

APPENDIX 2

Schedule of consultation responses on the Draft Odiham and North Warnborough Conservation Area Appraisal published August 2021

This schedule sets out the responses received to the public consultation and how they have been addressed.

Topic	Detail	Page number	Comment	Response/Action
Purpose of the appraisal	At start of Document	Page 1	Insert statement that document as Supplement Planning Guidance status, is adopted by HDS as S.PK.G. and supplements Local Plan and N. Plan.	Clarify that the document will go to Cabinet to be 'endorsed' and will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.
Conservation Area Boundaries	End of King Street/ Cemetery Hill	Map on Page 74	Why is agricultural field included in conservation area	It protects important views into and out of the Conservation Area.
Conservation Area Boundaries	Settlement boundary at Butts Cottages	Map - page 74	Should be extended to include garden of Butts Cottages	The conservation area boundary already includes the gardens of Butts Cottages. If this comment is referring to the settlement boundary identified in local plan and neighbourhood plan, it cannot be changed through a conservation area appraisal, it can only be changed through a local plan or neighbourhood plan process.
Conservation Area Boundaries	North Warnborough to the north	Map - page 83	Extending to the north, would afford CA protection to boundary trees around land designated as prone to flooding.	It would be an inappropriate extension as there is no recognizable boundary or

Topic	Detail	Page number	Comment	Response/Action
				character to justify inclusion of this area of land in the CA.
2.0 Overview	Wrong map	Page 6	Map on page 6 should show both Conservation Areas not just Odiham. Yellow lines are wrong if c.a. boundary, are they settlement boundary?	The caption to the map has been clarified stating that the yellow line around the settlement is original to the 1896 map. There is no similar map showing North Warnborough hence it is not shown.
2.0 Overview	2.3 North Warnborough Conservation Area: summary of special interest	Page 7	2.3 Correction required - Thatched Cottage is box framed and dates from 1444/5. Cruck Cottage is one of the easternmost examples of cruck construction in the country and is dated 1382-1384.	Agree – replace reference to Thatched Cottage with Cruck Cottage.
3.0 Summary History	Illustration	Page 10	Map on page 10 is incorrect and misleading and most of the area is outside the two conservation areas.	Clarify that the map is indicative only and included for historic interest.
4.2 Townscape details: Odiham		Page 14	Materials – reference should be made to the large number of slate roofs in the CA.	Agree – text has been amended accordingly.
4.2 Townscape details: Odiham	Street furniture and public realm	Page 15	Upper picture. Caption should read: “67-69 High Street. The re-fronted north facade of a major 15th- centre courtyard house”	Agree but centre should be ‘century’
4.2 Townscape details: Odiham	Building materials	Page 14	Addition of “windows and exterior doors are of timber, painted”. Without such addition there is no	Agree – text has been added at page 14.

Topic	Detail	Page number	Comment	Response/Action
			text from which it can be deduced that plastic and stained timber are inappropriate materials	
4.3 Open Space Assessment: Odiham	Open space outside the conservation area	Page 21	There is no mention of Odiham Common or Broad Oak Common.	Settlements at Odiham Common and Broad Oak Common are separate geographically and too distant to be included in the Odiham or NW CAs.
4.3 Open Space Assessment: Odiham	Bury Car Park	Page 20, no. 10	Disagree with wording as the Bury is a square and is a strong contributor	Agree, words should be changed to "...old Fire Station and its yard Take out words "incongruous" and reword This says 'agree', and the wording has been edited to insert reference to the 'yard', but the appraisal still shows this as a negligible contributor. Should this be changed?
4.3 Open Space Assessment: Odiham	Open space outside the conservation area	Page 21	More importance should be given to the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area which is close to both Odiham and N Warnborough Conservation Areas	Disagree. The text is clear that much of the canal is enclosed by vegetation, limiting the visibility between it and the conservation area. However, text has been added at 2.1 Location and Context to clarify that the Basingstoke Canal (and the Basingstoke Canal Conservation Area) runs to the north of Odiham and through

