

Appendix 5: Representations and Council Response

Tatenhill Conservation Area Boundary Representations and Council Response

Ref	Consultee	Representation	Council response
TCA1	Branston Parish Council	The parish council support the proposals.	Support noted.
TCA2	Mr J Melvin, Natural England	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 12th May 2014 which was received by email on the same date.</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England does not consider the above consultation to be of significant relevance to any of its interests and we therefore make a return of 'no comment'. Should you become aware of anything that you believe may have significant impact on the Natural Environment then please do not hesitate to make contact again.</p> <p>The lack of further comment from Natural England should not be interpreted as a statement that there are no impacts on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may be able to make comments that will help the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to fully take account of the environmental value of areas affected by this plan in the decision making process.</p> <p>We really value your feedback to help us improve the service we offer. We have attached a feedback form to this letter and welcome any comments you might have about our service.</p>	Noted.
TCA3	Mrs E Coleman, Tatenhill Parish Council	<p>Tatenhill Parish Council had their first opportunity to discuss the recent consultation at the meeting last night. Whilst acknowledging the formal consultation closed on Friday Council trusts that these comments will also be considered alongside others received.</p> <p>ESBC took ownership of the reviews around 12 months ago but the requisite formal consultation was not carried out on a timely basis. Have the residents forgotten the exercise and their support for the proposals.</p> <p>Council supports the proposals which were drawn up following extensive consultation with the electorate and associated discussions.</p> <p>Tatenhill Boundary Extension to South East – The proposed boundary to the South East cuts across a field, probably following the line of a water/sewer pipe. At the time of the original consultation exercise there was obviously little reason to do anything else. However, in March 2013 Council completed the purchase of that field (with the generous grant funding from both ESBC and National Forest. Forest Funding) and has planted a mixed woodland over the entire field (shown in white on the map between the stream and the track (east to west) and the</p>	<p>Noted. The Borough Council considers that the proposed further extension would be inappropriate as this departs from the recommended extended boundary as contained in the Tatenhill Conservation Area Appraisal.</p> <p>The English Heritage guidance <i>Understanding Place: Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management'</i> (para 2.2.5) does not make specific reference to the significance of woodland or plantations as a whole only groups of trees which may have significance (where they contribute to the overall special interest) or contribute to the overall landscape and setting of a conservation area. If a group of trees require protection or have special interest in terms of species or amenity value as a group then designating an area TPO may be more appropriate.</p>

		<p>Woodlands Wood and a small plantation by Aggregate Industries (north to south). This means that that field would now be coloured green. Tatenhill Parish Council now wish ESBC to seriously consider extending the boundary further at this point along the track & stream to the southern boundary of the field from the pumping station east to the stream. This would then encompass the entire wooded area.</p>	
TCA4	<p>Mr P Leaver, JLL on behalf of Nurton Developments (Quintus) Ltd</p>	<p>Introduction</p> <p>I act for Nurton Developments (Quintus) Limited (NDQL). NDQL owns the ridge of woodland (located on that part of the Needwood Scarp to the north-east of the Battlestead Hill promontory) that forms the proposed extension to the Conservation Area boundary to the east of Tatenhill.</p> <p>NDQL owns also the land directly to the east and south of the proposed revised boundary. This large of area is being promoted as a sustainable urban extension to Burton and is known as Branston Locks. The sustainable urban extension includes proposals for up to 2,500 houses, 1,000,000 sq ft of employment floor space, a local centre and a large area of public open space and National Forest planting.</p> <p>These proposals form part of the draft Local Plan for East Staffordshire (submitted to the Secretary of State in April 2014) and an outline planning application that the Planning Committee of East Staffordshire resolved to approve at its meeting on 20 January 2014, subject to the Secretary of State not calling in the application. The Secretary of State decided not to call in the application in March 2014.</p> <p>Since then, the applicant and the Borough Council have been discussing conditions and a Section 106 legal agreement. These will include for the provision of a hillside country park on the Needwood Scarp, including the area of land proposed to be added to the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Planning Policy Guidance</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework provides guidance on the designation of conservation areas in paragraph 127.</p> <p>Paragraph 127 reads:</p> <p><i>“When considering the designation of conservation areas, local planning authorities should ensure that an area justifies such status because of its special architectural or historic interest and that the concept of conservation is not devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest”.</i></p> <p>In addition, up to date English Heritage guidance on conservation area designation (Understanding Place) at para. 1.5 states that:</p>	<p>The Conservation Area Appraisal states that the unique topography of the landscape including the transition between the Trent floodplain and the Needwood plateau provides a unique landscape setting to the village. It goes into further detail on the significance of Battlestead Hill escarpment and how this is an important and prominent landscape feature to the east of the village. Chapter 9 explains the reasons for expanding the conservation area boundary which includes the distinct landform and landscape setting and the contribution that the landscape makes towards key views into the village. This is demonstrated by the map, fig 9.1 on page 62.</p> <p>Tatenhill has similar landscape significance to Rangemore where the surrounding landscape contributes to the overall setting of each village so it is not just about the significance of the historic buildings. This approach in viewing a CA more holistically is consistent with the English Heritage guidance <i>‘Understanding Place: Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management’</i> document which considers significance of the wider landscape and geographical context such as glimpses of landscape and surrounding hills.</p> <p>The Council therefore considers that the extension of the Tatenhill Conservation Area Appraisal as proposed is appropriate and proportionate, given that such land has been assessed in line with the relevant guidance contained within the English Heritage guidance.</p>

