

# CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISALS AND MANAGEMENT PLANS FOR WALL AND WIGGINTON



Cllr Ian Pritchard

Date: 12<sup>th</sup> November 2018

Contact Officer: Claire Hines

Tel Number: (01543) 308188

Email: Claire.hines@lichfielddc.gov.uk

Key Decision? NO

Local Ward Members Hammerwich with Wall Ward:- Cllr K. Humphreys and Cllr D. Pullen  
Whittington and Streethay Ward:- Cllr D. Leytham, Cllr R. Strachan, Cllr A. White.

**Economic Growth,  
Environment and  
Development  
Overview & Scrutiny**

## 1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 To inform the Economic Growth, Environment and Development (Overview and Scrutiny) Committee of the results of the public consultation on the draft Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans for Wall Conservation Area and Wigginton Conservation Area, and to request Committee's support for the final, amended appraisals and management plans and their recommendation for approval to the Cabinet and Full Council. Furthermore to seek Committee's support for the addition of the relevant buildings to the Councils 'Local List'.

## 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Committee notes the results of the consultation as per Appendix A of this report, supports the final appraisal and management plans and recommends them to be submitted to the Cabinet and Full Council for approval.
- 2.2 That the Committee supports the proposed boundary changes to the Conservation Areas as shown on the maps in Appendix B and recommends them to be submitted to the Cabinet and Full Council for approval.
- 2.3 That the Committee supports the proposal to add the properties listed in Appendix C of this report to the Register of Buildings of Special Local Interest and recommends these additions to the Register, to be submitted to the Cabinet and Full Council for approval.

## 3. Background

- 3.1 A programme of appraisal and management plan work was approved by this committee in June 2006 and members will recall that in March 2013, they were provided with an update on the Council's proposed programme for the implementation of conservation area appraisals and management plans across the District.

3.2 As part of this ongoing work, officers have established a protocol for the adoption of conservation area appraisals and management plans, of which this report forms an integral part. In line with national and regional advice, the Council has chosen to adopt the appraisal, and subsequent management plan, documents as Council policy, as opposed to supplementary planning documents (SPDs). This affords the documents 'material planning consideration' status in the decision-making process, but excludes them from the Local Plan timetable. Nevertheless, the adoption process is rigorous and comprises the following stages:

- seeking permission from the Cabinet to consult on a draft Appraisal and Management Plan;
- a 6 week consultation period, including letters to all residents residing within and adjacent to, the relevant conservation area, the Parish Council, local civic groups and agents, with documents being made available over the internet and paper copies provided on request;
- full consideration of representations received and amendment of the document, as necessary;
- presentation of the document at a public meeting, generally a meeting of the relevant Parish or Town Council;
- a report to this Committee, taking on board comments received, and seeking approval of the revised document;
- if agreed, the report and document are returned to Cabinet and subsequently Full Council for formal adoption.

3.3 The required consultation has been carried out and the Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans were presented at a meeting of Wall Parish Council Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> May and Hopwas and Wigginton Parish Council on Thursday 7<sup>th</sup> June.

3.4 The representation responses have been duly considered and all relevant amendments incorporated into the final documents. The representations and responses are contained within Appendix A of this report and the buildings to be added to the Register of Buildings of Special Local Interest within Appendix C of this report.

3.5 The documents are available electronically on the District Council web-site at:

[http://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/info/511/conservation\\_areas/526/conservation\\_areas\\_in\\_lichfield\\_district/2](http://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/info/511/conservation_areas/526/conservation_areas_in_lichfield_district/2)

Alternative Options	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The alternative option is not to undertake conservation area appraisals. This would weaken the local planning authority's ability to seek to preserve or enhance the special character and appearance of the area when considering planning applications.</li><li>2. An alternative would be not to carry out such robust public consultation and adoption process. This is not considered to be best practise and the final documents would not carry the same amount of weight in the planning process.</li></ol>
Consultation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Ward Councillors have been e-mailed advising them of submission of this report and with a copy of the draft report.</li><li>2. The details of the consultation process are contained in points 3.2-3.4</li></ol>

Financial Implications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The cost of production of the documents and consultation exercises will be met from existing budgets.</li> <li>2. The implementation of recommendations in the management plan will either utilise existing resources and existing budgets or be funded from external bodies.</li> </ol>
Contribution to the Delivery of the Strategic Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. These proposals support the aims of the District Council's Strategic Plan 2016 -20 to be a clean, green and welcoming place to live and specifically to maintain and enhance our heritage.</li> </ol>
Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Implications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In creating documents which contribute to the understanding and management of this conservation area, the Council is seeking to preserve and enhance this area for all future generations.</li> </ol>
Crime & Safety Issues	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The recommendations will have no discernible impact on our duty to prevent crime and disorder within the District (Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act, 1988).</li> </ol>

