

Report of:	Head of Economic Prosperity
Contact Officer:	Angela Grove
Telephone No:	01543 464517
Portfolio Leader:	Economic Development & Planning
Key Decision:	Yes
Report Track:	Cabinet: 07/02/19

CABINET
7 FEBRUARY 2019
CHURCH STREET CONSERVATION AREA, TALBOT STREET/LICHFIELD STREET CONSERVATION AREA AND TRENT AND MERSEY CANAL CONSERVATION AREA IN RUGELEY:
APPRAISALS AND MANAGEMENT PLAN SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS

1 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to give consideration to the consultation responses received on a number of Draft Conservation Area Appraisal updates and Draft Management Plan Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's) for Rugeley – for Church Street, Conservation Area, Talbot Street/Lichfield Street Conservation Area and the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area – recommend amendments in response to the consultation and approve the amended Appraisal and Management Plan SPD's for adoption.

2 Recommendations

That:

- 2.1 The proposed amendments to the draft Appraisal and Management Plan SPD for Church Street, Rugeley Conservation Area contained in Appendix 2 be approved.
- 2.2 The proposed amendments to the draft Appraisal and Management Plan SPD for Talbot Street/Lichfield Street, Rugeley Conservation Area contained in Appendix 4 be approved.
- 2.3 The proposed amendments to the Draft Appraisal and Management Plan SPD for the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area contained in Appendix 6 be approved.

- 2.4 Authority for any further minor amendments to the above documents be delegated to the Head of Economic Prosperity in consultation with the Economic Development and Planning Portfolio Leader.
- 2.5 The Appraisals and Management Plans, as amended, be adopted, the latter as Supplementary Planning Documents.
- 2.6 Cabinet authorise the proposed boundary extension to the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area shown in Appendix 7 (Plan 8).

3 Key Issues and Reasons for Recommendation

Key Issues

- 3.1 Each Conservation Area in the District is supported by two policy documents – an Appraisal seeking to provide a clear definition of the special architectural or historic interest that warranted its designation as a Conservation Area and a Management Plan SPD following on from the Appraisal setting out in more detail the means by which the preservation and enhancement of the character and appearance of that Conservation Area might be pursued.
- 3.2 Members may recall that a series of such documents covering each of the District's eight Conservation Areas have been adopted in recent years. Whilst the Appraisal coverage in the District is already complete, some of the early documents now require updating, so these Draft Appraisals for Church Street, Talbot Street/Lichfield Street and the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Areas form updates of earlier work. None of these Conservation Areas previously had Management Plans prepared, so these Draft Management Plan documents complete the District's coverage.

Reasons for Recommendation

- 3.3 Members may also recall that the draft Appraisals and Management Plan SPD's for Church Street, Talbot Street/Lichfield Street and the Trent and Mersey Canal were considered by Cabinet on 4th October 2018 when it was resolved that the Draft documents be approved for consultation and that the consultation responses be reported to a future meeting to allow for the finalisation and adoption of the documents as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan.
- 3.4 Consultees expressed their support for the documents and their objectives, suggesting a number of minor alterations and courses of action. Appendices 1, 3 and 5 set out the main issues raised during consultation relating to each pair of documents and Appendices 2, 4 and 6 the proposed amendments to the text.

4 Relationship to Corporate Priorities

- 4.1 This report supports the Council's Corporate Priorities as follows:

- (i) **Promoting Prosperity:** in seeking to preserve or enhance the Conservation Areas the documents support an environment that is attractive and encourages growth and economic regeneration.
- (ii) **Improving Community Wellbeing:** in seeking to preserve or enhance the Conservation Areas the documents support an improved living environment for the local community and awareness of local history with consequent benefits for community wellbeing particularly mental health, promoting attractive and healthy environments for people to live in and visit.

5 Report Detail

- 5.1 Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a duty on the Local Authority to designate Conservation Areas where appropriate. Section 71 requires the Local Authority to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of those Areas. Preparation of Appraisals and Management Plans are a recognised means of Local Authorities meeting their duties under the Act. They also provide a strengthened Local Plan evidence base and help to demonstrate effective delivery. The Historic England Advice Note 1 sets out more detailed guidance on the designation of Conservation Areas and their appraisal and management, noting that an Appraisal can be reviewed regularly as part of the management of a Conservation Area and can be developed into a Management Plan.
- 5.2 Appraisals are the first stage in the process and Management Plans are the next stage, putting forward specific proposals relevant to that particular Conservation Area. The Management Plans will be formally adopted as Supplementary Planning Documents and used to guide future development and change in the Area.
- 5.3 **Church Street Conservation Area** was designated in 1992 and covers one of the older, mainly residential areas around the town centre of Rugeley. Its townscape is defined by its linear street pattern focussed on Church Street, fronted by a variety of historic properties of both individual and group interest and including four listed buildings. An Appraisal of 'what matters and why' including the historic development of the Area and its positive and negative features, making recommendations for management to reinforce the positive and eliminate the negative, was adopted at Cabinet in 2006. The new Appraisal seeks to update this document including references to national and local planning policy changes, recent new development and changes of use in the Area, but makes use of much of the information previously contained within.
- 5.4 **Talbot Street/Lichfield Street Conservation Area** was designated in 2002 and covers another of the historic residential suburbs around Rugeley town centre, including a number of community buildings (historic former schools, churches, public houses and a cinema) around a 'planned' street layout. An Appraisal was adopted at Cabinet in 2005, and the new Appraisal seeks to update this document in a similar way to Church Street above.
- 5.5 **The Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area** throughout Staffordshire was designated in 1988 by Staffordshire County Council in conjunction with the

Districts in view of its outstanding industrial archaeological importance, both nationally and locally. On its completion in 1777, the Canal was the greatest civil engineering project yet carried out in England. Many features of great historic interest survive along the Canal throughout the county including locks and bridges, warehouses, wharves and basins. Within Cannock Chase District the Conservation Area covers the Canal and towpath, extending out to include several historic canal side structures with a relationship to the Canal including the warehouse at Mill Lane, cottages at The Mossley and Brewery Cottages along Armitage Road. Listed buildings within the Conservation Area include Brindley Bank Pumping Station, St Augustine's Church and Old Chancel, the railway viaduct and the arched canal bridge no. 64. An Appraisal was adopted at Cabinet in 2012. The new Appraisal seeks to update this document in a similar way to Church Street and Talbot Street/Lichfield Street above.