'Conservation area designation is not generally an appropriate means of protecting the wider landscape. Conservation area designation can in some circumstances be an effective way to protect open areas particularly where the character and appearance relates to historic fabric (to which the principal protection offered by conservation area designation relates), or a special element, such as a design form or settlement pattern.'

Tatenhill Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan

The scope of the study in the Introduction to the Conservation Area Approval and Management Plan (CAAMP) states that it will focus solely on the character and setting of the village of Tatenhill. Moreover, it will look at the village as a whole and will concentrate on the physical characteristics of the settlement and the surrounding countryside.

In Section 2, reference is made to Local Policy. However, for reasons that are not obvious, no reference is made to the proposed development of Branston Locks, although this would be the most obvious influence on the area of land on the Needwood Scarp that is now proposed to be incorporated within the revised Conservation Area boundary.

In Section 6, reference is made to Key Views, Vistas and Landmarks. Here, it is noted that:

"Despite the relatively small number of local landmarks, Tatenhill benefits from a series of important and attractive views. Important amongst these are views towards and from Battlestead Hill. Views into the village from the public footpaths approached from the east, afford rare opportunities to see the settlement in its entirety within the valley bottom."

Section 9 – Protection and Enhancement – provides the principal rationale for extension of boundaries to the Conservation Area. Essentially, the Conservation Area is to be extended to incorporate more of the wider landscape around Tatenhill. This is because the landscape setting of the Conservation Area is considered to be as an important a feature as the buildings and townscape of the village itself. Specific justification of the extension of the Conservation Area to the east, to take in part of the Needwood Scarp, is provided under the heading of Views and Vistas. The second paragraph to this sub-section reads:

"The boundary has also been extended to include a greater portion of the Battlestead Hill land form as it holds key panoramic views into the village and over the remainder of the Trent Valley".