	Risk Description	How We Manage It	Severity of Risk (RYG)
A	Draft appraisal and management plans may not stand up to testing at appeal	By means of thorough consultation, based on best practice with robust processes, we can minimise the risk of challenge.	Yellow
B			

Background documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final conservation area appraisal and management plan for Wall</li> <li>• Final conservation area appraisal and management plan for Wigginton</li> </ul>

Relevant web links
--------------------

## Appendix A

### Consultation representations and responses

#### Wall Conservation Area

Comment Ref	Consultee	Paragraph	Comments	Response
WACAA1	Mr P. Young  (Parish Clerk, Wall Parish Council)	1	Consultation response from Wall Parish Council Wall Parish Council welcomes the recognition and protection given to the Wall Conservation Area as an area of “special architectural or historic interest the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance”.	These comments are noted and welcomed. No amendments are proposed.

		2	<p><b>Section 1 - Appraisal</b></p> <p>The Wall Scheduled Monument site is of national importance and its historic significance forms a major element in the justification of the Conservation Area status. The Appraisal should therefore include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• greater detail on the Scheduled Monument</li> <li>• how the Scheduled Monument relates to the Conservation Area</li> <li>• how Conservation Area policies will assist in enhancing and preserving the Scheduled Monument</li> <li>• how Scheduled Monument policies complement Conservation Area policies. In particular, the Plan showing the boundary of the Conservation Area should have superimposed upon it the boundary of the Scheduled Monument site, in order to show the inter-relationship between the two.</li> </ul>	<p>The settlement of Wall is considered to be of sufficient special architectural and historic interest to merit designation as a conservation area. The Roman history of the site gives it additional interest but is only one of a number of factors leading to its designation. Greater detail will be included on the Scheduled Monument in Appendix C. This will include the full scheduling description as well as information provided by Historic England regarding Scheduled Monuments. It should be clarified that there is no legal or planning policy related relationship between scheduled monument and conservation area designations. They are covered by different legislation (Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 and Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) respectively). Proposals to designate new scheduled monuments or conservation areas, to amend the boundaries of existing scheduled monuments and conservation areas and applications for works affecting scheduled monuments and conservation areas are processed by two separate bodies (Historic England and the Local Planning Authority respectively). Therefore conservation area policies will not help in enhancing and preserving the scheduled monument. They can only help to preserve or enhance the conservation area itself. A map showing the scheduled monument boundary</p>
--	--	---	---	---

		3	Section 1 should also include reference to the Green Belt and the level of planning protection this affords.	<p>A reference to Green Belt will also be included in section 1.2. The text will read; <i>'It should be noted that the whole of the settlement of Wall falls within the West Midlands Green Belt. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence (NPPF 2018 para 133). '</i></p> <p>It should be noted that Green Belt legislation and policy is also separate from conservation area legislation and policy although applications for works within both designations are processed by the Local Planning Authority.</p>
		4	Para 1.6 The recognition of the importance of the re-used Roman stonework in the wall at Castle Croft fronting onto Watling Street is welcomed. This wall makes a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area and the protection against demolition provided by Conservation Area status is needed because, somewhat incongruously, this small section of the north side of Watling Street is not within the Scheduled Monument site.	These comments have been noted. It is proposed to include this section of wall on the local list. The schedule of properties in Appendix B will be updated to reflect this.
		5	The Plan as a whole would benefit from proof-reading to correct spellings, typos and punctuation errors etc. e.g. page 48 <i>"historic assets that are cleverly worthy of protection"</i> ; page 25 <i>"The major issue is to carefully manage any future development where it would be potentially crowd and physically impact on the value of the Roman remains and the character of the listed buildings"</i> ; and the two paragraphs on page 28 which are an exact repetition of text on page 18.	These comments are noted. The various errors will be corrected and the duplicate paragraphs removed.

