

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions
Bungay CAAMP

Comment ID/Ref	Name	Type of response	Comment	Council Response	Actions
1	Private Individual	Observation	This is fascinating – it is always good to have a virtual tour of our lovely town. However, you have two photographs in the Appendix 4 - Structures that make a positive contribution which are wrongly labelled. They are on page 100. You show two pictures of 15 & 17 Flixton Road, one from circa 1920. The one on the right is actually no. 19. Hopefully you will be able to correct this. We hate what previous owners have done to the windows and would dearly love to have sash windows put back – but funds sadly do not allow.	Noted – Minor text amendment	Amended photographs p.100 of Appendix 4
2	Private Individual	N/A	Requesting new map	New map sent	
3	Private Individual	N/A	Requesting print copy	Printed copy sent	
4	Private Individual	N/A	Requesting new map	New map sent	
5	Private Individual	N/A	Requesting new map	New map sent	
6	Private Individual	N/A	Requesting print copy	Printed copy sent	
7	Private Individual	N/A	Requesting new map	New map sent	
8	Private Individual	N/A	Requesting print copy	Printed copy sent	

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions
Bungay CAAMP

9	Private Individual	Support, Observation	I have had a look at the areas you have highlighted and agree they should be included but am puzzled why areas that should be protected like the grounds of the Primary school which I take it are prime development land are left out? Also with the 557 house proposed is there a fund for the damage the construction traffic and 44 tonne hgv's are doing to our Homes? I live in a small terrace house in the conservation area with parking issues and many others outside of your remit, but which you should consider when looking at the houses you can see damage throughout our street and St Marys caused by extensive and now increasing heavy traffic. I think that it is time you help with the conservation by forcing Heavy goods out of the town and by putting a fund together to allow us to replace horrid pebble dash coverings and plastic and none period windows to bring the Ollands back to its former beauty before all of this is pointless. In my uneducated guess with the building and the proposed insane amount of housing Bungay will see anything from a 1000 cars increase to maybe 1500 with the housing plus all the Building lorries that speed and destroy the roads and buildings by taking heavy loads of Building materials JP Pallet lorries being one of the fastest and heavy along with MRCT and Two sisters and the cattle lorries already using this road as a race track day and night.	Support for inclusions noted – Acknowledgement sent	
10	Town Council	N/A	Requesting new map	New maps sent	
11	Private Individual	N/A	Request for information – What are the consequences of being considered a 'positive unlisted building'?	Call-back	
12	Private Individual	Support	I live in Southend Road and am happy with the proposed changes.	Noted – Acknowledgement sent	
13	Private Individual	N/A	Requesting new map	New map sent	
14	Private Individual	Observation	As a resident I have nothing to comment on the area (assuming above) identified. My big gripe is the lack of any	Noted – Acknowledgement sent	

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions
Bungay CAAMP

			enforcement of the conditions which are laid down in any planning approval.. development has continued in the town's conservation area in some cases completely ignoring any restrictions or planning requirements whether these have been reported to the council or Broads Authority.. plastic windows .. loft conversions .. other key requirements/stipulations being ignored..		
15	Private Individual	Support	I am a new resident of Bungay, having bought a small cottage in Earsham Street, so do not feel equipped to make too many comments or suggestions. However, having looked through your most comprehensive pages of historical information on the link, I felt I must just say that your ideas to preserve this lovely old town must continue. And as far as my local knowledge allows, your suggestions for the new areas look ideal.	Noted – Acknowledgement sent	
16	Private Individual	Observation	Address on the consultation letter is incorrect	Noted – Acknowledgement sent	Amended address
17	Private Individual	N/A	Request for Information - General Enquiry about how they are affected by living in the Conservation Area.	Call-back	
18	Private Individual	Observation (Minor objection)	The wall lining the backs of the houses on Rose Hall Gardens is significant. It would be a shame if this is removed from the Conservation Area. The wall may be in ownership of the Anglia Water.	Call-back	
19	Private Individual	N/A	Request for information - General Enquiry about how they are affected by living in the Conservation Area.	Call-back	

