

POLICY CH1 - DEVELOPMENT AFFECTING LISTED BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES

OBJECTION: 070/66 GO-M 093/6 The Leverhulme Estate
215/41 Wirral Green Belt Council

Summary of Objections

- 11.1 The word 'normally' should be deleted from Policy CH1 (070/66). The Policy fails fully to take the guidance in PPG15 *Planning and the Historic Environment* into account and fails to provide adequate development control guidance. It should list criteria by which development will be considered (093/6). The Policy should make it clear that when interests conflict, the preservation and character of the environment will take precedence (215/41).

Assessment and Conclusions

11.2 A published change to Policy CH1 omits 'normally'¹. The proposed amendments also include a restructuring of the Policy and supporting text which would make it more positive in tone whilst retaining and clarifying criteria essential for effective development control. Reference to the statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building² is retained in the Reasoned Justification. The Policy as proposed to be amended also refers to specific environmental aspects such as detailed design and use of materials, to be taken into account when considering proposals affecting a listed building. These proposed changes are in my view an adequate response to the criticisms expressed in Objection 093/6.

11.3 I concur with the view expressed by the Council that it would be inadvisable to attempt to prioritise considerations in a general policy such as this. The range of criteria generally relevant to the consideration of proposals for listed building consent³ are not prioritised in national planning guidance, and demand a balanced judgement which will vary from case to case. Provided that the statutory duty referred to above is discharged, the decision maker should be able to weigh the environmental considerations in a proposal affecting a listed building against any other material considerations, although environmental matters will usually carry considerable weight. In these circumstances I do not consider that Policy CH1 should be changed in the manner suggested in Objection 215/41.

Inspector's Recommendation

11.4 I recommend that the UDP be modified by the amendment of Policy CH1 and its Reasoned Justification in accordance with ALT/HERITAGE/002, but that no modification be made in response to Objection 215/41.

¹ ALT/HERITAGE/002 (CD056, page 129).

² As imposed by Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

³ As listed in paragraph 3.5 of PPG15.

POLICY CH2 - DEVELOPMENT AFFECTING CONSERVATION AREAS

OBJECTION: 070/67 GO-M 093/11 The Leverhulme Trust
215/42 Wirral Green Belt Council

Summary of Objections

11.5 The word 'normally' should be deleted from Policy CH2 (070/67, 215/42). The Policy fails fully to take the guidance in PPG15 *Planning and the Historic Environment* into account and fails to provide adequate development control guidance. It should list criteria by which development will be considered (093/11).

Assessment and Conclusions

11.6 A published change to Policy CH2 omits 'normally'¹. The proposed amendments also include a restructuring of the Policy which would make it more positive in tone whilst retaining and clarifying criteria for effective development control. There is implicit reference to the statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character of appearance of the (conservation) area². The Policy as proposed to be amended also refers to specific elements of character such as the retention of important views, the relationship between buildings and spaces and the character and setting of 'period' buildings. Reference is also made to detailed design and use of materials. These proposed changes are in my view an adequate response to the criticisms expressed in Objection 093/11.

Inspector's Recommendation

11.7 I recommend that the UDP be modified by the amendment of Policy CH2 in accordance with ALT/HERITAGE/003.

¹ ALT/HERITAGE/003 (CD056, page 131).

² As imposed by Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

**POLICY CH4 - BIDSTON VILLAGE CONSERVATION AREA
(POLICIES CH5 TO CH23)**

OBJECTIONS: 024/1 Bidston Village Conservation Area Advisory Committee
044/5 to 044/7 The Vyner Estate 070/68 GO-M
215/43 to 215/63 Wirral Green Belt Council

Summary of Objections

- 11.8 The word 'normally' should be deleted from Policy CH4 (070/68). Policies CH4 to CH23 should make it clear that when interests conflict, the preservation and character of the environment will take precedence (215/43 to 215/62). Policies CH4 to CH23 should also, where applicable, contain additional criteria to ensure the protection of associated landscapes (215/63).
- 11.9 Policy CH4 should be amended to reflect that the character of Bidston Village was influenced by land use considerations (in particular rural activities) as well as the retention of buildings and their settings. This would involve the identification and protection of paddocks and grazing fields (024/1).
- 11.10 The reference in the last sentence of Policy CH4 to development not being permitted in the precincts of Ivy Farm, Yew Tree Farm and adjacent to Lennox Lane should be deleted. The designation of the Conservation Area does not necessarily mean that new buildings would cause demonstrable harm, especially where visual separation can be maintained and where new buildings complemented the area's unifying features. Sensitively designed housing could preserve and enhance the land concerned, incorporating open space which would benefit the locality and Conservation Area (044/5 to 044/7).