		6	<p><b>Section 2 – Management Plan</b></p> <p><b>Action 1</b> The boundary of the current Conservation Area should remain unchanged.</p> <p>1. There is no reason to include the additional areas proposed:</p> <p>a. The houses at The Butts were built in the 1920's and 1950's and have little (if any) historic merit. They are not part of the Scheduled Monument site and have little impact on views or the main streetscene. Inclusion of these properties within the Conservation Area would impose unjustifiable and unnecessary planning restrictions on them by removal of certain permitted development rights, and with the additional burdens of requiring formal consent for any pruning or felling of trees etc.</p> <p>b. The land to the north of Castle Croft is an open field and it is inconsistent to propose adding this to the Conservation Area when elsewhere fields are proposed to be removed from the Conservation Area.</p> <p>c. The land to West of Wall Lane is mainly an undistinguished row of early 20th century terraced housing so there is little reason to add this to the Conservation Area. The existing Conservation Area boundary along Wall Lane provides a far more logical and clearly-defined boundary.</p>	<p>The comments in relation to the houses in The Butts have been noted and these properties are no longer proposed for inclusion in the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The land to the north of Castle Croft is proposed for inclusion as the physical boundary, presumably a hedge, which was present when the conservation area was designated in 1974 has now unfortunately been lost. Therefore in order to have a logical and legally defensible boundary to the conservation area it is necessary to move the boundary to the next physical boundary which is what has been proposed. It is intended to retain this amendment as proposed.</p> <p>Land west of Wall Lane. These comments have been noted and it is no longer proposed to include the land to the east of Wall Lane in the conservation area due to a number of consultees objecting to this part of the proposals. Conservation area designation would have provided some control over the erection of large agricultural building which appears to be favoured by the parish council in paragraph 8.</p>
--	--	---	---	--

		7	<p>2. There is no reason to remove any areas from the current Conservation Area. The Conservation Area provides a much needed and additional layer of protection against development, over and above that afforded by Scheduled Monument designation or Green Belt. The boundary of a Scheduled Monument can potentially be changed by English Heritage and so is not within local planning control. As regards Green Belt, the experience within Lichfield District is that it only protects land from small-scale development such as single dwellings or home extensions. When major development is proposed (such as 1,500 new houses on land bordering Wall to the south of Lichfield), then land is simply removed from Green Belt. Nor does existing Green Belt provide protection against large-scale commercial development. For example, on land north of Wall Island a major business park and its forthcoming extension have been granted consent, even though in full Green Belt and despite any policy for development of this site appearing in the Local Plan. Previously the Wyevale Garden Centre (including its many non-garden retail units) was granted consent just south of Wall Island, even though in confirmed Green Belt.</p>	<p>Of the three areas proposed for removal from the conservation area the area to the west of the Butts and to the south of Watling Street do not form part of the settlement and appear only to have originally included because they are within the scheduled area. However, as previously explained conservation area designation is entirely separate from scheduled monument designation so there is no justification to retain these two areas within the conservation area. In terms of the land to the north of The Butts, the boundary that existing when the conservation area was originally designated, presumably a hedge, has now been lost therefore in order to maintain a logical and legally defensible boundary the boundary has been moved to the closest physically definable boundary. Therefore it is still proposed to remove these areas from the conservation area.</p> <p>It should be noted that conservation area designation provides no additional layer of protection against development over and above that afforded by scheduled monument or green belt designation. Scheduled monument designation offers the highest level of protection that can be afforded to a heritage asset. It is at the discretion of Historic England (not English Heritage) to amend the boundary of the scheduled monument. The following advice has been provided by Historic England regarding amendments to scheduled monument boundaries.</p> <p><i>'In broad terms, any new review or amendment to the designation would need to be based on clear evidence; however this would not necessarily be brand new information. The monument at Wall is a Minor Enhanced Old County Number. This basically</i></p>
--	--	---	--	---

