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1. Introduction

1.1. In preparing Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs), the Council is required to follow the procedures laid down in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and its adopted Statement of Community Involvement 2015 (SCI).

1.2. There are a total of 21 Conservation Areas in Trafford. Historic England guidance sets out, designation is not sufficient to preserve and enhance these areas. Instead local authorities need to develop policies which clearly identify what features of the area should be preserved or enhanced and set out how this should be done.

1.3. Such assessments help to generate awareness and encourage local property owners to take the right sort of action. The appraisals also identify areas where enhancement through development may be desirable.

1.4. Through the production of these documents the Council will be able to manage change in their historic areas in a way that will preserve and enhance them.

1.5. The Conservation Area Appraisal was carried out by consultants during 2014.

1.6. This Consultation Statement contains a summary of which bodies and persons were invited to make representations and how they were invited to make representations.

2. Statement of Community Involvement Review

2.1. The Council reviewed its Statement of Community Involvement (2010) and adopted a revised version in October 2015. This sets out the process by which the Council will consult appropriate bodies in the course of drafting all documents that are part of the Local Plan.

3. Public Consultation

Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation

3.1. A copy of the Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) was made available for a statutory 6 week public consultation from 29th June 2015 and 10th August 2015.

3.2. A wide range of stakeholders were consulted including landowners, all residents within any of the proposed changes to the Conservation Areas. Developers, key agencies and service providers, Parish Councils, Registered Providers and other interested parties. A full list of the consultees that were formally invited to comment on the document is available in Appendix 1.
3.3. In addition four drop-in sessions were arranged during the consultation period for people to come and discuss the appraisals with officers from the Council. These were held on:-

- 2nd July 2015 at Altrincham Town Hall between 12 and 2 pm.
- 7th July 2015 at Hale Library between 5 and 7pm
- 9th July 2015 at Devonshire Road Evangelical Church, Devonshire Road, Altrincham between 5 and 7pm.
- 14th July at the Swinging Bridge Restaurant, Trafford Boulevard, Urmston between 5 and 7pm

3.4. A public notice was displayed in the 29th June 2015 issue of the Manchester Evening News and is available in Appendix 3.

3.5. The SPD and associated documentation was made available for inspection at the following locations:

- Trafford libraries
- Access Trafford offices

3.6. Comments were invited in writing, no later than 10th August 2015, either by post to: Strategic Planning, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0TH or alternatively by email to: [strategic.planning@trafford.gov.uk](mailto:strategic.planning@trafford.gov.uk).

3.7. Consultation responses and the identity of those making them are matters of public record and open to public scrutiny. Copies of the responses received to the consultation can be viewed on request to the Strategic Planning team, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford M32 0TH.

**Conservation Area Management Plan Consultation**

3.8. A copy of the Management Plan (CAMP) was made available for a statutory 6-week public consultation from 04 January 2016 and 15 February 2016. A wide range of stakeholders were consulted including landowners, developers, key agencies and service providers, Parish Councils, Registered Providers and other interested parties. A full list of other consultees that were formally invited to comment on the document is available in Appendix 1.

3.9. In addition three drop-in sessions was arranged during the consultation period for people to come and discuss the Management Plan with officers from the Council. These were held on:-
3.10. A public notice was displayed in the 26th October 2015 issue of the Manchester Evening News and is available in Appendix 2.

3.11. The SPD and associated documentation was made available for inspection at the following locations:

- On the Council’s website: http://www-trafford.gov.uk
- Trafford libraries
- Access Trafford offices

3.12. Comments were invited in writing, no later than 07 December 2015, either by post to: Strategic Planning, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0TH or alternatively by email to: strategic-planning@trafford.gov.uk.

3.13. Consultation responses and the identity of those making them are matters of public record and open to public scrutiny. Copies of the responses received to the consultation can be viewed on request to the Strategic Planning team, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford M32 0TH.

4. Consultation Responses and Main Issues

4.1. A total of 18 representations were received to the public consultation. A summary of these representations is available to view in table 4.1 below, together with the Council’s response to the points raised. A notable number of comments were made, with general support for the policies and more specific points:

- The Bowdon Conservation Group (BCG) welcomes the CAA and proposed extensions but suggests more emphasis is needed on the importance of trees, issues of parking, loss of boundary treatments and some more specific recommendations for the Management Plan with a specific policy for adverts.
- Support for the inclusion of The Vale and Apsley Grove
- Objections from local residents to the inclusion of the McCarthy and Stone 1994 building Springbank, Winton Road, The Lawns and Belgrave Road in the proposed extensions to the CA.
- The Bowdon Residents Group proposes a further extension to include Vicarage Lane, York Road, Primrose Cottage and Brick Kiln Row
• General support for the policies with some minor amendments suggested to policies covering banners, rain water goods, materials and scale and massing.
• Objection to the Mercure hotel being a positive contributor and the area round the hotel being considered as open space.

4.2. Other more general comments are summarised below:-

• The inclusion of further wording and rewording to better reflect national policy and legislation on dealing with positive contributing buildings and designated heritage assets, for example listed buildings
• The need for additional maps in the CAMPs to show positive contributing buildings identified in the CAAs
• Requests for clarity in the policies and suggestions for additional text covering historical information
• Request for the inclusion of a policy to cover street lighting in all CAMPs which specifies warm LED lights and appropriate column styles in CAs.

5. Main Changes to the SPD
5.1. The majority of the suggested changes, outlined above have been taken on board in the documents. However the suggestions in relation to objections to the proposed boundary extensions in relation to Winton Road, The Lawns and Belgrade Road are not considered to be appropriate and therefore no changes have been made in relation to these matters. The main changes are listed below:-