Topic	Detail	Page number	Comment	Response/Action
				North Warnborough, directly abutting both conservation areas.
4.3 Open Space Assessment: Odiham	Butts Cottages, Cemetery Hill	Map - page 80 Page 21 no. 13 Page 17	This is not open space but private garden and should not be included in map of assessment of open space. Open space 13 - description.	Disagree. This area should be included as open space. However, the description on page 21 should be changed from "agricultural field" to "mostly agricultural field". Clarify under 4.3 that private gardens are 'generally' not included in this assessment of open space with some few exceptions.
4.3 Open Space Assessment: Odiham		Page 76 Open Space	Should Kitchen Garden be included as a contributor in its own right. It is in independent ownership and it would seem necessary to list independently as otherwise it stands out as unprotected. (space close to 2, 6 and 9)	Agree. This has been changed to having 'some contribution', - see No.9 Kitchen Garden on page 20 of the final version. Subsequent numbering of open spaces has been adjusted.
4.5 Character zones: Odiham	Illustration	Page 31	Wrong caption. Should be All Saints Church (no apostrophe)	Agree – correction has been made
4.6 Spatial and urban analysis: North Warnborough		Page 32	4.6 third bullet point Castlebridge Cottages requires correction. probably the most unusual urban domestic building from mediaeval Hampshire' They are not rural examples	Agree – text has been amended accordingly.

Topic	Detail	Page number	Comment	Response/Action
4.6 Spatial and Urban analysis: North Warnborough	North Warnborough	Page 32	Error in saying NW has a linear settlement form with no centre. This carries forward error from previous CAA. Statement contradicted by the Hampshire County Council ancient settlements appraisal of 1999, which is the most authoritative document in this regard, and asserts that the original settlement comprised clusters of buildings. 18th and 19th century maps show development spread outwards and neither the village as a whole nor the conservation area today can be described as linear.	Disagree. It is visually linear.
4.7 Townscape details: North Warnborough	Caption to second photo	Page 33	For Cruck Cottage picture, add "The earliest dated crown-strut roof in Hampshire at Shepherd's Cottage/Oakholme (1402)"	Agree with addition of 'is ' ie : "The earliest dated crown-strut roof in Hampshire is at Shepherd's Cottage/Oakholme (1402)" Pam and DH note that this has not been added.
4.7 Townscape details: North Warnborough	Building materials	Page 34	Addition of "windows and exterior doors are of timber, painted". Without such addition there is no text from which it can be deduced that plastic and stained timber are inappropriate materials	Agree – text has been added at pages 34.

Topic	Detail	Page number	Comment	Response/Action
4.7 Townscape details: North Warnborough	Wrong picture	Page 34	Illustration is inappropriate example to illustrate (it is modern). Historic brick logging in conservation areas is always horizontal not diagonal. Diagonal nogging is part of vernacular in some counties (Kent, Suffolk) not this area.	Agree it is a bad example of brick nogging. Herringbone brickwork in Odiham/NW is rare, and examples found have always been modern C20 additions. Suggest a photograph of historic brick nogging with lime mortar which better reflects the local vernacular is used instead. This has been corrected.
4.8 Open Space Assessment: North Warnborough	North Warnborough 21 and 22	Map - page 86	Boundary line to left of figure 22 should be deleted. It is incorrect, legal boundary is under figure 22.	Agree. Correction has been made.
4.8 Open Space Assessment: North Warnborough	Parcel 21	Page 38	Description misleading and not true as canal cannot be seen because of embankment. The views in page 83 do not mention parcels 21 or 22 so why is this view noted with the description as being of note or importance. Description should be reviewed and separated out between existing situation and future situation as site within NP.	Don't agree about separating out between current situation and future situation, but wording has been changed to "allowing potential views from the road towards the canal ..."
4.8 Open Space Assessment: North Warnborough	Parcel 22	Page 39	The area to the rear of Castle Bridge Cottages includes a higher density of development, including a recent residential development, a pumping station along the north boundary and Barley House to the	Agree that clarification is needed – the text and map have been adjusted to be clearer on the extent of these spaces. In the revised document, these spaces are numbers 22 and 23.

