

**Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council response/Action
North Lowestoft Conservation Area Appraisal**

Name/ Organisation	Comment ID/ Ref	Type of response	Comment Summary	Council Response	Action
Angela Risebro	1	Support/ Observation	Supports the document. The architect Edward Boardman also built the Methodist Church at Corton connected to the Colman Family.	Noted. Text of document not altered as not directly relevant to this document.	None.
A&M Zipfel	2	N/A	Request for printed copy of the document.	Printed copy sent.	None.
Mrs Gunton	3	Support/ Observation	General supported the document but wished for any photos of 46 Corton Road be removed should they exist.	Agreed. Removal of photos was offered in the consultation letter. Photo of No 46 Corton Road removed from page 169.	Text amended.
Carol Willis	4	N/A	Requested large copy of map as printed copy too small to be seen. Corrected her postal address for correspondence.	Links sent via email and printed large map sent.	None.
Mrs Woodgate	5	Observation	Wonderful idea to conserve things in Lowestoft but money should not be wasted. Consultations are an absolute waste of money. Ask the local people in Lowestoft what they want from Lowestoft!	Noted. Efforts to contact back in response to answer phone message received unsuccessful. Message left.	None.
Mr P Kelly	6	N/A	Request for printed copy of the document.	Printed copy sent.	None.
David Butcher	7	Support/ Observation	Wholly approve of the proposed boundary adjustments - particularly the major inclusion of the Denes Oval sports ground. Description of a number of the High Street shops, concentrate on external features but fail to mention some unseen (but historically important)	Noted. (Particular support noted for inclusion of the Oval in the CA) Agreed. Minor alterations to text to include extra historical detail for the three	None. Text amended.

			<p>details. Further historical details given for;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 43-44 High Street 2. 81-83 High Street 3. Nos. 148-149 High Street 	properties mentioned.	
Norman Castleton	8	Support/ Observation	<p>Interesting presentation - Suggests following amendments: Firstly, the position regarding the governance of the Conservation areas come heritage development zones (HAZ) should be made clear.</p> <p>A requirement to ensure that all the conservation area heritage structures are treated properly and not just hacked down or left redundant as they have been in the past e.g. the Coopers building & the Town Hall.</p> <p>Agree that the Oval cricket ground should be included.</p> <p>Extend the northern perimeter of the conservation area to the whole of the North Denes up to and including Gunton Cliffs & the Warren.</p>	<p>Noted. Conservation area designation is independent of regeneration schemes.</p> <p>Noted. Policies in the National Planning Policy Framework Local plan and the Planning (Listed buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 are the instruments for the management of development affecting heritage assets etc.</p> <p>Noted. Particular support for inclusion of the Oval in the CA</p> <p>Noted. This is primarily a natural environment and not a built environment, so not proposed to be included.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

		<p>Extend the eastern perimeter to include the Caravan Site with the aim of eventually removing it and creating a green corridor from the Ness Point Park to the north beach below Gunton Cliffs.</p> <p>Extend the conservation perimeter to include the corner site area bounded by Melbourne Road & Park Road and which includes the former Prince Albert public house. The Prince Albert pub (now called the Edge of Town) should in my opinion be upgraded to listed status. It is one of the few remaining examples of work in the town of the former Lowestoft Architects, Tayler & Green.</p> <p>Their work seems to be revered in other places and often mentioned in Pevsner but not in the town where they had their office. The present occupier has degraded the design with unsympathetic additions & modifications which are not consistent with the architects' original concept.</p> <p>Upgrade all the Scores & especially the Crown and Mariner's Scores which are included in the plan.</p>	<p>Noted. This area fails to meet the criteria of quality of built environment to be included in the CA.</p> <p>Noted. The areas adjacent to the existing CA boundary were assessed to see if they warranted inclusion as part of the reappraisal process. This area was not identified to be of the required standard for inclusion. However, they do benefit from some protection by forming the setting of the Conservation Area (a designated heritage asset) in this part of it.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
--	--	---	---	---------------------------