• Change to the draft proposed boundary to Bowdon to now not include Spring Bank.
• Addition of townscape analysis maps
• Minor corrections and additions to the general text
• The addition of and changes to the position in the text of photographs
• Changes to the text and policies to add more detail, improve clarity and ensure conformity with legislation and NPPF.
Table 4.1 Summary of representations and the Council’s response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Document Name</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
<th>Proposed Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-Sep-15</td>
<td>Local Resident</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Objection to dwelling of 9 The Lawns being included in Conservation Area as the Council already has many restrictions and safeguards in place to tackle any issues that may arise or contravene the beauty of this area.</td>
<td>It is not the intention of the Conservation Area designation to prevent development; rather it is a means of managing the process of change so that it does not have a negative effect on the recognised character of the Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Aug-15</td>
<td>Emery</td>
<td>1368</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>The draft conservation area appraisal is both wholly insufficient and inadequate with regards to its assessment of positive features and does not adhere to Historic England guidance. As a result, the proposals to extend the conservation area boundaries are fundamentally flawed. The vague description in Appendix 1 does not form a sound basis for making an informed assessment of whether a particular feature is of ‘special interest’ for the purposes of Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. In fact, it is precisely the same wording as that used for most of the other 140 or so assessments of ‘positive contributors’ made at Appendix 1. In the absence of any site-specific assessments to support Map 13 of the draft conservation appraisal document, an assessment with regard to nos. 1, 2, 4 and 6 Winton Road (the group identified at Appendix 1 of the draft appraisal document) against the Historic England checklist questions is provided. With regard to age, historic maps show that nos. 1, 2, 4 and 6 Winton Road post-date the existing housing within the Bowdon Conservation Area and the housing further along Winton Road to the east (beyond the Enville Road junction). However, the draft appraisal document inaccurately states that Winton Road was developed between 1870s and 1910 (paragraphs 4.3.108 to 4.3.109). There is a clear distinction between the older housing to east of Enville Road, indicative of late Victorian and Edwardian expansion in form and detailing, and the unremarkable Winton Road exhibits a number of features which are identified as characteristic in the CA. These include: The low level front boundary wall comprising distinctly shaped roughly hewn blocks of masonry. The presence of Art and Crafts inspired architectural features including scalloped roof tiles, decorative roof tiles, gable and bay windows and reference to the Cheshire or Tudor Revival Style. Collectively and individually these buildings on Winton Road continue the character of the area and it is considered this is a sound reason for their inclusion. The specific important details of the properties on Winton Road are included in the text commentary of the appraisal rather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
subsequent expansion along Winton Road to the west of Enville Road and north of St Marys Road.

Paragraph 4.36 of the draft appraisal document provides a rather vague description of the style and form within ‘Zone E’ (includes Winton Road) of the conservation area, which itself indicates that there is no predominant characteristic within Zone E:

However, paragraph 4.3.106 of the draft appraisal document then states that the dominant architectural style is of three-storey semi-detached housing and this is reflective along Winton Road. This is clearly not the case of the section of Winton Road to the west of Enville Road, which post-dates the earlier housing.

The architectural styles for the houses numbered 2, 4 and 6 along Winton Road do not reflect the characteristics above:

The draft appraisal document does not take the recent property alterations into account, and it is unclear whether the authors are aware of the planning history

much of Winton Road was developed in the 1970s period. However the part to the West of Enville Road was 1908 to 1936 so text has been amended to say 1898-1936. The date mapping shows there are many other houses of this age proposed to go into the Conservation Area.

Many changes are still permitted to properties within a Conservation Area to the rear of the property or through permitted development see link :-

