

Feedback from Mr Sinclair to the Lowerhouse extension to the Bollington Cross Conservation Area

<p><u>PUBLIC CONSULTATION - BOLLINGTON CROSS & LOWERHOUSE CONSERVATION AREA</u> ①</p> <p>REPORT RECEIVED ON 3/2/2020 FROM EMMA HARRIS WHO DESCRIBES THE DOCUMENT AS A MANAGEMENT PLAN.</p> <p>THERE IS NO SUCH AREA AS: <u>BOLLINGTON CROSS & LOWERHOUSE CONSERVATION AREA</u></p> <p>THE REPORT DESCRIBES THE DOCUMENT AS A CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL YOU CANNOT APPRAISE ANY OTHER AREAS THAN <u>BOLLINGTON CROSS CONSERVATION AREA</u></p> <p>FUNDAMENTALLY THE DOCUMENT IS FLAWED AS THE FRONT TITLE PAGE IS WRONG & TOTALLY MISLEADING. THE MOST RECENT DOCUMENT RECEIVED ON 3/2/2020 SHOULD HAVE BEEN DATED ACCORDINGLY & NOT DATED SEPT 2019.</p> <p>BOLLINGTON CROSS CONSERVATION AREA WAS DESIGNATED IN 1993 & HAS NEVER BEEN REVIEWED IN THE PREVIOUS 27 YEARS. BY ALL MEANS APPRAISE THE EXISTING CONSERVATION AREA FIRST BEFORE ATTEMPTING TO MAKE CONSIDERABLE CHANGES TO THE BOUNDARIES.</p> <p>HIDDEN WITHIN THE REPORT ARE PROPOSALS TO INCLUDE UP TO 7 ACRES OF PRIVATELY OWNED LAND KNOWN AS HALL HILL FIELDS IN A NEW CONSERVATION AREA.</p> <p>THIS REPORT I UNDERSTAND HAS BEEN COMPILED AT THE REQUEST OF BOLLINGTON TOWN COUNCIL. I WOULD RECORD THAT BOLLINGTON TOWN COUNCIL HAVE</p>	<p>The title page has been considered at length and it is still felt this best reflects the changes to the conservation area.</p> <p>Report has been re dated and edited to reflect all changes and references to draft or proposed.</p> <p>Just because this conservation area has not been revised in a number of years is no reason not to look at extending the area at the same time as looking at the original area again</p> <p>While the heritage group of Bollington Town Council did request CEC looking at Lowerhouse for inclusion within a conservation area it did not have the final say on what areas are to be included in the appraisal.</p>
---	--

IN THE PAST ATTEMPTED TO ESTABLISH RIGHTS OF WAY (2)
FOR FOOTPATHS OVER THIS LAND & THEIR APPLICATION
WAS REJECTED

MORE RECENTLY THEY HAVE CONSIDERED APPLYING FOR
VILLAGE GREEN STATUS OVER THE LAND AT HALL
HILL FIELDS, THEY DID NOT FOLLOW THIS PROCESS
THROUGH AS IT WOULD HAVE FAILED THE MOST BASIC
REQUIREMENTS OF ESTABLISHMENT.

SECTION 4 - INTRODUCTION

4.1.1.2. THE CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL WOULD NORMALLY
ONLY LOOK AT POTENTIAL EXTENSIONS IN THE APPROPRIATE
SECTIONS

WHY THEN DOES THIS REPORT SEEK TO EXTEND THE
CONSERVATION AREA TO INCLUDE 7 ACRES OF OPEN
LAND AT HALL HILL IN THE OWNERSHIP OF ORGANIC
DEVELOPMENTS

THIS REPORT SHOULD NOT BE USED AS THE TEMPLATE
TO EXTEND THE EXISTING CONSERVATION AREA
ESPECIALLY AS NO REVIEW OF THE EXISTING HAS
EVER BEEN DONE.