			<p>The HAZ & the former Post Office as administered by ESC is an example of poor development management and of ignoring the requirements of a heritage asset zone. Removal of part of a listed building and replaced by a 'rabbit hutch' development.</p> <p>The illustration for Whapload Road Nos 312 to 314 is out of date. There have been extensive alterations including a wooden penthouse on top of 314. The modifications have been left unfinished.</p>	<p>Noted. Aim to implement improvements to pedestrian access, including restoration works to the historic Scores is highlighted in the Management Plan.</p> <p>Noted. Comments not related to the content of the Conservation Area Appraisal.</p> <p>Noted. Replacement photo sourced.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Text amended.</p>
Sarah Foote Town Clerk9	9	N/A Request for further information	<p>Is there any justification in the document to why the whole of the Denes Oval area is being added to the conservation area? If it is in the document, can you please point me to the correct reference (noting that 10.11 simply states it is to be included) and if not could you please provide a summary of your reasoning for the Town Council to enable proper consideration at our next Planning and Environment Committee Meeting.</p>	<p>Response sent to TC setting out the reasons for including the Denes Oval was sent by email on 26.02.21</p> <p>This response is detailed in Appendix E as referred to in the Cabinet report.</p>	None.
Richard Moule	10	Support/ Observation	<p>General support for the document. Development of Ness Point is of concern. I am especially concerned about all the green area of North Deans going north from the Birds Eye Factory site and its should be kept away from further development. The area is becoming a tourist attraction itself with people coming to enjoy the</p>	<p>The area around Ness Point is allocated for commercial use. East of this it is primarily a natural environment and not a built environment. Thus these areas have not been</p>	None.

			coastal countryside. I would like this whole area to be in the Conservation Area.	proposed to be included in the CA	
Colin Butler	11	Objection	I oppose the inclusion of the Denes Oval into the Conservation Area because a) the recreation ground will be addressed within the Lowestoft Town Council's Neighbourhood Development Plan, b) the land is owned by LTC and therefore doesn't need an extra layer of bureaucratic oversight by East Suffolk Council, and c) it could restrict any future development that LTC might desire, e.g the pavilion, or alterations, such as demolition of the concrete perimeter wall and the gatehouses, which are derelict eyesores.	Noted. Particular objection for inclusion of the Oval in the CA. The conservation area designation is not to restrict development to achieve appropriate development. The entrance gates and fence have already been identified as "locally Listed" in the current Conservation Area Appraisal, so their positive visual contribution and significance to the area has already been recognised.	None.
Fiona Cairns, Suffolk Preservation Society	12	Support / Observation	Many congratulations on an excellent appraisal. It is a comprehensive document, well researched and the substantial increase in the number of designated Positive Unlisted Buildings (PUBs) is very welcome. Similarly, the stronger message within the management plan to limit the loss of buildings and architectural details is very necessary in a conservation area where its true worth has not been valued highly enough by	Noted	None.

			<p>those responsible for decision making.</p> <p>The following are minor edits which I came across. They are not exhaustive, but I thought it worth drawing them to your attention:</p> <p>Page 48 – The Crown Street Character Area map shows some buildings marked up as orange. As there is no corresponding notation for orange buildings in the key, I presume they should be red. Might be worth double checking the colours have been marked up correctly by the graphic designer.</p> <p>Page 132 – para. 3, line 5 has a rogue sentence “Listed Structures” which needs removing</p> <p>Page 137 – second column, para. 2, line 1 last word “to” is in the wrong typeface and in blue</p> <p>Page 142 – second column, para. 2, line 2 “helping to retaining” should read “helping to retain”</p> <p>Page 191 – para.3, line 4 “and” should be “are” to make the sentence make sense</p> <p>Page 205 – column 2, section titled Area for Removal, line 4 “existing of historic...” need to remove the “of”</p>	<p>Agreed. Map colours corrected</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Text amended.</p> <p>Text amended.</p> <p>Text amended.</p> <p>Text amended.</p> <p>Text amended.</p> <p>Text amended.</p>
Sarah Foote, Deputy Town Clerk	13	Objection/ Observation	The Town Council wishes to submit the following comments:		