4.3.110 acknowledges the rear extension to 6 Winton Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Document Name</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
<th>Proposed Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-Aug-15</td>
<td>Emery</td>
<td>1368</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>The council’s ‘blanket’ approach to extending the conservation area boundary without sufficient justification calls into question the legitimacy of and undermines public confidence in the conservation area process</td>
<td>The Council's heritage consultants carried out a full appraisal using Historic England methodology to assess areas suitable for inclusion in the Conservation. Justification of the historic interest of these area within proposed extension is included in the draft CAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Person ID</td>
<td>Document Name</td>
<td>Summary of Representation</td>
<td>Proposed Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Jul-15</td>
<td>Local Resident</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Errors to be corrected:</td>
<td>Text changed on photograph 91 and text changes as proposed on photograph 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p.60 Photograph 91 should read Stamford Road (not Stamford Park Road). The photograph was taken when the boarding was in place around Altrincham preparatory School. I have enclosed another photograph to replace that one which shows the fine wall bounding Bell Field Stamford Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p.71 Photograph 124 The Spindles is in St. Mary's Road (not Winton Road).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p.58 Photograph 86 should read Bell Field Stamford Road. Bell Field is bounded by Stamford Road on the north side, South Road on the west side and West Road on the south side and east side.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p.70 Photograph 119 should read grass verges and new trees in Winton Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p.70 Photograph 121 Setts and yellow lines on Envile Road Photographs included:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p.60 new photograph to replace photograph 91 which shows the walls without boarding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p.73 new photograph to show the trees in leaf in Envile Road instead of photograph 127 Photograph included of brickwork at the rear of Rosehill, South Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Photographs of 43 Stamford Road included.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Sep-15</td>
<td>Local Resident</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Photographs included:</td>
<td>Photographs 91 and 127 replaced with photographs provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Person ID</td>
<td>Document Name</td>
<td>Summary of Representation</td>
<td>Proposed Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Jul-15</td>
<td>Local Resident</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>There should be information on the management in the Conservation Areas of: Street lighting, Trees, Boundary treatments, Advertisements, Noise pollution, Light pollution, Odour pollution, Properties which become empty and begin to become derelict, Traffic management, Road maintenance.</td>
<td>Partially agree. More information is proposed to be provided in the Management Plan on Street lighting, trees, boundary treatments, adverts and empty properties. The other items listed are beyond the scope of the CAMP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Aug-15</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group welcomes the publication and form of the Conservation Area Appraisal for the Bowdon Conservation Area. In general this is a detailed and fair assessment of the area we live in, enjoy and whose attractive features we seek to protect.</td>
<td>Support Welcomed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Aug-15</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group strongly welcomes the extensions proposed to the conservation area. The large plot sizes and low density of the proposed Character Zone E are an important characteristic and we would welcome this low density being specifically included in the summary of features of special interest in the conservation area in Section 3.1 of the CAA and the descriptions of the relevant character zones.</td>
<td>Support Welcomed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Aug-15</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Greater emphasis on the value as a vital local amenity that off street parking has would be welcome. The importance of off street parking to the conservation area greatly diminishes any development potential, and that the statements in 4.3.29 if anything overstate the development potential in this part of the village.</td>
<td>Agree. Text added to 4.3.29 to acknowledge the importance of car parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Person ID</td>
<td>Document Name</td>
<td>Summary of Representation</td>
<td>Proposed Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Aug-15</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>The CAA does not include significant detail on the issue of street lighting, although this is a significant contributor to the character of a Conservation Area. Wherever possible a column height of 5m should be adopted - and where Trafford have, in the past, fitted 'odd' 6m columns in a stretch of road where the norm is 5m, those 'odd' columns should be shortened. In respect to 'standard' lanterns it is crucial that they are not of a design which appears 'incongruous'. Bowdon Conservation Group proposes a maximum CCT of 2700K for LED lighting in Conservation Areas. The refurbishment of all existing heritage columns, or their replacement with replicas which meet current regulations - or a hybrid of both options is supported.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Aug-15</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Issues which need to be addressed in greater detail include: changes to boundary treatments, increases in density and pressure on trees and landscaping. Trafford should enforce strictly a presumption against the subdivision of existing plots and to further restrict the extent of ‘permitted development’, using an Article 4 Direction. Make full use of its existing powers to protect the trees and landscaping.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Aug-15</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Page 27: The colour key on this map is wrong and does not correspond to the Proposed Character Zones. The key should be amended.</td>
<td>Agree. The key has been redrawn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Aug-15</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Page 58: Photograph 86 should be titled Bell Field, Stamford Road. Bell Field is bounded by Stamford Road, South Road and two parts of West Road.</td>
<td>Text changed as proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Aug-15</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Number 1 South Road is Laurel Bank and Altrincham Prep School and Number 50 Stamford Road is Bank Place, however these names are no longer in use.</td>
<td>No change necessary as names are not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Aug-15</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Page 60: Photograph 91 should be titled View along Stamford Road, not Stamford Park Road.</td>
<td>Noted, change has been made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Person ID</td>
<td>Document Name</td>
<td>Summary of Representation</td>
<td>Proposed Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Aug-15</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Page 71: Photograph 124 The Spindles is in St. Mary’s Road (not Winton Road).</td>
<td>Text changed as proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Aug-15</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Advertisements: We would welcome specific mention of detrimental advertisements as an intrusion and negative factor detracting from the characteristics of the conservation area. While, happily, there are not a large number of such advertisements in the area, there have been problems in the past with unsuitable, intrusive signs on some particular sites. The conservation area management plan should incorporate appropriate restrictions on the categories of advertisements allowed.</td>
<td>Noted. The Management Plan covers this issue in more detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Aug-15</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Blue plaques: We would welcome special mention of the blue plaques in the area as they contribute to the history of the area. Street sign: The Victorian oval street sign on Stamford Road opposite the entrance to Heald Road deserves photographic inclusion. 43 Stamford Road: The windows on the east side deserve photographic inclusion.</td>
<td>Noted. Text has been included in 4.3.42 to mention these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Aug-15</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Rosehill, West Road: The mosaic work around the windows at the rear of Rosehill, which can be seen from South Road, deserves photographic inclusion.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Aug-15</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Changes to the chapter on Plans for Further Action are suggested, with new sections of text.</td>
<td>Some changes made to the text where appropriate. However some issues are too detailed for CAA and instead are covered in the Management Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Aug-15</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>The lack of a ‘detailed’ description of the landscape function that the trees provide and the issues that affect these functions results in lack of clarity in the conclusions set out in Section 8 ‘A Plan for Further action’. It shows a lack of understanding the life expectancy of trees in specific localities but also of the timescales needed for such landscape to develop and maintained. A more technical landscape appraisal should have been undertaken similar to that taken on the built form. Section 8 fails to detail the tree elements that make up the key landscape tree cover of the</td>
<td>Disagree. It is considered text as suggested is not appropriate for the appraisal. No change proposed. However further actions concerning trees are provided in the Management Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Person ID</td>
<td>Document Name</td>
<td>Summary of Representation</td>
<td>Proposed Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Jul-15</td>
<td>Local Resident</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>We welcome the proposal to include our property in the expanded Bowdon Conservation Area. The draft Conservation Area Appraisal is very thorough and systematic.</td>
<td>Support welcomed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-Sep-15</td>
<td>Bowdon Downs Residents Association</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>The house on the front cover is not at all typical of Bowdon. I therefore attach two alternatives.</td>
<td>Agree. This has been changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Jan-16</td>
<td>Local Resident</td>
<td>1406</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>The document indicates that timber windows should only be replaced with timber, not uPVC, for example. Surely if the style and size of the window is maintained compared with the original, it makes sense to allow householders to enjoy the benefits of uPVC in terms of low maintenance, draught reduction and double glazing (which helps keep down energy consumption)?</td>
<td>Timber is preferable as it respects the original character. However the policy says “should” not “must” so any individual planning application on an extension etc. would be considered on its own merits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb-16</td>
<td>Local Residents</td>
<td>1416</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>As residents of Enville Road, we support the extension of the conservation area to include Enville Road, Winton Road and St Mary’s Road</td>
<td>Support Welcomed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Aug-15</td>
<td>Emery</td>
<td>1368</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>The proposals to extend the conservation area boundary, and identify our client’s property as a ‘positive contributor’, fails to satisfy the statutory tests with regard ‘special interest’ and national planning policy guidance.</td>
<td>Disagree. No. 6 Winton Road exhibits a number of features which are identified as characteristic in the CA. These include: The low level front boundary wall comprising distinctly shaped roughly hewn blocks of masonry. The presence of Art and Crafts inspired architectural features including scalloped roof tiles, decorative roof tiles, gable and bay windows and reference to the Cheshire or Tudor Revival Style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Person ID</td>
