

### Consultation Responses to the Draft The Avenue Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Plan - August 2013

No.	Organisation/ individual	Page No. etc.	Support/ object/ comment	Summary of comment	Officer response	Recommended change
1	Mr R. Cogger, resident	p.19, Clifford Dibben Mews	Support	Understood why Council is proposing to exclude properties from the Conservation Area but should the consultation letter read 1 – 6 Clifford Dibben Mews or 3 – 6?	Only 3 – 6 Clifford Dibben Mews are in the Conservation Area as the development crosses the Conservation Area boundary.	No change required.
2.	Mr J. Edmonds, resident	p.13, Issues affecting Cavendish Grove and Stag Gate shops	Comments	Issues regarding cycle lane between Cavendish Grove and The Avenue – cyclists do not give way to traffic/white lines have worn away. Cycle lane across the entrance to Cavendish Grove is very dangerous. View is restricted when leaving Cavendish Grove to join the Avenue where cyclists do not stop at give way signs. High risk of accident and injury to pedestrians and cyclists. The area could be improved by staggered gates or suitable alternative to slow down cyclists at entrance to Cavendish Grove.	Noted. These comments have been forwarded to the Active Travel Officer and Legible Cities & Partnerships Project Officer. There are long term plans to improve the cycle path along The Avenue when funds become available.	This issue has been added to the SWOT analysis in the Plan.
3.	Mr J. Edmonds, resident	Parking issue	Comment	Parking issues with people visiting Spiritual Church.	Noted. This comment has been forwarded to the Spiritualist Church and the Council's Parking Service.	This issue has been added to the SWOT analysis in the Plan.
4.	Mr J. Edmonds,	Stag Gate	Comment	Issues regarding area outside Stag	Noted. The areas that form part of	This issue has

	resident	shopping parade		Gate shops/pizza place, parking on footways, going to be an accident. Domino's Pizza shop – frontage of shop continually used for vehicles. Non stop traffic parking on and leaving property blocking footways. Suggest having bollards along shops at Stag Gates to stop vehicles parking on footway. Increase business taxes on fast food shops to cover cost of litter cleansing from Authority. Frontage of businesses at Stag Gates are in a very run down condition, owners need to be made responsible for upkeep.	Southampton City Council's Highways Register, and are clearly recognisable as public footpath and cycleway, are maintained by the street cleansing team at public expense. The area behind these assets i.e. the shop forecourts and parking areas are therefore technically for the premises to maintain and probably included within their curtilage in their deeds/leases. A draft shop front policy for shops within Conservation Areas is also being developed.	been added to the SWOT analysis in the Plan.
5.	Mr J. Edmonds, resident	Parking issues	Comment	Issue with people parking in Cavendish Grove before cutting through the path at the Common end of street, in order to access the Common.	This comment has been forwarded to Parking Services.	Added to SWOT analysis.
6.	Mr & Mrs McCarthy, residents	Cavendish Hall and Cavendish Grove	Queries	Why is Cavendish Hall worthwhile conserving? What year was it built? Does the construction contain any toxic materials such as asbestos?	The building would appear to have been constructed sometime in the mid 20 <sup>th</sup> century (source: historic maps). These types of building are becoming rare and, as a good example in relatively good condition, we think it is worth including in the Conservation Area. There is a history of similar 'tin tabernacle' structures on The Avenue but it is the only one	No change required.

