

London Borough of Wandsworth

CONSULTATION ON DRAFT CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISALS – RESPONSES ANALYSIS

April 2023

Sutherland Grove

A public consultation regarding the Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) for Sutherland Grove received 31 responses, 29 from members of the public and 2 from societies etc. 20 responses were in favour, 3 responses were neutral, and 8 responses disagreed with the draft CAA

1. Do you agree or disagree with the assessment and management plan proposed for your chosen conservation area?
2. If you would like to provide any further comments based on your choice above, please give details below.
3. Do you agree or disagree with the proposed additions to the Local List of Buildings of Architectural and Historic Interest.
4. The updated Conservation Area Appraisals have been produced in web-based format. How do you feel about this format?
5. Please provide any comments relating to this web-based approach, including accessibility and user friendliness.
6. Please use the space below to provide any additional comments.

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
1	Yes/No? Unknown	Management plan needs more clarity. (Neutral)	2. The document could benefit with some further detail in the Management Strategy section regarding advice for the buildings in Area 2 Whitelands/Gilbert Scott Character Area. Some clauses in the management plan appear to be written as a global statement for the whole conservation area but only have relevance for Area 1. For example, the Windows section of the Management section states 'Sash windows should be single panes with no glazing bars or a simple two-over-two'. While, this statement has relevance to	2. Noted, the Management strategy will be reviewed and amended where necessary to better reflect the Whitelands character area 4. Noted	Yes, see officer comments

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>the Sutherland Grove character area it is not relevant to the sash windows within the GSB building which are small multi-paned timber sash windows.</p> <p>4. Mostly positive</p>		
2.		Agree	<p>2. I enjoyed seeing so many photos that show the best features of SGCA to inspire us to value it. I appreciate the care that has gone into producing this draft Appraisal and Management Strategy. I would like the approach to solar panels to be amended though. Its good for us all to have opportunity to live more sustainably. With the big roof-area that those of us in houses have, solar panels can be part of this. if they are not allowed on the front of the house, no one whose house face south can do it. Solar panels can blend in with most roof materials. Maybe there is a way that residents could get approval from Wandsworth's conservation department for their solar panel design without the expense of having to get full planning permission? They needn't spoil the attractiveness of SGCA. In the future solar tiles may be practical but they really expensive at the moment. More people will also want to be able to charge electric cars on their drives. There are good examples in SGCA where this can be done without spoiling the front garden. SGCA can be beautiful & sustainable.</p> <p>3. I don't think this question applies to SGCA?</p> <p>4. Positive</p>	<p>2. Solar panels can have a significant impact on the appearance of a dwelling and this change can result in harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area – there is a legislative duty to preserve or enhance this under Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Side and rear elevations are often more suitable locations to avoid this harm. Applications will always be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Charging EVs on existing drives is supported and encouraged, but over landscaping front gardens where there is no existing drive can have a dramatic impact on the streetscape and erode the typical suburban garden character of the Area, which has been identified as a key contributor to its character and appearance. Where there is demonstratable thought given to preserving the garden, applications will be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>3. Noted, this question was included for all 8 areas being consulted on, and it</p>	No

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			5. Its puzzling that there doesn't seem to be a direct link from the draft Appraisal to this online response.	<p>should have been clarified it was not applicable in this instance</p> <p>4. Noted</p> <p>5. Noted, a clearer link between the documents and the appraisal responses will be considered to implement in future consultations</p>	
3.		Disagree	<p>2. Improving our homes' environmental sustainability should be the number one priority. It is wrong that the SGCA wishes to object against residents installing double or triple glazing windows, nor should it object to solar panels on any of the elevations. Our housing stock needs to move forward with the times, rather than entrench itself in the past unnecessarily at the sake of the environment. Making it harder for residents to improve their homes - practically and financially - is irresponsible in this respect.</p> <p>Further, some suggestions go too far - what are we actually conserving at this point? For example, most original single glazed windows have already been replaced. Preventing the remaining few from doing would not be fair. Further, suggesting that roughcast should be preserved in its unpainted form is simply unnecessary - very few people like it and most houses have painted it already or even removed it and replaced with modern smooth render (which has been approved by the planners, and thus precedent already set). To then object against other home owners painting their roughcast/pebbledash would, at</p>	<p>2. It is not the intention of the document to discourage sustainable measures such as double/triple glazing, but to present the options as those which are, from a heritage perspective, the most sympathetic, to greater degrees of intervention. For example, like-for-like matching replacements are often replacing existing single glazed windows but benefit from permitted development rights and therefore do not need formal planning permission. The text in the Management Strategy will be reviewed and amended as necessary to make this clearer. Noted regarding most windows having already been replaced with uPVC – the document acknowledges and identifies this as an element which erodes the identified character and appearance. The Management Strategy is intended as guidance for best practice and applications are considered on a case-by-case basis.</p>	No

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>this stage, be going against the norm and disadvantaging the few. These are not Listed Buildings - and nor should they be.</p> <p>Extensions should not be subject to such onerous restrictions - house prices and stamp duty is making moving and upsizing in the area totally unviable, and first floor extensions, loft conversions, and usable garden rooms are the most viable option to address this for the vast majority of home owners. The SGCA should not be making it harder for families to grow and live in the area.</p> <p>We do agree that total paving of front gardens is not ideal, and that green planting should be encouraged - unless there is a particular reason not to (e.g. disability access, or practical reasons such as facilitating EV charging/parking).</p> <p>It is worth remembering that 1930s housing stock is plentiful across London and the country and not particularly rare or special - there are more than 3 million across the country. The Southfields Grid is not subject to these conditions and it is arguable that this is also a special area of special characteristics due to its attractive and uniform character. The purpose of 1930s housing was to quickly meet housing stock demands at the time - and it should continue to serve that purpose today, rather than working against modern families seeking affordable ways to improve their home's environmental footprint and size and layout for modern family living. Respecting the past is</p>	<p>Solar panels can have a significant impact on the appearance of a dwelling and this change can result in harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area – there is a legislative duty to preserve or enhance this under Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Side and rear elevations are often more suitable locations to avoid this harm. Applications will always be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Roughcast elevations are a characteristic building finish to this period, building type, and area, and the loss of this feature has eroded the historic character, diluting the streetscape and creates a homogenous appearance, to the detriment of the conservation area. Retention of existing roughcast is encouraged to stop this erosion and preserve the existing character. Noted that these are not listed buildings, they are in a Conservation Area and are therefore subject to Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the NPPF, as well as Local Policies.</p> <p>Noted regarding onerous restrictions to extensions and the need for first floor extensions, loft conversions, and usable garden rooms. These types of alterations are frequently permitted in the Area provided they</p>	