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions
Bungay CAAMP

20	Private Individual	Observation	<p>Firstly, the document mentions a preference for electric vehicle charging points to be installed in car parks rather than at the roadside. I would like to see this statement strengthened so that there is a presumption against any roadside charging points. Bungay is heavily traffic congested and this needs to be alleviated, not worsened. Secondly, there are several mentions of characteristic large houses and large gardens. The character of Bungay changes as pieces of land are given up for development and I would propose a stronger statement in favour of the retention of urban open space, to maintain the character and nature of the area. Furthermore, with such heavy traffic in the town centre I do not believe more housing should be allowed unless and until a road relief system is in place to alleviate traffic pressures.</p>	Noted – Acknowledgement sent	Management Plan Text Reviewed – Minor amendment to text
21	Private Individual	Objection	<p>We are concerned that the reduction of the Conservation Area proposed in Rose Hall Gardens may, in the future, diminish the protection afforded to Rose Hall itself by the Conservation Area. Rose Hall is a rather important building and is listed II*. It would seem to us that there is no important reason for excluding the area of Rose Hall Gardens from the conservation area and, on the contrary it would make more sense to include the whole of Rose Hall Gardens and the small excluded area of Upper Olland Street running alongside Rose Hall and Rose Hall Gardens in the Area.</p>	Objection to exclusion noted – exclusion area reviewed: The low scale and massing of the existing bungalows does allow Rose Hall and this part of the Conservation Area to be experienced with a relationship to the countryside to the west, which is positive.	Area of exclusion removed from proposal
22	Private Individual	Observation	<p>In the description of our property there are two inaccuracies that I wish to address. 1. "Long red brick garden wall with square-section piers to south" If this is the wall that runs from our property south along Nethergate Street towards Bridge Street, it is the wall for No.8 Nethergate Street, not No.18. 2. The medallions on the front door casement are rectangular in profile, not round. I only wish to mention these two points to avoid any confusion if the document is referred to in any planning capacity in the future.</p>	Noted – acknowledgement sent. Errors corrected	Minor text amendment: Corrected errors

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions
Bungay CAAMP

23	Broads Authority	Support/ Observation	Thank you for your consultation. I can advise we are supportive of your proposals and the document generally. We are particularly supportive of the character area approach (part of 'the market' and 'the staithe' being in the Broads Executive Area) and pictures (particularly the old photographs and maps) which beautifully and clearly illustrate the area's historic importance. We also support highlighting the Broads Executive Area. The only comment is to highlight a potential error or change in situation from previous, on page 66-67 it says 'smoke house and warehouse buildings now converted for office use.' The smoke house (the building that was formerly a smoke house) is now an ancillary annexe to the main house (named The Smokehouse, 48 Bridge Street) and the warehouse is in commercial/business use (small scale card designing and printers)- neither are offices as stated.	Noted – acknowledgement sent.	Minor text amendment – correction.
24	Private Individual	Objection	I note that it is proposed to exclude Rose Hall Gardens from the conservation area. Please explain why this is and more importantly what affect it will have on the area. Will it for example mean that planning permission will be easier to obtain for alterations to or development of property in the area. I appreciate that Rose Hall Gardens is a comparatively new development but already has a character of its own and that should be maintained/preserved for the future. Thus is exclusion could result in a lack of control over future development then I for one would be totally opposed to it.	Objection to exclusion noted – exclusion area reviewed: The low scale and massing of the existing bungalows does allow Rose Hall and this part of the Conservation Area to be experienced with a relationship to the countryside to the west, which is positive.	Area of exclusion removed from proposal

