

APPENDIX 3:

CONSULTATION FEEDBACK

APPENDIX 3: CONSULTATION FEEDBACK

1. Background

- 1.1. Possible improvements to building facades and conservation area streetscape were the subject of public consultation between 7 April and 14 May 2017. Consultation documents were published on the council's website and a letter, notifying residents of the consultation, was sent to every address in Driffield Road and Medway conservation areas. An email was also sent to residents of the two conservation areas who had responded to previous consultations by email, the email provided direct links to the consultation documents. The consultation was also advertised on the council's Twitter feed.
- 1.2. Two drop-in events were held in Bow as part of the consultation. At these events, consultation material was displayed and council officers and the council's design consultants were on-hand to answer any questions and discuss the proposals with members of the public. The two events were held on:
 - Thursday 20 April 2017, 17.00 to 20.00 at Bow Idea Store.
 - Thursday 11 May 2017, 14.00 to 17.00 at St Paul's Church.
- 1.3. In addition to seeking the views of local residents; Historic England, the Victorian Society, the Georgian Group, the Ancient Monuments Society and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) were also contacted. As were Registered Providers who own housing stock in the two conservation areas were also contacted and asked to comment.

2. Public consultation responses

- 2.1. A total of **208** responses were received. The majority were sent by email, with some written comments handed in at the consultation events and a small number sent through the post. Not all of the responses received offered comments on the possible improvements to building facades and conservation area streetscape, but instead commented on the acceptability of mansard roof extensions in general.
- 2.2. **115** responses offered some support for the principle of façade enhancements to mitigate harm caused by mansard roof extensions. **94** responses offered some support for the principle of streetscape enhancements to mitigate harm caused by mansard roof extensions.
- 2.3. **15** responses objected to the use of façade enhancements to mitigate the harm caused by mansard roof extensions. **18** responses objected to the use of streetscape enhancements to mitigate the harm caused by mansard roof extensions.
- 2.4. A number of residents who supported the proposed façade enhancements did so cautiously, on the understanding that they are applied in a 'sensible fashion'. Some respondents questioned how harm and benefit might be quantified and how the assessment of these would be applied consistently and fairly across planning applications. Other respondents questioned if the council would be able to enforce the delivery of façade enhancements.
- 2.5. A number of residents advised that they have already carried out façade improvements to their buildings, commenting that this may limit their ability to provide further enhancements as part of a planning application including a mansard roof extension. Residents also commented that it would seem unfair if historic façade improvements were not taken into account in the balancing of harm for a future application for a mansard roof extension.

- 2.6. A number of residents who supported the proposed streetscape enhancements also did so cautiously, again on the understanding that they are applied in a 'sensible fashion'. Some of the proposed streetscape enhancements were specifically welcomed, and additional suggestions such as lighting to tackle anti-social behaviour, traffic calming measures and cycle storage were also made.
- 2.7. Many of the consultation responses received did not comment specifically on the example of a £1,000 contribution given in the consultation documents. However, a small number of residents commented that this would be a reasonable amount. A small number of residents suggested that the contribution should be greater than £1,000, including one suggestion that it should be 5% of the total build cost of the mansard roof extension.
- 2.8. As noted above some residents objected to the proposal to collect a financial contribution to fund streetscape improvements. This included comments that the types of improvement suggested should be paid for by the council or by financial contributions collected from larger commercial development schemes, rather than from contributions from householder development. It was also suggested that collecting an administration fee to cover the cost of administering the schemes was unreasonable.
- 2.9. **58** responses supported a more permissive approach to mansard roof extensions, but did not offer comments on the proposed enhancements. **14** responses objected to a more permissive approach to mansard roof extensions, but did not offer comments on the proposed enhancements.
- 2.10. Overall, **178** responses supported a more permissive approach to mansard roof extensions and **30** objected to it.
- 2.11. **Nine** responses were received from residents of other conservation areas (four from Clinton Road and five from Tredegar Square). All of these supported a more permissive approach to mansard roof extensions, and six specifically supported the proposed façade and streetscape enhancements. **44** responses did not state which conservation area they related to.
- 2.12. **36** responses indicated that they intended to submit a planning application for a mansard roof extension in the near future.

3. Other stakeholder responses

- 3.1. Historic England commented as follows:

"We remain concerned that the overall proposal still has the potential to create random roof interventions which would undermine the overall consistency of character as it does not facilitate a consistent approach. The impact of isolated or piecemeal roof extensions to compact properties could be significant. In our view, this may result in a greater detrimental impact than a consistent approach in terms of groups of properties undertaken to a set timescale through a Local Development Order.

Proceeding on an individual basis would require applicants to undertake a wider package of repairs and enhancements, presumably conditioned and secured through legal agreement to ensure they are delivered. We must therefore ask how the Council would approach an application from a property in good condition with little obvious public benefit which is seeking to implement a roof extension? The list of public realm and environmental enhancements could potentially be difficult to deliver and would require sufficient funding and coordination to achieve sufficient benefit to justify the potential for "serious" harm.

Ultimately the judgement in respect of whether the public benefit can outweigh the harm to character and appearance rests with Council as local planning authority. However, in our view

the mechanisms suggested within the draft cause concern that these aims are irreconcilable through this approach. Additionally, the proposal could be considered to set an unfortunate precedent which would be hard to resist in other conservation areas. ”

3.2. No comments were received from the amenity societies or Registered Providers.