5.6 Draft Management Plan SPD's for each of the above Areas seek to set out the means by which preservation and enhancement of the special character of each Area might be pursued. These follow on from the Council's adopted generic 'Conservation Areas Management Plan' 2014 which sets out a package of measures applicable to all of the District's Conservation Areas, including development control powers, enforcement and encouragement to repair and raise standards. The individual Management Plans seek to encourage debate on how the issues might be addressed in each Area.

5.7 Recommendations for Management include:

- the importance of retention and enhancement of buildings, boundaries and characteristic features making a positive contribution to the Area, through encouraging building owners to use traditional materials/designs for repairs eg the importance of the care and maintenance of historic garden walling
- requiring new development proposals to reflect existing building heights, materials colour and texture and encourage sensitive gap filling to reinforce strong frontages
- potential for enhancement through measures such as encouragement to accommodate modern infrastructure (eg solar panels and roof lights) in a considered and unobtrusive way, mitigating visual impacts where necessary, and new tree planting to replace existing mature specimens as they age
- working with the County Highways Authority to adopt the least visually intrusive traffic management measures.

5.8 There is no intention or power to compel, or to prevent change, merely to encourage change to happen in ways which maintain the visual quality and special interest of the Area over time. The main opportunities for enhancement are through the development management process and to make building owners aware of historic significance and encourage them to consider proposed alterations carefully. Indeed the documents make reference to a number of good new developments within the Conservation Areas as good examples to follow. The advice is contained in a Supplementary Planning Document in order to add weight to the more general heritage policies contained in the Local Plan.

- 5.9 **The Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan also propose a boundary extension to this Conservation Area** which was originally suggested by the Inland Waterways Association during consultation on the previous Appraisal in 2012 and was previously highlighted in the Brereton and Ravenhill Parish Plan 2006. The Council's response then was to defer consideration of the matter until preparation of the Management Plan to allow proper consultation to take place on the suggested boundary extension. The location of the proposal is the former Talbot canal basin, now filled in and forming an area of public open space covered by woodland at the junction of Armitage Road and Thompson Road and owned by Cannock Chase Council. In view of its historical links with the Canal as set out in the Appraisal it would fulfil the criteria of a surviving canalside feature with a relationship to the canal and would be an appropriate extension. No change in the existing use or appearance of the land is proposed, simply the boundary of the designated Conservation Area extended across Armitage Road as shown in Appendix 7 Plan 8. Consultation on the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area documents also invites comments on this proposed boundary extension. Responses from the consultation strongly supported this extension (see Appendix 5).
- 5.10 The purpose of designation of a Conservation Area is to provide a broader based form of protection for the built fabric and landscape of the area than would be available with normal planning powers. It recognises that historic and architecturally interesting buildings and structures exist within a particular urban or rural context which provides a setting for the buildings and which may have a special character or appearance which it is desirable to preserve or enhance. Conservation Area status ensures that:
- Any application for planning permission for development which would, in the opinion of the local planning authority affect the character or appearance of the Conservation Area must be given particular publicity and determined in a way which secures the preservation or enhancement of the area.
 - Any person wishing to demolish a building or cut down, lop or uproot any tree must (subject to certain exceptions) first apply for consent to the local planning authority, or in the case of trees, give the authority six weeks notice of the proposed action.
 - Permitted development rights which permit certain works to take place without planning permission are more restricted than in other areas.
- 5.11 These Draft documents were subject to public consultation over a six week period from 5th November to 17th December 2018 (extended to 21st December at the request of Rugeley Town Council). Letters were sent to occupiers of all properties within the Conservation Areas and a short presentation was made to Rugeley Town Council on 7th November 2018, and Brereton and Ravenhill Parish Council on 6th November 2018. Letters were sent to consultees (including Staffordshire County Council, Historic England, the Inland Waterways Association and the Landor Society) and Local Members and were available for inspection at the Civic Centre, Rugeley and Brereton Public Libraries and on the Council's website. Further copies were available on request and the availability

of the documents was advertised in the local press. All the consultation was carried out in accordance with the relevant regulations.

- 5.12 Comments received on the documents broadly expressed strong support as set out in Appendices 1, 3 and 5. Proposed amendments set out in Appendices 2, 4 and 6 are considered to satisfy the points raised, as far as possible, and to clarify the documents themselves.

6 Implications

6.1 Financial

There are no direct financial implications for the Council as a result of this report; any expenditure connected with the Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans, including staff time, will need to be contained within existing budgets.

6.2 Legal

Supplementary Planning Documents are prepared under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended). Prior to adoption the Council must prepare consultation statements in accordance with Regulation 12 and upon adoption, Regulation 14 of those Regulations requires the documents and adoption statements to be made available by the Council.

6.3 Human Resources

None.

6.4 Section 17 (Crime Prevention)

None.

6.5 Human Rights Act

None.

6.6 Data Protection

The Planning Policy Fair Processing Notice sets out how data is used in compliance with the GDPR.

6.7 Risk Management

A failure to produce Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans would run the risk of the Council not meeting its duty to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation or enhancement of those Areas under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The subsequent degrading of the District's historic assets would damage economic and environmental wellbeing.

6.8 Equality & Diversity

None.

6.9 Best Value

None.

7 Appendices to the Report

Appendix 1: Church Street Conservation Area – summary of main issues raised during consultation

Appendix 2: Church Street Conservation Area – proposed amendments to the Draft Appraisal and Management Plan SPD

Appendix 3: Talbot Street/Lichfield Street Conservation Area – summary of main issues raised during consultation

Appendix 4: SPD Talbot Street/Lichfield Street Conservation Area – proposed amendments to the Draft Appraisal and Management Plan

Appendix 5: Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area – summary of main issues raised during consultation

Appendix 6: Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area – proposed amendments to the Draft Appraisal and Management Plan SPD

Appendix 7: Plan 8 Proposed boundary extension to Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area

Previous Consideration

Church Street Conservation Area, Talbot Street/Lichfield Street Conservation Area, and Trent & Mersey Canal Conservation Area in Rugeley: Draft Appraisals and Draft Management Plan Supplementary Planning Documents	Cabinet	4 October, 2018
Cannock Chase Local Development Framework Conservation Areas: Appraisals and Management Plans (<i>Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area</i>)	Cabinet	19 April, 2012
Cannock Chase Local Development Framework: Appraisal for Church Street, Rugeley, Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document	Cabinet	20 April, 2006
Cannock Chase Local Development Framework: Appraisal for Talbot Street/Lichfield Street, Rugeley, Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document	Cabinet	14 July, 2005

Background Papers

None.