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions
Bungay CAAMP

25	Private Individual	Observation	My property address is currently being shown as being within the conservation area boundary. In a previous communication with Waveney District Council in October of 2011, I explained that my property had been so drastically altered in the past (over 40 years ago) that it no longer had any architectural significance. My explanation was accepted and Waveney District Council agreed. Incidentally, it was also agreed that the adjoining property had similarly been drastically altered. Given the above and that my property is on the edge of the conservation area, please would you consider removing it from the conservation area boundary.	Noted – Removal of property considered: The building still has a traditional form and as a corner group it encloses the streetscene, therefore it contributes to this part of the Conservation Area.	
26	Private Individual	Observation	Access to the Print Works at the bottom of Outney Road is pedestrian access with employees able to enter the car park. There is no access for HGVs as existed in the past. There is a new build on our side of the road and some house numbers have changed. When the old cottage next to our own was demolished it meant that there was no longer a No 11. However those living in No 13 quite recently built a new house in their garden. This is now the new number 13 and the original No 13 has become No 11. I note that the Management Plan recognises the negative impact of heavy traffic and car parking on the settings of key listed buildings. I would hope that the Plan would include the detrimental impact upon the foundations of many of our listed buildings within the conservation area as one of a number of reasons why HGVs are rerouted around the town via Flixton and only have legitimate access if making deliveries.	Noted – Acknowledgement sent	Management Plan Text Reviewed – Minor amendment to text
27	Private Individual	Observation	Request for information on any changes. The redundant CAB office in Chaucer Street is an eyesore.	Noted – Acknowledgement sent	

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions
Bungay CAAMP

28	Private Individual	Support/ Observation	<p>I broadly support the management proposals, and the relatively few glimpses of aesthetic judgement such as the abhorrence for brown stain on woodwork (equally, bright white paint at least on older woodwork is also anachronistic and, in my view, inappropriate)</p> <p>Brickwork: although there is frequent mention of the contribution made to the character of the conservation area by the various types of brick in the buildings and many boundary walls, I could not find any reference to the mortar and pointing. The use of thin courses of lime mortar finished nearly flush to the face of the walls is a feature as important as the bricks themselves and should be highlighted both in the description of the materials used and in the management section. Poor repointing using cement mortar or differently finished can be damaging and unsightly, as I am sure the authors of the report are aware. Appendix 4, walled garden, conservatory and gazebo North West of no. 56 Earsham Street: it is worth noting that the wall described extends beyond the northern corner, referred to as the location of a glazed gazebo, and defined by the listed section of wall shown in the map of the Outney Character Area in the main report. There is a further section of wall along the track which then turns a corner westwards on the lane leading to the river. The glazed gazebo no longer exists.</p>	Noted – Acknowledgement sent	<p>Review Management Plan Text – Minor amendment to text</p> <p>Corrected error in Appendix 4</p>
29	Private Individual	Observation	<p>Error in Appendix 4 - 61 Staithe Road: Still has original windows apart from left hand casement. What is the red brick return section? What is meant by 'shared outbuilding'?</p>	Call-back	Corrected errors

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions
 Bungay CAAMP

30	Private Individual	Observation	<p>1/ considering in your letter regarding trees adding to the conservation area I was surprised to see the two dead trees beside Wharton Street carpark that died have rather than being replaced have been tarmaced over. hardly a good impression or example to set. 2/I have seen pictures of St Johns rd tree lined, all gone. there is room on the verges for small trees which would add character. 3/ Many of the properties within the conservation area now seem to have out of character upvc windows/doors. I don't think many people know they need to be approved. Maybe a letter could be sent out advising people of their obligations. 4/ the heavy volume of lorries and general traffic, which will increase dramatically when the 557 new homes are built detract from the conservation areas value. 5/as many of the old properties have no parking within their boundaries, I was dismayed to find the council had put up the cost of parking at Wharton St carpark so much that the residents no longer use it, which has turned Bungay into one big parking lot. not much to look at!</p>	Noted – Acknowledgement sent	
----	--------------------	-------------	---	------------------------------	--