				<p>means it's an early scheduling (Wall was first scheduled in 1955 and amended in 1999) and the information on which it was based is probably not as detailed or comprehensive as some of our modern and more complex schedulings (<a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1006108">https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1006108</a>). It is therefore possible that there is additional information out there (new and historic archaeological evaluations, surveys, APs, antiquarian reports, field-walking results, amateur investigations etc.) which might not have been considered when it was originally scheduled (or later amended), and might be able to shed new light or provide clarification on its nature, extent and significance. Whilst that could result in an increase in the size of the scheduled area, it could just as easily result in a decrease – for example if investigations have proven that there is no archaeology or significance to a particular area.</p> <p>I'll caveat all of that by saying any change to the scheduled area would need clear and convincing justification and our Listing team would need an application (which can be done online) with all the relevant supporting information attached. Should an application for an amendment or new designation be proposed, our Listing Team would consult with the affected landowners, as well as us in the West Midlands Office and (I think) the County Archaeologist / HER. I'm not sure if they consult with the Parish Council or LPA - if you want to know for certain it would probably be worth dropping them a line (General Enquiry number is: 0370 333 0607 or by email: <a href="mailto:listing.enquiries@HistoricEngland.org.uk">listing.enquiries@HistoricEngland.org.uk</a>)'</p> <p>In terms of the comments on Green Belt the following advice has been received from our Spatial Policy and Delivery Team Manager. "Green Belts are</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p><i>given great importance at a national and local level. This importance does not mean development cannot occur within the Green Belt. However there significant policy hurdles to pass when allocating land, or applying for planning permission within the Green Belt. At the national level the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) contains a detailed section at paragraphs 133 – 147 relating to the importance of Green Belt. At the local level the council also have policy NR2 within the adopted Local Plan Strategy which seeks to support the national policy position.”</i></p>
	8	<p>It should also be noted that under the National Planning Policy Framework, new agricultural buildings, which may be both large and unsightly, are not classed as “inappropriate development” within the Green Belt. The Conservation Area designation is therefore a key factor in the control of such developments in the proximity of Wall village which might otherwise have a detrimental effect on the historic character of the village or the views from it.</p>	<p>This appears to contradict the request in paragraph 6 not to include the area to the east of Wall Lane where conservation area designation would provide the LPA with some degree of control over the erection of future agricultural buildings. It is no longer proposed to include the land to the east of Wall Lane in the conservation area due to a number of consultees objecting to this part of the proposals.</p>
	9	<p><b>Action 2 and Action 3</b> It is noted that an Article 4 direction (removing certain permitted development rights) can only apply to residential properties, and that these are listed in Appendix A. The list in Appendix A should not therefore include Wall Village Hall as it is not a residential property. Consideration should also be given as to whether The Trooper Inn would qualify as a ‘residential’ property, as it is also listed in Appendix A.</p>	<p>The Village Hall is proposed for Local Listing only as is The Trooper. Given that neither building is a residential dwelling and therefore not eligible for an Article 4. The schedule of properties in Appendix A will be corrected.</p>

		10	<b>Action 4</b> The Council welcomes the list of buildings for 'local listing' given in Appendix B but the terminology of "local listing" is confusing with formal designation of Listed Buildings.	The term Local List is used nationally including by Historic England and by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government in its National Planning Policy Guidance. Appendix B explains the difference between the two designations. No amendments to the text are proposed.
		11	<b>Action 5</b> Action 5b which is to "review and if necessary modify the management proposals" is too vague, particularly since the current Conservation Area has not been reviewed for over 40 years. This action point should therefore set out the frequency and timescale for future reviews.	The frequency and timescales of any future reviews of Wall Conservation Area is dependent on a number of factors, therefore it is not possible to set timetables for these. Lichfield District Council currently has 21 conservation areas and has a rolling programme of Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans which started in 2008 and is due for completion in 2019/20 at which point it will start reviewing each conservation area again. No amendments to the text are proposed.
		12	<b>Action 6</b> states that, "The Council will ensure that all proposed advertisements accord with policy set out in the emerging Local Plan". The Local Plan was adopted by Lichfield District Council in February 2015, so the word "emerging" should be deleted.	The text will be amended to reflect the current position on the Local Plan.
		13	<b>Action 7</b> As for Action 6, the reference should be to the Local Plan which has already been adopted, and not the "emerging Local Plan".	The text will be amended to reflect the current position on the Local Plan.

		14	<b>Action 8</b> Para 2.3.1 on page 40 refers to “works to historic buildings within Drayton Bassett Conservation Area” and appears to have been ‘cut and pasted’ from some other Conservation Area Plan. It would be helpful if the Wall Conservation Area Plan referred only to Wall and not to any other villages in the District.	This is an oversight and the text will be corrected.
		15	In order not to unduly raise expectations of the grant funding which owners of properties within the Conservation Area can apply for, it would be useful to set out in Action 8 the level of such funding which is available annually within the District	Section 2.3.1 reads: <i>‘The Council currently administers a small grants scheme available for works to historic buildings which are considered to be at risk.’</i> The text will be amended to read: <i>‘The Council currently administers a small grants scheme (giving grants of 25% of the total cost of eligible works, up to a maximum of £5,000) available for works to listed buildings which are considered to be at risk.’</i>
WACAA2	Friends of Letocetum)	1	<b>Comments from Friends of Letocetum who manage Wall Roman Site &amp; Museum on behalf of National Trust and English Heritage</b>  The Friends of Letocetum is a voluntary group that mans the Museum at Wall and publicises and promotes awareness of the Roman baths and mansio and other archaeological remains in Wall. We welcome the recognition given by the document to the archaeological importance of Wall.	These comments are noted and are welcomed. No amendments are proposed to the document.
		2	<b>1.4 Location and Setting</b> We welcome the statement about the importance of views across the mansio and bath house to the church.	These comments are noted and are welcomed. No amendments are proposed to the document.