					remaining. To our knowledge there is just one other similar structure in Southampton, at 93 Pointout Road. It is the owners' legal duty to manage any risks from asbestos.	
7.	Mr & Mrs McCarthy, residents	Cavendish Grove	Queries	Legal status of Cavendish Grove re ownership of the house frontages and of the road, the rights and responsibilities of these. Does this fall to the property owners or to the Council?	Cavendish Grove is an un-adopted road, which means it is not maintained at public expense. The owners of properties on the west side of the Grove are responsible for the maintenance of their frontage out to the centre of the road. The east side abuts an area of shrubs, trees and grass which is common land. As the care of the Common is vested in the City Council, as representatives of the citizens of Southampton, the Council has assumed responsibility for that part of the road adjacent to the Common.	No change required.
8.	Mr & Mrs McCarthy, residents	Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMO), parking, bins, estate agents' signs	Comment	Of 18 houses in Cavendish Grove, only 6 remain as family dwellings. Issues with HMOs in Cavendish Grove – parking, bins, estate agents' signs.	Some properties in Cavendish Grove have been converted into flats but these are not properties licensed as Houses in Multiple Occupation. The issues regarding parking, bins, estate agents' signs in relation to some properties in Cavendish Grove have been noted. Parking Services and Waste Management have been notified. With regards to estate agents'	Added to SWOT analysis.

					signs, if appropriate Regulation 7 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992 can be used to designate areas in which estate agents would require consent before boards can be displayed. This issue will be monitored.	
9.	Mr B. Mepham, resident	Appearance and maintenance of properties and open spaces	Comment	Main issues in the area include the retention of its character by controlling the structural appearance and maintenance of the properties and the surrounding environment.	Noted.	The Plan aims to set out how the area will be preserved and enhanced.
10.	Mr B. Mepham, resident	Access to Cavendish Grove	Comment	In Cavendish Grove specifically, the maintenance of access to all houses by emergency, refuse collecting and delivery vehicles, often restricted by parking of cars on the pavement particularly from its entrance and as far as No.8.	Noted. This comment has been forwarded to Parking Services.	Added to SWOT analysis.
11.	Mr B. Mepham, resident	Fly tipping	Comment	Residents renting properties are not always made aware by landlords/owners that restrictions are in place i.e. dumping rubbish in "copse" opposite, which is technically part of the Common and is therefore subject to its restrictions.	Comments have been passed to the Parks & Street Cleansing Manager. All incidents of fly tipping are recorded on a national data base called "Fly Capture" which is managed by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA).	Added to the SWOT as an issue.
12.	Mr B. Mepham, resident	Article 4 Direction	Support	I would be prepared to support a loss of Permitted Development	Noted. Support welcomed.	No change required.

				Rights (for householders) in Cavendish Grove.		
13.	Mr B. Mepham, resident	Advertisements	Comment	The area could be improved by standardisation and its enforcement of signs and overall appearance of the businesses in the Avenue, (the provision of outdoor eating by the restaurant is an attraction).	Where the Council is aware of unlawful advertisements in the Conservation Area enforcement action will be taken.	No change required.
14.	Mr B. Mepham, resident	Wheelie bins	Comment	Removal of all rubbish bins in the Avenue.	Noted. Some areas of Southampton are free of wheelie bins (black sacks are used instead). This comment has been forwarded to Household / Commercial Waste Services.	No change required.
15.	Mr B. Mepham, resident	Pedestrian crossings	Comment	Install a pedestrian crossing sequence on the North side of Bannister Road to cross the Avenue from East to West to the central refuge (traffic comes from three directions without a pause).	Noted and forwarded to Highways.	Issue added to SWOT analysis.
16.	Mr B. Mepham, resident	Cavendish Grove	Comment	Restore authenticity to the appearance of Cavendish Grove by removal of inappropriate items i.e. wooden sheds, fences.	Noted. An Article 4 Direction would aim to preserve and enhance boundary treatments and front gardens on Cavendish Grove.	In line with proposals.
17.	Mr. M. Edwards, resident	3 – 6 Clifford Dibben Mews	Support	I understand the rationale in removing numbers 3 – 6 Clifford Dibben Mews.	Noted.	In line with proposals.
18.	Mr. M. Edwards, resident	Trees and hedge row opposite numbers 1	Comment	I would like to ensure that the trees and hedge row opposite numbers 1 to 6 Clifford Dibben are protected and wonder if these are somehow	The trees and hedge row opposite numbers 1 to 6 Clifford Dibben are currently within the Conservation Area but only trees with a trunk	No change required.