			<p>1. It has been agreed that the Town Council is opposed to adding the whole of the Denes Oval (a Lowestoft Town Council owned asset) to the Conservation Area as the Town Council is already respecting the history of the site.</p> <p>2. The appraisal document mentions a gate at Belle Vue Park. You are aware that this has now been removed and you may wish to amend the document to reflect this.</p> <p>3. The Town Council supports the remainder of the recommendations in the appraisal.</p>	<p>Noted. Particular objection for inclusion of the Oval in the CA</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Text amended.</p> <p>None.</p>
Edwards James Historic England	14	Support/ Observation	<p>The production of an appraisal for the North Lowestoft Conservation Area is welcomed.</p> <p>We would like to make the following comments,; A broad comment we would make is that the draft contains considerable detail which is of great interest but which is sometimes duplicated in content or intent between different sections. suggest the appraisal could be consolidated to create a shorter and more concise document that may be more quickly and easily referred to and used as a planning tool by members of the public and other users. For example,</p> <p>Sections 4.1 and 4.2 contain a lot of interesting information to a high level of detail, but that the length and density of textual description may make the document difficult to use as a planning tool to quickly establish the historic interest of the area and its morphological development.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. However, this document follows the standard format adopted by the council for updated conservation area appraisals. This to be considered for production of future documents.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

		<p>Could the text in this section be consolidated and additional historic maps from later periods such as the Ordnance Survey's County Series and early National Grid editions be used to illustrate the town's historical and morphological development instead for example?</p>	Noted.	None.
		<p>We have spotted a number of inconsistencies in section and paragraph numbering. For example, Section 4: Assessing Special Interest is followed by Section 4: Character Areas. We would also normally recommend that all paragraphs and sections in appraisals and other types of SPD are clearly numbered to aid referencing by users of the document, and the titles of sections and sub-sections identified using obvious headings and sub-headings.</p>	Agreed. Numbering of the Section on Character Areas adjusted to 5.	Text amended.
		<p>We noticed that formatting also varies between two columns and a single paragraph across the document. This appears to be so that lots of photographs can be incorporated, which is welcome, but does make the document slightly difficult to follow.</p>	Noted	None.
		<p>We would suggest could be simplified to following a single convention. We welcome the inclusion of detailed and annotated maps that identify key positive and negative features and</p>	Noted	None.

		<p>elements such as important walls and positive buildings. Including these at the beginning of each character area section is helpful but we suggest reviewing these to ensure they are consistent with the aspects identified in the text, particularly in relation to key views, where there might be inconsistencies.</p> <p>We would also suggest that important walls are identified in a different contrasting colour, because using blue makes the walls on the scores difficult to pick out next to the blue used to show the boundary of the High Street Character Area. To reduce the length of the main document, we would suggest that the “key buildings” section in each character area is incorporated into a gazetteer that forms part of an Appendix, which can then be referred to in search of specific information if required.</p> <p>A final general comment is that there are a few examples where some of the language used is perhaps slightly negative in tone, and where we would suggest more neutral but still descriptive could be used: e.g. ‘disrupt’ or ‘obscure’ instead of ‘destroy’, and ‘non-descript’ instead of ‘bleak’ for instance?</p> <p>Page 1 We are pleased to see an extensive Bibliography supporting the information in the</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed. Text altered on pages 49, 52, 55 & 147</p> <p>Noted. This reflects the format of other East Suffolk</p>	<p>Text amended.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Text amended.</p> <p>None.</p>
--	--	---	--	---