		3	<b>1.6 Architectural Quality and Built Form</b> We welcome the statement about the tourism and educational importance of the archaeological remains. We welcome the statement about the importance of the reused Roman stonework forming part of the boundary between Castle Croft and Watling Street (pp21-22). We strongly urge that this wall should be retained because of the positive contribution it makes to the character of the Conservation Area.	These comments are noted and are welcomed. It is proposed to add this section of wall to the local list. The Schedule of properties in Appendix B will be amended.
		4	<b>1.7 Public Realm, Open Spaces and Trees</b> para 2: We strongly recommend that this be reworded to read: “ <b>There</b> are areas...” because its currently wording suggests that it relates to the features mentioned In the previous paragraph, which positively contribute to the character of the Conservation Area and do not require change or improvement. If there are considered to be areas which provide opportunities for change or improvement then they should be identified in the document.	The text will be re-worded to read: ‘ <i>There are also areas...</i> ’.
		5	<b>11 Maps</b> Both of these maps should show the extent of the scheduled monument because scheduling is mentioned in 1.3 as part of the significance of the Conservation Area, and because the extent of the scheduled area is slightly different from that of the Conservation Area.	Maps in section 11 will be amended to include the scheduled area

	6	<p><b>2.1.1 Boundary changes</b></p> <p>We acknowledge that the proposed boundary changes will result in a more logical boundary to the Conservation Area. We welcome the proposed extensions. We strongly recommend that it should be made clear that the proposed boundary changes to the Conservation Area do not affect the extent of the scheduled monument and that those areas of the scheduled monument which it is proposed to remove from the Conservation Area (north and east of The Butts, west of The Butts and south of Watling Street to the north of the A5 Wall Bypass) will remain subject to scheduled monument controls in addition to planning requirements. We note that while bullet point 3 under Action 1 says scheduled area, bullet points 1 and 6 do not acknowledge that they also refer to land is within the scheduled area. We therefore recommend that the words “scheduled area” be added to the descriptions in these bullet points. Because of the extent of the scheduled monument at Wall we strongly recommend that the document should contain information about scheduling (not just a website reference). Historic England should be asked for advice on appropriate wording.</p>	<p>Additional text will be added to clarify that the proposed changes will have no impact on the extent of the scheduled area or the protection it provides. The text will read; <i>‘It should be noted that the amendments to the conservation area boundary have no impact on the extent of the scheduled area or the protection it provides for the archaeological remains.’</i></p> <p>The text in Action 1 will be amended to read; <i>The District Council will amend the boundary of the Conservation Area in the following areas, as shown on maps in section 11;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Exclusion of the field to the west of The Butts, exclusion of the area to the North and East of The Butts and exclusion of land to the south of Watling Street to the North of the A5 Wall Bypass, all of which are included in the scheduled area.</i></li> <li>• <i>Inclusion of land to North of Castle Croft, to follow the boundary from close to Littlefield House Cottage to Wall Lane</i></li> </ul> <p>An additional appendix (Appendix C) will be added which will include the full scheduling description and information about schedule provided by Historic England.</p>
	7	<p>We also recommend that the document should state that there are other archaeological remains outside the area of the scheduled monument and that archaeological works are likely to be required as a condition of planning permission.</p>	<p>Additional text will be included in section 1.2 to read; <i>‘While not directly related to planning policy much of the settlement of Wall is a Scheduled Monument. Furthermore there are likely to be archaeological remains outside of the scheduled area and archaeological works are likely to be</i></p>

				<i>required as a condition of any planning permission.'</i>
		8	<b>Schedule of properties for local listing</b> We suggest that the Museum building, Watling Street, should be added to this list because of its long-standing association with the Roman remains. The boundary wall at Castle Croft as shown on page 22 should also be added to the local list as an example of the re-use of Roman masonry in the post- Roman period, which adds to the character and special interest of the area.	The Museum building and the section of wall at Castle Croft will both be proposed for the local list. The schedule of properties in Appendix B will be amended.
<b>WACAA3</b>	<b>S A Shelley</b>  <b>(local resident)</b>  <b>17/5/18</b> <b>by e-mail</b>		I attended the meeting at the village hall last night. I wish to state my objection to the proposed conservation changes I do not see the need to change what is in place If the main reason is establishing the boundary then they should be moved to the hedge and not moved to be near buildings Please take note of my objections your sincerely	These comments are noted. The Historic England document 'Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management' states in paragraph 66 that; ' <i>... in almost all situations the conservation area boundary runs around rather than through a space or plot. It will generally be defined by physical features and avoid for example running along the middle of a street...</i> ' Where the physical boundary that once informed the location of the boundary of the conservation area has been lost and therefore the boundary cuts through the centre of a field, the boundary is proposed to be moved to follow the nearest physical boundary that is visible on the ground. The intention is to form a logical and legally defensible boundary.
<b>WACAA4</b>	<b>Mrs A Perry</b>  <b>(local</b>		I don't have access to a computer but I do wish to comment on the above.	These comments are noted. The concern is that in some areas the present boundary is no longer easily defined. Where the physical boundary that once