		to 6 Clifford Dibben Mews		included in the current conservation area as they belong to the car park of number 1 Avenue Road which is a block of flats.	diameter greater than 75mm at 1.5m above ground level are protected and hedgerows cannot be protected unless they are Ancient and/or Species-rich.	
19.	Mr. M. Edwards, resident	Top part of Avenue Road that runs from number 1 down to the junction with Cambridge Road	Comment	I feel it is worth considering including the top part of Avenue Road that runs from number 1 down to the junction with Cambridge Road as the houses there are also a credit to the area.	The area to the east of The Avenue as a whole is of interest, having been developed slightly later with more modest housing. Having considered the inclusion of the top park of Avenue Road we feel that it moves away from the focus which is The Avenue and therefore is not appropriate in this instance.	No change/noted.
20.	Mr. M. Edwards, resident	Stag Gates shopping parade	Comment	The row of shops on the Avenue including Dominos Pizza are a disgrace and really do detract from the surrounding area. There must be some way of introducing a policy or at least a minimum code of conduct to ensure that owners properly maintain shop fronts in keeping with the rest of the area.	Noted. See response to number 4 above.	This issue has been added to the SWOT analysis in the Plan.
21.	Mr. M. Edwards, resident	Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMOs)	Comment	A very serious threat to the area is the number of HMO properties but hopefully new legislation will lessen the number in the future.	Noted. There are 3 properties (one of which is locally listed) registered as such on The Avenue. Also see response to number 29.	This issue has been added to the SWOT analysis in the Plan.
22.	Mr T. Gibbons, local business/ property owner	Traffic issues	Comment	The main issue in the area is traffic which has the single biggest impact on the local area/environment.	Noted. Comment has been forwarded to Highways.	No change to Plan.

				Whilst it's an essential main route for cars & buses, and whilst Thomas Lewis Way is perhaps rendered ineffective as an preferable alternative for HGVs, since it terminates at Bevois Valley, I believe a means should be found to compel all HGV traffic (e.g. over 7.5 tonnes) to use instead, the M27 / M271 and to a lesser extent, the A3024 and A3025.		
23.	Mr T. Gibbons, local business/ property owner	Cycle lane	Comment	Cycle Lane along The Avenue is poorly-engineered, dangerous at certain points (in particular, at the junction of Cavendish Grove, as discussed at length separately) and now, a tired eye-sore.	Noted. These comments have been forwarded to the Active Travel Officer and Legible Cities & Partnerships Project Officer.	This issue has been added to the SWOT analysis in the Plan.
24.	Mr T. Gibbons, local business/ property owner	Unsympathetic Buildings & Conversions /Article 4 Direction	Comment	Unsympathetic Buildings & Conversions: As stated in your review, there are many un-prepossessing and poorly-converted buildings within the Conservation Area. I'd assert that the prevalence of such buildings confirms the wisdom of [your] Proposal No.1 (exclusion of 3 – 6 Clifford Dibben Mews and Avenue Place) but undermines Proposal No.3 (development of an Article 4 Direction for Cavendish Grove), since no amount of regulation under an Article 4 (2) at Cavendish	An Article 4 Direction, combined with existing planning policies, will enable the Council to better control unsympathetic alterations to Cavendish Grove.	No change.

				Grove will materially redress the situation; in other words, this is proportionally inadequate as a remedy - The Council will be tinkering with the superficial rather than investing in real improvements.		
25.	Mr T. Gibbons, local business/ property owner	Cavendish Hall	Opposition	Proposal No.2 (to include Cavendish Hall in the Conservation Area) is a nonsense. The hall is invisible from The Avenue, dilapidated and should be razed to the ground and replaced by something entirely more sympathetic to the local area.	It is the view of the Historic Environment Team that Cavendish Hall contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and should be included.	Opposition noted.
26.	Mr T. Gibbons, local business/ property owner	Article 4 Direction	Support but with reservations	Regarding the proposed Article 4 Direction for Cavendish Grove, we (the owners of No.58 The Avenue) would support any initiative to maintain and enhance the character of Cavendish Grove and the immediately adjacent areas. However, I'm unconvinced the withdrawal of Permitted Development Rights will achieve this ambition to any material extent.	Noted. RPS Planning carried out research into the use of Article 4 Directions on behalf of the English Historic Towns Forum and one of the conclusions was that there are more and more cases where government appointed planning inspectors are upholding the decisions of local planning authorities to refuse planning permission for works that had previously been permitted but have been brought under planning control through Article 4 Directions.	Noted/no change.
27.	Mr T. Gibbons, local business/ property owner	HGV traffic, cycle lane improvements	Comment	The area could be improved by eliminating HGV traffic and making cycle lane improvements.	Noted. Comment forwarded to Highways, the Active Travel Officer and Legible Cities & Partnerships	No change.



