

**SUBJECT: MONMOUTHSHIRE CONSERVATION AREAS
REVIEW OF DESIGNATED CONSERVATION AREAS**

MEETING: PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE: 1st March 2016

DIVISION/WARDS AFFECTED: All

1. PURPOSE:

- 1.1 Further to Planning Committee on 5th January, the purpose of this report is:
- To seek Planning Committee's endorsement of the Conservation Area Appraisals as amended in the light of the public consultation, with a view to them being formally adopted as SPG in connection with the Monmouthshire LDP;
 - To note further work required including consideration of the need for Article 4 Directions and of potential new conservation areas in Abergavenny and Chepstow.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 Recommendations to Planning Committee are:
- To note the officer responses to the comments received during the public consultation;
 - To endorse the adoption of the amended Conservation Area Appraisals as Supplementary Planning Guidance by the Cabinet Member. These amendments are summarised below;
 - To endorse further work regarding Article 4 Directions and to further consider an additional conservation area in Abergavenny and in Chepstow, with the necessary associated public consultation process.

The principal amendments referred to above are:

Abergavenny	Inclusion of east end of Avenue Road and north end of Pen-y-pound Inclusion of North Street and Orchard Street Inclusion of land on Brecon Road west of roundabout Inclusion of Windsor Road and adjoining part of Western Road Exclusion of the part of Llanover Way currently in Conservation Area
Caerwent	Exclusion of Caerwent Gardens and Vicarage Gardens
Chepstow	Inclusion of Sunnybank Nursery Building, Regent Way Exclusion of Mount Way Exclusion of Tesco superstore and car park Exclusion of Garden City Way
Llandogo	Inclusion of the hamlet of Cleddon, to west

Magor	Addition of small area to of land to east of Mill House Exclusion of Wheatsheaf Court, Withy Walk, Withy Close, The Meadow, The Lawns and Chestnut Close Exclusion of Church in Wales Primary School and associated land Exclusion of housing to south of Primary School fields Exclusion of housing to south of St Mary's Church and Court Farm
Mathern	Exclusion of Parklands Close, opposite Mathern Crescent
Monmouth	Inclusion of Monnow Mill House, Cemetery, Brooklands and adjacent land along west side of Hereford Road, north of Girls' School Inclusion of land on Wonastow Road west of Drybridge House Inclusion of two properties on Goldwire Lane.
Raglan	Exclusion of Primary School
Shirenewton	Inclusion of Tan House and Lower House, Mounon Road Inclusion of land to south of Home Court Farm to include more of the setting of Shirenewton Hall Exclusion of Newton Estate to north side of Earlswood Road
Usk	Inclusion of area of Usk Woodside on west bank of River Usk Inclusion of area along former railway line to north of Castle Inclusion of Chepstow Road from former Greyhound Inn to Meadow Cottages

3. KEY ISSUES:

3.1 Background Legislation and Policy

The Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (S.69) imposes a duty on local authorities to review their areas "from time to time" and to consider whether further designation of conservation areas is called for.

A Conservation Area is defined in the Act as an "area of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance". A conservation area is more than a cluster of buildings of interest – special quality and interest can also be derived from surviving historic street patterns.

The reason for periodic reviews being necessary is that over time development can affect the character of an area and the way places are valued can change.

Paragraph 1.19 of the Adopted Local Development Plan commits to providing Conservation Area Appraisals as accompanying Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Planning Policy Wales, Chapter 2, edition 8 (January 2016) says:

"2.4.1 - LDPs should contain sufficient policies and proposals to provide the basis for deciding planning applications while avoiding excessive detail. They should not repeat national planning policy. Selective use of supplementary planning guidance (SPG) is a means of setting out more detailed thematic or site specific guidance on the way in which the policies of an LDP are to be interpreted and applied in particular circumstances or areas."