	<b>resident)</b>  <b>6/6/18</b> <b>By letter</b>		<p>After attending the public meeting and hearing the proposals, I see no good reason for altering what is already in place. In particular the argument for changing the boundaries of the present conservation area seems an unnecessary exercise as the present boundary is easily defined.</p> <p>As for including the houses in The Butts, Manor Cottages and a potato store, I think this may be acceptable depending on how the individual property owners feel.</p> <p>Please add my comments to the consultation.</p>	<p>informed the location of the boundary of the conservation area has been lost and therefore the boundary cuts through the centre of a field, the boundary is proposed to be moved to follow the nearest physical boundary that is visible on the ground. The intention is to form a logical and legally defensible boundary.</p> <p>The comments on the inclusion of areas are welcomed. Although it is no longer proposed to include the properties in The Butts or the properties and land to the east of Wall Lane within the conservation area.</p>
<b>WACAA5</b>	<b>W.J. &amp; A.J.W. Ryman</b>  <b>(local residents)</b>  <b>4/6/18</b> <b>By letter</b>		<p>I wish to object to any changes in the existing boundaries and in particular the proposal to make the land and cottages to the East of Clay Pit lane a conservation area, this is a farm working area with a 1950's potato store, general farm use and farm cottages. This is certainly not an 'area of special architectural or historic interest the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance.'</p> <p>The existing Eastern edge of the area quite satisfactorily follows Clay Pit Lane in a straight Northerly Line and no change is justified.</p>	<p>The road referred to here is Wall Lane and only becomes Claypit Lane further north.</p> <p>It is no longer proposed to include the land to the east of Wall Lane in the conservation area due to a number of consultees objecting to this part of the proposals.</p>
<b>WACAA6</b>	<b>J.C &amp; V.J. Hollins</b>  <b>(local residents)</b>		<p>With reference to the above mentioned draft plan, my wife and I attended the Annual Parish of Wall meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> May 2018 and listened with interest to the address by Claire Hines and her colleague from the conservation department of the district council.</p>	<p>The amendments to the conservation area boundary will not affect the scheduled monument designation and will not remove any protection from the archaeological remains of the Roman settlement. Conservation area designation is intended to protect the character and appearance of an area and not to</p>

	<b>18/5/18 by letter</b>		<p>Our views are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. With reference to the proposal to move the boundary to within yards of the existing roman site is totally wrong. It does not preserve or enhance the site in any way and in fact removes a layer of protection to the field to the north of the site below which I am led to believe are the remains of the old roman village. We understand that concern has been raised by the fact that the existing conservation boundary now runs across open fields with no obvious boundary. Apparently in the past the boundary followed hedge rows but these have been removed to make larger fields. We therefore suggest that instead of reducing the area, it be extended outwards to the next hedgerow, which not only protects the area, it also gives a clear indication of the boundary.</li> <li>b. The area to the west along the A5 could, we feel be reduced without detrimental effect. We have no observations about the boundaries to the south and east.</li> <li>c. The other observation we wish to make is to leave the existing boundaries as they are as they appear to have worked well for quite a number of years. If a thing is not broken, why mend it, and that appeared to the opinion of the majority of persons and the previously named meeting.</li> </ul>	<p>protect archaeological remains which in this instance have the highest level of protection as a scheduled monuments. In the case of the area to the north of The Butts we cannot move the boundary outwards as the next field boundary is far too far north so we have proposed instead to follow the edge of the built development which is common in conservation area designations.</p> <p>Comments regarding areas to the west, south and east are noted.</p> <p>In terms of leaving the boundary where it is. LPA's are required under the legislation to review their conservation areas from time to time and when we do we have to review the boundaries. Conservation areas are not stagnant and do change over time so the proposed boundary changes reflect this.</p>
--	------------------------------	--	---	---