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>not a bad thing, but the past is not necessarily superior and housing stock should meet the needs of the people and the environmental concerns of today, not the other way round.</p> <p>6. Disagree 7. Positive 8. Totally appropriate in today's age</p>	<p>are of a scale and appearance which is respectful of the host dwelling. Noted the respondent feels the Area is not particularly rare or special.</p> <p>3. Noted 4. Noted 5. Support of web based document noted</p>	
4.		Disagree	<p>2. My family and I have lived and continue to live in our properties in Sutherland Grove for almost the last 60 years. We have *aerial photographs of the area taken in 1963 which show that almost all the properties built in the 1920s included a gabled brick or prefabricated concrete garage in the long deep garden accessed via a shared driveway. The reason for this was to stop residents leaving their parked vehicles on the road and so preserve the open tree lined vista of Sutherland Grove. Most of the houses in Coombemartin and Skeena Hill had integral garages attached to the house for this very reason.</p> <p>There are now a group of residents who have rebuilt their garages, widened and lengthened them whilst going through the correct planning procedures and currently use them solely to park cars. However this has not been without some objection from local residents who have converted their garages to</p>	<p>2. Noted regarding loss of garages – while the use of garages for parking is encouraged, designation of a Conservation Area does not prohibit the conversion of garaged to living spaces under permitted development rights.</p> <p>3. Noted 4. Noted 5. Noted and comments received</p>	No

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>residential accommodation, or built wooden garden sheds or fences visible from the road which are an eyesore. Some residents have even gone to the extent of fencing the shared driveway.</p> <p>In the spirit of preserving this as a truly Conservation Area that retains the 1920s character we object to planning applications where garages are being replaced by timber sheds with black felt roofs, wood fencing or converted solely for the use as extensions as living accommodation and then parking several cars in the road</p> <p>3. Agree 4. Mostly Negative 5. We have encountered problems accessing this page hence the delay in submitting our comments.</p> <p>We have also mailed these comments to conform to the Council's deadline</p>		
5.		Disagree	<p>We would like to make 3 observations regarding the consultation: Windows - in light of the UK's net zero ambition it is unclear why the council are suggesting that single glazing for windows is the most acceptable replacement. Instead residents should be encouraged to have double or triple glazing.</p>	<p>2. Windows - It is not the intention of the document to discourage sustainable measures such as double/triple glazing, but to present the options as those which are, from a heritage perspective, the most sympathetic, to greater degrees of intervention. For example, like-for-like matching replacements are often replacing existing single glazed windows but benefit from permitted development rights and</p>	Yes, see officer comments

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>Roof extensions in semi detached paired houses — a semi detached house should not have to replicate what has been done by their adjacent neighbours in the pursuit of symmetry for symmetry's sake. Houses in the conservation area were predominantly designed to have a symmetrical or mirrored elevations, particularly those that form part of semidetached pairs. However it would appear that this consultation is advocating that where one neighbour has already built a roof extension (such as a side dormer) then the other neighbour has no choice but to replicate what their adjacent neighbour has already done in order to maintain the symmetry. Given that some of the roof extensions have been done in the 1980s-2000s and are rather bulky and aesthetically unpleasing in appearance, the requirement to mirror could have the unintended consequence of actually deteriorating the conservation area (by building a bulky side dormer when another option might be better). A semidetached neighbour should not be forced to replicate what has been done by their adjacent neighbour.</p> <p>Solar panels - again in light of the U.K.'s net zero ambition, consideration should be given to encouraging the use of renewable energy</p>	<p>therefore do not need formal planning permission. The text in the Management Strategy will be reviewed and amended as necessary to make this clearer.</p> <p>Roof extensions – Symmetry is a key element to the appearance of semi-detached pairs, and it is encouraged that the same or similar approaches are taken to retain this element. Interventions do not have to exactly match but can be inspired and informed by historic alterations, and their historic works are of an inferior quality, it is encouraged the design and form improved upon. In the situation of a matching pair, it is likely that only the same type of extension would be deemed appropriate, despite which half does it first. For example, it is best practice to insert a dormer into a hipped roof rather than convert a hipped roof to a gable roof, and this advice would be given to either applicant of a semi-detached pair.</p> <p>Solar panels - Solar panels can have a significant impact on the appearance of a dwelling and this change can result in harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area – there is a legislative duty to preserve or enhance this under Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Side and rear</p>	

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>sources such as solar panels. There are number of streets in the conservation area where the south facing roof faces the main road and residents should be encouraged to install solar panels, particularly new technologies which may be more disguised.</p> <p>3. Don't know</p> <p>4. Negative</p> <p>5. No page numbering and no paragraph numbering and difficult to print out. A PDF would be better. Difficult to navigate.</p> <p>6. It was also unclear what the questions were to the consultation. These should be included.</p>	<p>elevations are often more suitable locations to avoid this harm. Applications will always be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>3. Noted</p> <p>4. Noted</p> <p>5. Noted – there are no page numbers and difficult to print as this is a web-based document, and it is not intended to be printed in an effort to align with digital first strategies and avoid paper waste. Options to make the format more navigable/user-friendly will be explored.</p> <p>6. Unclear what questions are being referred to as the questionnaire was completed</p>	
9.		Agree	<p>This is a very impressive document, but unfortunately there are too many places where the English used to express the points is incorrect or incoherent. Prepositions are particularly prone to this: for example, frequently 'to' is used where the right word would have been 'in'. Examples of this include 'development is more common to Augustus Road', 'most prevalent to Girdwood Road', 'To the Sutherland Grove area, wide pavements ... ', ' Houses have little space between them to Combemartin Road', 'to the remaining</p>	<p>2. The document has undergone a standard review process and will be reviewed again, and any changes made as necessary. Certain words i.e. 'typology' are common in the field of Conservation with the meaning which is contextual to this document – it will be reviewed if this needs further clarification or if more accessible language needs to be used. Noted regarding figure 55 – the image is focused on the original roof form where the neighbour clearly diverges from this form. Will</p>	Yes, see officer comments