Topic	Detail	Page number	Comment	Response/Action
			<p>south. This is quite of different character to the open field to the north which extends from the canal corridor up to the hedgerow boundaries of houses (listed buildings) along Hook Road. The two areas of Open Space are of different character and represent a contrasting degree of change in the layout and form of development within the conservation area. It is considered that the extents of Open Space 21 and 22 should be defined and the contrasting character of the spaces to the north of Barley House expressed within the appraisal. The area to the north of Barley House and to the east of Castle Bridge Cottages is also an allocated site in both the ONWNP and in the Hart Local Plan - 2032. This has been omitted in the section of the appraisal dealing with Open Space 22.</p>	<p>Allocations for development in any plans are irrelevant as this is an appraisal of the situation as it is today.</p>
<p>4.8 Open Space Assessment: North Warnborough</p>	<p>25 and 26</p>	<p>Page 76, and 86 Open Space</p>	<p>If 14, 23 and 24 are strong, then it is reasonable for both 25 and 26 also to be strong - both have footpaths which are noted as one</p>	<p>Agree that 25 is important to the setting as very open and visible from many points. Disagree agree that 26 is a strong contributor because from within</p>

Topic	Detail	Page number	Comment	Response/Action
			of considerations for strong contributors.	the conservation area you only get glimpsed views from The Street to 26.
4.10 Character zones: North Warnborough	Zones or Areas?	Page 41 and page 88	Page 41 states character zones, map on page 88 caption reads character areas. Name should be the same.	Agree. Use the term 'character zones' consistently. Change 'areas' to 'zones' on map. With regard to Odiham character zone 4: West Street amend the text as it refers only to clay tiled roofs when many are slated. In addition, add text to explain that timber casement windows are typical of the area, and buildings are typically built along the edge of the street with no or limited set-backs.
4.10 Character zones: North Warnborough	Character Zone 2: Hook Road	Page 42	Error in saying NW has a linear settlement form with no centre. This carries forward error from previous CAA. Statement contradicted by the Hampshire County Council ancient settlements appraisal of 1999, which is the most authoritative document in this regard, and asserts that the original settlement comprised clusters of buildings. 18th and 19th century maps show	Disagree. It is visually linear.

Topic	Detail	Page number	Comment	Response/Action
			development spread outwards and neither the village as a whole nor the conservation area today can be described as linear.	
4.10 Character zones: North Warnborough	Zone 2 North Warnborough	Page 42	Bullet no. 4: Misleading comment about views and the land is not open as very overgrown and privately owned.	Disagree. Wording is correct
4.10 Character zones: North Warnborough	Albion Yard	Page 44	This should be in Zone 2 not Zone 4. It lies within the settlement boundary and is designated for housing development in NP.	Disagree. Whilst part of this site (southern section) is an allocated site for new homes in the neighbourhood plan, the land is being assessed as it exists today not in anticipation of what it might look like if it is developed.
Appendix A: History	Wrong caption	Page 68	Should read "Detail of Will Godson's map, 1739)"	Agree – has been changed to "Detail of Will Godson's map of the manor of Odiham, 1739".
Appendix A: History	Wrong caption	Page 70	Delete entire second sentence, (because the car park replaced the Old Fire Station, not a barn, and the historic barn behind the Oast Garage still exists today)	Agree – change made – and in addition 'King Street' is added to first sentence.
Maps	Wrong terminology in key to map of Odiham character zones	Page 82	1. The Little Park 7. Chalk Pit and Close Meadow Appendix Odiham Character areas	This comment relates to the key for the map showing Odiham character zones. It is not considered necessary to change references to Little Park to 'The' Little Park. Equally no need to change references reference to

Topic	Detail	Page number	Comment	Response/Action
				Close Meadow to 'The' Close Meadow.
Maps	Outbuildings	Page 45	<p>The problem concerns outbuildings, some of which are historic and are positive contributors (an example is the early C18 gazebo in the back garden of 16 Odiham High Street, which can be seen from the S side of the High Street). The problem can, I suggest, be overcome by adding a note as an extra and final element on page 45 - such a note would function as a kind of footnote, e.g.</p> <p>"A note on outbuildings The preparation of this appraisal has not included a survey of significant outbuildings in the conservation areas. Accordingly, outbuildings are left uncoloured on the maps, and no inference as to the nature of the contribution made by any particular outbuilding should be made from the absence of colouring. Most outbuildings of listed buildings are curtilage-listed, but have not been coloured as such."</p>	Agree. Text regarding outbuildings has been inserted at 5.2 page 45.