## Wigginton Conservation Area

Comment Ref	Consultee	Comments	Response
WICAA1	<p><b>Mrs M. Jones</b></p> <p><b>(Clerk to Wigginton and Hopwas Parish Council)</b></p> <p><b>20/6/18</b></p> <p><b>by e-mail</b></p>	<p>Wigginton and Hopwas Parish Council are supportive of the Plan and grateful that it has been re-evaluated and updated since the previous version has been in place for many years. It is appreciated that this has provided an opportunity to engage local people with the character and appearance of their community.</p> <p>The Parish Council notes the pressure from development on the parish and feels the plan will offer some protection against coalescence with Tamworth by continuing Wigginton's designation as a heritage asset.</p> <p>It welcomes the emphasis on preserving the rural nature of Wigginton's setting and the key views into and out of the village.</p> <p>The conservation area will remain very similar to the existing area, with minor changes to the boundary, and there is no objection to these changes.</p> <p>The information on the special character and appearance is of great interest to anyone connected to Wigginton. It points out matters that local people may just take for granted, including its hilltop location linear form, and views; it also gives information about the historic hollow way and shifted medieval settlement that may not be well known to some. It is important to protect this historic area from development as there may be a future opportunity for archaeological investigation.</p>	<p>The comments in the first to fifth paragraphs are noted.</p> <p>In line with comments in the 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph the text on page 9 will be amended as follows;          'The village does not have a clear centre but landmarks and focal points include Wigginton Manor, St Leonards Church and Post Office Farmhouse on the corner of Main Road and Syerscote Lane. They also include the small open space with the War Memorial at the junction of Main Road and Comberford Lane which is a feature in common with other nearby settlements including Comberford.'</p> <p>The amendment proposed in the seventh paragraph will be included.</p> <p>In respect of the eighth paragraph, the sentence on page 20 will be amended as follows; 'The substantial brick wall that runs along the east side of Main Road north of Manor Cottages is an important feature of the conservation area and positively contributes to the streetscene.'</p> <p>The sentence on page 28 (p29 in the final version) will be amended as follows; '- to the north of the conservation area the boundary will be amended to include the whole of the site associated with Wigginton Manor Farm.'</p> <p>The comments in the ninth to eleventh paragraphs are noted.</p>

		<p>It could perhaps be noted that the small triangular grassed area on which the war memorial is sited is a similar feature to that found in other local villages, such as Comberford and Hopwas.</p> <p>We would point out that the reference to Wigginton Fields Farmhouse on page 12 should be amended to Wigginton Manor, as Wigginton Fields is beyond the village on the road to Harlaston.</p> <p>Other minor points to note - the sentence about the brick wall at the top of page 20 isn't complete and on page 28 of the management plan, there is no conclusion to the final sentence in Action 1. Small amendments would serve to clarify these points.</p> <p>The Parish Council supports the action points in the Management Plan, and particularly Action 6. This reflects policy WHC3 in the Wigginton, Hopwas and Comberford Neighbourhood Plan which stresses the importance of protecting the heritage assets of the parish.</p> <p>Wigginton and Hopwas Parish Council has no objection to the inclusion on Lichfield's Local List of the buildings referred to in Appendix B, as this will protect against unauthorised changes that may affect the conservation area. Residents occupying such properties will have the opportunity during the process of appraisal to submit their own views on such an inclusion.</p> <p>The Parish Council supports the draft document and looks forward to its final adoption. Should there be significant amendments made following public feedback we would be</p>	
--	--	--	--

		grateful to see these and have a further opportunity to comment.	
<b>WICAA2</b>	<b>Mr P. Boland</b>  <b>(Historic Places Advisor, Historic England)</b>  <b>28/6/18</b> <b>by e-mail</b>	<p>Thank you for consulting Historic England on the above draft appraisal. Whilst recognizing that the local planning authority is responsible for conservation area designation you may wish to note the following observations.</p> <p>The Appraisal follows a logical format that is fully in line with national guidance. There is a clear articulation of the conservation areas special interest, its buildings, the contribution made by open spaces, trees and other vegetation and of views to the adjacent rural landscape setting. There is a succinct and insightful analysis as to how all of this this currently contributes to the areas character and appearance.</p> <p>Both positive and negative aspects of the conservation area are carefully itemized and clear prescriptions for management are suggested. The conservation area boundary changes suggested have equally clearly been arrived at after thoughtful analysis.</p> <p>As a very minor observation please note the incorrect use of the word “compliment” rather “complement” throughout the document.</p> <p>I hope you find these comments helpful.</p>	The comments are noted and the proposed spelling correction will be carried out.
<b>WICAA3</b>	<b>Julia Banbury</b>  <b>(Principal Landscape Officer,</b>	Please find below Staffordshire County Council’s Environmental Advice Team response to the Draft Wigginton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plans	The bullet point on page 7 will be amended as follows; ‘There is a strong relationship between the village and the surrounding field pattern and surviving earthworks which provide fossilised evidence of agriculture and former settlement.’