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>streets', 'found to the rest of the area', and so on. Wherever the word 'typology', which means 'the study of types', appears, the right word would have been 'type'. Very often I feel that 'characteristic' has been used where 'appropriate' is really what was meant. There are some straightforward errors of grammar, e.g. 'None [singular]' followed by 'look' [plural], 'views [plural] ... helps [singular]', 'amount of originals', etc.; and the occasional word , e.g. 'materiality', which doesn't exist in modern English. Finally there are some unfortunate infelicities: e.g. ' is comprised of', which the OED describes as 'especially frowned upon' and should have simply read 'comprises'.</p> <p>Altogether I get the impression that the writer, although having done an excellent job of recording the state of the area, together with its merits and demerits, does not have English as their first language, and that the whole article would benefit from the text being edited by someone who has.</p> <p>On a separate point, a few photos seem not to illustrate to points made in their captions. E.g. Fig 55, where the photo seems to be of the dwelling to the left of the offending gable, and fig 56, where there is no obvious imbalance.</p>	<p>be reviewed and replaced if deemed necessary for clarity.</p>	

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
10.		Agree	<p>2. The assessment and management plan are very helpful and well considered. Greater clarity on how design and materials should be used (or not used) is welcome. It should be possible, with thoughtful design and use of materials, to meet the needs of individual residents in a way that fits appropriately within the character and appearance of the conservation zone. A particular example is metal clad dormers which look dreadful and completely out of place; these are unnecessary and much better solutions are possible.</p> <p>Retaining the local character, such as original doors and porches etc., does make a difference. The original front doors on Sutherland Grove should be treasured.</p> <p>Keeping a balance between garden space and buildings is vital to retain the character of the area. The negative impact of paving over front gardens is highlighted in the assessment.</p> <p>Keeping rear garden developments in proportion should also be considered as the open garden spaces are important features of the area even though they are not generally visible from the roadways.</p> <p>3. Agree</p>	<p>2. Supportive comments noted, noted re: metal clad dormers which are generally discouraged</p> <p>3. Noted</p> <p>4. noted</p> <p>5. Noted potential limitation to accessing digital copy – paper copies were made and will remain available at both the Town Hall as well as local libraries – this information was included in the letter as well. Previous PDF versions were available in the same way and digital versions reduce reliance on paper and other resources.</p> <p>6. Noted</p>	No

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>4. Mostly Positive</p> <p>5. The web-based appraisal is very clear and well presented. It was easy to access. Very good, environmental etc. for those with digital access. However, it is important to consider the risks of digital exclusion, and those who do not have online access will not be responding to this on-line question! It would be good practice to offer an alternate means of access for those who need it, or signposting to services/support that can help with access. The letter posted to residents offered help for those with access difficulties via an email address. If you can't access the web, you might not have email.</p> <p>This is a very helpful assessment and management plan, I hope it has a positive impact on local design and on the planning process.</p>		
11.		Agree	<p>2. Historic England also includes guidance about traffic considerations, which I would urge the Council to add into this report. This conservation area is highly residential with not a single shop to be found within its borders. Yet, with the explosion in households within Wandsworth Town Centre and the Riverside Quarter, the number of delivery vehicles, Ubers, contractors and general traffic has increased steadily</p>	<p>2. Noted regarding traffic. This is outside the remit of the Conservation Area Appraisal, comments will be forwarded to the relevant teams.</p> <p>Noted regarding access – outside the remit of the Appraisal document – comments passed to relevant team</p> <p>3. Noted</p>	No

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>over the past 10 years to an intolerable level for local residents and visitors to the environment and tranquility of this very special area, particularly on the stretch of Sutherland Grove between the A3 and Girdwood/Granville Roads and Girdwood Road. This is ongoing and at its worst from approx 2pm to 7pm on weekdays; Saturday mornings and afternoons; and Sunday from approximately 11am onwards.</p> <p>Also, Whitelands Park has become the star attraction in this area: the mature trees, the gardens and the Gilbert Scott Building are highlights in this oasis. The development is also an example as to how architecture creates a sense of community between its residents, particularly with regard to the Whitelands Crescent (southern side) of the estate. However, the Whitelands Park directors need to be encouraged to improve and replace the highly unattractive and worn-down signage on the Estate. The Council also needs to work with Whitelands Park directors, as this is a private community, needing the Council's support for non-residents to respect the by-laws (dogs on leads for example) and respectfully observe hours of access from dawn to dusk only</p> <p>3. Agree</p> <p>4. Positive</p>	<p>4. Noted</p> <p>5. Noted</p>	

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>Very clear, really well done. I enjoyed all the colour photographs.</p> <p>Thank you for compiling this report. I can tell a huge amount of thought and consideration has gone into it.</p> <p>I also learned a lot more about the Arts & Crafts and cottage-style architecture within the area.</p>		
9		Disagree	<p>I am generally in favour of conserving the front of the conservation especially maintaining the front gardens for ecological reasons. However I find that there is no consistency in what is allowed and what is not. Also when sensitive designs meant only to be seen at the back of the house are interfered with. No attention is paid to the fact that our homes now have to be available for other family members who can not afford to buy in London. So extensions are necessary when more space is needed.</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Mostly Positive</p> <p>They are a good idea but must be easily accessed</p> <p>More dialogue with those submitting plans should be carried out</p>	<p>Noted regarding front gardens. Often gardens are subject to permitted development rights in which case approval from the Council is not required.</p> <p>Rear extensions that are only visible from the back of the house are frequently permitted – extensions which are visible from the public realm must be designed appropriately to compliment the character of the host dwelling.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	No
10		Agree	<p>I broadly agree with everything in the appraisal, and would support a ban on zinc-covered dormers.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	No