Analysis

		<p>NDQL has retained independent landscape architect, Nigel Cowlin, to consider what panoramic views exist from the extended area (i.e. part of the Needwood Scarp) into the village. Nigel Cowlin's analysis is provided in a Visibility Study and this is attached. Nigel Cowlin's analysis concludes that:</p> <p><i>"This extension to the Conservation Area boundary is an area with no visual relationship to the village of Tatenhill. It lies over the ridge and there is also continuous dense woodland intervening immediately to the west. The area is not visible from the environment of the village and from the village it is only discovered on emerging from the immediately adjacent woodland edge. Also, once in this area the landform and woodland cover prevents any chance of a view back into the village. This extension to the Conservation Area should not be included for any reasons relating to the visual context of the village".</i></p> <p>In addition, Nigel Cowlin concludes that the proposed extension of the Conservation Area cannot be justified on any grounds relating to its having any importance for the character and appearance of the village in relation to its historic fabric. In addition, Nigel Cowlin considers that it is not an important spatial element in relation to any design form of the village or its particular settlement pattern.</p> <p>The CAAMP makes reference to key panoramic views over the remainder of the Trent Valley.</p> <p>However, NDQL fails to see how this relates to Tatenhill Conservation Area and, in any event, will be subject to significant changes due to the proposals for Branston Locks.</p> <p>Objection On this basis, NDQL considers that the proposed extension of the conservation area in this direction does not pass the test set up in the National Planning Policy Framework. Its addition will serve no purpose in terms of maintaining and enhancing the conservation of Tatenhill. Moreover, such a designation will be an unnecessary encumbrance in designing and bringing forward the hillside country park.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you could take into account these representations in reviewing the Conservation Area's boundaries. However, please do not hesitate to contact me if you wish to discuss this. Nigel Cowlin and I would be happy to meet you on site to consider this specific aspect.</p>	
TCA5	Ms R L Woolliscroft	<p>Thank you for your letter of 9th May 2014 setting out the new proposed Conservation Area Boundary for Tatenhill.</p> <p>Whilst I fully support the proposed extended area as outlined in red on the enclosed plan I would have preferred the inclusion of the additional area that borders Lawns Farm Cottage with Bronston Road and the green shaded area beyond Collingwood Lane marked Pool Green Farm. I believe this would have created a better balance for the whole</p>	<p>Noted. The Borough Council does not consider that the proposed further extension would be appropriate as this departs from the recommended extended boundary as contained in the Tatenhill Conservation Area Appraisal. Overall it is not considered that this area warrants inclusion into the conservation area as this section of land is of a considerable distance from the main village and has little relationship with the main village.</p>

		area. I hope my comments are helpful.	
TCA6	Mr & Mrs P Cooper	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the two conservation areas. We very much support all proposals.	Support noted.

Rangemore Conservation Area Boundary Representations and Council Response

Ref	Consultee	Representation	Council response
1	Branston Parish Council	The parish council support the proposals.	Support noted.
2	John Wren, JMW Planning Ltd	<p>1. I am writing to object to the current proposal to extend the boundary of the Rangemore Conservation Area which I understand to be a recommendation from external consultants. I wrote last year objecting to this proposal on behalf of the Rangemore Estate which is the landowner primarily affected by the proposed extension. A further objection will be submitted illustrating the lack of need for this proposed change and the consequences it would have on the efficient running of the Estate. In this objection I intend to concentrate on planning principles only. 2. A superficial view of the proposal might well be that it was a "good thing." The idea of conserving our heritage is popular with many people. The important point is that it should be done in a manner that does not devalue the concept. 3. Paragraph 127 of The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) says "when considering the designation of conservation areas, local planning authorities should ensure that an area justifies such status because of its special architectural or historic interest and that the concept of conservation is not devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest." I consider that it is reasonable to follow this guidance when deciding whether or not to extend a Conservation Area boundary. 4. Rangemore Conservation Area is described in your Council's 1990 document announcing the adoption of the Conservation Area as covering "a close knit community" with all the older buildings included within the Area. The existing boundary is tightly drawn and includes within it some notable listed buildings. 5. Paragraph 3.2 of the Tatenhill Parish Design Guide says Rangemore is a very coherent Conservation Area. Given its background as a model village to provide accommodation for estate workers at Rangemore Hall, its reason for designation is clear. The 1883-84 OS map shows how the village was developed as quite a compact settlement around a minor crossroads. 6. Extending the conservation area boundary in the manner proposed to take in adjoining fields and distant properties is going to completely change the character of the conservation area and the purpose for which it was designated in the first place. 7. I understand that the reason being given for the proposal is that your external consultants have subjectively decided that the landscape setting of this compact Conservation Area is as important as the buildings within the Conservation Area. Views in and out of the existing Conservation Area</p>	<p>Conservation area status does not preclude change and should support the effective positive management and maintenance of land. The Council is mindful and appreciates that Rangemore Estate undertakes a positive approach to the successful management of the estate and consider that conservation area, associated appraisal and amendments to the conservation area boundary status continues to support the historic landscape of the area. It is not intended that conservation area status should get in the way of successfully managing the estate.</p> <p>Whilst Rangemore is a compact settlement, the landscape and some surrounding buildings have a common identity with the main settlement as part of the historic estate. The role of the conservation area is to acknowledge historic linkages to the other peripheral buildings through a common identity and status.</p> <p>The Borough Council does not consider that the proposed further extension would be appropriate as this departs from the recommended extended boundary as contained in the Rangemore Conservation Area Appraisal.</p>