Assessment and Conclusions

11.11 A published change to Policy CH4 omits 'normally'¹. I concur with the Council's view that it would be inadvisable to prioritise considerations in Policies CH4 to CH23. The range of criteria generally relevant to the consideration of proposals in conservation areas demands a balanced judgement which will vary from case to case. Provided that the duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area² is discharged, the decision maker should be able to weigh the environmental considerations against any other material considerations, although environmental matters will invariably carry considerable weight. In these circumstances I do not consider that Policies CH4 to CH23 need to be changed in the manner suggested in Objections 215/43 to 215/62.

¹ ALT/HERITAGE/006 (CD056, page 134).

² As set out in Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

11.12 I accept that the character of a conservation area can be influenced not only by the buildings within the designated area, but by their setting within the landscape. PPG15 *Planning and the Historic Environment* advises that where the setting of buildings which justify designation as a conservation area is important, that setting can also be included within the designated area³. Where the landscape within a conservation area contributes to its particular character or appearance of that area, such a matter must be taken into account when the desirability of preserving or enhancing that character or appearance is considered. Policies CH4 to CH23 describe the essential attributes of each conservation area worthy of preservation or enhancement; these measures are sufficient in my view to ensure that contributory landscapes are fully considered, and the additional criteria suggested in Objection 215/63 are in these circumstances unnecessary.

11.13 It is proposed to amend Policy CH4 to make reference to retaining primarily rural land uses within the precincts of Church Farm, Ivy Farm, Yew Tree Farm and Bidston Hall Farm, and to also retaining the open aspect of land between Boundary Road and Bidston Hall and at the junction of Lennox Lane and Bidston Village Road. This would meet the criticisms raised in Objection 024/1, but may mitigate against small housing development of the kind envisaged in Objections 044/5 to 044/7, although the amended Policy would no longer contain the express statement that new buildings will not be permitted in those areas.

11.14 I accept that the spaces associated with the farmhouses and buildings in the old village are an essential part of the character of the Bidston Conservation Area; hence my conclusion that the characteristics and use of these spaces should be recorded in Policy CH4 as contributing to that character. Similarly it seems to me that the open land within the Conservation Area to the north-east of the junction of Lennox Lane and Bidston Village Road reinforces the village character of the Conservation Area, as well as providing a semi-rural setting for Bidston Hall. Should it come about in the future that there was no longer the means of sustaining 'rural uses' within the village, that is a matter which would need to be assessed on its merits at that time in the context of any development proposals.

11.15 I conclude elsewhere that Bidston Village should not be included in the Green Belt⁴. If my recommendation on that matter is accepted by the Council, then the last sentence of paragraph 11.16 of the Reasoned Justification for Policy CH4 should be omitted.

Inspector's Recommendation

11.16 I recommend that the UDP be modified by the amendment of Policy CH4 and its Reasoned Justification in accordance with ALT/HERITAGE/006 subject to the deletion of the last sentence in Paragraph 11.16, but that no modification be made in response to Objections 215/43 to 215/63.

³ PPG15, paragraph 4.6.

⁴ See pages 124-127 of this report.

*Part II: Policy CH5 and supporting text - Hamilton Square Conservation Area
Policy CH6 - Birkenhead Park Conservation Area
Policy CH7 - Oxton Village Conservation Area
Policy CH8 - Rock Park Conservation Area*

POLICY CH5 - HAMILTON SQUARE CONSERVATION AREA

Written Statement Paragraphs 11.17 and 11.18

POLICY CH6 - BIRKENHEAD PARK CONSERVATION AREA

POLICY CH7 - OXTON VILLAGE CONSERVATION AREA

POLICY CH8 - ROCK PARK CONSERVATION AREA

OBJECTIONS: 070/69 to 070/72 GO-M
084/13, 084/26, 084/27 Merseyside Development Corporation
215/44 to 215/47, 215/63 Wirral Green Belt Council¹

Summary of Objections

11.17 The word 'normally' should be deleted from Policies CH5, CH6, CH7 and CH8 (070/69 to 070/72). The Reasoned Justification for Policy CH5 should refer to the extension to the Hamilton Square Conservation Area in 1994, to the broader character of the enlarged area and to the revised boundaries. The planning objectives should refer to securing renewed economic, residential and leisure activity. The Proposals Map should be amended accordingly (084/13, 084/26, 084/27).