		ts			Project Officer. Current work being done to Platform Road will help but The Avenue is a major historic arterial route into the City.	
28.	Mr T. Gibbons, local business/ property owner	Grants	Comment	The area could be improved by giving grants to property owners to incentivize sympathetic improvements to the exterior of their buildings, not simply their frontages/façades but their entire exterior appearance. This is probably not an option available, in these economically-difficult times but resurrecting targeted grants would be a worthwhile ambition to make substantial enhancements.	Unfortunately the Council no longer has the resources to give grants to private owners to carry out restoration work. Property maintenance is the responsibility of owners. The Historic Environment Team will support owners with advice on how to preserve and, preferably enhance, the appearance of buildings in Conservation Areas.	No change.
29.	Mr T. Gibbons, local business/ property owner	Property conversions	Comment	There's a lack of clarity of ambition in the proposal, concerning property conversions: Page 13 : 'Threats' include "Change of offices ..... to Houses of Multiple Occupancy"; Page 17 : 1.24-1.25 these underline a wish to stimulate growth in residential capacity and oppose any contraction of same; Page 17 : 2.1 "There will be a presumption against further loss of residential properties to commercial uses". 2.2 elaborate on matters affecting the acceptability of conversions to family dwellings. There appear to be	The Council has taken a consistent approach in its consideration of applications for HMOs in the city, particularly since the adoption of the HMO Supplementary Planning Document (adopted on 23 March 2012). The Council is still enabling the delivery of HMOs in the city but only approving applications where they would not have unacceptable character and amenity impacts. Furthermore, the Council's approach to such applications has been supported at appeal. Within The Avenue Conservation Area conversion to residential per se is	No change.

				<p>inconsistencies here: If we distil things down to a stated prejudice against proliferation of HMO(C4) property, this points to a preoccupation with something lying outside your remit; unless that is, the focus here is on the potential for inadequate parking provision &amp;/or loss of front gardens or walls. Why does your proposal talk about these property conversion issues when they don't appear to be addressed by the legal devices you are seeking to employ in your efforts to constrain residents to adapt or maintain their properties in a manner sympathetic to the area? We occupy a Victorian residential property (converted to offices years ago). There is now a surplus of <u>purpose-built</u> office accommodation in Southampton which has depressed the value of converted office properties such as ours. The sort of businesses which still favour our style of property do not value the position of No.58 The Avenue – it's just too far out of the city for the lawyers, solicitors and so on. There has been a huge growth in the student population and in low income groups in Southampton.</p>	<p>not opposed; there are a number of sympathetic conversions to privately-owned flats and indeed to family dwellings, of which there is a shortage in the City.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				Such people are the target market for HMOs. The conversion of No.58 The Avenue would recover some of the property value we have lost AND provide much-needed HMO accommodation. Our commitment to preserving and enhancing the façade of the building would not be compromised simply because of an HMO-conversion. We have ample parking in front of and behind the building; there's no garden to lose/we might institute one; and we'd keep the front wall as is. We will need to discuss this concept with someone in Planning but I cannot see where the conflict is.		
30.	D. Goodwin, Cavendish Grove	Windows	Comment	Insisting that uPVC frames which need renewal are replaced by sliding wooden slashes could be unaffordable for many and ignores the currently standard levels of draught and sound proofing. I have spent over a week renovating just one bay of six sliding sash windows. My neighbour renovated his Victorian windows last year and had double glazing inserted, a synthetic quality job but at a cost.	The Historic Environment Team would advocate the use of wooden windows in properties in Cavendish Grove but this does not mean windows could not be double glazed. Our aim is to oppose the use of inappropriate materials in historic buildings (e.g. uPVC) but not to the detriment of residents' comfort. When maintained wooden windows will outlive uPVC windows (the lifespan of uPVC windows is approximately 25 years). Our aim would be that when uPVC windows need to be replaced (having come	