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			Agree Mostly Positive No Complaints	Noted Noted	
11		Agree		Noted	No
12		Don't Know	<p>2. I have mixed feelings about the management plan. Obviously we don't want development running rampant, nor new builds suddenly appearing in gardens, but there needs to be some compromise to adapt to the modern needs of families in respects to space and energy efficiency. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Energy efficient glazing replacements should be encouraged. The properties on Sutherland Grove benefit from having large areas of window coverage, but the legacy glazing does results in heat losses that needs to be counteracted. - The statement on encasing the stained glass windows in double glazing makes it sound like there would be reluctance to approve this. That should not be the case. It is the best solution to retain the original feature while also introducing a huge improvement to the energy efficiency of these houses where those large side mounted windows expose half the house. - The council's approach to expansion on rear gardens seems to be based on nimbyism and 	<p>2. Comments on windows noted, the text will be reviewed and amended as necessary to clarify guidance. Traditional timber windows are encouraged from a heritage perspective, sustainability is considered as part of the planning balance process</p> <p>Noted regarding stained windows, to be reviewed and amended as necessary</p> <p>Noted regarding rear development</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	Yes, see officer comments – in line with similar comments

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>inconsistency, especially given how willing they are to overlook the quality and consistency of their own projects (such as the St. Cecilians build and ongoing expansions). The garden space in Sutherland Grove is more than generous, and the vast range of different styles already permitted gives the backs of the gardens a certain charm. Designs should be encouraged that provide a good use of space while leaving a balance of garden space remaining.</p> <p>Don't Know</p> <p>Mostly Positive</p>		
13		Agree	It is good to see the assessment provides a full stop to the complete paving over of front gardens and the reduction in uniformity that has been creeping in via non matching windows and unsympathetic renovations. I	Noted	No
14		Agree	Agree Positive	Noted Noted	No
15		Agree		Noted	No
16		Disagree	Personally I question whether it is really worth maintaining the SGCA, whilst it has some interesting features, it is only reflective of the huge urban development of the 1930s across suburban London and I am surprised we feel the need to protect given its widespread abundance. I also believe there has	Noted regarding concerns of the quality of the Conservation Area. The Appraisal has found that there is sufficient special interest to retain designation. Noted regarding concerns regarding sustainability etc. The purpose of the	No

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>been so many alterations to the appearance of many of the items in the appraisal that its been changed fundamentally.</p> <p>I have an overriding concern that, in a world in which we are need to take environmental efficiency seriously, we have policies that are in direct conflict with that. The appraisal is protecting regression not progression, many aspects just not appropriate for the current age, and will be placing ever increasing cost pressures on residents.</p> <p>Windows - the majority from what I can see across the SGCA are already uPVC so am not clear why holding on to retain wood is really warranted. I am also amazed that the policy would advocate single glazing and to avoid trickle vents in the age of energy performance and wellbeing re ventilation.</p> <p>Roof extensions - the reality of the 1930s boom in housing was to satisfy an immediate need for housing linked to the infrastructure investment of the tube network. I find it ironic a modern policy is the opposite to that with a plan to restrict the ability of owners and residents to increase the number of rooms in their house, a very efficient way to help increase dwellings in the borough.</p> <p>Garage conversions - there is no clarity in the appraisal over approach to these but again, maximizing space in a space starved city just seems an approach that should be supported. The conversion of garages also provides the opportunity for residents to</p>	<p>document is to provide guidance from a heritage and conservation perspective. Benefits such as sustainability are considered as part of the wider planning process/balance. Noted regarding roof extensions but point is unclear – roof extensions, such as dormers, are often allowed when placed appropriately and of a sympathetic design and not overly dominant or large.</p> <p>Noted regarding garages although comment largely objects to text/guidance which does not form part of the Appraisal. Works to garages are considered on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Noted regarding EVs – again, from a heritage perspective, the loss of front gardens erodes the character of the streetscape.</p> <p>Solar panels drastically alter the appearance of houses and there are alternatives which can minimise this impact such as tiles or placing in rear gardens. Some solar panels can be applied under PD rights.</p> <p>Noted</p>	

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>create home offices, a highly relevant point post pandemic, and for the economic success of the borough. I cannot understand why we can't support progression, buildings must remain relevant to modern needs - placing restrictions on that seems regressive. This may suit residents who are retired and don't have the desire or means to invest into their houses but not those that are the contributors toward the local economy.</p> <p>Gardens - how are we really going to be able to adopt EVs without allowing these to be used as driveways, its interesting to note that many of the driveways house EV vehicles meaning adoption in the SGCA, anecdotally at least, is higher then in other areas of the borough.</p> <p>Solar - I strongly believe its a mistake to not allow solar PV on both elevations, you are in effect only allowing 50% of residents to access this very sustainable means of energy production arbitrarily based on house orientation. We have to progress in our approach, the 1930s are a fantastic example of that with the development of the suburbs, its ironic that we then let that stop us, 100 years later, progress with change and toward a decarbonized society.</p> <p>Mostly Positive</p> <p>I</p>		

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
17		Agree	<p>Planners should resist further front gardens being turned into hard standing / parking. Especially where no part of the front garden remains.</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Mostly Positive</p> <p>How long will this web page remain available?</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The CAA will remain available until a new CAA is adopted in the future</p>	No
18		Agree	Agree	Noted	No
19		Don't Know	<p>My main concern about a Conservation Area relates to potential restrictions to property owners wanting to improve the levels of insulation of their properties and installing other energy production or energy usage reduction equipment. Although we are fortunate to be able to live in these nice houses, they are not museums and are not of significant historic interest e.g. Listed, so the Conservation management plan needs to take into consideration the need to continually update properties so as to reduce UK CO2 emissions in the longer term as the world gradually moves towards a net zero carbon target.</p> <p>Don't know</p> <p>Mostly positive</p>	<p>Noted regarding concerns around insulation and other sustainability initiatives and the view that the houses are not of significant historic interest because they are not listed. The area, and the houses that make up the area, have been established as being worthy of preserving their special character and appearance. Although more tolerant to change than listed buildings, alterations still must be considered regarding Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Insulation and other sustainability measures should be carried out with consideration of preserving this character and appearance.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	No