Assessment and Conclusions

11.18 Published changes to Policies CH5, CH6, CH7 and CH8 omit 'normally'². The amendments to Policy CH5 introduce an additional objective (Criterion (iv)), seeking renewed economic, residential and leisure activity within the area. The Conservation Area extension is referred to in revised paragraph 11.17 of the Reasoned Justification, with an additional paragraph giving a broader context. It is proposed to revise the Proposals Map to indicate the extended Conservation Area³. These changes appear to meet the points raised in the Objections.

Inspector's Recommendation

11.19 I recommend that the UDP be modified:

- (a) by the amendment of Policy CH5 and the representation of the Hamilton Square Conservation Area on the Proposals Map in accordance with ALT/HERITAGE/008 and ALT/HERITAGE/009 and
- (b) by the amendment of Policies CH6, CH7 and CH8 in accordance with ALT/HERITAGE/010, ALT/HERITAGE/011 and ALT/HERITAGE/012.

¹ These Objections are considered on pages 252-253 of this report.

² ALT/HERITAGE/008 (CD056, page 136), ALT/HERITAGE/010 (CD056, page 138), ALT/HERITAGE/011 (CD056, page 139) and ALT/HERITAGE/012 (CD056, page 140).

³ ALT/HERITAGE/009 (CD056, page 137 and map following).

Part II: *Policy CH9 - Port Sunlight Conservation Area*
 Policy CH10 - Eastham Village Conservation Area
 Policy CH11 - Caldy Conservation Area
 Policy CH12 - Frankby Village Conservation Area
 Policy CH13 - Gayton Conservation Area
 Policy CH14 - Heswall Lower Village Conservation Area

POLICY CH9 - PORT SUNLIGHT CONSERVATION AREA
POLICY CH10 - EASTHAM VILLAGE CONSERVATION AREA
POLICY CH11 - CALDY CONSERVATION AREA
POLICY CH12 - FRANKBY CONSERVATION AREA
POLICY CH13 - GAYTON CONSERVATION AREA
POLICY CH14 - HESWALL LOWER VILLAGE CONSERVATION AREA

OBJECTIONS: 068/17 UML Ltd 070/73 to 070/77 GO-M
 215/48 to 215/53, 215/63 Wirral Green Belt Council¹

Summary of Objections

11.20 The word 'normally' should be deleted from Policies CH9, CH11, CH12, CH13 and CH14 (070/73 to 070/77). Policy CH9 insofar as it does not normally permit development within formal open spaces and landscaped areas within the Port Sunlight Conservation Area identified under Proposal GR2², would unreasonably restrict future development within the Lodge Grounds, Port Sunlight (GR2/73) (068/17).

Assessment and Conclusions

11.21 Published changes to Policies CH9, CH11, CH12, CH13 and CH14 omit 'normally', and there are consequential changes to the Reasoned Justification for two of the policies³. I consider an objection to the designation of a site at the Lodge Grounds, Port Sunlight under proposal GR2/73, elsewhere, and recommend that the site be deleted⁴. If that recommendation is accepted, the site would no longer be subject to the restriction on development in Policy CH9 arising from its designation under Proposal GR2, and Objection 068/17 would not be relevant.

Inspector's Recommendation

11.22 I recommend that the UDP be modified by the amendment of Policies CH9, CH11, CH12, CH13 and CH14, and the Reasoned Justification for Policies CH13 and CH14, in accordance with ALT/HERITAGE/013 to 019.

¹ These Objections are considered on pages 252-253 of this report.

² Proposal GR2 - The Protection of Greenspace within the Urban Area.