"2.4.3 - SPG does not form part of the development plan but it must be consistent with the plan and with national policy. It must derive from and be clearly cross referenced

to a generic LDP policy, specific policies for places, and/or – in the case of a masterplan or site brief – a plan allocation. SPG cannot be linked to national planning policy alone; there must be an LDP policy or policy criterion that provides the development plan ‘hook’, whilst the reasoned justification provides clarification of the related national policy. The LDP should note which policies are supplemented by SPG.”

“2.4.4 - Only the policies in the development plan have special status under Section 38(6) of the 2004 Act in deciding planning applications but SPG may be taken into account as a material consideration. In making decisions on matters that come before it, the Welsh Government and the Planning Inspectorate will give substantial weight to approved SPG which derives from and is consistent with the development plan, and has been the subject of consultation.”

3.2 Monmouthshire’s Conservation Areas

Monmouthshire has 31 Conservation Areas, most of which were designated in the 1970s but apart from a partial review of Abergavenny c.2000, only Trellech has been appraised. They cover 1,648 hectares in total. They form part of a suite of heritage designations in the county including 2,200 Listed Buildings, 169 Scheduled Monuments, 44 Registered Historic Parks and Gardens and 3 Landscapes of Outstanding Historic Interest as well as part of the Blaenavon Industrial Landscape World Heritage Site.

3.3 Resourcing the Conservation Area Appraisals to date

The progress with Conservation Area Appraisals had long been recognised as a priority. Having completed the review of Trellech Conservation Area in-house it was agreed that the amount of time required necessitated bringing in additional resource. It was not until in 2009 a Planning Improvement Grant was secured from Welsh Government that Monmouthshire County Council was able to commission consultants to carry out Appraisals. The budget did not allow for all 31 areas to be reviewed but the following 18 conservation areas were selected as the priorities:

Abergavenny	Llandogo	Raglan
Caerwent	Llanover	St Arvans
Chepstow	Llantilio Crossenny	Shirenewton
Grosmont	Magor	Tintern
Llanarth	Mathern	Usk
Llandenny	Monmouth	Whitebrook

Tenders were invited and CDN was appointed in 2009 and the work completed in 2012, fully funded by a Welsh Government grant. The delay in going out to public consultation was a consequence of a period of limited resources to progress the project.

3.4 Public Consultations September 2015

Public consultation included a series of drop-in meetings where members of the public could come and see the plans displayed, view the draft appraisal documents and discuss issues with officers, primarily the Heritage team. The draft appraisals were also made available on the Council’s website. County Councillors and all Community and Town Councils were notified of the consultation and drop-in meetings, the events and consultation were publicised via the Council’s website and Twitter, and site notices were displayed in the areas where changes to the Conservation boundaries are proposed. Some County Councillors assisted with further publicity, for example at the Shirenewton Village Fete. Other known interest groups were also notified directly, such as Civic Societies and Whole Place teams.

Meetings were held as follows:

Usk 3rd September (*Usk, Raglan, Llandenny*)

Chepstow 7th September (*Chepstow, Tintern, St Arvans, Llandogo, Mathern*)

Abergavenny 9th September (*Abergavenny, Llantilio Crossenny, Llanover, Llanarth*)

Monmouth 16th September (*Monmouth, Grosmont, Whitebrook*)

Caldicot 29th September (*Magor, Shirenewton, Caerwent*)

Magor 19th October (extra meeting to respond to concerns that few local people attended the consultation at Caldicot)

The primary focus was to seek local views on the existing and proposed boundaries. Comments could be made verbally, by email, through completing pro-formas or through longer letters and representations. The consultation ended on 31st October.

Attendance at the consultations was variable:

Usk (26); Chepstow (39); Abergavenny (41); Monmouth (18); Caldicot (15) and Magor (16), making a total of 155 attendees.

3.5 Summary of Consultations received

All comments, completed pro-formas, emails and letters have been considered by the Heritage Management team.

There were 96 consultation responses. Most comments were supportive of the process and of the way staff conducted the various events. The majority of comments were either providing typographical or factual corrections or were focusing on a specific issue related to their own property.

