

RAMSEY BOUNDARY REVIEW, CHARACTER ASSESSMENT & MANAGEMENT PLAN: SUMMARY OF RESPONSES **APPENDIX ONE**

- 1 – action taken
 2 – not within the remit of this document
 3 – no action taken

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Action
1	Ramsey Town Council 7 Church Green Ramsey Cambs PE26 1DW Town Council	(i) Councillors indicated a preference for the Conservation Area to be restricted to areas of architectural merit and interest.	<i>This issue discussed further with the Town Council on 10th November 2005 to explain the importance of areas of historic significance as well as those of architectural significance;</i>	1
		(ii) Councillors pointed out that land included in the Conservation Area at the northern end of Ramsey is also included in the Northern Gateway Development.	<i>Inclusion of part of the Northern Gateway within the proposed conservation area will ensure that any new development will respect the elements of historic and architectural significance that exist and the setting of the Great Whyte.</i>	2
2	Cambridgeshire County Box ET1010 Shire Hall Castle Hill Cambs CB3 0AP Council	(i) In general welcome the review of the Conservation Area boundaries, particularly the extensions that include the rural landscape and associated landscape features (such as trees and hedgerows);	<i>Noted</i>	3
		(ii) District-wide Core Strategy will require a change to the Conservation Area policies (B7) that currently only refer to built structures and features. These will need to be widened to cover protection of the landscape & landscape features.	<i>Passed on to relevant officer for action</i>	1
3	Middle Level Commissioners Dartford Road March	(i) The commission is one of four drainage bodies involved within the proposed Conservation Area;	<i>Noted</i>	3

	<p>Cambs PE15 8AF</p>	<p>(ii) Comments concerning development within area 2 only (on behalf of either the Commissioners or the Ramsey, Upwood & Great Raveley Internal Drainage Board) remain generally those raised in a letter dated 10th June 2004 concerning the draft Ramsey Gateway document.</p>	<p><i>Noted</i></p>	
<p>4</p>	<p>English Heritage Brooklands 24 Brooklands Avenue Cambs CB2 2BU</p>	<p>Pleased to see that the Council has approached the review in a bold and far-reaching manner. Having visited Ramsey and read the documents would like to make some specific comments:</p> <p><u>A: Boundary Review</u></p> <p>(i) The main justification for inclusion of the area around the northern railway station is historic rather than architectural. Needs more information about the “shadow” of the industrial archaeology in the text;</p> <p>(ii) The 20th century housing within the Abbey Environs not of special local character but the buildings contained in spaces in an Arcadian manner justifies inclusion. A more detailed description would help in an appeal situation.</p> <p>(iii) The post-enclosure areas need re-assessing in those sections where the majority of the houses are from the late 20th century and exhibit nothing in terms of local distinctiveness of style, materials or layout.</p> <p><u>B: Character Assessment</u></p> <p>Arguably more detail is required with regard to buildings, spaces and other townscape features (including information on specifically local materials and details such as shop fronts, window surrounds etc.) that give conservation areas a definable character.</p>	<p><i>A meeting was held with English Heritage on 27th September to agree an approach to changes to the documents.</i></p> <p><i>Amendments have been made to the text of the character assessment to provide more information;</i></p> <p><i>More information added in the additional pages added dealing with spatial analysis and building detail;</i></p> <p><i>This is a contentious issue as it is difficult to reach agreement between experts as to where the dividing line should be drawn. After further consideration officers have re-aligned the boundary along Newtown Road and Station Road to accommodate this point.</i></p> <p><i>This point has been taken on board by the addition of two further pages in the sections on the localities in the Character Assessment document. Officers are indebted to English Heritage for their guidance on this issue.</i></p>	<p>1</p>