³ ALT/HERITAGE/013 (CD056, page 141), ALT/HERITAGE/014 (CD056, page 142), ALT/HERITAGE/015 (CD056, page 143), ALT/HERITAGE/016 and 017 (CD056, pages 144 and 145) and ALT/HERITAGE/018 and 019 (CD056, pages 146 and 147).

⁴ Objection 068/6; see page 211 of this report.

Part II:

- Policy CH15 - Thornton Hough Conservation Area*
- Policy CH16 - West Kirby (Old Village) Conservation Area*
- Policy CH17 - Saughall Massey Conservation Area*
- Policy CH18/supporting text-Wellington Road (New Brighton) Conservation Area*
- Policy CH19 - Thurstaston Conservation Area*
- Policy CH20 - Bromborough Village Conservation Area*
- Policy CH21 - Barnston Village Conservation Area*
- Policy CH22 - Bromborough Pool Conservation Area*
- Policy CH23 - Flaybrick Cemetery Conservation Area*

POLICY CH15 - THORNTON HOUGH CONSERVATION AREA
POLICY CH16 - WEST KIRBY OLD VILLAGE CONSERVATION AREA
POLICY CH17 - SAUGHALL MASSEY CONSERVATION AREA
POLICY CH18 - WELLINGTON ROAD (NEW BRIGHTON) CONSERVATION AREA
Written Statement Paragraph 11.55
POLICY CH19 - THURSTASTON CONSERVATION AREA
POLICY CH20 - BROMBOROUGH VILLAGE CONSERVATION AREA
POLICY CH21 - BARNSTON VILLAGE CONSERVATION AREA
POLICY CH22 - BROMBOROUGH POOL CONSERVATION AREA
POLICY CH23 - FLAYBRICK CEMETERY CONSERVATION AREA

OBJECTIONS:

- 062/8 Redrow Homes (Northern) Ltd 070/78 to 070/83 GO-M
- 084/12, 084/25 Merseyside Development Corporation
- 093/7, 093/8 The Leverhulme Trust
- 215/54 to 215/63 Wirral Green Belt Council¹

Summary of Objections

- 11.23 The word 'normally' should be deleted from Policies CH15, CH16, CH18, CH19, CH22 and CH23 (070/78 to 070/83).
- 11.24 The UDP should recognise that land to the north of the Saughall Massey Conservation Area is suitable and required for housing development, which could be made to be compatible with the objectives of the Conservation Area as set out in Policy CH17 (062/8).
- 11.25 The wording of Policy CH18/Paragraph 11.55 could unreasonably restrict development of land to the north and east of the Wellington Road (New Brighton) Conservation Area, including the former Bathing Pool site and Marine Lake (084/12, 084/25).
- 11.26 Policies CH15 and CH21 relating to the Thornton Hough and Barnston Conservation Areas are too detailed, having regard to the guidance in PPG15 *Planning and the Historic Environment*, and should be deleted (093/7, 093/8).

¹ These Objections are considered on pages 252-253 of this report.

Part II: *Policy CH15 - Thornton Hough Conservation Area*
 Policy CH16 - West Kirby (Old Village) Conservation Area
 Policy CH17 - Saughall Massey Conservation Area
 Policy CH18/supporting text-Wellington Road (New Brighton) Conservation Area
 Policy CH19 - Thurstaston Conservation Area
 Policy CH20 - Bromborough Village Conservation Area
 Policy CH21 - Barnston Village Conservation Area
 Policy CH22 - Bromborough Pool Conservation Area
 Policy CH23 - Flaybrick Cemetery Conservation Area

Assessment and Conclusions

11.27 Published changes to Policies CH15, CH16, CH18, CH19, CH22 and CH23 omit 'normally' and make other adjustments to the text of some Policies². I conclude elsewhere that the land at **Saughall Massey** referred to in Objection 062/8 should remain in the Green Belt and should not be developed for housing³. I acknowledge that apart from the Green Belt issue, it might be possible to develop part of this land for housing in a way which would not act against Policy CH17 (i and ii). I see no reason however to modify those criteria to justify development on the land in question; I do not therefore regard Objection 062/8 as making a justifiable case for any further amendment to Policy CH17.