Topic	Detail	Page number	Comment	Response/Action
Maps	Heritage, positive contributors	Page 81	<p>The key: first, the shading for scheduled monuments should be removed from this key, because there are no scheduled monuments on this map;</p> <p>The key: the order of the key is presently illogical but it can be made logical by rearranging it into hierarchical order, as follows: grade I, grade II*, grade II, locally listed, positive buildings, non-contributing buildings.</p> <p>The same comment applies to the corresponding map of the North Warnborough c.a. (page 87), except that there the key has to continue to include scheduled monuments (at the head of the hierarchy, followed by grade I, and so on).</p>	The keys of these maps have been amended.
Maps	Heritage, positive contributors	Page 81	Car park on the site of the old Fire Station: under the rules which this map follows with respect to everything else, it's impermissible to colour the car park, because it's not a building but an open space: colouring this single open space pink would imply, wrongly, that no other open space in the c.a. makes a negative contribution to	Disagree – it is a feature and so it is appropriate to colour it. It does not contribute to the defined character so is coloured pink.

Topic	Detail	Page number	Comment	Response/Action
			the character of the c.a. In fact, there are other detracting open spaces and gaps, such as the horrible unloading area behind the Co-op, the forecourt of the Oast Garage, and (in its present state) the car park of the Vine Church.	
Maps	Heritage, positive contributors	Page 81	High Street, N side [note that house numbers are given on the coloured map at the end of OCACAMP]:- Although nos 42, 44 and 44A have High Street addresses, their driveway is private and the High Street doesn't turn a corner into it: the words High Street should not appear on that driveway	Agree - label was removed
Maps	Heritage, positive contributors	Page 81	Goodchild Square: the small block should be pink, not grey (it is residential, with parking space at ground-floor level)	Agree – this has been changed
Maps	Heritage, positive contributors	Page 81	No.66 (Courtyard Cottage) should be green, not grey (this building was erected in the late C19 as the stable block of Orchard House)	Agree – this has been changed so it is recognized as a positive contributor.
Maps	Heritage, positive contributors	Page 81	Ackender House (behind no.68: an L shape on the map) should be green, not grey (a good building, compliant with OCACAMP)	Agree – this change has been made.

Topic	Detail	Page number	Comment	Response/Action
Maps	Heritage, positive contributors	Page 81	No.88 (Byways) and nos 1-4 Fountain Terrace (S of no.88) should be pink, not green. This is an extremely serious mistake. I have no images which I can supply in order to demonstrate that these are damaging elements. But in case the consultants have no images either, I can at least point out that (as proved by this map) Byways is closer to the Little Park and much larger than the pink 42 High Street and its adverse impact on the Little Park is thus proportionally much greater than that of no.42. In addition, it can easily be appreciated that allowing Fountain Terrace to be built was a direct contravention of OCACAMP (see OCACAMP, page 45).	Disagree – it is appropriate to the conservation area.
	Heritage, positive contributors	Page 81	No 90 (Fountains Mall): the grey in the middle of the front block should be yellow (because the opening is at ground level only); but the block behind (named The Wheat House) is modern and unlisted so should not be yellow (see coloured map in OCACAMP	Agree – this change has been made

Topic	Detail	Page number	Comment	Response/Action
			for dividing line between front and back blocks).	
Maps	Heritage, positive contributors	Page 81	High Street, S side [again, see OCACAMP map for house numbers]:- No.5: the part shaded grey is oversailed by the upper storey of the house: should be yellow	Agree – this change has been made
Maps	Heritage, positive contributors	Page 81	Nos 27-33: these form an unbroken terrace and all are listed: the area of grey in the middle needs to be converted to yellow	Agree – this change has been made
Maps	Heritage, positive contributors	Page 81	No.37 (Waytes): this is a C20 house built on a backland site and is of no interest: it is not locally listed and it should be coloured grey, not blue Waytes Barn (behind no.41 and beside the driveway to Waytes): this is the building which is locally listed: it should be coloured blue, not green	Agree that main house should be coloured grey. Waytes Barn is shown as a positive contributor (references to local list in this appraisal have been replaced as 'positive contributors').
Maps	Heritage, positive contributors	Page 81	No.45: the consultants have repeated an error made on the coloured map in OCACAMP: in fact, the whole of this very deep property is both ancient and listed: the whole should be yellow, not just the front part Note on Hart	Agree – this change has been made