Draft Church Street Conservation Area Appraisal and Management PlanSummary of main issues raised during consultation

Name	Comments	Officer recommendation
Rugeley Town Council	<p>During 2018 the Town Council sought to object to a planning application which it felt was contrary to the existing conservation area and NPPF. Despite numerous local objections and a comprehensive written report, Cannock Chase agreed to permit development of two modern properties, of little architectural merit, in a rear garden. For this reason, the Town Council feel strongly that the Church Street Conservation Area Management Plan is not robust enough to protect the history and notable local architecture. The plan offers guidance for home owners and developers and uses works like 'should' rather than stronger directional enforcement terms that would direct any development or architectural changes.</p> <p>The stone and hedge boundary walls are mentioned but planning approvals are still given to remove them. This immediately erodes at the integrity of the street scene as you pass down Church street. The Town Council would like to see consideration to listing these boundaries.</p>	<p>In this case the Council in its decision making took the view that the proposed development was of good design and materials, retained a built frontage to the street including a frontage wall and considered that the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. The Appraisal seeks to highlight key features which contribute to character and appearance and which should be conserved and the Management Plan provides supplementary planning guidance to inform consideration of specific proposals. The Council's adopted generic Conservation Areas Management Plan SPD 2014 should be read in conjunction with the individual Management Plans and contains measures available to the Council to apply across all of its conservation areas, including enforcement. The Council's powers are limited even in conservation areas and use of words like 'should' is deliberate. The Council is aware from previous day to day work that property owners are using its guidance to inform choices about change, and these documents seek to reinforce this approach.</p> <p>Noted, however most frontage and property walls and hedges do not fall within the remit of planning permission. Planning applicants are generally encouraged to retain them (see comment above). This guidance is intended to emphasise to property owners the importance of retention of such features and the Management Plan offers advice on the importance of their care and maintenance including use of matching mortar and reinstatement of capping stones to extend the life of old walls.</p>

	<p>There is little made of the importance of the views into and the views out of the conservation area. Glimpses of local churches and significant buildings are becoming restricted with houses being put up in back gardens. The majesty of large dwellings sitting in their established large gardens is also being eaten away with rear developments being almost encouraged as a way of solving a much larger housing issue. Older rear garden developments are of single storey which, whilst at odds with the surroundings, were at least low level and still retained views for older residents. Recent approvals have allowed for two storey developments that block views and start to erode at the edges of the conservation area itself.</p> <p>In summary, Rugeley Town Council support the continued protection of Church Street Conservation Area , but would like to see its protection given more legal and planning standing, with clear direction for any future developers which would retain the history and architecture of this space.</p>	<p>Key views are highlighted in the Appraisal plans and text (section entitled ‘Setting and Views’), however it is agreed could be further emphasized in the Appraisal and Management Plan. Further reference to the majesty of larger dwellings in mature plots could also be added to the Management Plan, a matter which is already highlighted in the Council’s Design SPD 2016 which includes a section on ‘Mature Suburbs’, but which is also relevant here. Text updated accordingly to cover these matters.</p> <p>Noted and support welcomed. However Council powers are limited by national legislation, even in conservation areas, which is a subject of national debate amongst conservation organisations seeking to avoid the cumulative impacts of ‘permitted’ change in the built environment. These documents do seek to set out clearly a direction for future developers to help retain the history and architecture of the Conservation Area.</p>
<p>Amy Williams Local resident</p>	<p>We do not need any more building in Church Street, it will spoil the area and the street cannot cope with any more traffic. We haven’t enough doctors or schools and we now have plans for development on the power station site, the town can’t cope. Church Street is used as a ‘cut through’ to the town, Tesco and other areas and is so busy. It will ruin the street if they build more houses on Church Street and in the town.</p>	<p>Noted. The documents are intended as a guide upon which to base the form and style of future development in the area when future planning applications are being considered; the latter will also consider traffic and other impacts on a case by case basis.</p>
<p>Ray Till Local resident</p>	<p>Good idea to make conservation areas to protect the old buildings and the environment for the future. Some parts of conservation areas have not been policed in the past so who will police the areas to maintain character for the future.</p>	<p>Noted. Many alterations to buildings are classed as ‘permitted development’ to householders, even in conservation areas, however the documents seek to encourage all alterations to be done in the most appropriate way.</p>

<p>Harry Thornton Local resident</p>	<p>2018 Draft Appraisal is timely as it draws attention to the various changes, good and otherwise, since the 2006 Appraisal, and the impending major changes on the site of the recently demolished Aelfgar School.</p> <p>Draft Appraisal and Management Plan are very informative, easy to read and set out the best way forward. Proposed survey on a 5 year cycle is particularly welcome as it should help to contain the problem of fitting of upvc windows and doors and the practice of bringing forward windows almost flush with the surrounding brickwork.</p> <p>Attention is drawn to some neglected boundary walls and cases of front walls being reduced in height or rebuilt in unsuitable materials.</p> <p>Improvements have however been made, such as the three new bungalows facing Fortescue Lane, with provision for residents car parking. Car parking is a problem along much of Church Street and double yellow lines are unfortunately necessary but as mentioned in the documents consideration should be given to ways of making them less obtrusive.</p> <p>It is also hoped that new development behind the Sarah Hopkins almshouses will provide parking for residents of the almshouses. It may also be possible to provide dedicated parking on the Aelfgar site for some of the older houses higher up Church Street, and vehicular access to the rear of houses on the north east side of Lion Street.</p> <p>The Draft Appraisal and Management Plan are greatly welcomed.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Use of upvc is 'permitted development' even in conservation areas but the Council works to encourage use of better designed windows and doors where use of traditional timber is not an option.</p> <p>Noted. Boundary treatment can have a significant impact on the streetscape of a conservation area and this guidance is intended to emphasize to property owners the importance of retention of such features.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. This will be an issue for consideration through relevant planning applications when parking and highway matters will be considered on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Noted and support welcomed.</p>
--	--	---

ITEM NO. 10.