Specific comments to note or to be actioned are identified in the next section. This highlights the key issues raised. It does not report factual errors or typos that have been duly corrected. It also does not report other matters raised but not relevant to conservation area designation, e.g. the need for more dog waste bins.

3.6 Specific comments received and initial responses / proposed action to be taken

Conservation Area	Subject of consultation response	Recommended action
Abergavenny	One comment expressed concern at the number of empty buildings owned by Monmouthshire County Council	Officers to investigate what empty properties MCC owns in Abergavenny and explore if they are eligible for the Town Centre Loan Scheme.
	One comment expressed concern about the gradual erosion of historic character through window and door changes and removal of chimneys	Officers to explore the potential for, and resource implications of, an Article 4 Direction to remove Permitted Development Rights on these aspects of the Conservation Area.
	Cllr Tatum supports the extension of the area to include the former railway	Include but modify consultant's recommendation by removal of modern building at roundabout as

	barracks.	it has no historic merit.
	Cllr Edwards recommended that Oxford Street, Richmond Road and Priory Street should be included as should Bailey Park.	Officers to consider whether this historic character is best protected through an extension of the existing conservation area or the creation of a specific new one. Members to note that the extended area marked by Cllr Edwards on an accompanying plan also includes the former Cattle Market site, decisions about which have already been made.
	<p>Abergavenny Civic Society</p> <p>The Society welcomed the Appraisal which they “regard as sound, perceptive and interesting”. They also say that “awareness of its content has already been valuable as a context for our own [i.e. ACS] characterisation study of the entire urban area”.</p> <p>However their main criticism is that the consultants “have failed to provide adequate guidance on how development proposals may satisfy policy HE1.”</p> <p>The society also expressed concern at the delay since the preparation of the drafts and the missed opportunity for the appraisal to have informed a number of planning decisions in the intervening period.</p> <p>They support the boundary changes with one exception – that the extension to include the railway yard area south of Brecon Road should be reviewed as since the preparation of the draft there has been clearance of buildings and redevelopment which has affected its character.</p> <p>They also ask that 5</p>	<p>Recommended that the Appraisal can adequately inform future development proposals as it stands</p> <p>Heritage Managers to review this proposed extension. Its character is mixed with some out of keeping modern buildings. It may now be appropriate to remove this whole area from the proposed conservation area.</p>

	<p>additional areas are considered (these are shown in ACS annotated map at Appendix 1):</p> <p>a) area between Hereford Road and Ross Road on account of its character deserving of conservation area status;</p> <p>b) area immediately to the north of this (north of old railway)</p> <p>c) Lansdown Road</p> <p>d) northern part of Pen-y-pound including some listed buildings</p> <p>e) Belgrave Road extension</p> <p>In addition they ask that Bailey Park be included.</p> <p>Re Article 4 Directions the Society supports recommendations for them but feels the Appraisal offers insufficient detail</p>	<p>This comment was also made by Cllr Edwards - the recommended action is as above for officers to survey and advise on conservation area merit. Initial findings are that this area meets the criteria of being an area of special architectural and historic interest.</p> <p>Officers to survey and advise – initial view is the case for extension here is less clear than it is for the preceding area as the character is later and less significant.</p> <p>Officers to survey and advise – initial view is that this is detached from the existing area and the potential Hereford Rd/Ross Rd area and whilst the road retains good character it may not be of sufficient quality in itself to merit designation as a stand-alone conservation area.</p> <p>Officers to survey and advise. Initial view is that there is a good case for slight extension of the boundary as proposed by the Civic Society.</p> <p>Officers to advise – initial view is that this building at the junction of Western Road is of a different character to that which justifies conservation area designation of this part of the town and that the boundary as proposed in the appraisal is correct.</p> <p>This has been considered before but officers will review again</p> <p>Policy decision to be made on Article 4 Directions and the associated resource implications.</p>