CIRESHIRE EAST COUNCIL STATES

WE HAVE SOUGHT TO AVOID CONFUSION BY REFERRING
TO IT AS A PROPOSED EXTENSION. THE TITLE PAGE
OF THE REPORT SHOULD HAVE REFLECTED THIS VIEW.

SUGGESTED TITLE PAGE HEADING
BOLLINGTON CROSS CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL
- SUGGESTED EXTENSION TO LOWERHOUSE/HALL HILL

Not part of our assessment, it has been made clear within the appraisal that the land is private and there is no right of way.

The objective of this report is to identify areas that will contribute to the conservation area, either in its current form or an extended form where there are valid reasons for inclusion of new areas of land. In this instance there is an historical connection with workers from Lowerhouse Mill walking up Hall Hill to go home or to the school etc.

SECTION 3. THE SUMMARY OF SPECIAL INTEREST

3

YOU STATE THAT BOLLINGTON CROSS CONSERVATION AREA INCLUDES EXTENSIVE GREEN SPACE.

THIS IS NOT TRUE ALTHOUGH MAY BE MORE EXTENSIVE IF YOU ARE ALLOWED TO INCLUDE HALL HILL FIELDS WITHOUT ANY JUSTIFICATION.

YOUR REPORT REFERS TO TREES ON OPEN LAND INCLUDING HALL HILL. AS ALL TREES ON HALL HILL FIELDS ARE COVERED BY A BUDGET PRESERVATION ORDER THERE IS NO NEED OR BENEFIT OF CONSERVATION AREA STATUS AS ALL TREES ARE ALREADY PROTECTED.

ASSESSMENT OF SPECIAL INTEREST

4.1.3 LOCATION & SETTING

YOU STATE - MOSS BROW IS THE HISTORIC ROUTE TO LONGHOUSE FROM BOLLINGTON.

I AGREE WITH THIS STATEMENT & AM HAPPY TO DISCUSS A BUFFER ZONE ON THE BORDER OF MY LAND AT THE POINT IT MEETS MOSS BROW.

4.4. OPEN SPACES PARKS & GARDENS

6) WITHIN THE CONSERVATION PROPOSED EXTENSION THE MOST SIGNIFICANT OPEN SPACE IS HALL HILL, ESPECIALLY TO THE SOUTHERN SECTION ALONG HOSKINSON ROAD.

THE AREA OF HALL HILL THAT BORDERS HOSKINSON ROAD IS NOT PART OF THE PROPOSED EXTENSION TO THE

Green space doesn't necessarily mean its publicly accessible, just as a matter of fact it is open and undeveloped land.

can still make a positive contribution to the conservation area, even with standalone protection for the trees. The legislation for designating both are different and can stand alone and together.

Amended.

~~THE REMAINING PART OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ARE~~
CONSERVATION AREA SO HAS NO RELEVANCE TO THE REPORT & IS MISLEADING! (4)

YOU STATE THAT HALL HILL FIELDS ARE A WELL USED RESOURCE THAT PROVIDE WALKS & RECREATION SPACE FOR THE LOCAL COMMUNITY.

THIS COMMENT IS TOTALLY WRONG & MISLEADING. FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS!

- 1) THIS IS PRIVATE LAND
- 2) THERE ARE NO ESTABLISHED FOOTPATHS
- 3) HISTORICALLY STEEL FENCING HAS BEEN CREATED TO STOP TRESPASS. THE FENCING HAS BEEN VANDALISED
- 4) PRIVATE LAND SIGNS HAVE MORE RECENTLY BEEN ERASED AT - GREG AVENUE & ASHBROOK ROAD & HAVE BEEN VANDALISED & DESTROYED
- 5) THE LAND IS TOTALLY OVERTGROWN & SHOWS VERY LITTLE EVIDENCE OF CONTINUED TRESPASS

YOU STATE THAT THE LAND AT HALL HILL PROVIDES AN OPEN VIEW OF GREEN LAND

THIS IS PRIVATE LAND & IS NOT OPEN TO PUBLIC ACCESS & THEREFORE DOES NOT PROVIDE OPEN VIEWS.