Draft Church Street Conservation Area Appraisal and Management PlanProposed amendments following consultation

Document, section and page number	Proposed amendment
Appraisal – Recommendations – p24	Recommendation 1 - Add sentence ' In particular, the majesty of the larger dwellings in mature plots contributes to this special character and appearance. '
Management Plan SPD – Main Issues – p3	Issue 1 – Add to list of examples: ' the majesty of larger dwellings in mature plots '.
Management Plan SPD – Delivery Plan – p4	Add to first box: ' in addition the majesty of the larger dwellings in mature plots which contribute to the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area merits special consideration. The Council's adopted Design SPD 2016 includes Design Guidance for Mature Suburbs which should be referred to in conjunction with this Management Plan. ' Also: ' Views/glimpses of local churches and significant buildings beyond the Conservation Area boundary should be retained. '

ITEM NO. 10.

Draft Talbot Street/Lichfield Street Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan**Summary of main issues raised during consultation**

Name	Comments	Officer recommendation
Brereton & Ravenhill Parish Council, Brereton & Ravenhill Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee and Brereton & Ravenhill Heritage Committee	<p>Welcome the draft documents subject to the following comments:</p> <p><u>Appraisal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P6 2nd para – the old station was on both sides of the bridges • P7 2nd para - railway was constructed in 1850's, completed 1859. • P12 final para – the railway bridges between Horse fair on the one side and Armitage Road and Brereton road on the other side need careful cleaning and repointing • P14&15 - the railway bridges between Horse fair on the one side and Armitage Road and Brereton road on the other side need careful cleaning and repointing and the railway bridge over Arch Street should be clearly identified as significant buildings • P27 6th indent – care needs to be taken to ensure that trees (especially larger trees) do not harm residential amenity when fully grown. <p><u>Management Plan SPD</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P5 – we suggest adding a final box: 'the Council will be prepared to use its powers under the Planning Acts where neglect threatens the survival of historic structures or harms amenity'. • P9 & 10 – the railway bridges between Horse Fair on the one side and Armitage Road and Brereton road on the other , and the railway bridge over Arch Street should be clearly identified as significant buildings 	<p>Noted and support welcomed.</p> <p>Text updated accordingly to cover these matters.</p> <p>Added to plan.</p> <p>Text does specify 'appropriate trees'. New tree planting should be carefully chosen for site to avoid future amenity impacts.</p> <p>The Council's adopted generic Conservation Areas Management Plan 2014 should be read in conjunction with the individual Management Plans and contains measures available to the Council to apply across all of its conservation areas, including enforcement.</p> <p>Added to plan.</p>

<p>Ray Till Local resident</p>	<p>Good idea to make conservation areas to protect the old buildings and the environment for the future. Some parts of conservation areas have not been policed in the past so who will police the areas to maintain character for the future.</p>	<p>Noted. Many alterations to buildings are classed as 'permitted development' to householders, even in conservation areas, however the documents seek to encourage all alterations to be done in the most appropriate way.</p>
<p>Rob Gibbon Local resident</p>	<p>As a resident of Talbot Street I am keen to keep updated on the Council's plans regarding this Conservation Area. Document mentions p7 – 'consideration of alternative methods to control on-street parking'. I feel that on-street parking is becoming a problem in Talbot Street and will only get worse if something is not done to address this. In particular vehicles are parked on both sides of the street and since it is narrow they park on the footpath in some cases totally blocking access on the footpath. Could the Council look into the viability of issuing residents with parking permits to allow their vehicles to park on the car park next to St Pauls Church? If this does not provide enough incentive then maybe parking should only be allowed on one side of the street.</p>	<p>Noted, text of Management Plan updated to encourage exploration of parking solutions (which in themselves go beyond the remit of these documents).</p>
<p>Dave Lucas Co-ordinator of Antlers restoration project</p>	<p>P23 – Antlers – these are not a replica but the restored original The original cast iron light fitting was repaired and SCC in conjunction with Network Rail re-erected them in their original position.</p>	<p>Text of Appraisal updated accordingly</p>
<p>Harry Thornton Local resident</p>	<p>The 2018 Draft Appraisal is welcomed as it highlights many of the changes that have occurred within the Conservation Area since the 2005 Appraisal. The Draft documents are informative and comprehensive, and are an easy-to-read assessment of the area in general and the changes still needed to improve the area.</p> <p>The Talbot Street former girls school is now much improved after being converted to residential use. P9 para 3 refers to the school 'now used as offices' which may be an error.</p> <p>Appraisal p28 – recommendation 6 is particularly welcomed as being necessary to improve views from Lichfield Street.</p> <p>Draft Management Plan p3 – summary of items of special interest – while many of the shops facing Horse Fair still fall short of what is desired, they have to a limited extent benefitted by the recent road improvements and by the improved street scene</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted and Appraisal text updated accordingly.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

	<p>brought about by the trees and suitably matching exterior of the new care home facing the shops.</p> <p>Heron Court is still in need of tlc, although now that residential development has been approved on spare land at the front and side of the building it is hoped that Heron Court itself will soon be improved, despite having much of its imposing frontage lost from view in Heron Street.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Rugeley Town Council</p>	<p>The residential area has been well protected by the Conservation Area plans. Rear gardens to properties are protected with little/no secondary dwellings affecting the setting of the original houses. The railway is a dominant feature especially as it passes across the end of Horse Fair.</p> <p>Whilst the core of the area has a tranquil feel and retains many original features on the houses, the boundary of the conservation area has not been as well protected and offers little in the way of architectural merit. Horse Fair itself is a significant road in the history of Rugeley but this history has been developed out through incremental modern planning permissions.</p> <p>Rugeley Town Council would like to see more direction for planning applications along Horse Fair in order to re-establish it as the significant thoroughfare that it once was. It is suggested that the use of a 'street scene development guide' may assist in this.</p>	<p>Noted and support welcomed.</p> <p>Noted. The significance of Horse Fair could be further emphasized in the Appraisal 'Negative Features' and 'Enhancement Opportunities' sections and in the Management Plan SPD Delivery Plan. Text updated accordingly.</p> <p>Noted. Horse Fair could be added to an update of the Council's Design SPD 2016 in due course which already includes coverage of design enhancements for significant 'corridors' such as the A5. Horse Fair would seem to merit such specific treatment, offering a more comprehensive approach to enhancing the settings of two conservation areas – Talbot Street/Lichfield Street and Rugeley Town Centre – as well as the street scene of a well used thoroughfare. Management Plan SPD updated accordingly.</p>

ITEM NO. 10.