					to the end of their lifespan) they are done so with appropriately designed traditional windows therefore preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of the area. The Historic Environment Team is sympathetic to the cost of replacing windows and seeks to work with owners of properties to minimise costs while maintaining character.	
31.	D. Goodwin, Cavendish Grove	Front walls and gardens, wheelie bins	Comment	The management of front walls and gardens is desirable; partly demolished brick walls look terrible. The age of the car is here to stay so most front gardens have already been converted to parking. Certainly gravel looks better than hard paving. Wheelie bins are the other front garden blight. Until residents can be sure that collections are on a reliable schedule the bins stay in the road permanently for unannounced emptying.	Noted. An Article 4 Direction would aim to preserve and enhance boundary treatments and front gardens on Cavendish Grove. Bin collection dates are published on the Council's website at <a href="http://www.southampton.gov.uk/s-environment/householdwaste/waste-collection-calendars.aspx">http://www.southampton.gov.uk/s-environment/householdwaste/waste-collection-calendars.aspx</a> and any issues should be reported to Action Line on 023 8083 3005.	No change.
32.	D. Goodwin, Cavendish Grove	Trees	Comment	The trees are an integral part of the area but the Council's restrictions on lopping needs to take into account tree growth. I have let self seeded sycamores grow at the end of my back garden. Now they are taking all the light but I am	The Council does not wish to prevent sound arboricultural management. The purpose of this requirement is to give the LPA an opportunity to consider whether a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) should be made in respect of the	No change.

				<p>prevented from thinning them out. In the same way there is an ash tree in my neighbour's garden which was allowed to develop into a lovely mature tree. Now it is too big and too close to the buildings; if it comes down in a Southerly storm it will cause a lot of damage. Last year the Council would only allow a small percentage of the canopy to be thinned, this just promoted growth and the leaf canopy is even thicker now. The limit on trunk diameter is too small and householders need to have more freedom to manage tree growth.</p>	<p>tree(s). The size limit for protection of trees in a Conservation Area is not set by Southampton City Council and there is provision within the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012. It is recommended that homeowners speak to the Southampton City Council Tree Team if there are issues with light or stability of trees.</p>	
33.	D. Goodwin, Cavendish Grove	Design	Comment	<p>The Victorian look. New buildings and renovation need to fit in with existing schemes but this should not mean that modern designs are excluded. In Hulse Road there was a nod to the Victorian feel with gables and pitched roofs but now we have the weird circumstance where virtually all the old Victorian originals are gone leaving new buildings with just a fake look. An example of interesting modern design can be found in the house recently erected behind the Lime Pub in Lodge Road. It is a nice place even though it is very</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments. As stated in the National Planning Policy Framework, "Planning policies and decisions should aim to respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation." This is our aim.</p>	No change.