Topic	Detail	Page number	Comment	Response/Action
			maps it is also incorrect, see Historic England listing site	
Maps	Heritage, positive contributors	Page 81	Archway of no.85: this should be yellow, not grey, because it is listed and it is oversailed by the upper storey of a listed building (see Historic England mapping)	Agree – this change has been made
Maps	Heritage, positive contributors	Page 81	Church Street: 1-2 Bury Villas is a pair of grade II properties, but on the present draft of this map no.1 (the W property) is grey: needs to be yellow (see Historic England mapping)	Agree – this change has been made
Maps	Heritage, positive contributors	Page 81	King Street:- The ancient barn which runs northwards from the E end of the modern part of the Oast Garage is a very important positive contributor and needs to be coloured green [nowadays the barn is in the curtilage of the C20 Old Dray House, 55 High Street]	Agree – this change has been made
Maps	Heritage, positive contributors	Page 81	In my original submission (October 2020) I drew attention to the fact that the coloured map in OCACAMP fails to colour the cemetery gates on King Street as grade II listed. The present consultants have repeated the error, so rectification is needed. The exact location of the gates is	Agree – they are already coloured yellow but very small

Topic	Detail	Page number	Comment	Response/Action
			marked on the map which accompanies the list entry, which can be searched for by its number: 1244403.	
Views	Setting views	Page 24	Setting views - change wording to "from outside the built-up area") instead of "outside the conservation area"	Agree – wording has been changed to "outside the developed area"
(see attached sheets with new views)	Setting views	Page 24	Wording page 24 - setting views of Odiham are defined as being from outside the conservation area, but on this map Odiham views A, B and C are views from inside the conservation area.	Wording has been changed to "outside the developed area"
Views	Maps	Page 83	View from Hook Road eastwards positioned to the south of Barley House and Nevills	Agree
Views	Wider setting views	Page 77	Add view from just west of crest of Hatchwood Hill across village to church tower and also southwards towards the downs along the footpath between Hatchwood House and Oak Tree Drive.	Agree Has this been addressed – Pam says yes
Views			Add view from Redbrick Cottage at Hillside back towards Odiham (wide view)	Agree
Views		Page 83	Add view from bench at corner of West St near the junction with the Firs across Hockleys Farm and across NW CA.	Disagree

Topic	Detail	Page number	Comment	Response/Action
			Add wide view from midway down West Street between its junction with The Firs and its junction with The Street looking Eastwards.	Disagree
Views	Contextual views	Page 77	Map on page 77 contextual views: two additions are needed: the views over the Chalk Pit (through the two viewing gaps in the hedge) from the footpath which runs along the top of the SE edge of the Chalk Pit. These views have been mentioned by the consultants on page 30. They are finer views than the view of the Chalk Pit from Alton Road.	Agree
Views	NW Views	Page 83	Add view looking eastwards along the Street from approx the traffic calming at its western end.	Disagree
Views		Page 83	Add view from The Cat on Hook Road up towards the canal and from the Canal opposite The Cat looking back down again (this latter re-instates one of previous CA views)	Agree
Views		Page 83	Add view from towpath looking westwards as the castle comes into sight.	Disagree
Views	Odiham Views	Page 77	View K - angle should be widened eastwards	Agree

Topic	Detail	Page number	Comment	Response/Action
Views	Add Views	Page 83	Down river Whitewater from aqueduct carrying canal over the river Approaching the Castle on towpath or by boat Towards the canal from the ford East from the Cat towards Odiham	Agree
Views	Wrong view	Page 83	View U page 83. Inconsequential glimpse never been noted before. It undermines the logic, credibility and value of the Character Appraisal. It is as if there has been a printing error of 180 degrees, since the view eastwards to Odiham across the Deer Park from the pavement outside the Cat was always highly prized.	Disagree. One of the last remaining glimpses on Hook Road due to infill building giving a glimpse of the rural part of the Conservation area, and reinforces the rural character of the area.
5.0 Heritage assets and opportunities for enhancement	Listed and Locally Listed Buildings	Page 45	5.2.Odiham should be 11 (as coloured blue on map on page 81). Waytes is a C20 house and is coloured blue in error. The locally listed structure is Waytes Barn	Agree. This change has been made.
Recommendations	1 - Article 4 Directions	Page 52	Change to sides and rear of buildings should not apply to modern properties that cannot be seen from anywhere else in CA. (i.e. Burlingham Grange, development of 12 houses in back garden)	This recommendation has been revised to state that the Article 4 Directions should be reviewed on a regular basis, taking into account the appraisal.