Draft Talbot Street/Lichfield Street Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan**Proposed amendments following consultation**

Document, section and page number	Proposed amendment
Appraisal – Development History – p6	2 nd para: amend 9 th sentence to: ...when the railway was built in the 1850's, completed 1859 (the old station was on both sides of the bridge).
Appraisal – Development History – p9	3 rd para: amend 2 nd sentence to:...the Girls Primary School in Talbot Street in 1892 (now converted to dwellings).
Appraisal – Character Analysis – p12	Final para: amend 1 st sentence to: 'The brick built railway bridges on Horse Fair form a substantial and distinctive edifice at the entrance to the town centre and would benefit from careful cleaning and repointing.'
Appraisal and Management Plan – Plans 4 & 5	Shade railway bridges in Horse Fair and Arch Street as 'unlisted buildings of significant interest'.
Appraisal – Public Realm – p23	6 th sentence: amend to: 'Recent local support for restoration and replacement of the original historic 'antler' light fitting on the Horse Fair bridge ...'
Appraisal – Loss/Intrusion/Negative Features – p25	End of 4 th para: add: ' In particular, Horse Fair is a historically significant thoroughfare in Rugeley which retains sections of its attractive historic frontages. Whilst modern redevelopment has had an impact, the history, character and street scene could be enhanced by sympathetic repair of the older buildings and sympathetic redevelopment of some of the modern ones, especially those noted as having a negative impact. Appropriate tree planting to enhance the street scene would also be welcomed.'
Appraisal – Enhancement Opportunities/recommendations – p28	Add additional bullet point and adjust numbering: ' Opportunities to enhance the significance of the Horse Fair frontage of the Conservation Area will be encouraged, with sympathetic repairs to historic buildings and sympathetic redevelopment of sites noted as having a negative impact, including appropriate tree planting. In addition the Council will give consideration to including the Horse Fair frontage in an update of its Design SPD 2016 to encourage a more comprehensive enhancement of the edge and setting of two conservation areas – Rugeley Town Centre and Talbot Street/Lichfield Street – with guidance covering the whole corridor.'

<p>Management Plan – Delivery Plan – p4</p>	<p>1st box: add sentence: ‘In addition opportunities to enhance the historic significance of the Horse Fair frontage with sympathetic repair of the older buildings and sympathetic redevelopment of some of the modern ones, especially those noted as having a negative impact, together with appropriate tree planting, will be encouraged.’</p>
<p>Management Plan – Delivery Plan – p5</p>	<p>2nd box: add sentence: ‘ The Council will give consideration to including design guidance for the whole Horse Fair corridor in an update to its Design SPD 2016 to encourage more comprehensive enhancement of this significant street scene including the edge and setting of two conservation areas.’</p>
<p>Management Plan – Delivery Plan – p7</p>	<p>Potential for Future Enhancements 3rd box: amend sentence to: ‘Consideration of traffic calming/parking restrictions with the County Highway Authority to explore the least obtrusive and most effective ways to regulate on street parking.’</p>

Draft Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan**Summary of main issues raised during consultation**

Name	Comments	Officer recommendation
Brereton & Ravenhill Parish Council, Brereton & Ravenhill Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee and Brereton & Ravenhill Heritage Committee	<p>Welcome the draft documents subject to the following comments:</p> <p><u>Appraisal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P3 – while welcoming in principle improved cycle links via the canal corridor it is important to minimise the potential for conflict between cyclists and pedestrians. • P6 last complete para – final sentence should begin ‘In Rugeley and Brereton’ • P7 first line – we suggest replacing ‘control of British waterways’ with ‘guardianship of the Canal and River Trust’ • P14, 29 and Appendix 3 – we wholeheartedly support the proposed extension of the conservation area to include the site of the former canal basin at the bottom of Thompson Road. • P19 – we suggest identifying the relevant parts of the disused concrete bridge as negative boundaries. • P19&21 – we firmly believe that 1760’s bridge 65 should be clearly identified as a significant building • P25 2nd para – we suggest adding at the end of the penultimate sentence ‘which impedes use by disabled and less able people and by parents with pushchairs’. • P25 last complete sentence – we suggest adding ‘ which now form a valuable and valued feature of the canal’. • P26 1st complete para – we suggest replacing ‘which should aim to preserve its character whilst at the same time facilitating use by disabled and less able people, parents with pushchairs and cyclists’. • P27&28 – the disused concrete former railway bridge should be identified as a negative feature. <p><u>Management Plan SPD</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P4 5th box 1st sentence – we suggest replacing this with ‘ The Council will seek the repair and maintenance of towpath surfacing and waterway edging using appropriate materials and methods in conjunction with Brereton and Ravenhill Parish Council (which has obtained 	<p>Noted and support welcomed.</p> <p>Text updated accordingly to cover these matters.</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Plans updated.</p> <p>Plan updated.</p> <p>Text updated</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>Plan updated</p> <p>Text updated</p>

	<p>funding for this in its area) and the Canal and River Trust.’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P4 6th box final sentence – we suggest replacing this with ‘ careful removal of vegetation growing in wall crevices and ivy overgrowth will reveal the attractiveness of the structure to view, avoid damage and loss of integrity from root growth and facilitate proper maintenance’ • P5 sec 1 – we suggest adding a final box ‘ the Council will be prepared to use its powers under the Planning Acts where neglect threatens the survival of historic structures or harms amenity’ • P6&12 – we wholeheartedly support the proposed extension of the conservation area to include the site of the former canal basin at the bottom of Thompson Road. • P10 – we suggest identifying the relevant parts of the disused concrete railway bridge as negative boundaries. • P10&11 – we firmly believe that the 1760’s Bridge 65 should be clearly identified as a significant building. 	<p>Text updated</p> <p>The Council’s adopted generic Conservation Areas Management Plan SPD 2014 should be read in conjunction with the individual Management Plans and contains measures available to the Council to apply to all of its conservation areas, including enforcement.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Plan updated.</p> <p>Plan updated</p>
<p>Inland Waterways Association</p>	<p>IWA responded to the previous consultation in 2011 and we note that many of the changes suggested previously have been incorporated, including extension of the conservation area boundary to take in the Talbot Basin. We are generally content that these two documents provide a sound basis for the protection and improvement of the conservation area. Detailed comments as follows:</p> <p><u>Appraisal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • p6 1st para last line – add Canal after Caldon • p6 2nd para 2nd line – change ‘costed’ to ‘cost’. • p6 3rd para sentence beginning ‘in 1948...’ change to: ‘In 1948 the canal was nationalised and since 2012 has been under the control of the Canal and River Trust, a charity, which exists to maintain and develop the canal and the inland waterway network to fulfil its economic, social and environmental potential’. • P7 1st para – delete ‘because the technology to build skew arches had not then been developed’ and replace with ‘to minimise the length of the aqueduct and the embankment 	<p>Noted and support welcomed.</p> <p>Text updated accordingly to cover these matters. Ditto</p> <p>Ditto</p>