Caerwent	Cllr Murphy identified typographical and factual errors	Typos had already been corrected and where circumstances had changed since writing of the draft (e.g. the nursery closing and proposed as a dwelling) it was decided not to amend and to accept the appraisals as an assessment at a particular date.
	James Harris provided written comments citing errors or points of disagreement and expressing concern over the management of the heritage by the Council and by Cadw	Factual errors have mostly already been corrected. Other comments have been noted.
	Clerk to the Community Council expressed concern at the proposed amendment of the boundary to take out a small area to the east including Caerwent Gardens and Vicarage Gardens	This small area contributes nothing to the special character of Caerwent and as such does not merit retention in the conservation area. It is recommended to follow the proposal in the Appraisal and delete this area.
Chepstow	A view was expressed at the consultation event that the Garden City should be included.	Garden City should be assessed by the Heritage team re whether it should be a separate conservation area. Joining it up to Chepstow CA would not be feasible on account of the intervening built area not meeting the criteria for conservation area status. Many parts of the Garden City have been adversely affected by later alterations and so the further review will need to balance this against the historic and architectural interest of the original.
	Cllr Farley asked that the Garden City be considered for inclusion. He advocated greater enforcement action taken to protect the character of the conservation area and he recommended considering appointing "conservation ambassadors" and building closer links with the Civic Society.	As above it is agreed the Garden City should be further assessed. Enforcement action is taken where necessary but has to be prioritised to match existing staff resources. Conservation ambassadors is perhaps something for the Town Council to promote and closer relations with the Civic Society would certainly be welcomed.
	Chepstow Town Council supports much about the	Officers to review boundary, in particular re Garden City which has

	<p>appraisal but objects to the proposed removal of Mount Way and Garden City Way. It advocates the extension of the area to include the Garden City and to continue much further up Welsh Street towards the racecourse roundabout.</p>	<p>been raised by many people.</p>
	<p>Cllr Le Peltier urges Article 4 Directions to be introduced</p>	<p>Planning Committee are invited to consider the resource implications; Officers can advise.</p>
	<p>Savills object on behalf of Mabey Bridge to the extension of the Conservation Area to the east on three grounds: no visual or practical connection between the proposed area and the closest parts of the conservation area; the extension is not necessary as Brunel House and the railway bridge are already listed; most of the land is allocated for redevelopment and therefore will be subject to substantial change.</p>	<p>On balance it is accepted that as the Railway Bridge and Brunel House are Listed Buildings and the adjacent building to Brunel House is afforded curtilage protection, the building's heritage value suitably protected. It is therefore proposed that this area is not included in the Conservation Area.</p>
	<p>One comment objected to the proposed amendment to the boundary to the north-west to remove Mount Way but this was for reasons of concern over development threat in the area.</p>	<p>Recommended to amend as the boundary as shown in the appraisal. This small part of the conservation area now has modern housing that does not merit being part of the designated area. It is considered that the 20th Century Mount Way development has a character that is distinct from the historic core of Chepstow and so the proposal to remove this area is appropriate.</p>
	<p>One respondent objected to the lack of an Equality Impact Assessment. Also felt that the existing conservation area was too large to be effectively managed and cited two properties in particular that he urged action on –No 5 Mount Pleasant and Rosedale.</p>	<p>An Equality Impact Assessment Screening Form and Sustainable Development Checklist were prepared in 2013 and presented to Planning Committee together with the Officer report to gain approval to go out to public consultation. An updated Future Generations Evaluation has been prepared to accompany this report and the proposal to adopt the CAAs as</p>