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
20		Agree	<p>Regarding stained glass windows . We had our original glass encased in new double glazing - cost more but will last decades and looks like the original- well it is the original. I think planning should tell people to do this with their doors windows and not just rip them out trashing 100 years of history.</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Mostly Positive</p> <p>Once I found it-its v good</p> <p>One huge blight to the area not mentioned is the huge detrimental effect of increasing rat running through this ' homely, domestic suburban housing'. This must be addressed.</p>	<p>Noted re: window treatments. Retention of historic elements is preferred and encouraged</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted regarding rats, this is outside of the remit of the Conservation Area Appraisal</p>	No
21		Agree	<p>Agree</p> <p>Positive</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	No
22		Agree	<p>Agree</p> <p>Mostly Positive</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	No
23		Agree	<p>I would agree that large dormer extensions are unsuitable and velux windows are less obtrusive. Front gardens being converted to hardstanding is also unsuitable and should not be allowed. Plenty of</p>	<p>Supportive comments noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	No

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			people manage without cars in the city and cars should not be given priority. Agree Mostly Positive		
24		Agree	Agree Positive	Noted Noted	No
25		Agree	Agree Positive	Noted Noted	No
26		Agree	Great description of the area and its special character Agree Mostly Positive Easy to use it would be good to have the link to this page for comments on the top of the first appraisal page about the area	Noted Noted Noted Noted Noted, a clearer link between the documents and the appraisal responses will be considered to implement in future consultations	No
27		Agree	Agree	Noted	No
28.	Yes	Disagree	a. The Appraisal is more thorough than previous versions with helpful photos showing positive and negative design treatments. This is welcome. The Appraisal does not address the exclusion of	A. Positive comments noted. As part of the review of the conservation area, consideration for boundary extensions were given however it was not considered that any areas outside of	No

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>Sutherland Grove houses in the NE of the area, between Cromer Villas and the Council Estate on West Hill. It is also silent on the issue of trees and greenery. I am aware of current "rules" which allow Tree Officers to TPO trees that are visible between houses - is this still the case?</p> <p><u>The So What? question</u></p> <p>b. There is an ideal world quality of the Appraisal that distances itself from reality and I see the more important document to be the guidance that should follow - as recommended by Historic England - setting out what are material considerations when Planning Officers consider applications from residents to make changes. This guidance is key and should be subject to further consultation with residents. It is absolutely vital that everybody understands where they stand in terms of features they must conserve or achieve and which are desirable only. The guidance should , in my view, pass the following tests:</p> <p>1. It should be clear about permitted development issues and the definition of material considerations so that everything that residents and others - not least Planning Officers -need to know is in one place. (There are by the way several examples of design changes sanctioned by Planning Officers that are counter to the current Appraisal and guidance - if the latter</p>	<p>the conservation area were worthy of sufficient interest to be included at this time. Tree Officers would only consider TPOs on trees which have amenity value which includes their contribution to the street scene. If trees in rear are not visible from public areas of the street, it is not likely that they would be worth of TPO status.</p> <p>b. 1) Permitted development rights have been included in the Appraisal where deemed necessary, otherwise planning policy is outside the remit of the Appraisal document, as it instead serves as guidance for best practice. Planning controls are outside of this scope and can be found in the Local Plan</p> <p>2) There is a statutory duty to 'preserve and enhance' the character and appearance of the conservation area, and where proposals come forward, an opportunity is presented to improve the appearance of sites where this special character and appearance has been identified as having been eroded. Traditional materials are always the most fitting, with alternatives considered on a case-by-case basis subject to design considerations etc.</p> <p>3) Such features can be considered in the context of a conservation area which still has a legal requirement to preserve and enhance the special character and appearance. There are</p>	

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>exists? Eg the flat roofed side dormers signed off at No 15 SG.I understand the difficulty of Planning Officer turnover but this only heightens the need for strong, accessible and clear guidance.)</p> <p>2. It should not attempt to rectify "breaches" when "the horse has already bolted" on some key issues. Particularly, the Appraisal's affinity for wooden windows is absurd when economy and heat saving factors make uPVC windows close on universal and are acceptable in my view in keeping the look of windows.</p> <p>3. It should be realistic about modern trends and lifestyle issues such as the affordability of changes, access to car charging points near the house, the need to attract young families to the area who will want more space and the need to install features such as solar panels to reduce energy use and save money.</p> <p>4.It should strike a balance and have two lists - of must dos and do if possible.</p> <p>My own view of what should appear on the must do list are largely features facing the street:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • retention of the roofline, meaning no vertical gable ends for loft conversions unless it matches the other pair that already has this. (<p>different approaches to such interventions and these will be considered in the context of this identified character, and on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>4) Suggested additions are noted. It is outside the remit of a Conservation Area Appraisal to distinguish between 'can' and 'must' dos. There is no one size fits all approach and proposals should be contextual to the site location, building type etc.</p> <p>c) Guidance can be found in the Housing SPD (2016) with further detail of how car parking in front gardens is often inappropriate in Conservation Areas. Plans for successful applications are publicly available via the Wandsworth Planning Search. The Council cannot provide recommendations to private business but encourages residents to communicate this information to each other. The Buildings Conservation Directory is a valuable resource https://www.buildingconservation.com/</p> <p>D) Noted the applicant feels the area is not a museum and changes to houses are necessary. The area is a Conservation Area which has statutory protection, and the Council has a legal duty to maintain its special character and appearance. The document does not impose any new or additional</p>	