	<p>where the canal crosses the river valley from the north side to the south' (explanation: whilst it is true that skew arches had not then been developed, it is most unlikely they would have been used at this location'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P7 2nd para – delete 'most recently' from 'and has most recently been used as the South Staffordshire Water Museum' (explanation: the museum items are a private collection that has in the past been open to visitors by appointment, but rarely in recent years.) • P8 1st para – consider deleting 'It is said that as her body was pulled from the water her blood ran down the flight of steps and the spot is still rumoured to be haunted to this day' (explanation: although much repeated this is no more than a fanciful myth, and perhaps therefore not appropriate for a serious conservation area appraisal. A drowned body would not leak blood when carried up steps. In any case the present steps are a relatively modern concrete replacement for the original red sandstone steps, partly on a different alignment. An IWA excavation in 20011 uncovered the bottom two steps still in situ although these appear to be the only ones remaining. They are still there under a shallow protective covering of soil. The redness of the local sandstone may have given rise to the myth about blood stains. Suggest adding 'the modern concrete steps are a replacement of the original sandstone steps of which only the bottom two survive below ground'. • P8 3rd para – change 'is believed to have been' to 'was' a cobbled yard and wharf... (explanation: this was visible until largely destroyed by excavation for the present swimming pool in 2008. You might also mention the stone wall still visible behind the pool building with its 3 large arched openings, which it is believed were for underground storage or stables. The distinctive and attractive Churchdale Cottage facing the canal was extended in 2008 but in a closely matching style. Although the Cottage and arches are outside the conservation area you might consider including them for their historic interest.) • P.20 3rd line – correct typo 'scheme leading' • P.23 – the parapets of Leathermill Lane Bridge (66) have been rebuilt and capped with incongruous concrete slabs in place of the 	<p>Ditto</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>Consideration will be given to extending the Conservation Area boundary in a future update when this proposed inclusion can be advertised. In the meantime text updated.</p> <p>Text updated The canal bridges are understood to be the responsibility of the Canal</p>
--	---	--

	<p>original sandstone coping stones. This should be a priority for replacement with authentic materials, in conjunction with repairs to the bridge wing wall.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P.29 – if ‘copies were sent to British Waterways’ is describing the current consultation (use of past tense makes this unclear) then this should be changed to Canal and River Trust. • Appendix 1 p.33 – in ‘the pumping station is situated close to a branch of the Trent and Mersey Canal, delete ‘a branch of the’ (explanation: the pumping station adjoins the main canal, there is no branch.) <p><u>Draft Management Plan SPD</u> IWA suggests that section 4 of the Plan should also include the following specific potential enhancement objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moorings – the main moorings for visiting boats used to be north of Leathermill Lane where mooring rings still exist, but the canal bank has now deteriorated with wash holes and collapsed sections such that most boats can no longer moor here. Although boats can moor south of the bridge where the bank is sheet piled, this section often gets congested and the towpath here is very narrow. Repairing the bank and reinstating the moorings between Leathermill Lane and Station Road, using sheet piling but topped with original stone copings recovered from the collapsed wash wall would both respect the heritage and provide an improved facility for boaters to stop, visit and shop in Rugeley. The Council should work with the Canal and River Trust to identify additional third party funding for this. • Leathermill Lane Canal Bridge (66) – Now that the bridge has been pedestrianised, funding should be sought to rebuild the parapets by replacing the modern facing brickwork with heritage bricks that match the original c.1771 	<p>and River Trust (CRT)so this matter will be brought to their attention. The Council is aware that damage is occurring due to large vehicles attempting to turn at the top of Leathermill Lane so will be referred to Staffordshire County Council (SCC) Highways too. An item will be added to the Management Plan SPD Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Text updated</p> <p>Text updated</p> <p>Text updated and matter will be referred to CRT. Item added to Management Plan SPD Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Text updated and matter will be referred to CRT and SCC Highways. Item added to Management Plan SPD Delivery Plan</p>
--	---	--

	<p>hand made bricks of the main arch. The incongruous concrete slab copings should be replaced with sandstone blocks to reinstate the original appearance of the bridge as an important heritage feature of the canal and of Rugeley. The damaged wing wall (fig 9 of Appraisal) should also be rebuilt in a way that facilitates the improvement of the towpath access ramp to remove the steps and provide disabled access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside storage – the external storage of materials behind industrial units, such as vehicle tyres at the Starco and Granurite sites, is visually intrusive and damaged the setting of the conservation area. Enforcement action should be taken where appropriate to prevent this, or other interventions made to screen such sites with reinforced planting or new fencing. 	<p>The Council’s adopted generic Conservation Areas Management Plan SPD 2014 should be read in conjunction with the individual Management Plans and contains measures available to the Council to apply across all of its conservation areas, including enforcement. A landscaped buffer zone to the canal boundary formed part of development approvals for all recent commercial sites along Wheelhouse Road. The case will be investigated.</p>
<p>Harry Thornton Local resident</p>	<p>The new documents are welcome because of the several changes that have taken place since the previous Appraisal of 2012, and the major changes that are likely to take place in the near future when the Power Station site is redeveloped.</p> <p><u>Draft Appraisal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • p.16 – as a matter of interest, Love Lane is shown on the 1815 parish map (WSL Ref. 14/19/45) as Hodgley Lane and extends to provide access to fields behind the Mossley area. • P.19 – plan 6, add the redundant concrete railway bridge should be a negative boundary • P.23 Bridges – the disused concrete railway bridge is deteriorating and could eventually become dangerous. • P.27 1st para – as a matter of interest the lime kiln at Mossley was owned by John Cox, who used it to produce lime for processing leather after he bought the Bryans Lane tannery at auction in 1820, following the bankruptcy of its former owner Walter Nixon (SRO Ref, D603/X/5/30) It was in use from at least 1840 	<p>Noted and support welcomed.</p> <p>Text updated accordingly (on p.10).</p> <p>Plan updated.</p> <p>Ownership of this bridge will be investigated.</p> <p>Text updated in summary.</p>