<td>Document Name</td>
<td>Summary of Representation</td>
<td>Proposed Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-Aug-15</td>
<td>Local Resident</td>
<td>1349</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>On behalf of the residents at Springbank I would like to object to the inclusion of our properties in the conservation area. The building is of no historical or architectural significance being built in 1994. The houses to the left, next to us, are older and have been missed off the conservation area. On the map, the red inclusion line has been routed round our building but we are at a loss to know why.</td>
<td>Agree. Springbank Park constitutes the grounds of the now lost Springbank house. The current Springbank building is a modern construct which does not warrant inclusion within the boundary of the Bowdon CAA on the basis it has &quot;no special architectural interest&quot;. The boundary will be amended to exclude this property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-Aug-15</td>
<td>Local Resident</td>
<td>1349</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Our property is leasehold and therefore already adheres to strict guidelines. The development is purpose built by McCarthy &amp; Stone and therefore will not be adding any extensions.</td>
<td>Agree. Springbank Park constitutes the grounds of the now lost Springbank house. The current Springbank building is a modern construct which does not warrant inclusion within the boundary of the Bowdon CAA on the basis it has &quot;no special architectural interest&quot;. The boundary will be amended to exclude this property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-Aug-15</td>
<td>Local Resident</td>
<td>1349</td>
<td>CAA Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Trees were already given TPO’s at time of planning so we cannot see what possible reason there is for us to be included in the conservation area.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb-16</td>
<td>Patrick Properties Altrincham Holdings Ltd</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon - Jan 2016</td>
<td>With regard to the extension of existing buildings, it is unclear as to how developers should interpret such a policy and for what purpose this policy would serve for the wider objectives for managing change within conservation areas.</td>
<td>Agree. Policy 42 has been amended to encourage extensions to be of high quality and in keeping with the character of the Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb-16</td>
<td>Patrick Properties Altrincham Holdings Ltd</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon - Jan 2016</td>
<td>Seriously concerned that a number of the draft policies require significant re-drafting or deletion with due regard for the provisions of the NPPF and the need for a positive approach to managing appropriate and desirable change within the Bowdon Conservation Area.</td>
<td>Noted. Some policies have been redrafted to be more positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Person ID</td>
<td>Document Name</td>
<td>Summary of Representation</td>
<td>Proposed Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb-16</td>
<td>Patrick Properties Altrincham Holdings Ltd</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon - Jan 2016</td>
<td>The Council should undertake a thorough reassessment of the Draft Appraisal. The identification of the Bowdon Mercure Hotel complex of buildings as a 'Positive Contributor' with the grounds comprising 'Open Space' should be deleted.</td>
<td>Agree. Wording has been added to recognise that the building has inappropriate additions and the reference to open space deleted. However it is still considered to be a positive contributor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb-16</td>
<td>Patrick Properties Altrincham Holdings Ltd</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon - Jan 2016</td>
<td>There is no justification within the Draft Management Plan or the Draft Appraisal for the Townscape Analysis to identify the grounds of the hotel as being 'Open Space'. The grounds of the hotel comprise hardstanding car park. There is no soft landscaping with very few boundary trees. There is no access to the public. The grounds of the building are not characteristic of the 'green, semi-rural feel' of the area (Character Zone C) noted at paragraph 4.3.81 of the Draft Appraisal. There is no justification for identifying the grounds as 'Open Space'; indeed it is inappropriate and misleading to do so.</td>
<td>Agreed. The Townscape Analysis map has been amended to take off the open space annotation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb-16</td>
<td>Patrick Properties Altrincham Holdings Ltd</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon - Jan 2016</td>
<td>The identification of the site as a 'Positive Contributor' fails to meet the test set out within this guidance document at the footnote of page 14.</td>
<td>Disagree. It is considered the hotel meets the criteria as a positive contributor despite its alteration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Jan-16</td>
<td>Local Resident</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon - Jan 2016</td>
<td>Support for the proposals</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Person ID</td>
<td>Document Name</td>
<td>Summary of Representation</td>
<td>Proposed Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb-16</td>
<td>Patrick Properties Altrincham Holdings Ltd</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon - Jan 2016</td>
<td>The Draft Appraisal underlying the Draft Management Plan is fundamentally flawed in its assessment of the key characteristics of the conservation area, and the Bowdon Mercure Hotel site in particular. The document falls well short of what is required to justify the Townscape Analysis Map and list of ‘Positive Contributors’.</td>
<td>Disagree. The draft appraisal has been carried to Historic England guidance and it is considered the Bowdon Hotel is representative of the characteristic architectural Bowdon Villa style in the area. A large part of the hotel is an historic building dating from 1871. Its former use as the Bowdon Hydropathic Establishment is representative of the historic development in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb-16</td>
<td>Patrick Properties Altrincham Holdings Ltd</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon - Jan 2016</td>
<td>The wording of Policy 42 provides a basis for perpetuating poor, low-quality development within the conservation area. It will clearly not be appropriate for extensions to all buildings to ‘echo’ the existing. Secondly, it is a very well-established practice to design extensions to historic buildings such that the addition represents a contemporary departure from the historic form of the existing (see for example the ‘Building in Context: New Development in Historic Areas’ document by Historic England and CABE).</td>
<td>Partially agree. Policy 42 has been amended to encourage extensions to be of high quality and in keeping with the character of the Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb-16</td>
<td>Patrick Properties Altrincham Holdings Ltd</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon - Jan 2016</td>
<td>A number of the forty-seven draft policies within the Draft Management Plan are vague and difficult to understand within the context of development management and for the purposes of assessing planning applications. Furthermore, a number of the draft policies, and those within Section 3.8 in particular (Demolition, Extensions and New Development), are wholly incompatible with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</td>
<td>Partially agree. Policy 42 has been amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Person ID</td>
<td>Document Name</td>
<td>Summary of Representation</td>
<td>Proposed Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb-16</td>
<td>Patrick Properties Altrincham Holdings Ltd</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon - Jan 2016</td>
<td>Loss, substantial harm or less than substantial harm to a heritage asset may be considered acceptable in certain instances such as where public benefits outweigh the harm (see paragraphs 133 and 134). This is consistent with a positive strategy for the historic environment that facilitates appropriate and desirable change over time. Policies 44 and 45 of the Draft Management Plan state that there will be no instances where demolition, partial demolition or substantial alteration to a ‘Positive Contributor’ will be considered acceptable. It is worth noting that a ‘Positive Contributor’ relates to a building or ground of buildings that are not of such heritage interest that they warrant formal designation. This approach fundamentally conflicts with the provisions of the NPPF. Furthermore, there is no recognition whatsoever of the instances where harm, even the loss of or substantial harm of a heritage asset, may be desirable for the local planning authority and the wider community e.g. desirability of putting heritage assets to viable uses or ‘enabling development’ (see for example paragraphs 133 and 140 of the NPPF).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. Policy 45 has been amended to include reference to public benefits outweighing harm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb-16</td>
<td>Patrick Properties Altrincham Holdings Ltd</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon - Jan 2016</td>
<td>The provisions of Policies 44 and 45 are of even more acute concern given the fundamentally flawed nature of the Townscape Analysis at Map 3 of the Draft Management Plan. For instance, there would be no mechanism for the demolition, partial demolition or substantial alteration of any of the existing Bowdon Mercure buildings, which mostly comprise inappropriate and poorly designed 1970/80s additions that contribute negatively to the character of the conservation area.</td>
<td>Partially agree. Map 3 has been amended and Policies 44 and 45 have been amended to encourage the alteration of inappropriate features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Person ID</td>
<td>Document Name</td>
<td>Summary of Representation</td>
<td>Proposed Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb-16</td>
<td>Patrick Properties Altrincham Holdings Ltd</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon - Jan 2016</td>
<td>There is no mechanism within the Draft Management Plan for securing modern, distinctive design that sits well within the historic environment. Rather than providing for a positive and proactive starting point, the Draft Management Plan takes a negative approach to contemporary development with Policy 41 stating that “Modern design is not prohibited within the Conservation Area but ...” There is no acknowledgement of the benefits associated with securing new development of a high quality and contemporary idiom.</td>
<td>Partially agree. Policy 41 has been amended to delete the negative wording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Jan-16</td>
<td>Local Resident</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon - Jan 2016</td>
<td>Boundaries of existing CA's should be kept under review</td>
<td>Agree. The CAMP makes reference to being reviewed on a regular basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Jan-16</td>
<td>Local Resident</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon - Jan 2016</td>
<td>We support the proposed Boundary 'Extension A' area.</td>
<td>Support Welcomed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Feb-16</td>
<td>Local Resident</td>
<td>1421</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon - Jan 2016</td>
<td>Write to enquire as to the methodology used in choosing buildings of 'positive interest'. Any building of some age seems to have been included without having regard to its merit or usefulness. The sheds adjoining the Stamford pub are one example: Yes, the sheds lining the Firs are attractive examples of brickwork, but the sheds behind are an eyesore. Yet they are all listed.</td>
<td>A single building, group or landmark can be classed as a positive contributor. Identification within the appraisal focuses primarily on a building or structure and does not necessarily take in account the positive contribution made also by landscaping, spaciousness and other historic structures within the curtilage or setting of positive contributors. The methodology is written by Historic England. The sheds are former stables that are positive contributors for their place in the character of the area. They are not listed buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Dec-15</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon - Jan 2016</td>
<td>The Environment Agency has no comments to make to the Draft Conservations Management plans.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Representation