		<p>appraisal, but suggest that this would be better placed at the end of the document.</p> <p>Page 6 We welcome the commitment by East Suffolk Council to continue to formulate and publish proposals for the enhancement of the conservation, the requirement for which is set out in legislation and the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>We suggest the Planning Policy Context section could be simplified slightly, with each relevant piece of planning policy clearly identified and relevant policies and paragraphs referenced.</p> <p>We would suggest also clarifying the information regarding Article 4 Directions so that it refers only to the current terminology and regulatory provisions, rather than now superseded forms.</p> <p>We also suggest that Article 4 Directions and their implications could be set out in their own section and highlighted appropriately with a sub-heading, and dealt with in detail in the management plan.</p> <p>Section 4 (Special Interest) We would suggest that the 'Location and Setting' section is focused on the area's geographical and topographical characteristics and situation, and that</p>	<p>Appraisals</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>information such as the creation of the Heritage Action Zone, other regeneration initiatives and the area's status as Heritage at Risk, whilst important, could be incorporated into the introduction or another section or even just the management plan. Up to date statistics on Heritage at Risk (for 2020) can be found here: https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/heritage-at-risk/findings/official-statistic/ .</p> <p>We welcome section that highlights Lowestoft's traditional building materials. This is useful but could benefit from being in a distinct sub-section apart from the historical and topographical development. We would suggest each category of material is identified using a sub-heading, and photos identifying key features in each associated with the sub-section in question. This information could be incorporated into a separate 'Section 5' which deals with the general characterisation of the area in terms of built form, materials, etc, as opposed to being included in the previous sections dealing with historical development and archaeological potential. This would make it easier for the reader to find and use to inform decision taking or design development.</p> <p>Section 4.3 "Scheduled Ancient Monuments" should be "Scheduled Monuments", to reflect current planning policy terminology.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Word omitted page 25</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Text amended.</p>
--	--	--	---	-----------------------------------

			<p>Section 4.4 Likewise, we welcome the inclusion of specific information regarding historic shopfronts and the reference to the Research Report prepared by Historic England. We think this section might potentially be broken up into chronological period, allowing the reader to identify the oldest and potentially most significant frontages more easily.</p> <p>Street Furniture – we welcome this section and agree with the general emphasis on de-cluttering and unifying the furniture and materials used in the public realm. Reference could be made here to the adopted HAZ Design Guide, which contained some proposals to take this forward.</p> <p>We would suggest removing the reference to guardrailing being ‘necessary’ on page 44. This is not the case as Manual for Streets sets out, and the need for guardrailing is often as a result of design failures elsewhere. Alternative more attractive solutions that nonetheless delineate the area could be sought as part of the Management Plan’s recommendations. This could include undertaking a street-furniture and guardrailing audit (see Manual for Streets 2 for details), to specifically identify the elements that detract, and formulate specific proposals for enhancement that can be pursued when</p>	<p>Agreed. Weblink to document added to Bibliography, page 1.</p> <p>Agreed. The word necessary to be removed.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>Text amended.</p> <p>Text amended.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>resources are available.</p> <p>We would suggest that the faded ‘ghost signs’ and clock to No.138 belong more appropriately in the shop frontage section above, as neither are technically furniture but are more related to the architectural and aesthetic embellishment of the private commercial buildings to which they are attached.</p> <p>Section 4: Character Areas – this section is mis-numbered.</p> <p>We predominantly agree with the identification of the Character Areas as proposed on the map, except that we would suggest the boundary for the Denes and the High Street areas running through the centre of Arnolds Bequest might be modified to follow either the line of the High Street or the line of property boundaries along Whapload Road, so that it is wholly within one or the other, and question whether the Denes Oval should also be incorporated in The Denes Character Area?</p> <p>Section 6 – High Street 6.2 – use of phrases such as ‘scars taking decades to heal’, whilst very evocative, could be rephrased more neutrally?</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed. Mis-numbering already altered as part of earlier comment.</p> <p>Noted. The boundary follows the historic development line.</p> <p>The Oval is a recreational space which links with the parks and closely relates to the development above on the cliff.</p> <p>Agreed. Text altered on Page 49.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Text amended</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		<p>Similarly, while we agree wholeheartedly that car parks are often depressing (page 51), and that the industrial units do nothing for the character of the conservation area east of the Scores, their appearance and impact could be described using different terminology.</p>	Agreed. Text altered on page 51.	Text amended
		<p>Section 6.6 We welcome the identification of key views in the character area, but we note that there are no key views of the High Street included in the High Street Character Area on the map. Is this correct? There are a number of photographs within the section that show what could be considered important views up and down the High Street that aren't identified on the map, and while the point regarding the curved nature of the street is recognised, we would suggest this in some respects enhances the quality of the view, as it creates a sense of suspense and intrigue, encouraging the viewer to walk and discover what's 'round the bend'.</p>	Noted. Arrows added	Text Amended .
		<p>p.57 Minor typo: "Wilde's Score bears" as opposed to bares.</p>	Agreed. Typo corrected.	Text amended
		<p>Could the individual sections describing the Scores be identified using sub-headings?</p>	Noted	None
		<p>Crown Street Character Area We agree that this area is worthy of designation but consider that it</p>	Noted	