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>This seems to be the current Planning line and I know is controversial as it means that space in the loft conversion is very tight)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuation of the no dormers on street facing rooves when loft extensions are agreed - but allowing such dormers on the back rooves. • pitched rooves not flat rooves on side dormers - Planning Officers have not been consistent on this matter. • retention of open porches with no enclosed porches - so their removal if they exist • retention or reinstatement of original design front doors - again controversial as they cost around £5000 for reinstatement • retention or reinstatement of front window designs but allowing uPVC solutions • retention or reinstatement of stained glass side windows but allowing replicas to be installed using uPVC double glazed units that are available and are much cheaper. • front garden designs to allow for permeable paving for parking and areas of planting, which is possible even providing up to 3 cars • solar panels only on the rear rooves of properties unless there is clear evidence that the aspect of a property means that the optimum location for catching sunlight is at the front. This accepts that panels at the front 	<p>restrictions/policies/rules, but simply serves as a more indepth analysis with expanded guidance to help residents make better informed decisions to meet existing policies and legislation.</p>	

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>would be acceptable but this would be no more "unsightly" than the Velux roof lights that are currently allowed on street facing rooves when loft extensions are approved.</p> <p>c) But crucially, to help applicants with these requirements, there should be Council help for us/them as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Illustrative layouts for using front garden space to accommodate cars and planting - to be provided by Enable? • A list of providers of replacement/replica front doors for residents to approach and seek quotes. • Examples of how existing approved loft conversions have dealt with the space constraints - drawing from the plans submitted for conversion applications that have been approved <p>I am aware that residents collectively might assist with these supports but the leadership should come from the Council.</p> <p>d) To conclude there has, in my view, to be a realistic balance between pure design aspiration and what is practically achievable by the people living here with the pressures on them to maximise space, save</p>		

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			energy and provide acceptable and affordable design responses. This is a community of people not a museum and we need to attract new younger households who can live with, afford and support the compromises.		
28 –	Yes	Disagree	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Sutherland Grove Conservation Area Appraisal. The Council is to be congratulated on the thorough and detailed description of the Conservation Area forming the substantive part of the document. The Management Plan Summary at the end, however, is by contrast surprisingly weak.</p> <p>Whilst I endorse the three bullet point overall purpose of the document, I think these points need spelling out more precisely. We of course want the core character and features of our Area to be conserved but also for the residents to be able to undertake appropriate upgrading and improvement to their properties. This requires much more specific information for residents as to what they are <i>required</i> to do versus what it is <i>desirable</i> that they do in any renovations or upgrading.</p> <p>The document needs to spell this out more specifically, ie:</p>	<p>1. Noted that the respondent feels there needs to be more distinction between what is 'required' and what is 'desirable.' It is outside the remit of an Appraisal to offer this information. The purpose of the document is to 'Appraise' the Area and what contributes to its special character and appearance, which has a statutory duty to be preserved and enhance. The 'Management Strategy' then offers guidance and best practice advice about approaching works in a way which is mindful to this duty. Therefore, the only 'required' consideration is to preserve or enhance the character and appearance. There is also a balance that can be made between identified harm and benefits, though the NPPF. Different proposals will have different impacts and must be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Gardens – Front gardens are often covered in hard standing under permitted development rights which the Council cannot prevent without the introduction of an Article 4 direction which would benefit from local</p>	Yes, see Officer comments

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What the limits of permitted development are and the circumstances when planning permission must be sought • What features <i>must be preserved</i>, eg front doors in the style of the area • What features it is <i>desirable to retain</i> where at all possible. <p>Being much clearer on the list of ‘required’ features versus ‘desirable’ would also help to ensure much greater consistency in decisions made by planning officers – at the moment there seems sadly too much variability in decisions made by officers.</p> <p>The following are the areas where I consider further clarity is required.</p> <p>Gardens</p> <p>Your document states that the entire area is made up of ‘large detached and semi-detached residential properties with generous and mature front gardens. <i>This provides the principal characteristic of the townscape</i>’. And yet, we sadly have numerous examples where these gardens are now lost entirely to hardstanding. It would be helpful for the Council to include, as a requirement, that a certain percentage of the front garden be retained as green space.</p>	<p>support. Most works to rear gardens will have minimal impact on the character and appearance of a conservation area due to their limited visibility from the public realm. Where extensions/garden rooms are visible from the public realm, these are subject to design and scale considerations. Features such as pavement, which are not visible, are less likely to impact the public realm.</p> <p>Impact of climate change and energy efficiency – As above, Conservation Area designation cannot prevent the loss of front gardens without an Article 4 Direction. Trees are protected in that the Council must be notified 6 weeks prior to their proposed removal at which time a decision is made to implement a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) or if the works are acceptable. The loss of mature trees is typically resisted without strong cause.</p> <p>Basement Developments – As basements are largely hidden from the public realm the main concern in Conservation Areas is the appearance of lightwells and other amenity features. Structural issues are outside the remit of this document – comments will be passed to relevant departments.</p>	

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>It would also help to have greater clarity on the status of rear gardens. These too form a key element of the area's character and should be retained as thriving green spaces as far as possible, ie not excessively paved over. Garden rooms at the rear are becoming more common and should be required to be built in materials sympathetic to the area with, where possible, living roofs to mitigate their visual and environmental impact. There are good examples of where this has been done successfully.</p> <p>Impact of climate change and energy efficiency</p> <p>There is surprisingly little in the document about mitigating the effects of climate change and conserving natural habitat and the environment. The requirement to retain a percentage of front gardens as green space as outlined above, would help to mitigate some of the effects of climate change, specifically enabling better draining away of the excessive rain water we now experience on a more frequent basis. Furthermore it would retain habitat for encouraging biodiversity. Likewise, it would be helpful to have as a requirement the preservation of the trees lining our streets and in our front and back gardens, unless permission is sought to remove them.</p>	<p>Zinc cladding – zinc dormers can be viewed as 'contemporary' interventions which are more legible as additions – tile hung dormers are more sympathetic and often more suitable where the dormers will be partly visible.</p> <p>Stained Glass – Original character features are always encouraged to be preserved where possible. The document will be reviewed and updated as deemed necessary to ensure this is reflected sufficiently</p>	