1. **Local Resident (12-Jan-16)**
   - **CAMP Bowdon - Jan 2016**
   - **Summary**: In the draft map that divides the conservation area into various character zones. The houses in Birchdale (there are 5 in total, built in late 1970s) are allocated to a zone called 'Ch/?? (cannot read the plan as it is fuzzy) and Commercial Area'. The houses in Birchdale are all residential so I do not understand this categorisation.
   - **Proposed Council Response**: The Zone is "A2 and called "The Civic and commercial" zone. The Appraisal which supports the Management Plan has more detail on the area and states that "The area is characterised by larger buildings, most of which are not residential in use, and large areas of open space." Hence its name.

2. **Health & Safety Executive (15-Jan-16)**
   - **CAMP Bowdon - Jan 2016**
   - **Summary**: Has no comment to make.
   - **Proposed Council Response**: Noted.

3. **Local Resident (10-Feb-16)**
   - **CAMP Bowdon - Jan 2016**
   - **Summary**: As residents of Vale Road in Bowdon we whole heartedly support these proposals.
   - **Proposed Council Response**: Support welcomed.

4. **Natural England (10-Feb-16)**
   - **CAMP Bowdon - Jan 2016**
   - **Summary**: Natural England does not consider that these Draft Conservation Area Management Plans poses any likely risk or opportunity in relation to our statutory purpose, and so does not wish to comment on this consultation.
   - **Proposed Council Response**: Noted.

5. **Bowdon Conservation Group (15-Feb-16)**
   - **CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015**
   - **Summary**: We welcome the publication of the Conservation Area Management Plan (CAMP) for Bowdon.
   - **Proposed Council Response**: Support Welcomed.

6. **Bowdon Conservation Group (15-Feb-16)**
   - **CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015**
   - **Summary**: The content of the draft CAMP is a significant step backwards from the 1992 guidelines in the way that it deals with soft Landscape and the Trees, Green and Open Spaces in Bowdon, both in terms of the description of the Conservation Area (CA), the evidence base and the policies proposed.
   - **Proposed Council Response**: Disagree. The criteria for Conservation Appraisal and Management Plan guidance have changed since the SPG. Historic England Guidance 2008 has been used by our heritage consultants and the former level of detail is not considered appropriate now.