		<p><u>C: The management Plan</u></p> <p>With regard to the public realm the few surviving local features warrant identification. Aspects such as the dominance of parking and the clutter arising from excessive amounts of street furniture could be the subjects of enhancement projects (with community involvement) in the lifespan of the management plan.</p>	<p><i>This issue is being taken forward in the plans to implement the management plan upon approval by the Council. The involvement of the community is seen as essential to the success of this aspect of the project.</i></p>	
5	<p>Smiths Gore The Kings Lodging Minster Precincts Peterborough PE1 1XT</p>	<p>Representing Clients who own land and property in Ramsey, which is potentially affected by the proposals. Objection to the proposed extension to the Ramsey Conservation Area on the following basis:</p> <p>(i) A belief that the proper way to consider changes to conservation areas is via the Local Development Framework; Cannot see any particular need to enlarge the existing Ramsey Conservation Area and believes that to increase the designated area carries with it the danger that the concept of a conservation area is undermined and devalued;</p> <p>(ii) Disagrees with the inclusion of Bury Church and the intervening open land. Would prefer a separate conservation area for Bury.</p> <p>(iii) Client specifically objects to the inclusion of the area described as No. 4 'Extension along the Bury Road'. Questions whether it is "special" enough.</p>	<p><i>The respondent has not declared where his client's property is located, which makes a full response to the issues raised more difficult. However, a written response will be sent to the respondent by the Conservation team Leader.</i></p> <p><i>There is a clear statutory process laid down for boundary review by the Planning (Listed building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which has been followed by officers of the Council. This does not correspond with the opinion of the respondent. In line with best practice set out by Planning Policy Guidance 15 consultation with the public has been undertaken, even though this is not a statutory requirement.</i></p> <p><i>This is an opinion that is not shared by officers of the Council or the majority of respondents.</i></p> <p><i>The case for the inclusion of Bury Road is very strong. The majority of the other respondents recognise this and support it.</i></p>	1

		(iv) Suggests that the Management Plan needs greater detail to make it effective.	<i>The document concerning the management plan is, at this stage, an outline document identifying locations and approaches to be developed into a full operational plan once the parameters have been agreed. Therefore, officers can agree with this statement.</i>	
6	John Martin & Associates Farm Hall Offices, West Street, Godmanchester	<p>On behalf of The Fellowes Family Trust objecting to the inclusion of area 2 (North of the Great Whyte) & area 3 (North Eastern Approaches) in the proposed Boundary review. Reasons for the objection are as follows:</p> <p><u>Area 2:</u></p> <p>(i) A belief that a raft of measures is already in place with sufficient safeguards to enable the development of Area 2 to be carried out to a high standard and safeguard the few acknowledged important historical features such as the High Lode water way, whilst preserving and enhancing the entrance to the town and the 'backdrop' to the existing conservation area boundary in this part of the town;</p> <p>(ii) The client's opinion that Area 2 has no areas of special architectural interest and limited tangible historic interest and that inclusion would devalue the concept of the conservation area as stated in PPG 15.</p> <p><u>Area 3:</u></p> <p>(i) The client believes that sufficient safeguards are already in place to protect Area 3 from harmful development which might have a detrimental impact on this approach into the town, adjacent the existing conservation area boundary;</p>	<p><i>In general terms it is felt that the respondent has failed to take the needs of the whole conservation area into consideration. The two localities commented upon are elements within the whole. They are not designed to be judged in their own right as separate "conservation areas". The decision to break the Conservation Area down into localities was to make analysis easier, and officers regret that this has led to some confusion. Response explaining this to be sent by Conservation Team Leader.</i></p> <p><i>A raft of measures designed, primarily, for other purposes is not considered to be justification for exclusion of this locality from the Conservation Area. This area is considered to be important for the integrity of the conservation area as a whole.</i></p> <p><i>Officers are not in agreement with this opinion. The value of this locality has been discussed with English Heritage who have recognised the importance of the historical elements within it.</i></p>	1
			As above	

		(ii) The client's opinion is that, despite containing several listed buildings, the large expanse of farmland in the open countryside does not warrant conservation area status.	<i>This is not a viable argument in terms of the whole settlement upon which judgement about conservation area status depends. The respondent's analysis does not take sufficient account of the relationships between the different elements as required by PPG 15.</i>	
7	Jane Yardley Ramsey Rural Museum	(i) Welcomes the extension of the conservation area boundary.	<i>Noted</i>	1
		(ii) Particularly concerned that the historic and architectural infrastructure at the Northern Gateway is retained.	<i>Noted</i>	
		(iii) Also drew attention to the need to provide adequate parking in the right place to encourage economic growth within the town.	<i>This point referred to the officer responsible for the Management Plan;</i>	
		(iv) Supports enhancement schemes at Boothe's Hill and Bury Brook behind the George; restoration of the railings around the war memorial and the Clock in the Great Whyte;	<i>As above</i>	
		(v) Proposed the inclusion of a significant archaeological site south of Bury Church containing a possible Roman or Saxon fortified site and deserted medieval village.	<i>Cambridgeshire Archaeological Service has confirmed the significance of the site and its relevance to the early history of Bury. Having considered the evidence it is proposed to include an additional two fields, which contain the best archaeological material.</i>	
8	Ramsey Resident	(i) Think it is a good idea to change the boundary of the conservation area and that the new boundary is correct;	<i>Views noted</i>	3
		(ii) Find the Character Assessment useful for understanding the historic character of Ramsey;	<i>Views noted</i>	
		(iii) Support the idea of a management plan for the new conservation area, that it will benefit the town and agree with the range of projects proposed;	<i>Views noted</i>	
		(iv) This will be a continually evolving process so it will be necessary to carry out regular reviews.	<i>Views noted</i>	