CHARACTER & INTERRELATIONSHIP SPACES

YOU STATE - SMALL OPEN SPACES SUCH AS HALL HILL PROVIDE RELIEF FROM THE BUILT UP AREAS

Amended

Amended

The land is open, this contributes to the significance of the CA, this does not mean it is open space in the sense that it is open to the public. This has been clarified in the document.

AS THE LAND IS IN PRIVATE OWNERSHIP IT DOES NOT PROVIDE ANY SIGHT RELIEF OTHER THAN TO THE RESIDENTS IN PARADES AT THE TOP OF HALL HILL. (S)

4.4 POINTS 10-18.

THESE POINTS ARE MISSING FROM THE REPORT. MR A RAMSDELL ASSURES ME THAT IT IS DUE TO A NUMBERING ERROR IN THE REPORT & NO MATTERS HAVE BEEN OMITTED.

LANDMARKS & POSITIVE CONTRIBUTIONS

YOU STATE - LONGLEIGH MILL CHIMNEY IS VISIBLE FROM HALL HILL

1) AS THE LAND IS OWNED PRIVATELY & PUBLIC ACCESS IS DENIED NO SIGHT VIEW IS AVAILABLE

2) ANYWAY THE VIEW OF A CHIMNEY IS INSUFFICIENT TO WARRANT A CONSERVATION AREA EXTENSION OVER 7 ACRES OF PRIVATE LAND

DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

25. DUE TO THE COMPACT GRAIN OF THE MICA THERE ARE LIMITED OPPORTUNITIES FOR BUILDING.

THIS COMMENT IS ACTUALLY WRONG, PLEASE REFER TO SHLAA SITE NO 4091. HALL HILL FIELDS HAS THE CAPACITY TO BUILD 111 HOUSES THE SITE IS BOTH DELIVERABLE & ACHIEVABLE.

Amended

Amended /clarified.

There are limited areas for development within the conservation area. SHLAA is not an assessment of suitability for development. At the time of writing the appraisal the part 2 Local Plan remains under review and all the land remains green belt.

IDENTIFYING THE BOUNDARY

6

I STRONGLY DISAGREE WITH THE INCLUSION OF LAND AT HALL HILL (7 ACRES) BEING INCLUDED IN AN EXTENDED CONSERVATION AREA.

EXTENSION 3

I STRONGLY DISAGREE WITH HALL HILL FIELDS IN ANY CONSERVATION AREA EXTENSION. IN FACT I AM HAPPY TO DISCUSS SEPARATELY A CORRIDOR OF MY LAND THAT BORDERS MASS BRAW.

YOU SAY - THE EXTENSION AREA ALSO INCLUDES HALL HILL. THIS AREA PROVIDES INFORMAL LEISURE OPPORTUNITIES.

NO IT DOES NOT!! THIS IS PRIVATE LAND & IS NOT OPEN TO ANY PUBLIC ACCESS SO DOES NOT PROVIDE ANY INFORMAL ACCESS. AS PRIVATE LAND IS DOES NOT PROVIDE SIGNIFICANT VIEWS THAT YOU CLAIM, WITHOUT TRESPASS.

IN CONCLUSION. THE DOCUMENT ISSUED REFERS TO A CONSERVATION AREA THAT DOES NOT EXIST. AND IS TOTALLY FLOORED IN IT'S PRESENTATION.

I AWAIT CONFIRMATION THAT HALL HILL FIELDS WILL NOT BE INCLUDED IN ANY EXTENSION TO THE EXISTING CONSERVATION AREA (BOLINGDON CROSS) I RESERVE THE RIGHT TO INSTITUTE LEGAL ACTION AGAINST COTESHIRE EAST COUNCIL AS IN MY VIEW THIS REPORT IS FLAWED!!!
S E SINKAR

Noted

Not for this process.

Amended.

Clarified and amended.

The areas included in the boundary are significant for the reasons highlighted in the appraisal, the fact these spaces are private or public doesn't alter this significance. However the public/ private spaces have been clarified.

The proposed boundaries remain as recommended in the final version.