7. **Bowdon Conservation Group (15-Feb-16)**
   - **CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015**
   - **Summary**: The document confuses open space with streets and gardens and tree cover in private gardens, these require separate headings to reflect the description of the Conservation Area set out in the introduction.
   - **Proposed Council Response**: Disagree. Both open spaces with trees and gardens with trees are separately mentioned in the main text of the CAMP. The Policies separate them out under 3.6 Streetscape and Public Realm to cover open spaces and public trees and 3.7 Trees and Landscaping covers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Document Name</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
<th>Proposed Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Within the document the Council does not include any detailed information, in terms of evidence from adopted survey methodology, to defend the soft landscape or even to give applicants any real guidance on retention, enhancement and conservation of the soft landscape of the Bowdon Conservation Area.</td>
<td>Disagree. HE guidance criteria was used and there is considered to be of an appropriate level of detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>The wording of the proposed policies in relation to landscape and trees, put forward in the document, lacks any clarity as to what the Council expects land owners / developers to consider or any references to which they could go to for guidance</td>
<td>Disagree. HE guidance criteria was used and there is considered to be of an appropriate level of detail. It is considered trees and landscape advice is very specific to the circumstances of each individual application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>There is a greater degree of detail in the Devisdale CAMP than in the Bowdon document, in terms both of the description of the characteristics of the CA and the policies proposed. We would like to see a greater level of detail in the Bowdon CAMP, at least matching the level in the Devisdale CAMP.</td>
<td>Disagree. The Devisdale is characterised by a very significant historic open space very different from Bowdon. Each CAA and CAMP contains appropriate detail on the different characteristics of each area. The importance of the landscape is referenced in many places in the Bowdon CAA and CAMP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>At section 1.2.1 (Significance Statement), there is no mention of landscape which is a ‘significant omission’ in a planning sense.</td>
<td>Disagree. The rich architectural variety and integrity in Bowdon CA is its predominate significance referenced in 1.2.2 refers to more details in the CAA where landscape importance is mentioned in 3.1.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>While the CAA may be adequate in terms of its descriptions and analysis of buildings it is certainly wholly inadequate in how it deals with soft landscape features and green spaces, as was set out in BCG’s formal response to the draft CAA for Bowdon. The CAMP contains no improvement in terms of its inclusion of soft landscape issues, details of the structure and function of the soft landscape.</td>
<td>Disagree. The Council’s heritage consultant considers the level of detail appropriate to a CAMP, but suggests further assessment focussing specifically on the trees should be the subject of a separate document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>While the document provides some 8 pages and 14 policies on buildings, which provide the sound evidence base (as required by the NPPF) for directing development applications and defending at appeal, the same cannot be said for the details on soft</td>
<td>Disagree. The Council’s heritage consultant considers the level of detail appropriate to a CAMP, but suggests further assessment focussing specifically on the trees should be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Person ID</td>
<td>Document Name</td>
<td>Summary of Representation</td>
<td>Proposed Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>landscape and trees. There is 1 page and 4 policies on landscape and trees and no evidence base for the soft landscape, in particular the tree cover.</td>
<td>the subject of a separate document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>At Section 1.6 the document refers to Conservation Area Policy Guidance and lists the guidance documents issued by Historic England (HE) since 2005; however, it does not list the most recent updates from 2012.</td>
<td>Noted. The CAA and CAMP was carried out by heritage consultants using the relevant HE guidance for these types of documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>We suggest that much of the detail from the 1992 SPG should be incorporated into this updated CAMP for Bowdon.</td>
<td>Disagree. The criteria for Conservation Appraisal and Management Plan guidance have changed since the SPG. Historic England Guidance 2008 has been used by our heritage consultant and the former level of detail is not considered appropriate now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>We suggest publishing the CAA as an appendix to the CAMP and incorporating clearly signposted links (including web links) from one document to the other.</td>
<td>Noted. The CAA and CAMP are both adopted as supplementary planning guidance of equal weight and make reference within their text to each other. The advice from the heritage consultant was that they should be two separate documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group strongly argues that a detailed survey should be undertaken of the soft landscape, trees, green and open spaces of the CA and that this should cover both the public open spaces and, at least in outline, the private green spaces within the CA.</td>
<td>Noted. The Councils heritage consultant suggests further assessment focussing specifically on the trees should be the subject of a separate document. Policy 29 includes a policy as suggested through consultation comments for the preparation of a Tree Management Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>We reiterate the offer in this response and restate our willingness to fund and undertake a pilot for a landscape/tree character study of the Bowdon CA in order to start the process of providing a proper evidence base for this aspect of the CAMP.</td>
<td>Noted. This offer will be passed onto the Council’s Tree Officer for further consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>The Bowdon draft CAMP, unlike the Devisdale document, does not separately describe the five different character zones in Bowdon CA. The distinctive planting referenced in the CAA is not discussed in detail, even at the level of the CA overall and this results in a lack of adequate evidence, guidance and policy.</td>
<td>The CAA has equal weight to the CAMP in planning terms and the different layout and styles of the different CAAs and CAMPs reflects their different issues but also different authors and times of preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>The map provided at page 21 does not meet the standard</td>
<td>Noted. Views are an important characteristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Person ID</td>
<td>Document Name</td>
<td>Summary of Representation</td>
<td>Proposed Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Conservation Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>methodology in terms of the symbols used or the approach, e.g. it does not include any views of the conservation area from outside the area to highlight the skyline views from south, north and west. In fact the map only shows views into public open space and along the main highway system.</td>
<td>of Bowdon and numerous references and detail to them is contained in the CAA. It is acknowledged that these are not all shown on the Townscape Map as they are so far reaching. However the CAA and CAMP will be used together to guide planning decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Some important gaps in terms of how the CAMP deals with issues such as lighting for sports clubs, street lighting, street clutter, the hard landscaping associated with traffic management and parking. These gaps need to be addressed in the CAMP and its policies. This issue is dealt with in the Devisdale CAMP. We suggest that the Bowdon CAMP should incorporate similar policies to those in the Devisdale CAMP.</td>
<td>Agree. A policy should be added to cover floodlighting for sports pitches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>The suggestion of use of a lantern style lamp made in paragraph 2.7.1 is welcomed and should be reflected in the policies in the CAMP and, as in the case of the Devisdale CAMP, there should be a policy of reduced light levels to ‘warm white’ LED lighting if and where existing sodium lighting is replaced by LED lighting.</td>
<td>Agree. Policy 36 has been amended and covers the appropriate lighting levels as “warm white”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Alongside the retention of historic kerbstones and cobbled setts, we suggest that any hard landscaping associated with existing and new traffic management schemes (parking, speed restrictions and so on) should be in keeping with the existing conservation area characteristics and there should be a policy to this effect.</td>
<td>Agree. It is considered Policy 37 adequately addresses traffic calming measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>We suggest that street furniture and street signage be kept to a minimum in the conservation area and street clutter minimised. Signage should also be well designed and in keeping with the CA. The CAMP should incorporate policies aimed at achieving this.</td>
<td>Agree. It is considered that this is adequately addressed in several places in both the text of the CAA and CAMP particularly on signage and through Policy 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>It is important for the character of the CA that it is protected from displaced parking and rat runs caused by development and parking restrictions in neighbouring areas.</td>
<td>Noted. This is considered to be beyond the scope of the CAA and CAMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>The CAMP for Bowdon should incorporate policies aimed at protecting the green spaces, trees and landscaping of the CA from these incremental, ongoing losses as well as from losses at the time of development.</td>
<td>Agree. Section 3.6 and 3.7 incorporate these policies. Trees in Conservation Areas are protected by legislation. Policy 29 and Appendix C states this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Receive d</td>
<td>Organisatio n</td>
<td>Perso n ID</td>
<td>Document Name</td>
<td>Summary of Representation</td>
<td>Proposed Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>We agree with the statements in 2.9.2 and 2.9.3 and 2.10.1. However, these statements need also to be reflected in a specific policy for the CA.</td>
<td>Disagree. The whole CAA and CAMP is policy in the form of Supplementary Planning Guidance and is taken into account in Planning decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>A number of changes are required to the proposed management policies in the draft CAMP. In some cases these are needed to remedy gaps in the current proposed policies, in other cases they are needed for consistency with policies in the adjacent Devisdale CA.</td>
<td>Disagree. Each CAA and CAMP is bespoke to the issues of the specific conservation area. However, it is considered that policies have been replicated, where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td><strong>Policy 1</strong> states that it will investigate cases of unauthorised development as appropriate and take action as necessary etc. However, there is no mention of putting in place an Enforcement Concordat with developers to minimise such occurrences. In addition there is no mention of undertaking pro-active enforcement particularly important for safeguarding soft landscape features such as trees and important boundary plantings.</td>
<td>Disagree. This is not appropriate for the CAMP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td><strong>Policy 2</strong> should also make reference to the Conservation Area Appraisal for Bowdon.</td>
<td>Disagree. Text in the introduction in 1.1.6 and 1.3.3 states that the CAMP should be read in conjunction with the CAA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td><strong>Policy 6</strong> should also make reference to the Conservation Area Appraisal for Bowdon as this contains further detail on the characteristic palette of materials and design features in the CA. The words ‘where possible’ should be added to Policy 11. The guidance on doors is particularly detailed and side hung garage doors cannot be used on some garages, notably basement ones.</td>
<td>Disagree. Text in the introduction in 1.1.6 and 1.3.3 states that the CAMP should be read in conjunction with the CAA. It is not considered appropriate to include the word “where possible”, this would undermine the overall weight of the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td><strong>Policy 24</strong> should be amended to be consistent with the policy proposed for the Devisdale CA.</td>
<td>Disagree. Each CAA and CAMP is bespoke to the issues of the specific Conservation area. However, it is considered that policies have been replicated, where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>The existing 1992 Guidance for this conservation area contains a blue print layout showing the ‘landscape structure’ that should be aimed for. Policy 29 is also currently drafted far too narrowly. A Tree Management strategy should be prepared and</td>
<td>Disagree. The 1992 Guidance does not meet current HE criteria for a CAA or CAMP. Reference is made to TPO legislation in the Bowdon CAMP. Each CAA and CAMP is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open green spaces are also protected by Policy R5 in the Core Strategy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Document Name</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
<th>Proposed Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Policy 37 needs to be amended. As drafted it refers to streets in the adjacent Devisdale CA rather than in Bowdon. A traffic survey is needed along the roads which provide access to the newly rebuilt and expanding Bowdon Church School, notably Grange Road, and the reference should be changed to this</td>
<td>Agree. Policy 37 should be amended to change the streets named to: include Roads around Bowdon Church School notably Grange Road and Stamford Road near the School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>The Policy and Aims for Trees and Landscaping, Section 3.7, while welcome, fail to provide any real guidance to developers and landowners as to what information is needed in regard to soft landscape and trees to ensure they are correctly assessed</td>
<td>Disagree. The amount of detail needed will depend on each individual application and will need to be considered on a case by case basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>Policy 45 should be amended and strengthened by adding to it the second sentence of the corresponding policy in the Devisdale CAMP</td>
<td>Disagree. Policy 45 has been amended as a result of another representation as it was considered too restrictive. Notwithstanding this, the requested additional sentence is considered to be covered by Policy 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>An additional policy is also needed which makes clear the undesirability of the sub-division of existing plots to build additional residences.</td>
<td>Disagree. The policies already refer to Section 2 where this detail is found. Most specifically in 2.9.3 and 2.10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Feb 16</td>
<td>Bowdon Conservation Group</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>CAMP Bowdon Draft-2015</td>
<td>We believe that it is important to emphasise the linkage between these two documents as the detail in the CAA provides much of the evidence base relevant to the CAMP</td>
<td>Noted. The two documents should be read together and both make reference to the other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Person ID</td>
<td>Document Name</td>
<td>Summary of Representation</td>
<td>Proposed Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supplementary Planning Document: Bowdon Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan
Consultation Statement
Appendix 1 – List of Consultees