	<p>(No 1184 on the Tithe Map) until at least 1889 when conveyed by later Cox family members to another owner (SRO Ref D4244).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P.31 Note 6 – consider adding the need for demolishing the redundant concrete railway bridge. <p><u>Draft Management Plan SPD</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P.4 – retention and enhancement of buildings, boundaries and characteristic features: I would suggest an additional box is required solely to deal with the future of the listed Bridge no. 64 which appears to be ownerless and in need of systematic maintenance, in particular, the immediate removal of vegetation growing into the brickwork. • P.7 & 12 – the inclusion of the former ‘Talbot Basin’ into the Conservation area would be desirable because of its past close connection with the canal and by being the only visible reminder of the old Brereton Colliery in the locality. The proposed location of the linkage over the Armitage Road is logical as it coincides with the former bridge under the road and draws attention to the reason for the canal side railings at that point. • P.7 table 4 – it would be beneficial if the redundant and truncated concrete bridge was removed as it is already deteriorating and may eventually become dangerous. • P.10 – the map should show the redundant concrete bridge as a negative boundary. 	<p>See note above</p> <p>Text updated accordingly. This bridge is understood to be in the ownership of the CRT so the matter will be brought to their attention.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>See note above.</p> <p>Plan updated</p>
<p>Lesley Jewkes Local resident</p>	<p>I read the reports with great interest, the historical and contemporary information showed considerable and detailed work, and the Council is to be commended for this. However I think that the report does tend to convey a rather rosy picture of the canal and immediate environs. I take a particular interest in this much abused and neglected stretch of canal and would like to add the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bridge 66 (Leathermill Lane) is in a very poor state, it has been crudely and unsympathetically repaired, capping stones are missing (probably in the canal) and there are several deep cracks in the roadside brickwork and is possibly in danger of collapse. The access here to the canalside is a confusing, ugly and hazardous mess. 	<p>Noted and support welcomed.</p> <p>Noted. A scheme of enhancement to this canal access is planned to be implemented by the CRT in partnership with the Council using S106 funds from the Tesco development. Matter of damage will be referred to CRT and SCC Highways. Item added to Management Plan Delivery Plan.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ATS premises adjacent to the bridge are a neglected eyesore, and possibly an environmental hazard. The bank on their property and down to the canal is a scruffy overgrown mess. I have written to ATS about this; they don't care about their premises and do nothing. • The Old Mill nearby is up for sale at a price in excess of £1million. It remains unsold. It will I am sure, eventually collapse into the canal. • The towpath from Bridge 66 and away from the town is rarely used as moorings, the coir rolls along with other measures such as concrete filled sandbags are a temporary measure designed to preserve the path edge; however the bank continues to collapse and it is very difficult for boats to moor here because the water is so shallow. The consequence is that boats moor further away and beyond the '48 hour' limit to the detriment of possible boater trade in the town and to the annoyance of canalside residents. The canal here is in urgent need of piling, backfilling and dredging, thus restoring the canal to its proper width and depth. • The towpath from the town and all the way to Shugborough is much used by walkers and cyclists and if properly restored could become a considerable asset to the town, its residents and visitors. <p>If one compares the canal environment here in Rugeley to Stone or Alrewas, the contrast is significant, inasmuch as Rugeley is sorely neglected, repairs or restoration have been carried out in a haphazard and unsympathetic manner and as</p>	<p>Noted. Planning permission was granted for refurbishment of this site in 2018 but so far there has been no progress on development.</p> <p>Noted. The Old Mill is in private ownership and was the subject of a Feasibility Study for conversion to residential use under the recent Rugeley Town Centre Partnership Scheme. Whilst the site is being marketed and is on the 'Save Britain's Heritage' Register of available properties, so far there has been no progress on development.</p> <p>Canal maintenance issue to be referred to the CRT. Item added to Management Plan Delivery Plan</p> <p>Noted. The adopted Rugeley Town Centre Area Action Plan 2014 sought to raise the profile of the Canal within the town and realise the opportunity it presents.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>cheaply as possible. Having approached the Canal and River Trust, Rugeley Town Council and Cannock Chase District Council all to no avail, I sincerely hope that the report goes some way towards starting a significant improvement to the area.</p>	
<p>Rugeley Town Council</p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the conservation area consultation.</p> <p>As mentioned in the opening paragraphs of the plan the Old Chancel is a significant building when viewed from both the town and the canal. Its 'imagineering' into a destination for tourism and heritage should be positively directed and the support and specific input from Cannock Chase Council would be welcomed.</p> <p>With the development of the power station site, the canal can be viewed as either a boundary not to be crossed or more hopefully a corridor for pedestrians, cyclists, boaters in exploring and benefitting from the town of Rugeley. Works proposed to further enhance this important corridor are welcomed.</p> <p>The increased use of the canal/towpaths can be achieved through increased accessibility. The opportunity for pedestrians, cyclists and mobility scooter users to access the towpath would bring increasing enjoyment to residents and tourists alike.</p> <p>The Town Council agrees that some of the residences backing onto the canal are not caring for the boundaries and this is a negative visual impact. Are there opportunities to encourage private property owners to improve this aspect?</p>	<p>Noted and support welcomed.</p> <p>The Council is supportive of proposals for the Old Chancel which enable it to be brought into a viable use to secure its long term future following redundancy for ecclesiastical purposes.</p> <p>Noted. The Power Station SPD 2018 recognised this opportunity which will be considered in the course of development of proposals for the Power Station site. The Council will continue to work with CRT and SCC to enhance the canal corridor.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council has no powers but would adopt a conciliatory approach. The document seeks to raise awareness of issues affecting the Conservation Area generally and one option might be to embark on a publicity campaign to raise awareness targeted at property owners adjoining the Canal. Item added to Management Plan Delivery Plan.</p>

ITEM NO. 10.26

	<p>Significant historical industrial buildings border the canal and their refurbishment should again be encouraged where the work undertaken adds to their unique location.</p> <p>We do not know if the following would fall into the concerns of a conservation area plan, but Rugeley Town Council are keen to see that the understanding of, and interpretation of the history of, the canal is maximised at every opportunity. This could be through talking posts, information boards, canal trails etc. Any opportunity to develop this aspect would be welcomed.</p>	<p>Noted. The document seeks to raise awareness generally.</p> <p>Noted and agreed. Interpretation forms an element of Council Local Plan policy towards the historic environment. Item added to Management Plan Delivery Plan.</p>
--	--	---

ITEM NO. 10.