		<p>are important and should be protected, it is claimed. The solution being put forward, without consultation with the Rangemore Estate, is to include the surrounding fields owned by The Estate in the Conservation Area. 8. That would significantly devalue the reason for creating this Conservation Area in the first place and is based on the false premise that without Conservation Area status the views in and out of the village will be lost, presumably through development. 9. Somewhere along the line the consultants have lost sight of the fact that the fields and woodland around Rangemore are only there because of the responsible stewardship of The Estate over many years. They also do not appear to have considered other methods of ensuring the current setting of Rangemore remains unchanged, which rather devalues your Council's role in making planning policy and determining planning applications. I cannot envisage any circumstances in which either your Council or the Planning Inspectorate would support large scale development in these fields, whether or not they are in a Conservation Area. 10. All of the fields proposed for inclusion within the new boundary are covered until 2020 by Stewardship Agreements with Natural England, mostly higher level agreements. These guarantee these fields will be maintained in an environmentally friendly manner, much as The Estate has been doing for many years prior to the existence of Natural England or your Council. Had the consultants talked to The Estate about this they could have been told how these fields are protected and perhaps might not have come forward with such a draconian and damaging proposal as is contained in this consultation. 11. The Estate will be writing to explain how this proposal will seriously hamper the efficient running of The Estate shortly. In the meantime, on planning grounds alone, I would ask your Council to leave the Conservation Area boundary where it is now.</p>	
3	The Burton Property Trust	<p>Objection by the Burton Property Trust to the proposal to extend the Rangemore Conservation Area boundary I write as land agent to the Rangemore Estate, a position that I have held since 1978, to make an objection on behalf of the Burton Property Trustees who own the Estate, to the extension of the conservation area boundary. Our planning consultant has sent you an objection on planning grounds explaining why it is unnecessary and inappropriate to change the existing Conservation Area boundary which is tightly drawn around Rangemore. My objection is made because of the damaging effect the proposal would have on the continuing management and maintenance of the land it is suggested should now be in the Conservation Area. The proposal involves bringing dwellings up to half a mile distant from the historic core of the village together with over 100 acres of agricultural land into the Rangemore Conservation Area. These houses and the large area of land would become subject to the same restrictions as those within the existing Conservation Area. All but three of the dwellings and all of the fields it is proposed to bring into the Conservation Area are in the ownership of the estate.</p> <p>The Rangemore Estate, as the major landowner affected by this proposal, is disappointed by the lack of discussion that has taken place</p>	<p>Conservation area status does not preclude change and should support the effective positive management and maintenance of land. The Council is mindful and appreciates that Rangemore Estate undertakes a positive approach to the successful management of the estate and that conservation area status aids to consolidate and support the historic landscape of the area. It is not intended that conservation area status should get in the way of successfully managing the estate.</p> <p>The Council has made efforts to notify all owners or occupiers within the existing conservation area as well as those within the proposed conservation area. This consultation is the second round of consultation following the consultation of the conservation appraisals for both Tatenhill and Rangemore conservation areas during 2013.</p> <p>Discussion has also been undertaken as part of the successful implementation of the Tatenhill Neighbourhood Plan which these proposals support.</p>