Duty to Cooperate Bodies:

- Association of Greater Manchester Authorities;
- Cheshire East Council;
- Civil Aviation Authority;
- Environment Agency;
- Greater Manchester Combined Authority;
- Greater Manchester Local Enterprise Partnership;
- Greater Manchester Local Nature Partnership;
- Historic England;
- Homes and Communities Agency;
- Manchester City Council;
- Natural England;
- NHS England;
- Office of Rail Regulation;
- Salford City Council;
- Trafford Clinical Commissioning Group;
- Trafford Local Highways Authority;
- Transport for Greater Manchester;
- Warrington Council;

Specific Consultation Bodies:

The following Specific Consultation Bodies will be consulted as a matter of course on all GMSF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan documents and, where relevant, Supplementary Planning and Other Planning Documents.

Please note: This list also relates to successor bodies where re-organisations occur.

- Agden Parish Council
- Ashley Parish Council
- Carrington Parish Council
- Cheshire East Council;
- Dunham Massey Parish Council
- Environment Agency
- Greater Manchester Combined Authority;
- GM Local Enterprise Partnership
- Highways England;
- Historic England;
- Homes and Communities Agency (HCA)
- Little Bollington Parish Meeting
- Lymm Parish Council
- Manchester City Council;
- Natural England
- Network Rail Infrastructure Limited
- NHS England
- Partington Town Council
- Rixton with Glazebrook Parish Council
- Rostherne Parish Council
- Salford City Council
- The Coal Authority
- The Marine Management Organisation
• Warburton Parish Council
• Warrington Council;
• Any person to whom the electronic communications code applies and who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus within the Borough e.g. Mobile Operators Association, Hutchinson 3G, etc.
• A person to whom a licence has been granted under the Electricity Act 1989 e.g. Electricity NW Ltd;
• A person to whom a licence has been granted under the Gas Act 1986 e.g. National Grid
• A sewerage undertaker e.g. United Utilities
• A water undertaker e.g. United Utilities

General Consultation Bodies

The following General Consultation Bodies will be consulted as appropriate on all GMSF, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan documents and, where relevant, Supplementary Planning and Other Planning Documents.

• Voluntary bodies, some or all of whose activities benefit the Borough
• Bodies representing the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups within the Borough
• Bodies representing the interests of different religious groups in the Borough
• Bodies representing the interests of disabled persons in the Borough
• Bodies representing the interests of persons carrying on business in the Borough

Other Consultation Bodies

The following groups/ organisations will be consulted on GMSF, Local Plan, Neighbourhood, Supplementary and Other Planning Documents and Planning Applications as and when this is deemed to be appropriate by the Council in relation to the subject matter and their area of interest. Please note: This list is not exhaustive and will be amended as and when it is necessary to do so.