11.28 PPG15 gives guidance to local planning authorities on the way in which development plans should contain policies for the preservation and enhancement of the historic environment in their area, both as a whole and in respect of particular neighbourhoods, which can be used in development control⁴. However, excessively detailed or inflexible policies about individual buildings or groups of buildings should be avoided⁵. The Council are justified in my view in setting out in Policies CH4 to CH23 the objectives they wish to see upheld in each declared conservation area within the Borough.

11.29 The preservation of the historic character of **New Brighton's Marine Park** (Criterion (iii) of Policy CH18) may have the effect of limiting the scope of any development proposed there. However, that objective seems to be to be an important part of protecting the character of the Conservation Area. Development is envisaged on the former Bathing Pool/Marine Lake site (Proposal TL4/1). I consider an Objection to the terms of that Proposal elsewhere⁶. The Council propose to remove the 'presumption against new development' reference in the last sentence of Policy CH18 and to replace it by reference to *priority* being given the retention of the open aspect of the land designated as Green space to the north and east of the Conservation

² ALT/HERITAGE/020 (CD056, page 148), ALT/HERITAGE/022 (CD056, page 150), ALT/HERITAGE/023 (CD056, page 151), ALT/HERITAGE/025 (CD056, page 153), ALT/HERITAGE/026 (CD056, page 154) and ALT/HERITAGE/027 (CD056, page 155).

³ See pages 150-151 of this report.

⁴ PPG15, paragraphs 2.7 and 2.8.

⁵ PPG15, paragraph 2.8.

⁶ See page 244 of this report.

Part II:

- Policy CH15 - Thornton Hough Conservation Area*
- Policy CH16 - West Kirby (Old Village) Conservation Area*
- Policy CH17 - Saughall Massey Conservation Area*
- Policy CH18/supporting text-Wellington Road (New Brighton) Conservation Area*
- Policy CH19 - Thurstaston Conservation Area*
- Policy CH20 - Bromborough Village Conservation Area*
- Policy CH21 - Barnston Village Conservation Area*
- Policy CH22 - Bromborough Pool Conservation Area*
- Policy CH23 - Flaybrick Cemetery Conservation Area*

Area. Paragraph 11.55 of the supporting text is also proposed to be clarified⁷. This appears to me to be a more flexible way of expressing the planning objectives for this land.

11.30 Most of the criteria in Policies CH15 and CH21 relating to **Thornton Hough** and **Barnston** are of general scope and do not provide detailed advice on a site- or building-specific basis. They are not therefore in my view over-restrictive or unduly prescriptive. Criterion (iii) of Policy CH15 seeks to preserve the setting of St George's Church as a focal point within Thornton Hough village, a role which I saw it clearly has. I do not therefore regard this criterion as unreasonably restrictive. The published change to Policy CH15 removes the 'presumption against' development on the Thornton Hough Recreation Ground, replacing it by reference to the objective of retaining the open character of the land to preserve the visual setting of the village. This open space is close to the village centre, falls within the Conservation Area and clearly gives the southern end of the village an attractive open character. This is clarified in a proposed amendment to the Reasoned Justification⁸. The protection of the open character of this site is therefore in my view appropriately featured in Policy CH15.

11.31 Policy CH21 may by implication be viewed as restrictive insofar as it refers to the preservation of the wooded corridor to the north of the Barnston Village and the retention of the generally spacious setting around Christ Church. However to me it reflects an objective assessment of the character of the Conservation Area; it does not expressly preclude development either generally or in respect of specific sites, although the preservation or enhancement of the character of the Conservation Area may restrict opportunities for new development. In summary, I do not consider that Policies CH15 or CH21 are unreasonably detailed or over-restrictive, given their purpose to provide the basis for the protection of the character and appearance of the Thornton Hough and Barnston Conservation Areas.

Inspector's Recommendation

11.32 I recommend that the UDP be modified by the amendment of Policy CH15 and its supporting text, Policy CH16, Policy CH18 and its supporting text and Policies CH19, CH22 and CH23 in accordance with ALT/HERITAGE/020, 021, 022, 023, 024 and 025, but that no modification be made in response to Objections 062/8, 093/7 and 093/8.

⁷ ALT/HERITAGE/024 (CD056, page 152).