9	Ramsey Resident	(i)	Good idea to change the boundary of the conservation area. Good idea to see long views included – shame this didn't exist before development behind Church Green;	<i>Noted</i>	3
		(ii)	The new boundary is mostly correct, but why Newtown Road and not Field Road? Both Victorian/Edwardian – more old buildings in Field Road!	<i>The decision about the placing of the boundary in this part of the town has been mentioned under the responses to comments made by English Heritage above. There is merit in the argument concerning Field Road, but inclusion would be difficult without creating an outlier (in effect a small conservation area on its own, which it would not merit).</i>	
		(iii)	Find the Character Assessment useful for understanding the historic character of Ramsey	<i>Noted</i>	
		(iv)	Support the idea of a management plan but uncertain whether the plan will bring benefits to the town. Economic development is essential! We're getting more houses & fewer shops & businesses. Long commuters add to global warming.	<i>Noted</i>	
		(v)	Need more detail on the range of projects proposed.	<i>Agreed</i>	

10	Ramsey Resident	(i)	Good idea to change the boundary of the conservation area. Increase area to the north and include any proposed future development/current development;	<i>Noted</i>	
		(ii)	The new boundary is not correct. Please include railway site: future rail link;	<i>This is not an issue for this document</i>	2
		(iii)	Centre Market on Great Whyte should have individual bay underground services/grid for water/electricity supply. Pave out area of road as pedestrian with permitted vehicle access for market & residential/trade.	<i>Suggestion passed on to appropriate officer for action</i>	2
11	Ramsey Resident	(i)	Good idea to change the boundary of the conservation area – currently too small and needs to take in broader area. The new boundary is correct;	<i>Noted</i>	3
		(ii)	The character Assessment is self-explanatory and useful for understanding the historic character of Ramsey. Useful to have explanation of development from pre-medieval times to 21 st century;	<i>Noted</i>	
		(iii)	Support the idea of a management plan. Need to keep aware of development and increased building – industrial, residential & commercial. Think the plan will bring benefits to the town & may stop unsympathetic development;	<i>Noted</i>	
		(iv)	Agree with the range of projects generally. Very keen to keep façade of Grand Cinema;	<i>Noted – a separate Development Brief for the Grand cinema site has been produced by the Council</i>	
		(v)	The plan should address development of facilities, not just the character but also the content. More provision needed for the young; affordable housing etc. Ramsey in danger of becoming a retirement town.	<i>The Ramsey Action Plan intends to address these issues, in consultation with the community.</i>	

12	Ramsey Resident	(i)	Think it is a good idea to change the boundary of the conservation area – original very small;	<i>Noted</i>	3
		(ii)	The new boundary is correct. Nice to see some of Bury included;	<i>Noted</i>	
		(iii)	The Character Assessment useful for understanding the historic character of Ramsey;	<i>Noted</i>	
		(iv)	Support the idea of the management plan and think that it will bring benefits to the town. Agree with the range of projects proposed.	<i>Noted</i>	
13	Ramsey Resident	(i)	Think it a good idea to change the boundary of the conservation area and that the new boundary is correct. I hope that the area around Ramsey N Station will become an open area sympathetically managed for wildlife;	<i>Noted</i>	3
		(ii)	The Character Assessment useful for understanding the historic character of Ramsey;	<i>Noted</i>	
		(iii)	Support the idea of a management plan for the new conservation area, that it will benefits to the town and agree with the range of projects proposed;	<i>Noted</i>	
		(iv)	Avoid large developments that will wreck town centre shopping.	<i>Noted</i>	
14	Ramsey Resident	(i)	Think it is a good idea to change the boundary of the conservation area and that the new boundary is correct;	<i>Noted</i>	3
		(ii)	Find the Character Assessment useful for understanding the historic character of Ramsey;	<i>Noted</i>	
		(iii)	Support the idea of a management plan for the new conservation area, that it will bring benefits to the town and agree with the range of projects proposed;	<i>Noted</i>	

15	Urban Design Officer, HDC	<ul style="list-style-type: none">i) Minor text and graphic improvements needed to Design Codeii) Amend Management Plan map to accord with revised Conservation Area boundary.	<i>Amendments made</i>	1
----	------------------------------	---	------------------------	---

END.