		SPG.
	<p>Chepstow Civic Society accepts most of the proposals but like other commentators the society argues for the inclusion of the Garden City housing. It notes a number of inaccuracies and it expresses concern about the adverse impact of parked cars in key views of and from the castle.</p>	<p>As above officers to review Garden City as to whether it meets the criteria for Conservation Area designation.</p>
Grosmont	<p>Three consultation responses cited the discrepancy in the document where the map showed proposed removal of two small areas to the west side of Grosmont whereas the text referred to no boundary changes.</p>	<p>For those who attended the public meetings this was clarified as an anomaly that we have no explanation for. The officers' recommendation has always been to follow the text and retain the existing boundary and this is reinforced in the light of comments received. No boundary change is proposed, and the map has been corrected to reflect this.</p>
Llanarth	<p>No substantive comments or comments about boundary</p>	
Llandenny	<p>One respondent provided detailed and helpful factual corrections and extra historical information.</p>	<p>Corrections made; information noted.</p>
Llandogo	<p>No substantive comments or comments about boundary</p>	
Llanover	<p>No substantive comments or comments about boundary</p>	
Llantilio Crossenny	<p>No substantive comments or comments about boundary</p>	
Magor	<p>Cllr Taylor concerned that: the conservation area had in some instances suffered and that the Appraisal was an opportunity to improve; the reduction in the size of the area could put trees at risk and asked that TPOs be considered;</p> <p>Sycamore playing field is a</p>	<p>The Appraisal is intended to raise awareness of the character that needs to be preserved. Officers have already spoken to the Tree Officer who has assessed the impact on trees and is content that no further action is required, i.e. there are no trees worthy of a TPO.</p> <p>The areas of removal have been</p>

	<p>key green space and should be retained within the CA; And questioned the removal of Pond Cottage and asked why some properties on Newport Road had not been included.</p>	<p>carefully considered and include only buildings of more modern character which do not enhance the character of the conservation area. The playing fields are not considered to be a key part of the conservation area. These areas are not considered to be essential to the wider setting or context of the historic core of the town. Pond Cottage is separated from the historic core of Magor by the main road. For clarity, Pond House remains in the conservation area.</p>
	<p>One comment focused on one of those points above – the playing fields and objected to their removal from the area.</p>	<p>As above</p>
	<p>One comment expressed concern that taking the areas of modern housing out of the conservation area removed the buffer zone to the historic core of Magor; also commented that signage should be improved</p>	<p>The areas of removal have been carefully considered and include only buildings of more modern character which do not enhance the character of the conservation area. The playing fields are not considered to be a key part of the conservation area. These areas are not considered to be essential to the wider setting or context of the historic core of the town.</p>
	<p>Several comments expressed view that they could not see the point of the proposed conservation area boundary change</p>	<p>As above</p>
	<p>One comment asked for the boundary at various points - Pond Cottage, Ty Cornel and Procurators House to be reviewed.</p>	<p>The boundary will precisely follow the perimeter wall of the Procurators House. Pond Cottage is discussed above.</p>
	<p>One comment expressed particular concern about Manor Farmhouse and Pond Cottage.</p>	<p>Officers to consider what action could be taken to address the condition of these buildings (the comment is believed to refer to Pond House not Pond Cottage). Environmental Health officers will be contacted regarding Manor Farmhouse.</p>
	<p>One comment felt the consultants had proposed reducing the size of the area too much but supported MCC officers views on retaining more of the</p>	<p>No action needed.</p>

	existing area.	
Mathern	No substantive comments or comments about boundary	
Monmouth	Comments received that the Wye Bridge and Wyesham should be included in the Conservation Area. This is an extension the consultants had not recommended.	Wye Bridge is listed and whilst the river is an essential part of the setting of Monmouth it is felt that the eastern river bank and Wyesham do not merit inclusion in the conservation area.
	One respondent objected to the proposed amendment to the boundary towards Osbaston as it would include their house.	It is considered that the building merits inclusion within the conservation area; the concern at its inclusion was more to do with perceived impact on future development but in reality this is controlled anyway by virtue of being outside the development boundary.
	One respondent advocated greater attention to signage.	Conservation Area status provides some stronger controls regarding advertisements. Enforcement action is taken against unacceptable unauthorised advertisements, and particular success can be seen in Church Street.
Raglan	One comment relates to Orchard Lea and objects to its proposed inclusion in the conservation area believing that it will prevent the carrying out of further improvements.	Boundary to remain as proposed. Conservation Area status does not prevent improvements or development: it does however reduce some 'permitted development' rights and requires a higher standard of design for works that do require planning permission.
St Arvans	No substantive comments or comments about boundary	
Shirenewton	No substantive comments or comments about boundary	
Tintern	One comment said the area looked "scruffy" and felt the appraisal was not going to do much to change this.	Officers to investigate complaint when received regarding unsightly land. Officers have worked with the owners of Bay Cottage, it is anticipated that works will start shortly.

