

Con Area and Local List Consultation

St Osyth

Respondent	Summary of comments	Place Services' Response	Action Taken
Cllr John White	<p>Comments that a correction is needed regarding the text in the history section. The remains believed to be that of Ursula Kemp (with in St Osyth) were tested and found to be male.</p> <p>Also states that the paragraph relating to The King Arms needs to be updated, as the pub is back in operation (it is described in the text as vacant).</p>	Both edits will be made to the final draft.	Edits have been made to correct the inaccuracies. P59 amended to remove reference to the White Hart being vacant.
Historic England	<p>Detailed comments on St Osyth not provided. The letter provides comments which give an overview on five appraisals conducted by Place Services for Tendring District Council.</p> <p>Comments relating to the document are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - maps, where provided, are clear and legible. - The inclusion of a management plan is positive, including the reference to Cll or S106 monies could be used. - Notes that the management plan should provide targeted policy and intervention which deals with any 	Check the references to Article 4 Directions and the management plan.	No changes required – Article 4 directions and the management plans are felt to be sufficient and consistent.

	<p>identified negative or detracting elements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strong encouragement of Article 4 directions; HE note that the reference to Article 4s is inconsistent across the five documents. 		
Maureen Phillips	<p>Comments express concern at the construction of new houses and how this will affect traffic on St Johns Road.</p> <p>States that traffic is already a concern due the affect it has on the village.</p>	<p>Traffic reducing matters would need to be approved an implemented by Essex Highways. Within the management plan it is identified that traffic calming measures would be beneficial, as would consultation with the highways authority.</p>	<p>No action taken as the possibility of reducing traffic is not within the realms of this appraisal document.</p>
Natural England	<p>'Natural England does not consider that the Tendring Conservation Area Appraisals & Local List Criteria Consultation pose any likely risk or opportunity in relation to our statutory purpose, and so does not wish to comment on this consultation.'</p>	<p>No action required.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
The Sargeant Family (City & Country)	<p>Provides commentary on inaccuracies in the historical development section – highlights a typo regarding the section on Ursula Kemp and requests changes to the text, to say the Priory was sold to The Sargeant Family, not City and Country.</p> <p>Questions the boundary in section 2.3 in relation to West Field and Spring Road – feels that this could dilute</p>	<p>All typos highlighted will be updated, as well as small additions to the text such as the references to the sections of the priory.</p> <p>The boundary has been assessed and is proposed due to the architectural interest of the area's included. We do not support the proposed</p>	<p>Page 11 updated to read 'St Osyth's flourished [...] becoming one of the most important and powerful Abbeys in the local area' rather than 'in the county'. Section also updated to read 'following the dissolution of the Abbey' on P11.</p> <p>P13 – 'trialled' changed to 'tried'</p>

	<p>the overall significance of the CA.</p> <p>Asks for an amendment to section 3.1 to state that the special interest of the CA is derived from the Priory in the first instance.</p> <p>Proposes a building highlighted as a non-designated asset is worthy of listing.</p> <p>States that the description of dormer windows in character area 1 implies they are not appropriate, whereas they feel dormers may be acceptable in some instances.</p> <p>Comments on the description of weatherboarding and dormer windows in character area 2. Disagrees with the wording and feels that it is too prescriptive and would limit new development. Also states that the butchers on Spring Road has a dormer – it does, but its not in this character area.</p> <p>Comments that character area three's description features a typo and that the The Bury should be within the Character Area 5. Disagrees that the houses on The Bury are a positive contributor to the CA.</p> <p>Comments on the descriptions in Character Area 5, The Priory, disliking the descriptions used for some of the buildings and</p>	<p>constriction of the boundary.</p> <p>Section 3.1 is felt to be an accurate description of the CA and will not be amended to stress the importance of the Priory as this suggests bias. A small section of text will be added to enhance the description.</p> <p>Place Services have not determined the building is worthy of listing, the respondent can submit an application for listing should they feel appropriate.</p> <p>The text regarding dormer windows and weather boarding in character area 1 are felt to be correct, however a sentence will be added to say that any change will have to be assessed on its individual merit.</p> <p>The typo in character area three will be amended; the boundary is not proposed for amendment. The Bury is a public place and therefore very different in use and access to the Priory and its associated park.</p>	<p>P15 'City and Country' changed to 'The Sargeant Family'.</p> <p>P25 has been amended to add a section in brackets which describes St Osyth's Priory - (a scheduled monument and site of considerable historic and architectural interest).</p> <p>P29 amended to read that dormer windows are 'often disruptive' in the street scene.</p> <p>P34 amended to include the sentence 'although instances of other styles and softwood boarding are present.'</p> <p>P64 amended to omit the references to CABE.</p> <p>No change to the description of the gatehouses, which are taken from the list entry. Vintoner's Gatehouse is placed in quotation marks in its first use and a description of the hall and reading room added.</p> <p>Page 56 has been adapted to clarify that the views are from public areas and three may be other</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>seeking alternate title eg. 'hermitage' rather than 'grotto' Provides comments on the views section and offers their preferred views section and description of the parkland.</p> <p>Provides other commentary on the use of coloured paint/render in the conservation area, the new development currently being built by City and Country and the potential for interpretation boards.</p>	<p>The section on the Priory will be amended to refer to the respondent's preferred terminology if appropriate. The views will not be amended as per the request as these are not publicly accessible.</p> <p>The section on paint and interpretation boards will be amended to provide additional commentary.</p> <p>A number of the requests within the comments would alter the neutral descriptions we have aimed to use in relation to the priory and the land in the Sargeant's ownership. We do not feel it is appropriate to highlight that there were previously additional structures within the parkland (now lost), as requested, as this could be seen to suggest that further development of the park land would be acceptable subject to following old maps etc, yet this would not necessarily be the case.</p> <p>We also will not amend the text to promote or look</p>	<p>views of importance in private land areas.</p> <p>The text has been amended to read 'Hermitage' rather than Grotto on page 55. A small section of text has also been added on page 55 to make reference to additional buildings in the parkland and works which are being undertaken.</p>
--	--	---	--

		favourably on the development at the Priory. Whilst it was won at appeal, as stated within the response, this does not neutralise the negative affect it has on the conservation area and surrounding listed buildings.	
--	--	---	--

Notes from the event:

Boundary revision (separate document enclosed)