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions
Bungay CAAMP

31	Private Individual	Objection/ Observation	<p>I note that it is proposed to remove an area to the west of Rose Hall, Upper Olland Street from the conservation area. I wish to object to this proposal. This land stands to the west of Rose Hall, one of the most important listed domestic residences in Bungay. This area should remain in the conservation area as it lends protection in conservation terms to the Rose Hall site. Maintaining this area within the conservation area will also provide some protection against development of this area which may have a visually detrimental impact when viewing Bungay from the western water meadows. In addition I propose that the area immediately to the south of the Rose Hall site should be added to the conservation area. The area I am referring to is the land occupied by 2 properties in Rose Hall Gardens whose gardens back on to Upper Olland Street. My proposal is that the conservation area boundary be extended from the south east corner of the above existing conservation area along the northern edge of the Rose Hall Gardens service road to its boundary with Upper Olland Street. This will extend protection to the Rose Hall site. The maps that you have provided do not include a compass; if you are in any doubt about the areas I am referring to please contact me.</p>	<p>Objection to exclusion noted – exclusion area reviewed: The low scale and massing of the existing bungalows does allow Rose Hall and this part of the Conservation Area to be experienced with a relationship to the countryside to the west, which is positive. The properties to the south of Rose Hall are two-storey late-C20 blocks. Their mass forms a suburban boundary to the grounds of Rose Hall. This area is not considered to contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area in a way to merit designation.</p>	Area of exclusion removed from proposal
32	Private Individual	Support/ Objection/ Observation	<p>Thank you for sending me a copy of the Bungay Draft Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Plan which I have enjoyed reading. The appraisal is clearly the product of much scholarly research both by the present team and by those who wrote the earlier study. In contrast to the appraisal I was slightly disappointed by the management plan element, but I suppose it reflects the fact that Conservation is in effect part of the development management / control mechanism rather than proactive interventions by the local authorities. However there are parts of the town which have benefitted from public sector improvement investments – notably St Mary’s Street,</p>	Noted – Acknowledgement sent.	Area of exclusion removed from proposal

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions
 Bungay CAAMP

			<p>the Butter cross and the beginning of Earsham Street which were all repaved in about 2012. It is very disappointing to see how much that paving and brickwork has been damaged – not just by HGV’s driving through the town but by statutory undertakers who have lifted the paving and failed to restore it. I don’t know who has what power under existing law, but it seems to me that those who damage a public asset (such as a pavement or footway) ought to be under an obligation to repair their damage. If the damage is done by a passing truck, in the absence of excellent CCTV coverage it might be difficult to make a case against a particular company. But Statutory Undertakers are under an obligation to consult the Local Highways Authority before (or in the case of urgent work, after they have done it and they should be required to restore it. As to your proposals to include extra or delete some buildings from the Conservation area, I approve of the following inclusions - Bethesda Chapel, Chaucer Street - Chaucer Club, Popson Street - 16 and 18 Nethergate Street. But I don’t understand why you are proposing to delete - Rose Cottage & Nr 4 Stone Gardens - 3,4 & 5 Rose Hill Gardens. It seems to me that the justification is that the owners have made so many changes that they are no longer deserving of conservation area “protection” but that surely reflects poor conservation area management. I don’t understand your point about the use of brown stain in fences. I fully take your point about the upcoming problem of vehicle recharging points: presumably there is or will be some guidance on this from Central Government. We should learn from the experience of adding not one but three “Wheelie bins” for every household, before we rush into installing re-charging points.</p>	<p>Support for inclusions noted.</p> <p>Objection to exclusion noted – exclusion area reviewed: The low scale and massing of the existing bungalows does allow Rose Hall and this part of the Conservation Area to be experienced with a relationship to the countryside to the west, which is positive.</p>	
33	Suffolk Preservation Society	Support, Observation	<p>The analysis of the character of the area is robust and the production qualities of the document are high. We fully support East Suffolk’s rolling programme of review and</p>	<p>Noted – Acknowledgement sent</p>	

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions
 Bungay CAAMP

			<p>recognise the importance of keeping these documents up to date.</p> <p>However, within the Management Plan we note that there is only a cursory mention of buildings At Risk and no reference to the council's intended course of action to address their deteriorating condition. Some of the identified buildings are at the heart of the conservation area and very prominent, and materially impact upon the character and appearance of the designation. It is therefore surprising that greater emphasis is not placed on the council's response to this issue.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Management Plan Text Reviewed – Minor amendment to text</p>
--	--	--	--	---------------	--