Usk	Mill Street – this is currently in the Conservation Area but consultants recommended its removal. One comment received supported the consultant’s opinion.	Officers judge it to retain distinctive period character and whilst different from the majority of Usk Conservation Area recommend that the boundary is unchanged in this respect.
	Usk Civic Society notes a number of inaccuracies. It supports the amendments to the Conservation Area boundary and officers decision not to remove Mill Street. It agrees with Article 4 Directions but would wish to be consulted on detailed proposals at draft stage. It recommends a number of areas of the town for enhancement and would wish to see draft proposals.	These are noted. If Article 4s are drafted and/or enhancement proposals prepared the Civic Society will be consulted at an early stage.
	One comment felt the proposed boundary appeared on the west side of the river should instead be along the levy flood bank and up and across the old railway bridge.	It is considered that the boundary as shown is appropriate.
Whitebrook	No substantive comments or comments about boundary	

4.0 NEXT STEPS FOR THE DRAFT APPRAISALS

- 4.1 Many of the comments received have cited errors. Where these are errors such as the name of a building or road these should be changed but where the discrepancy relates to a change in circumstance since the date of the fieldwork carried out by the consultants then no changes are proposed. The appraisals are a record of a particular time and there is a risk of continually updating them to take account of ongoing developments.
- 4.2 Some have asked for a Council response to their comments but the resource implications of ongoing feedback needs to be carefully managed. This report to Committee has provided initial responses to many of the comments.
- 4.3 In some cases (e.g. Abergavenny and Chepstow), comments received raise the question as to substantial additions should be made to the designated area or whether a whole new conservation area should be designated to recognise particular streets of significance that lie well outside the existing area. These proposed additions will all be

assessed and recommendations about new conservation areas made to a future Planning Committee.

In some cases comments received have led us to review proposed minor amendments to boundaries (e.g. at Chepstow and Monmouth)

- 4.4 Final versions of the Conservation Area Appraisals need to be produced and owners of properties brought into the designated areas need to be individually notified.
- 4.5 Where areas are taken out of designation it removes the automatic protection afforded to trees in conservation areas. The Tree Officer was asked to consider if any of these affected trees merit Tree Preservation Orders and considers that no further action is needed.
- 4.6 The need to consider the introduction of Article 4 directions has been raised both by the consultants and by some of the comments so a response needs to be agreed. An Article 4 Direction allows the Local Planning Authority (under the powers of the Town and Country Planning Act (General Permitted Development) Order 1995) to remove specific permitted development rights for the purposes of ensuring the preservation of an area. Article 4(2) directions relate specifically to Conservation Areas and the aim is to encourage the retention of high quality architectural features and to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the built heritage. For example the loss of small-pane timber sash windows can easily erode the historic character of a conservation area but, on unlisted buildings, cannot be prevented without the existence of an Article 4 Direction. If the decision is that they should be introduced in appropriate parts of certain conservation areas in Monmouthshire these will need to be reviewed in detail by Heritage Management and sufficient resource allocated. The process would involve survey to identify the specific features or characteristics which would benefit from removal of permitted development rights and then a process of consulting owners affected would need to be managed. The pros of supporting the preservation of the conservation area (e.g. retention of more traditional windows on unlisted buildings) need to be considered against the resource needed to manage additional applications for consent that could result from introducing Article 4 directions. The resource needed to manage enforcement action that would inevitably arise should also be taken into account. Planning applications for works that would have been permitted development were it not for an Article 4 Direction are free of charge: so the benefit of protecting the character of the area needs to be weighed against reducing home-owner's rights/freedom and being realistic about the resource implications in terms of planning applications and enforcement work, with no additional budget.