		<p>before this proposal was published. It is understood that your external consultants want to include the Estate's fields and isolated houses into the Conservation Area to protect views in and out of the core settlement. Those views will remain irrespective of the decision on this consultation. The Estate is committed to agreements with DEFRA, English Nature and National Forest to secure the long term management and enhancement of the Landscape and natural history of the Estate and your Council is just as unlikely to approve development that would obscure those views as the Estate is to apply for them in the first place. Please remember that the attractive landscape around Rangemore is there because the Family, who still own the Estate, created it in the first place and has managed it responsibly more than a century and they intend to continue to do so. Indeed it is a fact that the only buildings which are detrimental to the Rangemore Conservation Area occur where the Estate has sold off plots without retaining control of subsequent development, a mistake that will not be repeated. Although there are no advantages to extending the Conservation Area boundary it would cause difficulties for the management of the Estate and subsequently, I believe, for your Council. This is because, as you know, all trees over 75 mm in diameter within a Conservation Area become subject to a six week notification procedure to your Council before work may be carried out on them. There are exceptions but that is the general rule. The plan your Council has published to show the proposed Conservation Area boundary is, I regret to say, extremely misleading in respect of the number of trees within it. In excluding the woods (quite rightly) it gives the impression that that few trees will be affected. That is not the case. The Estate forester has estimated that there are around 350 trees in varying stages of growth within the extended area. Not all are currently of a size to be covered by the legislation but obviously they will grow to the point where they are. Those that would be immediately affected include significant mature trees where work is routinely needed to keep them in a healthy and safe condition. It will seriously hamper the routine maintenance of the Estate's land if every time a tree needs work doing to it an application has to be made to your Council. It is true that an application will not attract a fee for your Council but the paperwork needed could lead to a bureaucratic nightmare for us both. The six week delay whilst waiting for a decision will be particularly harmful to the Estate but I also wonder if you have the manpower to deal properly with the applications you would receive and the specialised knowledge that is required for you to make a meaningful response. A great many of the mature trees are situated alongside the public roads or footpaths and this requires constant vigilance and frequent formal tree safety inspections which often result in immediate action being necessary to ensure public safety. Your council would also need to become involved when hedges are laid as that usually involves cutting and laying quickthorn stems over 75mm diameter and decisions over which trees to leave to grow on to eventually replace the ageing mature trees. Does the Council really wish to be involved in such inspections or decisions when it is self-</p>	
--	--	--	--

		evident that the Estate does this responsibly and effectively. All this could have been pointed out to the consultants making this recommendation to your Council had the Estate been a party to earlier discussions. It, however, is not too late to reject this impractical and damaging proposal. Please leave the Conservation Area boundary where it is. T M Evans BSc TD DL FRICS Land Agent to the Burton Property Trust.	
4	Mr J Melvin, Natural England	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 12th May 2014 which was received by email on the same date.</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England does not consider the above consultation to be of significant relevance to any of its interests and we therefore make a return of 'no comment'. Should you become aware of anything that you believe may have significant impact on the Natural Environment then please do not hesitate to make contact again. The lack of further comment from Natural England should not be interpreted as a statement that there are no impacts on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may be able to make comments that will help the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to fully take account of the environmental value of areas affected by this plan in the decision making process.</p> <p>We really value your feedback to help us improve the service we offer. We have attached a feedback form to this letter and welcome any comments you might have about our service.</p>	Noted.
5	Mr N Brown	<p>I am writing to formally oppose the plan to extend the conservation area around the village of Rangemore. As a tenant farmer on the Rangemore Estate, I farm some of the land shown on the map.</p> <p>The land is farmed in a sympathetic manner, with flora and fauna encouraged. The land is in the Higher Level Countryside Stewardship Scheme, governed by Natural England.</p> <p>As the actual village of Rangemore is already in a conservation area, extending the area to include fields, is not necessary. The additional constraints involved, by being in a conservation area, to us, as tenant farmers, would be onerous and time consuming.</p> <p>I have only just heard about your proposal and have not received any formal notification from ESBC.</p> <p>I do hope that you will take my objection into consideration when you make your final decision.</p>	<p>The Council has made efforts to notify all owners or occupiers within the existing conservation area as well as the proposed conservation area.</p> <p>Conservation area status does not preclude change and should support farming practices on the land.</p>
6	B Parker & I Woolliscroft	We wish to lodge a formal objection against this proposal on the	The Council has made efforts to notify all owners or

