considered when determining any applications that may affect this character.</i></p>
<p>13. By email, no address</p>	<p>Does not think that the boundary amendments should go ahead due to ECC’s practice of building on conservation areas, in particular Rowancroft.</p> <p><i>Proposed boundary amendments are based upon the application of a consistent set on principles. Conservation areas are not themselves constraints to development, they merely apply a duty to preserve or enhance the character. The approval of the development at Rowancroft was a decision endorsed by an independent planning inspector.</i></p>
<p>14. By email, no address</p>	<p>Wants to know why 5 areas have been excluded; Ladysmith School; Ladysmith school playing field; 4 houses in North Avenue; All but 3 houses in East Avenue; Other 1900’s building on the Hospital site.</p> <p><i>Ladysmith School is a typical early twentieth century school building that has been greatly extended and altered. Whilst it is interesting in terms of the social history of the area, the later buildings and extensions have altered its character substantially, however a paragraph has been added to the appraisal to outline the history. The properties in North Avenue and East Avenue are not considered to be of sufficient quality to justify inclusion into the conservation area. The other buildings on the hospital site will be investigated further before Planning Member Working Group.</i></p>