• Adactus Housing Group;
• Altrincham and Bowdon Civic Society;
• Altrincham and Sale Chamber of Commerce;
• Altrincham Forward;
• Altrincham Town Centre Business Neighbourhood Forum;
• Ancient Monuments Society;
• Arawak Walton Housing Association;
• Arriva Bus;
• Arriva Trains Wales;
• Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA) Joint Units;
• Bowdon Conservation Group;
• British Chemical Distributors and Traders Association;
• British Energy Association
• British Gas
• British Geological Survey;
• British Telecommunications PLC
• British Waterways
• Campaign for Better Transport;
• Campaign for Real Ale;
• Centre for Ecology and Hydrology;
• Cheshire Wildlife Trust;
• Church Commissioners;
• Citizens Advice Bureau
• Civic Trust;
- Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment at the Design Council;
- Commission for Equality and Human Rights;
- Council for British Archaeology
- Council for the Protection of Rural England;
- Crown Estate Office;
- Department for Business Innovation & Skills;
- Department for Culture, Media and Sport;
- Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs;
- Department for Transport;
- Department of Health;
- Department of Work and Pensions;
- Diocesan Board of Finance;
- Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee;
- Fields in Trust;
- First Group PLC;
- First TransPennine Express;
- Forestry Commission;
- Freight Transport Association;
- Friends of the Earth;
- Garden History Society;
- Georgian Group;
- Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service;
- Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce;
- Greater Manchester Ecology Unit;
- Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service
- Minerals and Waste Unit;
- Greater Manchester Police
- Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority
- Great Places Housing Group;
- Gypsy Council
- Hale Civic Society;
- Health and Safety Executive
- Home Builders Federation
- Home Office
- Irwell Valley Housing Association;
- Lancashire Wildlife Trust;
- Lead Local Flood Authority;
- Living Streets;
- Local businesses;
- Major land/property owners
- Manchester Airport;
- Manchester Barton Aerodrome;
- Manchester Ship Canal Company;
- Ministry of Defence;
- Ministry of Justice;
- NASSEA;
- National Trust;
- Network Rail;
- New Economy;
- Northern Trains;
- Peel Ports;
- Renewable Energy Association
- Road Haulage Association;
- Royal Mail Property Group
• Royal Society for the Protection of Birds;
• Sale Civic Society;
• Society for Protection of Ancient Buildings;
• Sport England;
• St Vincent’s Housing Association;
• Stagecoach Bus;
• Stretford M32 Group;
• The Rail Freight Group;
• The Showmen's Guild of Great Britain
• The Theatres Trust;
• Timperley Civic Society;
• Trafford Cycle Forum;
• Trafford Housing Trust;
• Trafford Partnership & Locality Partnerships
• Trafford Ramblers;
• Transport for Greater Manchester;
• Traveller Law Reform Project;
• Twentieth Century Society;
• Voluntary Community Action Trafford;
• Women's National Commission;
• Woodford Aerodrome;
• Woodland Trust;
TRAFFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL
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Supplementary Planning Document – Regulation 12 Public Participation

Proposed titles of the Documents
• Conservation Area Management Plan – Ashley Heath - Consultation Draft
• Conservation Area Management Plan – Bowdon - Consultation Draft
• Conservation Area Management Plan – Devisdale - Consultation Draft
• Conservation Area Management Plan – George Street - Consultation Draft
• Conservation Area Management Plan – Goose Green - Consultation Draft
• Conservation Area Management Plan – Hale Station - Consultation Draft
• Conservation Area Management Plan – Sandiway - Consultation Draft
• Conservation Area Management Plan – The Downs - Consultation Draft

Proposed subject matter of the Documents
The Conservation Area Management Plans provide guidance for property owners or occupiers to ensure historic features are protected and/or enhanced within the conservation area. Guidance is also given for owners who want to make changes to their properties.

Notification of Adoption of the Documents
Any representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address of the approval of the documents/adoption of the Supplementary Planning Documents.

Availability of documents: All the Draft Documents are available for public inspection at all public libraries/Access Trafford offices in Trafford, during normal opening hours. For more information about location and opening hours go to: http://www.trafford.gov.uk/residents/leisure-and-lifestyle/libraries/libraries-intrafford/libraries-in-trafford.aspx

The documents, including the comments form, can also be found on the Council’s website: www.trafford.gov.uk. If needed, summary material can be made available in large print, Braille and other languages. For further information please contact the Planning helpline on 0161 912 3149.

Address to which representations must be sent: Written representations should be submitted to Planning Services, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0TH or by e-mail to strategic.planning@trafford.gov.uk. If you have any queries please call 0161 912 3149.

Period in which representations must be made: Written representations must be made between 9.00am 4th January 2016 and 5.00p.m 15th February 2016.

Stephen James
Head of Strategic Growth
TRAFFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
Localism Act 2011

The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

Supplementary Planning Document – Regulation 12 Public Participation

Proposed titles of the Documents
Revised Trafford Statement of Community Involvement – Consultation Draft;
Review of Planning Guidance in Trafford – Consultation Document;
Conservation Area Appraisal – Ashley Heath - Consultation Draft
Conservation Area Appraisal – Barton-Upon-Irwell - Consultation Draft
Conservation Area Appraisal – Bowdon - Consultation Draft
Conservation Area Appraisal – Devisdale - Consultation Draft
Conservation Area Appraisal – Hale Station - Consultation Draft
Conservation Area Appraisal – Linotype Consultation Draft and Management Plan
Conservation Area Appraisal - Sandiway - Consultation Draft
Conservation Area Appraisal - South Hale - Consultation Draft

Proposed subject matter of the Documents
- The proposed revised Trafford Statement of Community Involvement sets out how and when the community in Trafford will be involved in the preparation of a Local Plan and other planning documents and how they will be consulted on planning applications.
- The Review of Planning Guidance in Trafford sets out the scope of a proposed review, including details of how the Council will update or replace existing guidance and produce new guidance for development proposals in the Borough;
- The proposed Advertisements, Signage and Shop Fronts Supplementary Planning Document sets out and explains the Council’s requirements and expectations in terms of design, location and positioning of adverts, signage and shop fronts across the Borough, in the interests of creating and maintaining high quality commercial and residential environments;
- The proposed conservation area appraisals provide an assessment of special interest; an audit of heritage assets; an assessment of condition and; set out a plan for further action. Additionally, the proposed conservation areas identify the proposed boundary for each of the conservation areas and Linotype Management Plan proposes development management policies.

Notification of Adoption of the Documents
Any representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address of the approval of the documents / adoption of the Supplementary Planning Documents.

Availability of documents: All the Draft Documents are available for public inspection at all public libraries/Access Trafford offices in Trafford, during normal opening hours. For
more information about location and opening hours go to: http://www.trafford.gov.uk/leisureandculture/libraries/librariesintrafford/

The documents, including the comments form, can also be found on the Council’s website: www.trafford.gov.uk. If needed, summary material can be made available in large print, Braille and other languages. For further information please contact the Planning helpline on 0161 912 3149.

Address to which representations must be sent: Written representations should be submitted to Planning Services, Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0TH Tel: 0161 912 3149 (e-mail: strategic.planning@trafford.gov.uk).

Period in which representations may be made: Written representations may be made between 9:00am Monday 29th June 2015 and 5:00 p.m Monday 10th August 2015.

Rob Haslam Head of Planning