5.0 NEXT STEPS FOR THE REMAINING CONSERVATION AREAS

- 5.1 The remaining conservation areas that still need to be appraised in line with legislative guidance are:

Bettws Newydd	Itton	Rockfield
Caldicot Castle	Llanhennock	Rogiet Llanfihangel
Dixton	Mounton	Skenfrith
Hendre	Pen-y-fal	Tredunnoch

- 5.2 Funding needs to be allocated. It is recognised that there is insufficient in-house resource to carry out these appraisals on top of all the day to day conservation/heritage work and therefore, as before, a consultant needs to be appointed. A Brief needs to be agreed and formal tenders invited.

- 5.3 Monmouthshire is one of the few local authorities in Wales to be granted delegation from Cadw to determine listed building consent applications. It is essential to the retention of delegated authority that Monmouthshire continues to be regarded as delivering a high quality conservation service. Part of this is effective management of our conservation areas and as such it is important that the appraisal process is concluded as soon as possible.
- 5.4 It is therefore recommended that Planning Committee endorse the adoption of the Conservation Area Appraisals, as amended in response to consultation replies, as Supplementary Planning Guidance. This endorsement would then be reported to Cabinet Member, who would make the final decision.
- 5.5 It is also recommended that Planning Committee endorses further work regarding the potential additional Conservation Area in Abergavenny and Chepstow. This would need to be subject to separate public consultation.
- 5.6 It is also recommended that Planning Committee endorses further work regarding the introduction of Article 4 Directions to protect the best features of the Conservations Areas. The results of this assessment would be reported back to Planning Committee and to Cabinet Member, and any proposal to introduce an Article 4 Direction would be subject to consultation of the occupiers of affected properties.

6. REASONS:

- 6.1 Draft Conservation Area Appraisals have been completed and consulted upon and now need to be finalised. The local authority has a legal requirement to review its conservation areas.

7. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- 7.1 With regard to the existing Appraisals the further resource implications are:
- officer time and costs in finalising boundary maps and, where necessary, in notifying owners accordingly;
 - officer time and costs in identifying potential new conservation areas and in writing the necessary appraisals and in managing the follow up public consultation (in the case of Abergavenny some resource may be available from Abergavenny Civic Society to assist with survey work);
 - if the principle of Article 4 directions is supported there is an up-front resource demand in drafting and notification and thereafter officer time and costs in monitoring and determining applications;
 - finalisation of the draft documents, and adoption of the Appraisals as Supplementary Planning Guidance;
 - Publication on the Council's website.
- 7.2 The further phase involves preparation of Conservation Area Appraisals for the remaining conservation areas and carrying out the required consultation exercises which it would be necessary to outsource to a suitably qualified consultant. By the end of this process Monmouthshire would have up to date appraisals for all its 31 conservation areas.

8. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 Conservation Area Appraisals are adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance and as such are part of a suite of guidance to complement the Local Development Plan to ensure suitable and sustainable development within MCC. These documents support the preservation and enhancement of local identity and culture.

There is neutral impact on Equality and there are no discrimination issues. An updated EqIA/Future Generations Assessment has been produced.

9. CONSULTEES:

- Head of Planning
- Head of Legal Services
- Development Management Officers

10. BACKGROUND PAPERS:

Monmouthshire Local Development Plan
Welsh Office Circular 61/96
Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

11. AUTHOR & CONTACT DETAILS:

Edward Holland/Amy Longford Heritage Manager.

Tel: 01633 6444877

E Mail: amylongford@monmouthshire.gov.uk