	<p><b>Staffordshire County Council)</b></p> <p><b>25/6/18 by e-mail</b></p>	<p><b>Historic Environment</b></p> <p>I am happy that the Historic Development section of the Appraisal has provided an appropriate overview which highlights the archaeological interest of the Conservation Area and its setting. For clarity page 7 bullet point 2 may wish to specify that the earthworks in question relate to both fossilized agricultural evidence and former settlement.</p> <p>Page 6: to assist users of the document to find the Staffordshire Historic Environment Record it is advise that the web-link be changed to <a href="http://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/historic-environment-record">www.staffordshire.gov.uk/historic-environment-record</a></p> <p><b>Ecology</b> No comments</p> <p><b>Landscape</b> No comments</p> <p><b>Rights of Way</b> We welcome the information within the plan and would encourage that recognition is given to improve accessibility on the walking and cycling networks throughout the Parish. However, there needs to be some recognition that this coincides with reduced finding for rights of way work and there will be an increased need for parishes to become more heavily involved in the maintenance of their local path network.</p> <p>The desire to increase the levels of physical activity is also welcomed and the public rights of way network should be integral to any schemes that are developed to promote this. The Rights of Way team would be happy to provide</p>	<p>The web-link on page 6 will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>All the other comments are noted.</p>
--	---	--	---


		<p>advice and work together on any schemes which benefit through improvements to the path network.</p> <p>The Parish Council should also encourage developers to enhance the existing path network where possible in line with Staffordshire County Council's Rights of Way Improvement Plan. This could include the creation of public bridleways or the upgrading of public footpaths to bridleways to improve provision for horse riders and cyclists. The creation and promotion of short circular walks to promote the health benefits of walking the replacement of stiles with gaps (where there are no stock) or gates (where there are) in line with Staffordshire County Council's Least Restrictive Principle for path furniture. The County Council is able to provide further advice and guidance as and when required.</p>	
--	--	--	--

## Appendix B

### Maps and schedule of boundary changes

#### Wall Conservation Area

The proposed boundary changes are shown on the map below and described in the schedule. The rest of the boundary is unchanged.




#### Schedule of boundary changes

- Removal of the field to the west of The Butts
- Exclusion of the scheduled area to the North and East of The Butts
- Inclusion of land to North of Castle Croft, to follow the boundary from close to Littlefield House Cottage to Wall Lane
- Exclusion of land to the south of Watling Street to the North of the A5 Wall Bypass.

## Wigginton Conservation Area

The proposed boundary changes are shown on the map below and described in the schedule. The rest of the boundary is unchanged.



### Schedule of Boundary changes

- to the west of the conservation area the boundary will be amended to include all of the rear gardens of numbers 93, 95 and 97 Main Road and Sunnyside Farm.
- on Comberford Lane the boundary will be amended to include the whole field adjacent to Westward and the whole of the garden of Woodview and the whole of the rear garden of Churchlands.
- to the north of the conservation area the boundary will be amended to include the whole of the site associated with Wigginton Manor Farm.

## Appendix C

### Schedule of properties proposed for addition to the Local List

#### Wall Conservation Area

Road	Property or structure
The Butts	K6 Telephone Kiosk
Green Lane	Pear Tree Cottage
Market Lane	School House Littlefield House
Watling Street	The Trooper Inn The Seven Stars, 12 Watling Street Wall Village Hall Stone wall to north side of Watling Street English Heritage Museum

#### Wigginton Conservation Area

Road	Properties
Main Road	Wigginton Village Hall 84 86 (Wigginton Cottage) 91 99 (Sunnyside Farm), 101 (The Secret House) 103 Oak Barn 108 (The Old Police House) Numbers 111, 113, 115, 117, 119, 121 & 123 (Poplar Cottage) War Memorial The Old Vicarage 146 Numbers 150 & 152 Wigginton Manor

	Range of barns to the north-west of Wigginton Manor Range of barns to the south-west of Wigginton Manor Hill Top Cottage
Syerscote Lane	Oak Barn
Comberford Lane	Barnfield Cottage Westward Woodview