⁸ ALT/HERITAGE/021 (CD056, page 149).

**POLICY CH24 -
DEVELOPMENT AFFECTING SCHEDULED ANCIENT MONUMENTS
POLICY CH25 - DEVELOPMENT AFFECTING NON-SCHEDULED REMAINS
Written Statement Paragraph 11.74**

OBJECTIONS: 070/10, 070/84, 070/85 GO-M
119/3 National Museums and Galleries on Merseyside 121/11 MAFF

Summary of Objections

- 11.33 The word 'normally' should be deleted from Policies CH24 and CH25 (070/84, 070/85). A list of unscheduled sites was included in the UDP Draft for Public Consultation and in association with Policy CH25 would be helpful to developers and others and should be reinstated (070/10, 121/11). Paragraph 11.74 of the Reasoned Justification for Policy CH25 should refer to 'Liverpool Museum, National Museums and Galleries on Merseyside' rather than the 'Field Archaeology Unit at Liverpool Museum' (119/3).

Assessment and Conclusions

11.34 Published changes to Policies CH24 and CH25 omit 'normally'¹. I accept the Council's view that as there are a great many non-scheduled archaeological sites, it would be impracticable to list them individually in the UDP; the UDP list might also become out-of-date. Instead, a proposed expansion of the Reasoned Justification for Policy CH25² would include explicit details of where and how the database of known archaeological sites in the Borough may be inspected. These details embody the correction requested in Objection 119/3.

Inspector's Recommendation

11.35 I recommend that the UDP be modified by the amendment of Policies CH24 and CH25, and of the Reasoned Justification for the latter policy, in accordance with ALT/HERITAGE/029 and 030.

¹ ALT/HERITAGE/029 (CD056, page 156) and ALT/HERITAGE/030 (CD056, page 158).

² ALT/HERITAGE/030, as above.

*Part II: Omissions from the Heritage and Conservation Section:
Historic Parks and Gardens
Industrial History and Archaeology
Old Bebington
Greasby Village
Mountwood, Prenton*

OMISSIONS FROM THE HERITAGE AND CONSERVATION SECTION:

**Historic Parks and Gardens; Industrial History and Archaeology
Old Bebington; Greasby Village; Mountwood, Prenton**

OBJECTIONS: 007/1 Mr J O'Neil 048/1 Mr W G Favager 049/1 Ms N Cristall
119/1, 119/2 National Museums and Galleries on Merseyside
220/2 Birkenhead History Society

Summary of Objections

- 11.36 The UDP would benefit from a policy on historic parks and gardens. This would enable any proposals affecting them to be properly considered and the appropriate conservation bodies consulted. It should be made clear that such a policy would apply to any new sites in the Historic Parks and Gardens Register designated during the Plan period (119/1, 119/2). There is no specific mention of industrial archaeology in the Plan (such as in Policy CHO1¹ or its Reasoned Justification). This is important in the Wirral and needs a higher profile (220/1).
- 11.37 Consideration should be giving to declaring a conservation area in Greasby Village (007/1). The UDP makes no mention of any building in the old village of Bebington, such as Pennant House, Mayer Hall, the Clock Tower and associated buildings given to the people by Joseph Mayer for future generations to enjoy (048/1). The decision of the Council not to declare the Mountwood, Prenton area as a conservation area will open up the area to harmful development. That decision ought therefore to be reviewed, and the inclusion of Stanley Avenue considered (049/1).

Assessment and Conclusions

11.38 A published change to the UDP² would introduce a new policy, CH26 relating to **historic parks and gardens**, and seeking to protect such areas from harmful development. This accords with national planning guidance in PPG15 *Planning and the Historic Environment*³. It can in my view be left as understood that this policy would apply to any new sites designated under the Historic Parks and Gardens Register, and express reference to that fact is unnecessary.

11.39 The Council maintain that there is no justification for any express reference to **industrial history and archaeology** in the UDP, as there are no conservation areas based on

¹ Policy CHO1 - The Protection of Heritage.

² ALT/HERITAGE/031 (CD056, page 160).

³ PPG15, paragraph 2.24.