Draft Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area Appraisal and Management PlanProposed amendments following consultation

Document, section and page number	Proposed amendment
Appraisal – Introduction – p3	Add sentence to end of 3 rd para: ‘Consideration will be given to ways of minimising conflict between cyclists and pedestrians.’
Appraisal – Development History – p6	Amend sentence at end of 1 st para: ...the Caldon Canal...’
Appraisal – Development History – p6	Amend sentence at start of para 2:...’as trips cost over two thirds less by canal...’
Appraisal – Development History – p6	Amend last sentence para 2: ‘In Rugeley and Brereton the coal mines were...’
Appraisal – Development History – p6-7	Amend 3 rd sentence in 3 rd para: ...’the canal was nationalised and since 2012 has been under the control of the Canal and River Trust (CRT), a charity , which exists...’
Appraisal – Development History North Section – p7	Amend 2 nd sentence: ‘...this crossing was made at 90 degrees to the River to minimise the length of the aqueduct and the embankment where the canal crosses the river valley from the north side to the south. ’
Appraisal – Development History North Section – p7	Amend 5 th sentence to delete: ‘...most recently..’
Appraisal and Management Plan – Plans 6 & 7	Shade Bridge 65 as a significant building; shade disused concrete railway bridge as negative boundary.
Appraisal – Development History North Section – p8	1 st para, delete 4 th sentence and substitute new sentence at end of para: ‘The modern concrete steps are a replacement of the original sandstone steps of which only the bottom two survive below ground.’
Appraisal – Development History North Section – p8	3 rd para: amend 2 nd sentence to:’...there was a cobbled yard and wharf for use of the Estate, and three large arched openings remain which it is believed were for underground storage or stables. The distinctive and attractive Churchdale Cottage facing the Canal was extended in 2008 but in a closely matching style. ’

Appraisal – Development History Central Section – p10	Insert additional para 5: ‘Love Lane, which bounds the north-east side of the Canal at this point, is shown on the 1815 Parish Map as Hodgley Lane and extended to provide access to fields behind The Mossley area.’
Appraisal – Character Analysis – p20	1 st whole sentence, correct typo: ‘...scheme leading...’
Appraisal –Public Realm – p25	1 st para amend penultimate sentence: ‘...is inclined to be muddy which impedes use by disabled and less able people and by those with wheeled transport/pushchairs.’
Appraisal – Public Realm –p.25	Amend last complete sentence: ‘There are three replica cast iron mileposts... which now form a valuable and valued feature of the Canal.’
Appraisal – Public realm – p.26	2 nd para: amend 5 th sentence to:‘...’which should aim to preserve its character, whilst at the same time facilitating use by pedestrians and cyclists, including disabled and less able people.’
Appraisal – The Setting of the Conservation Area –p.27	1 st para: amend 2 nd sentence to:‘...’a settlement of cottages with some lime kilns, in use from at least 1840 to at least 1889, and used to produce lime for processing leather after its owner bought the Bryan’s Lane Tannery.’
Appraisal – Loss/Intrusion/Negative Features – p.28	Add additional sentence at end of 3 rd para: ‘The disused concrete former railway bridge remains across the Canal though truncated just beyond the Conservation Area boundary.’
Appraisal – Community Involvement – p.29	Para 1: update reference to ‘British Waterways’ to ‘Canal and River Trust’ .
Appraisal – Appendix 1 – p.33	Delete ‘a branch of’ from the List Description.
Management Plan SPD –Delivery Plan – p.4	Part 1 box 3: amend final sentence to: ‘...’the potential of the Old Mill and Listed canal bridge 64 will be explored, both of which appear to be in need of maintenance.’
Management Plan SPD – Delivery Plan – p.4	Part 1 box 5: amend final sentence to: ‘...will be sought, and the Council will work with Brereton and Ravenhill Parish Council which has obtained funding for this in its area.’
Management Plan SPD – Delivery Plan – p.4	Part 1 box 6: amend final sentence to:‘...avoid damage and loss of integrity from root growth, facilitating proper maintenance.’

<p>Management Plan SPD – Delivery Plan – p7</p>	<p>Box 1: expand text with additional sentence: ‘The Council will work with property owners to encourage enhancement of garden and other frontages to the Canal boundary, including the use of planting to help screen ‘clutter’ and outside storage.’</p>
<p>Management Plan SPD – Delivery Plan – p7</p>	<p>Split Box 4 into two: first box as existing first sentence on improving pedestrian/cycle links to the surroundings; second box as existing second sentence on improving boat mooring facilities with additional sentence: ‘ The Council will work with the CRT to secure the repair of boat moorings and the canal bank north of Leathermill Lane in a sympathetic manner to provide an improved facility for boaters to stop, visit and shop in Rugeley.’</p>
<p>Management Plan SPD – Delivery Plan – p7</p>	<p>Additional box: ‘The Council will work with the CRT to secure repairs to Leathermill Lane canal bridge no.66 including repair of the parapets, using appropriate materials and methods.</p>
<p>Management Plan SPD – Delivery Plan – p7</p>	<p>Additional box: ‘The Council will encourage the provision of canal related information and interpretation including opportunities for links to the wider historic environment, town centre and footway/cycle routes.’</p>
<p>Management Plan SPD – Delivery Plan – p7</p>	<p>Additional box: ‘ The Council will work with property owners and the CRT to seek the satisfactory solution of issues adversely affecting the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.’</p>

ITEM NO. 10.

 <p>Cannock Chase COUNCIL</p>	<p>Plan 8: Location of Former Talbot Basin</p>	 <p>N W E S</p>
---	--	--