				different from the surrounding villas.		
34.	D. Goodwin, Cavendish Grove	Stag Gates shopping parade	Comment	The parade of shops and Stag Gates is an eyesore. The conversion of what were front gardens into parking has made the area a dangerous wasteland of moving vehicles and obstructive wheelie bins. Its shabby look is only aggravated by fast food outlets. This is certainly an area that needs attention. The Travelodge at Lodge Road is also starting to look seedy and the owner should be encouraged to tidy it up.	Noted. A draft shop front policy for shops within Conservation Areas is being developed. Only the footway adjacent to The Avenue is adopted. The area in front of the shops remains the responsibility of the shop owners to maintain. The area around the Travelodge will be monitored.	Added to SWOT analysis.
35.	D. Goodwin, Cavendish Grove	Article 4 Direction	Comment	If an Article 4 Direction is adopted its application needs to bear in mind that private citizens will often find compliance a heavy financial burden.	Noted. The Historic Environment Team is sympathetic to this and seeks to work with owners of properties to minimise costs while maintaining character.	No change.
36.	M. McColl, Cavendish Grove	Traffic, litter, poorly maintained shopfronts, bins in Cavendish Grove.	Comment	Main issues in the area are traffic, litter, poorly maintained shopfronts, bins in Cavendish Grove.	Noted. See responses above.	Added to SWOT analysis.
37.	M. McColl, Cavendish Grove	Article 4 Direction	Support	Would support loss of Permitted Development Rights for householders in Cavendish Grove.	Noted. Support appreciated.	No change required.
38.	M. McColl, Cavendish Grove	Stag Gate shopping parade	Comment	The area could be improved by improving road surface between Northlands Road and Stag Gates	Noted. A draft shop front policy for shops within Conservation Areas is being developed.	Added to SWOT analysis.

				junction, and improving shop frontages and forecourt north of Stage Gates.		
39.	M. McColl, Cavendish Grove	Avenue Place	Comment	Avenue Place is quite successful and attractive, so would favour retaining it as part of the Conservation Area.	Noted. The boundary will remain unaltered so that Avenue Place is retained as an example of appropriate contemporary design within the Conservation Area.	Change to proposal.
40.	John Rawson-Smith, lease owner	Preservation of 'quality'	Comment	Main issue in area is preservation of 'quality' approach to city.	Noted.	No change required.
41.	John Rawson-Smith, lease owner	Article 4 Direction	Support	Would support loss of Permitted Development Rights for householders in Cavendish Grove.	Noted. Support appreciated.	In line with proposal.
42.	John Rawson-Smith, lease holder	Stag Gates shopping parade	Comment	Area could be improved by tidying up shops at Stag Gates. I support the production of a shopfront policy.	Noted. Support appreciated.	No change required.
43.	John Rawson-Smith, lease owner	Cavendish Hall	Opposition	The tin shed hall should not be included – it has <u>no</u> architectural merit, is out of keeping with the area and no legitimate historical context.	Noted. See response to number 6 above.	Opposition noted.
44.	Southampton Commons & Parks Protection Society (SCAPPS)	SWOT and section 1.18-1.20	Comments	The document is well researched & well presented. SCAPPS' principle comment is that the 'Management plan' section 1.18-1.20 is headed 'retain important trees and green spaces', a proposal SCAPPS supports, but it does not promote improvement. SCAPPS is disappointed by the statement 'Unfortunately, due to traffic	Noted. While researching the area it was noted that pedestrian/dog walkers do (at times) use the central green space. SCAPPS' comments have been forwarded to the Active Travel Officer, the Legible Cities & Partnerships Project Officer and the Council's Highways department.	No change.

				<p>volumes, the majority of green spaces are valuable more as a visual experience rather than useable space'. Although unfortunately true, SCAPPS urges 'Do something about it then!' SCAPPS recognises that a conservation management plan is not the appropriate policy document to make proposals for changes to highway arrangements. Nevertheless, it can prompt consideration of changes which would result in a significant enhancement to the character of the conservation area. Present pedestrian crossing arrangements provide three points where pedestrians can cross both traffic carriageways, and the central grassed area. There is no encouragement to walk within the central strip. Changed arrangements, perhaps in conjunction with improvements to the cycle route to the University, should make it easy for pedestrians approaching from London Road to cross directly from College Place to Asylum Green. (As with many shared-use routes, there is pedestrian/cyclist conflict on the</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--