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>In terms of solar panels, it is welcome that the document encourages these. However, from a practical perspective, not all houses have south facing roofs at the rear on which to place these. It should therefore be possible for residents whose front roofs face south to be able to install solar panels at the front.</p> <p>Basement developments</p> <p>Unlike other Councils, eg Lambeth and Kensington & Chelsea, Wandsworth Council has very little guidance for residents on this topic. In our area, we have already experienced basement developments causing problems, most recently where the house became unsafe to live in and also temporarily rendered the adjacent house unsafe to live in. Requiring a resident to include a structural engineering survey with the planning application would enable the Council to better assess the risk of the development, not just to the property in question but also to adjacent properties. This is particularly important in this area which is susceptible to subsidence as it is built on London clay - there have been numerous instances of subsidence over the last 15 years.</p> <p>Zinc Cladding</p>		

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>Zinc cladding is not a material of the original houses in this area and it is surprising that planners continue to approve its use, particularly for dormers. I suggest that the inappropriateness of zinc cladding and flat roofed dormers should be emphasised in the document.</p> <p>Stained glass</p> <p>Stained glass still features in front doors and in some panels to the side of front doors throughout the area and on the side walls of houses, particularly but not exclusively in Sutherland Grove. These are key features of our area which we would want to see preserved unless specific permission is sought to remove them for exceptional reasons.</p> <p>I hope these comments are helpful and I would encourage the Council to give serious consideration to producing a list of features that are required/mandatory and a list of features that it is desirable to retain unless particular circumstances pertain.</p>		
29		Disagree	<p><u>Comments on SGCA (Sutherland Grove Conservation Area) Draft Appraisal</u></p> <p><u>1 Overall Comment</u></p> <p>1.1 The overall view of the Appraisal is reflected at the beginning of Part 3 ('Management Strategy') which states in paragraph 4 that "... it is apparent that</p>	<p>1.1 noted the respondent feels the Area has improved but the findings of the Appraisal have concluded that the character and appearance has been eroded over time</p> <p>1.2 Noted and same response cited here: Noted the applicant feels the area is not a</p>	No

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p><i>any further deterioration would endanger the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.</i>“</p> <p>The implication of this is that the Area has deteriorated since the last Appraisal – a conclusion which I would not share. Having lived in the area covered by the SGCA for almost 40 years, it would be my overall view that the Area has been generally enhanced during that time by the various changes made by its residents and other developers. Any suggestion that there is a need to introduce further Planning restrictions to change the general direction of travel would, in my view, stifle the healthy creativity which is necessary if we are going to make a contribution towards providing practical homes for the future.</p> <p>1.2 To reiterate the point made by a fellow contributor who has commented via the Council website:- <i>“... Although we are fortunate to be able to live in these nice houses, they are not museums and are not of significant historic interest e.g. Listed, so the Conservation Management Plan needs to take into consideration the need to continually update properties...”</i></p> <p>2. More Specific Comments</p> <p>2.1 The Draft Appraisal is an interesting summary of the current state of the SGCA. However, I would have preferred to see more emphasis on a forward-looking (rather than a rearward-looking) approach – particularly at</p>	<p>museum and changes to houses are necessary. The area is a Conservation Area which has statutory protection, and the Council has a legal duty to maintain its special character and appearance. The document does not impose any new or additional restrictions/policies/rules, but simply serves as a more indepth analysis with expanded guidance to help residents make better informed decisions to meet existing policies and legislation.</p> <p>2.1 Noted the appraisal is felt to be ‘rear-wrd looking’ – the purpose of the document is as guidance to help influence future development which respects the history and therefore character and appearance of the CA</p> <p>2.3 A presence of variety does not imply that any changes contribute to this or the variety can be expanded. There is variety within a specified scope which is discussed in more detail in the character areas.</p> <p>3.1.1 Noted that houses need to change to meet changing needs. These changes still have a duty to fulfil the statutory requirement of preserving the identified character and appearance.</p> <p>3.1.2 Noted the applicant feels security threat towards cars and views gates as a solution</p>	

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>the present time when the nation’s housing stock is under close scrutiny with a view to future-proofing existing houses.</p> <p>2.2 There is a mix of comments in the Draft Appraisal which applaud the variety within the SGCA and other comments which criticise some changes because they interrupt the consistency of the area – all of which is a confusing contradiction for residents who need to understand the best way forward if they are planning future projects on their homes.</p> <p>2.3 Rather than promoting an approach which appears to want to take us back to the 1930’s/20’s, I would have preferred to see more acknowledgement that life has moved on since the early SGCA houses were originally built and there is a need to embrace necessary changes required to meet modern demands.</p> <p>3. Need to Meet Modern Demands</p> <p>3.1 To give some examples where changes may be required:-</p> <p>3.1.1 Residents now need to consider expanding their homes for a number of reasons:-</p>	<p>3.1.3 – Noted the applicant feels front gardens are more appropriate places for vehicles than garages for electric charging</p> <p>3.1.4 – Timber frames are often the most suitable and most sympathetic, the appraisal will be amended as necessary to clarify this is considered the ‘least harmful’ option and often viewed as an improvement, rather than as the only option.</p> <p>- Again timber windows are the ‘better’ option but not the only option and windows are considered on a case-by-case basis. Aluminium windows are not discounted in the document.</p> <p>- There are many draft solutions available which do not significantly alter the appearance of the porch, some of which are suggested in the document</p> <p>-Imaginative solutions include tiles panels and panels in positions that do not impact the front elevation, such as in a garden or outbuilding</p>	

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>- We are all living to older ages. Many have to provide a home suitable for an elderly person or an incoming, cared-for family member who can no longer manage to live independently and/or has mobility problems. The garage conversion/expansion to provide a downstairs bathroom/bedroom is frequently the only option. The garage is therefore no longer available for car parking – which puts more demands on parking on hardstanding areas in front of the house. We might also need to accommodate wheelchair access which requires a modern, wide front door and hard-standing + ramps at the front of the house to take priority over garden space;</p> <p>- Increasingly, we are working from home and require extra space for a home office;</p> <p>- As we instal green energy solutions + MVHR (mechanical ventilation heat recovery) systems, we will potentially have to find space for a Plant Room for the accompanying infrastructure.</p> <p>3.1.2 Criminals involved in car theft are becoming more sophisticated. There are almost daily reports of locked cars being stolen from local streets and driveways. The most effective way to stop car thieves is to</p>		