		<p>grounds that proper consultation has not been carried out. We understand that residents within the existing Rangemore conservation area have been notified, but we have not received any communication from either yourselves as Planning Authority, or from the Parish Council.</p> <p>Our farm, which is adjacent to the Gables house, falls within the proposed conservation area and we believe the restrictions associated with the proposal will severely hamper both our ability and that of the Burton Property Trust (our landlord) to manage the many trees within the extended area. It also introduces additional controls over buildings which may restrict our ability to grow our farm business and does not recognise the many years of responsible stewardship carried out by tenant farmers and the estate since the 1800s. Indeed the two fields directly opposite the church, and the field which runs alongside Holly Bank wood are part of a Natural England Entry Level Stewardship scheme aimed at conserving hay meadows and increasing biodiversity. There is absolutely no need for this area to be protected further. It is completely unnecessary.</p> <p>Furthermore, you will be aware that the land will be crossed by a new gas pipeline in the very near future which will cause disruption to our farming activities? the designation as a conservation area will make it more difficult to reinstate the landscape afterwards.</p> <p>We ask the Council to reject this proposal, at least until all the residents and farmers who will be impacted most have been adequately consulted.</p>	<p>occupiers within the existing conservation area as well as the proposed conservation area.</p> <p>It is not considered that Conservation area status would make it more difficult to reinstate the landscape after gas pipe works as it only concerns itself with the protection of the demolition of buildings and work/felling of trees. Restoration works following such engineering works would be expected to be carried out satisfactorily in open countryside regardless of whether it was inside or outside of a conservation area.</p>
7	Mr J Vaughan	<p>We strongly disagree with the proposal to include Forest Gate Farm in the Listed Building Plan. This property was extensively modified in the 1980s and therefore does not represent the original design.</p> <p>The outbuildings are currently used in our farming activities and so it is essential we retain the current rights to modify the buildings in the event of future contingencies. Our land is farmed in a sympathetic manner and wildlife encouraged for the enjoyment of the whole village. This has been done voluntarily without inducement.</p> <p>We formally object to the proposal to extend the Rangemore Conservation Area as totally unnecessary.</p> <p>The current planning consents are perfectly adequate, the village has retained its character over the last 150 years without this additional layer of bureaucracy.</p> <p>We are unaware of any consultation that has taken place and feel this plan is being forced through without consideration for the residents.</p>	<p>The significance of Forest Gate Farm is stated on page 15 of the Rangemore Conservation Area Appraisal. It is appreciated that there may have been some modifications made to the building but it still contributes positively to the character, setting and appearance of the overall conservation area. Being located at the end of Chapel Lane, there are significant views around the farmstead.</p> <p>Conservation Area status does not preclude future development, though it must be of appropriate high quality design in order to take into account its historic character, setting and appearance in terms of overall context.</p>
8	Mrs E Coleman, Tatenhill Parish Council	<p>Tatenhill Parish Council had their first opportunity to discuss the recent consultation at the meeting last night. Whilst acknowledging the formal consultation closed on Friday Council trusts that these comments will also be considered alongside others received.</p>	<p>Noted (No specific comments have made for the Rangemore Conservation Area boundary amendment).</p>

		<p>ESBC took ownership of the reviews around 12 months ago but the requisite formal consultation was not carried out on a timely basis. Have the residents forgotten the exercise and their support for the proposals.</p> <p>Council supports the proposals which were drawn up following extensive consultation with the electorate and associated discussions.</p> <p>Tatenhill Boundary Extension to South East – The proposed boundary to the South East cuts across a field, probably following the line of a water/sewer pipe. At the time of the original consultation exercise there was obviously little reason to do anything else. However, in March 2013 Council completed the purchase of that field (with the generous grant funding from both ESBC and National Forest. Forest Funding) and has planted a mixed woodland over the entire field (shown in white on the map between the stream and the track (east to west) and the Woodlands Wood and a small plantation by Aggregate Industries (north to south). This means that that field would now be coloured green. <i>Tatenhill Parish Council now wish ESBC to seriously consider extending the boundary further at this point along the track & stream to the southern boundary of the field from the pumping station east to the stream.</i> This would then encompass the entire wooded area.</p>	
9	Ms R L Woolliscroft	<p>Thank you for your letter of 9th May 2014 setting out the new proposed Conservation Area Boundary for Tatenhill.</p> <p>Whilst I fully support the proposed extended area as outlined in red on the enclosed plan I would have preferred the inclusion of the additional area that borders Lawns Farm Cottage with Bronston Road and the green shaded area beyond Collingwood Lane marked Pool Green Farm. I believe this would have created a better balance for the whole area.</p> <p>I hope my comments are helpful.</p>	Noted (No specific comments have made for the Rangemore Conservation Area boundary amendment).
10	Mr & Mrs P Cooper	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the two conservation areas.</p> <p>We very much support all proposals.</p>	Support noted.