				path on the west side of The Avenue: SCAPPS advocates provision of a segregated cycle lane.) Providing a safe, direct and attractive pedestrian route onto the central green space from the top of London Road could promote greater use, and enjoyment, of this pleasant but under-used green area, so it is more than just 'a visual experience'.		
45.	Southampton Commons & Parks Protection Society (SCAPPS)	Preservation of stones close to the junction with Cavendish Grove (marking the site of the first Common gate) and a milestone	Comment	The document does not identify, or propose protection of, minor historical features - the stones each side of The Avenue close to the junction with Cavendish Grove marking the site of the first Common gate and the milestone in the central grass area near the junction with Archers Road.	Omission noted.	Reference to these have now been added to the Plan.
46.	Southampton Commons & Parks Protection Society (SCAPPS)	Parking issues	Comment	SCAPPS is aware of occasional parking of vehicles on the central green strip near the Courts and St Edmunds Church. Installation of unobtrusive but effective restraint measures, similar to those already installed to protect the verges on the west side of The Avenue, should be considered.	Noted. This information has been forwarded to the Council's Parking Service and added to the SWOT in the Conservation Area Plan.	Added to SWOT analysis.

47.	Mr J. Langran, resident	Stag Gates shopping parade, the arrangements for the cycle lane that runs the length of the conservation area, and parking issues.	Comments	In many ways I agree with the analysis set out in the consultation document. However some of the problems with living in the area were well expressed by other residents at the consultation meeting held on 22 <sup>nd</sup> May. They principally relate to issues concerning the parade of shops at Stag Gates and as a pedestrian, cyclist and car driver the arrangements for the cycle lane that runs the length of the conservation area. I also share with other residents of Cavendish Grove the concern with the parking arrangements in the Grove.	Noted. See responses to numbers 4, 2 and 5 above.	Noted in SWOT analysis.
48.	Mr J. Langran, resident	Cavendish Grove	Comment	In respect of Cavendish Grove I am pleased that quite major developments have proceeded without losing the essential character of the individual houses. I also applaud the council's initiative in tarmac-ing the Grove and the recent improvements in street lighting. However I am aware that such matters always run on a knife edge and that it would not take much to tip the balance between tolerable individual variations in maintenance of properties and an aesthetic calamity.	Noted.	No change required.

49.	Mr J. Langran, resident	Article 4 Direction	Support in principle, with caveat	<p>I am in two minds about the proposal to remove permitted development rights in Cavendish Grove. One can play ultimate conservationist just in case someone plans to commit some visual atrocity on the front of their building. Alternatively, we can recognize that with one or two minor exceptions residents have kept or restored frontages that are in keeping with the spirit of the original designs. Issues include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insistence on use of certain materials</li> <li>• Design</li> <li>• Sustainability and energy efficiency</li> <li>• Painting previously unpainted surfaces</li> <li>• Means of enclosure</li> </ul>	<p>Your comments have been noted. The Historic Environment Team (HER) would argue that changes to properties must be sensitive to both materials and design. uPVC is not a traditional material and is therefore considered inappropriate on any facade of a Victorian building in a Conservation Area which front a highway, waterway or public open space. The lifespan of a uPVC window is approximately 25 years, whereas timber windows (if maintained) can far exceed this. Double glazed timber windows are now widely available. Painting a wall surface to conceal maintenance issues is not recommended either practically and aesthetically. The HER will work with homeowners regarding the design and practicality of driveway and boundary treatments with the aim of preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.</p>	No change required.
50.	Mr J. Langran, resident	Common land opposite Cavendish Grove	Comment	<p>The emphasis in the Management Proposals in respect of Cavendish Grove reflects the wrong priorities. In essence we already have a handsome and well-kept street -</p>	<p>The area is dense with trees and under-story vegetation, and there is little evidence of litter, fly tipping or other types of ASB you might sometimes associate with areas of</p>	No change.