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>securely park a car in a locked garage or at the front of the house behind a modern, lockable gate. 1930s garages are too small to easily accommodate modern cars + bicycles etc. The Appraisal suggests that the supposedly 'urban' look of security gates is unwelcome (- not a view which all would share). However, no-one is going to stop the criminals from increasingly adopting 'urban' tactics to steal our cars.</p> <p>3.1.3 As we move towards adoption of electric cars, we will need to expand the hard-standing areas at the front of our houses to allow all our vehicles to reach the charging points on the building for overnight charging.</p> <p>3.1.4 The energy crisis is now being factored in to new building requirements. Older buildings struggle to keep pace and retrofitting is invariably complex:-</p> <p>- The Appraisal appears to be suggesting that there should be restrictions on future installations of either aluminium- or uPVC-framed windows in favour of wood frames. Given the existing prevalence of uPVC windows in the Area, it is difficult to see</p>		

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
			<p>how this would work and how it can realistically produce an effective result.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If houses are to meet modern insulation retrofitting requirements, triple glazing now has to be a consideration where single, double or secondary glazing might have been used previously. The reality of current life is that this limits choices re available designs (e.g. wooden frames may not be available/affordable and uPVC may be the only realistic option). Modern uPVC windows are also available in wood-look finishes if required. Furthermore, if the reason for proposing limitations on frame choices is that single-use materials are to be avoided, there is no reason why aluminium should be discounted. Modern uPVC windows are also available as recyclable products. - Draft exclusion is a necessary requirement for an energy-efficient house and is enabled by having enclosed porches at the entrance doors. - We need to be imaginative in promoting use of solar panels as they will be increasingly important for future energy needs. 		
30		Agree	SGCARA – attached as appendix 1	1) Noted that the respondent thinks the previous Appraisal was clearer about ‘important’ vs ‘should be’ actions – but	Yes, see Officer comments

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
				<p>this is not the purpose of these documents so this updated Appraisal is actually more reflective and accurate. These documents are supplementary guidance, not policy documents, and therefore they do not have the power to dictate things that must be done or should be done. The purpose of the document is to guide best practice and provide enough information that applications are informed. The only 'must do' is the statutory duty to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the area, as well as fulfil policies in the Local Plan.</p> <p>2) Noted regarding clarity on front gardens. The Appraisal encourages thoughtful approach to introducing hardstanding but in many cases, this is carried out under Permitted Development rights and cannot be controlled without the introduction of an Article 4 Direction.</p> <p>3) Again, it is not possible to include a 'must be retained' list and that is not the intention of the document, but the loss of original features which make a positive contribution to the identified character will always be resisted and</p>	

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
				<p>sympathetic replacements encouraged. Any alteration visible from the public realm must consider the character and appearance of the CA, and this sometimes includes rear alterations, but often it does not. Unfortunately, grants are unlikely to return due to the costs associated with them but the support is noted.</p> <p>4) Noted – the text relating to dormers will be reviewed and amended if deemed necessary to clarify this point</p> <p>5) PP is required for heat pumps dependent on location and solar panels are often under Permitted Development Rights. The view is that panels can significantly alter the appearance of a house or pair and other locations should be explored.</p> <p>6) Outside the remit of the Appraisal, comments to be passed on to Planning</p> <p>7) Largely agree and the text will be reviewed to make this clearer if necessary. Solutions will be considered on a case-by-case basis, there is not a one-size-fits all approach</p> <p>8) Noted regarding stained glass window – the draft appraisal will be updated to mention these more specifically</p>	

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
				<p>9) Noted re: Quoins, the appraisal will be updated accordingly</p> <p>10) Noted – a line highlighting the unaltered roofscape will be added</p> <p>11) It is beyond the scope of the Appraisal to control development to an individual property, but this feature is noted and would be a consideration in any consultation with the Conservation team</p> <p>12) Outside the remit of the Appraisal</p> <p>13) Noted regarding support for resistance to front gates. Conservation Area designation only prevents the removal of boundary treatments if they are above 1m – replacement boundary treatments can be controlled with an Article 4 Direction, but overly modern gates are not viewed as keeping with the identified character and appearance and are generally not supported</p> <p>14) A. It is outside the remit of the Appraisal to protect biodiversity but it is felt the importance of greenspace is highlighted throughout. The placement within the document is standardised throughout updated web-based appraisals for consistency</p>	

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
				<p>B. There has been a general resistance to the introduction of Article 4 directions – residents are encouraged to express interest or support to their local councillors</p> <p>C. Many trees are subject to Tree Protection Orders and any works to trees in Conservation Areas require 6 weeks written notice to the Council. Noted regarding concern about removal of trees to front gardens, which the appraisal discourages. Comments to be passed on to relevant departments</p> <p>15) The majority of this wall is considered curtilage listed to the college and therefore any proposed changes would be closely scrutinised and require PP. Boundary walls under 1m are not protected in CAs, but appropriate retention or replacement is always encouraged.</p> <p>16) DO</p> <p>17) Noted and passed to relevant departments</p> <p>18) The document will be amended following all consultation responses – if no substantial changes are required the Appraisal can be adopted by Councillors decision under Delegated Authority. The web version will remain accessible and can be circulated as required. All residents have been notified of</p>	

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral / Add Something Else	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
				the Appraisal, as well as public notices posted for those travelling within the Area.	
31 – Historic England		Agree	Comments included as Appendix 2	<p>A views section will be added or additional text regarding views inserted into relevant sub-areas, as appropriate, as well as reference to Views and Vistas SPD as relevant</p> <p>The positive contribution buildings are marked on the interactive map</p> <p>There are no locally listed buildings within the CA and none have been identified for inclusion at this stage.</p> <p>Support of Management Strategy is noted</p>	Yes, see Officer comments