Topic	Detail	Page number	Comment	Response/Action
Recommendations	9 - Trees	Page 57	Further strengthening of this recommendation and inclusion of encouragement to carry out new planting to start to replace many trees that have been lost to improve biodiversity, residents' health and combat future climate change.	Trees in CAs are protected whether or not they have a tree Preservation Order and new tree planting in residential development and ecological enhancement through biodiversity gain are national requirements
Recommendations	10 - Deer Park	Page 58	More protection needed, following heritage Big Dig examination	This recommendation has been revised to better reflect the Parish's preference for a stronger designation.
Recommendations	11 - Overhead wires	Page 58	Should be expanded to include other unsightly yet essential infrastructure plant. Suggest: <i>The removal or consolidation of unsightly overhead wires, pumping stations, and all other communications technology and infrastructure plant and equipment, will be encouraged as enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation areas.</i>	This recommendation deals explicitly with communications infrastructure because this was an issue identified in the appraisal and in theory there is scope to put overhead wires underground. Most utility structures are permitted development.
Recommendations	New recommendation	n/a	Most of the recommendations in the draft relate to prevention, with the exception of the removal of overhead lines. It would be nice to include more recommendations and guidance that would positively	A further recommendation in this vein is not considered necessary. There are already policies in the local plan and neighbourhood plan that cover good design, open space and biodiversity.

Topic	Detail	Page number	Comment	Response/Action
			enhance the conservations areas, such as encouragement of gardens and tree planting and ponds in new developments - to maintain historic character and increase and support biodiversity.	
References	Additions and changes	Page 63	Add: Tithe Map of Odiham Parish, 1842	Agree – has been added into references.
References		Page 63	<i>VCH</i> : a serious mistake has been made and needs to be corrected: the present reference is to the chapter on Odiham hundred, but it's not that chapter but instead the chapter on Odiham parish which needs to be referred to here: the parish chapter is in the same volume, but its page numbers are 87-98. For the purposes of this appraisal, it's best to leave the chapter on the hundred unmentioned.	The reference to A History of the County of Hampshire has been amended.
References		Page 63	Add: Hampshire Houses 1250-1700, Edward Roberts and others, 3rd edition, 2015	Agree – this is now referred to.
General	River Whitewater	n/a	It would be helpful to hear comment on the future of the River Whitewater and its banks. It was immaculately maintained by water bailiffs and gardeners of	No change. This is not within the control of the Planning Authority

Topic	Detail	Page number	Comment	Response/Action
			Castle Mill and the Mill House until approximately 1970 and older residents would say it is a pale shadow of its former self today.	
General	Comment on two specific sites not mentioned in appraisal	n/a	The appraisal does not mention the either the Land East of Hook Road nor Swan Inn, Hook Road, North Warnborough. It may be good to see a recommendation for what should happen at these sites to maintain the nature of the conservation area with so many historic buildings in the vicinity.	No change. Land east of Hook Road is an allocated development site with identified important views. The Neighbourhood Plan (NP) sets out the design principles for the site, and local and national policies provide further protection. Open space south of Nevills is referred to on p.38, It is part of the allocated site which should be left undeveloped as set out in the NP. With regards to the Swan Inn, rather than be prescriptive on this or any other building, any proposals should be informed by an understanding of context and local character as set out in this appraisal. The revised document is clear that the appraisal is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.
General	Pavement parking	n/a	Comment on the future of pavement parking on the B3349 would be helpful. Though a recent feature, it is gradually increasing	No change. This is a matter for the Highway Authority and the police.

Topic	Detail	Page number	Comment	Response/Action
			and undoubtedly affects the setting, safety and enjoyment of pavement walks.	