*Part II: Omissions from the Heritage and Conservation Section:
Historic Parks and Gardens
Industrial History and Archaeology
Old Bebington
Greasby Village
Mountwood, Prenton*

industrial areas, nor designated industrial scheduled Ancient Monuments. I accept that Policy CH25 as proposed to be amended⁴ would apply to features capable of being categorised under the 'industrial archaeology' heading. What appears to me to be important is that the Sites and Monuments Record for Merseyside⁵ contains all sites considered to be of interest as archaeological sites, including those constituting 'industrial archaeology'. I do not therefore consider it essential that this term should receive a specific mention in the UDP.

11.40 The buildings mentioned in Objection 048/1 are clearly of some historical and townscape interest, but are not listed as of special historical or architectural interest⁶. The Council confirm whilst that they have considered declaring **Bebington Village** as a conservation area, this area was not regarded as meriting formal action. Whilst the Council could review the position this is not a function of the UDP, and I therefore conclude that no change to the UDP is justified. The Council considered possible declaration of **Greasby Village** as a conservation area in 1990, but concluded that it did not merit such action. I saw that the old village does possess some buildings of character and it would be open for the Council to review the position, again as a separate exercise from the UDP. I therefore recommend no change to the Plan.

11.41 I saw that the **Mountwood** area contains many large individually designed houses set in extensive mature gardens bounded by attractive walls, hedges or other means of enclosure. The Council considers that the area is worthy of declaration as a conservation area, but state that resources have not yet enabled the necessary work to be done. When the area has been declared (and it would be for the Council to decide upon the merits of including Stanley Avenue), it would be appropriate for a policy to be inserted into the UDP describing the features which should be protected and enhanced in the area. Until then it is not in my view necessary, and it might be inconsistent and confusing, for a specific policy on Mountwood to be included. I note that development proposals in the area would be considered under HS3/2⁷, which should enable harmful developments of excessive density or incompatible character to be resisted.

Inspector's Recommendation

11.42 I recommend that the UDP be modified by the insertion of a new Policy (CH26) and its Reasoned Justification in accordance with ALT/HERITAGE/031, but that no modification be made in response to Objections 007/1, 048/1, 049/1 and 220/2.

⁴ Development Affecting Non-scheduled Remains; proposed amendment ALT/HERITAGE/030 (CD056, page 130).

⁵ Referred to in the UDP Written Statement, proposed amended paragraph 11.73b (ALT/HERITAGE/030 (CD056, page 131).

⁶ Under Section 1 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

⁷ Policy HS3 - Density and Design Guidelines; Area 2 - Mountwood, Prenton.

CONSERVATION AREAS AND SCHEDULED ANCIENT MONUMENTS: Proposals Map

COUNTER-OBJECTIONS: 090/B, 090/D Mr D I Maurice Jones

Summary of Objections

11.43 The proposals to endorse the Proposals Map Key with the words 'for illustrative purposes only' in relation to Conservation Areas and the sites of Scheduled Ancient Monuments¹ should not be put into effect, because the whole of the Proposals Map is for illustrative purposes.

Assessment and Conclusions

11.44 The Council make the point that the definition of Conservation Areas and of sites scheduled as Ancient Monuments is not a function of the UDP, and the Objector does not appear to dispute this. The definition of other areas, such as allocations of land or designations of Urban Greenspace is however part of the UDP process, and it is therefore right in my view that this distinction should be recognised in the manner proposed.

11.45 Other designations such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest are defined under separate provisions, and their origins, together with those relating to Conservation Areas and Scheduled Ancient Monuments are in my view generally explained in the appropriate parts of the Written Statement². I do not consider that any further amendment is needed to the Proposals Map by way of explanation of the background to designations, as the Map should be read with the Written Statement.

Inspector's Recommendation

11.46 I recommend that the UDP be modified by the amendment of the Proposals Map in accordance with ALT/HERITAGE/005 and 029.

¹ ALT/HERITAGE/005 (CD056, page 133) and ALT/HERITAGE/029 (CD056, page 157).

² See UDP Written Statement paragraphs 11.6, 11.14, 11.17, 11.20, 11.22, 11.25, 11.28, 11.30, 11.32, 11.35, 11.38, 11.41, 11.45, 11.48, 11.51, 11.53, 11.56, 11.59, 11.62, 11.65, 11.67, 11.70, 13.15, 13.17.