		<p>may benefit from being identified as its own designation with a specific and targeted appraisal and management plan, rather than being subsumed within the larger area to the east.</p> <p>The Denes Character Area. We welcome the reference to the Historic England report on 333 Whapload Road, and suggest that a link to the free PDF download should be included either here, or in the bibliography. The report can be found on the Historic England website. https://research.historicengland.org.uk/Report.aspx?i=16387&ru=%2fResults.aspx%3fp%3d1%26n%3d10%26ry%3d2019%26a%3d4809%26ns%3d1 .</p> <p>This character area should be updated to incorporate the changes that have taken place with the development of the Ness Park.</p> <p>Boundary alterations We have reviewed the boundary alterations and, having regard to paragraph 186 of the NPPF and also our suggestion regarding the Crown Street character area above, do not object to any of the proposed alterations suggested, and welcome the detailed justification given.</p> <p>However, we note the inclusion of a small section of Arnold Street, incorporating the AP Motors</p>	<p>Agreed. Link added to bibliography.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Text amended</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		<p>building. A desk-top survey suggests this building is in poor condition, and given its express inclusion in the conservation area we would recommend that the management plan should therefore include a strategy for its enhancement.</p> <p>The same applies to the inclusion of the Dene Oval, the entrance to which is certainly of interest and worthy of inclusion, but also neglected and in poor physical condition.</p> <p>Management Plan In general, a management plan should contain clear, detailed, specific and achievable aims and objectives, setting out priority actions and long term goals for management, including for any heritage at risk or areas that detract from the character and appearance of the area. It can also set out where the community feel there is scope for sensitive change within the areas, and provide guidance as to how that development can be achieved in terms of form, style, materials etc., in order to ensure that any developments conserve what is special about the area.</p> <p>We are pleased to note that this advice is contained in the management plan, but suggest it is separated into its own discrete section to highlight it.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
--	--	---	---	---

			<p>We note that the management plan identifies that, despite the existence of an Article 4 Direction across much of the area, negative changes have occurred. This has partially contributed to the area's At Risk status, and we would encourage the management plan to commit to a targeted and proactive campaign of enforcement against any eligible properties that have carried out work in contravention of the Article 4's restrictions, especially where this detracts from the character and appearance of the area. The goal of such activity should be, in concert with more positive action such as the grant programme, the removal of the area from the At Risk Register. Our guidance on enforcement can be found in Stopping the Rot – A guide to enforcement action to save historic buildings: https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-looks/publications/stoppingtherot/ (15 April 2016). To support future action, an audit of existing features, with a corresponding photographic record, is recommended as a useful way to monitor and manage inappropriate alterations that would contravene any Article 4 Direction imposed. This may already exist, a similar record having been undertaken in support of HAZ activities.</p>	Noted.	None.
--	--	--	--	--------	-------

		<p>The Management Plan could also consider how CIL or Section 106 monies from development could be targeted for enhancements within the conservation area, particularly in areas that do not currently benefit from any of either HAZ or Town Investment Plan funding.</p>	Noted.	None.
		<p>We recommend the inclusion of a glossary containing relevant historic environment terminology contained in the NPPF, in addition to details about the additional legislative and policy protections that heritage assets and the historic environment in general enjoys.</p>	Noted.	None.