				<p>albeit one which is capable of improvement. There are far greater actions that could improve the area. In respect of the area of the Grove itself I would address the Plantation opposite. This has now been incorporated as Privately owned Common Land. In the original development of the Grove this was gated, fenced and maintained for the benefit of the residents who had (have?) rights of access and through it into the strip of original common land and the Avenue. I am pleased that the Council are taking rudimentary steps to control the vegetation. A small increase in effort to manage this area would greatly improve its visual amenity both from the point of view of residents of the Grove and users of the Avenue. I would cite the work done on west side the Inner Avenue recently as an example of what could be achieved.</p>	<p>this type. This may well be because the denseness of the perimeter vegetation does not allow for easy access, which is probably desirable. The current maintenance is considered appropriate to the site, and any more extensive pruning could potentially encourage unwanted activities, and may be detrimental to established wildlife.</p>	
51.	Mr J. Langran, resident	Stag Gates shopping parade	Comment	<p>I agree that the use of the shops at Stag Gates is a problem. Pressure to control the use of the forecourts would be welcome as would more appropriate signage. Having said that given the state of UK retailing I would warn against inappropriate</p>	<p>Noted. See number 4 above.</p>	<p>This issue has been added to the SWOT analysis in the Plan.</p>

				pressure, as I would rather have these premises occupied than empty eyesores.		
52.	Mr J. Langran, resident	Cycle lanes	Comment	<p>Issues regarding the cycle routes: Firstly the junction between Cavendish Grove and the Avenue is unsafe. Inadequate segregation between cycles and pedestrians on the cycle route is a problem. There is particular difficulty outside the Stag Gates shops caused by the presence of parked vehicles on the pedestrian pathway and no separation over the entire length of the Inner Avenue. I think these problems could be solved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proper management of the Stag Gates area and also the end of the cycle path near the Law Courts.</li> <li>• Better signage. I note that on a recent cycle path development near Winchester “rules of the road” are stated. In essence they give priority to pedestrians over cyclists but also ask pedestrians not to “hog” the full width of the pathway.</li> <li>• A stop warning could also be erected on the cycle path where it meets Cavendish Grove. Alternatively signage or other</li> </ul>	These comments which have been forwarded to the Active Travel Officer, the Legible Cities, Partnerships Project Officer and the Council’s Highways department.	Noted in SWOT analysis.

				<p>signals could be used to make it clearer that the cycle path crosses a road at this point. A raised kerb or some way of making the Cavendish Grove street signs more prominent might be more subtle signals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similar devices could be used at other junctions in order to make priorities clearer.</li> </ul>		
53.	Mr J. Langran, resident	Inappropriate modern infill buildings	Comment	In respect of the rest of the Conservation area I realize that there is little that can be done at the moment to rectify the impact of inappropriate modern infill.	Noted.	No change.
54.	Mr J. Langran, resident	Advertisements	Comment	I would support pressure for appropriate signage for commercial premises.	Noted. Where the Council is aware of unlawful advertisements in the Conservation Area enforcement action will be taken.	No change.
55.	Mr J. Langran, resident	Design	Comment	I am concerned an architectural code on new buildings that would make them "faux Victorian" is not imposed. We should note the difference of visual impact derived from the two major garage forecourts at Stag Gates to identify what could be done. The recent Land Rover premises works well but the Vauxhall dealership does not and detracts from the area.	Noted. The Historic Environment Team supports high quality modern architecture in the right context.	No change.
56.	Michael Weakley Associates	Cavendish Hall, 3 – 6	Opposition	I support the realignment of the boundary to exclude Clifford Dibben	Noted. See number 6 above.	Opposition noted.

	(chartered architect & planning supervisor), The Avenue	Clifford Dibben Mews and Avenue House		Mews and the new flats which have since been created in that area, but cannot see the justification for including Cavendish Hall within the new proposed boundary of the Avenue Conservation Area. It was not 'an oversight' that this corrugated iron building was omitted. It was a considered opinion of those in power at the time. It is poorly constructed, cheaply built and in no way should it be included within the Conservation Area, otherwise it would make a farce of the whole process. I have been the architect for Southampton Spiritualist Church and undertake repairs on their building. I know Cavendish Hall well. I have a little knowledge of historic buildings. Just because it is clad in corrugated iron does not make it a quasi historical reference point worthy of attention. I hope common sense prevails.		
57.	Alan Baker, Southampton Spiritualist Church	Cavendish Hall	Support	We are content for the hall to be included in the conservation area.	Noted.	In line with proposals