Consultation Responses

Name		Comments	Conservation Area	Council Response
BB	Resident	Thanks for your circular dated 10 January 2019. I've been a Tower Gardens resident for thirty years and am passionate about maintaining its conservation status. However it feels that due to Central Government cuts and lack of interest by local Council Officers, we've lost the battle. Although Tower Gardens conservation status is (I believe) protected by law, it hasn't been enforced. The front of our houses is protected. We're forbidden from placing satellite dishes below the gutter on the front of our homes. We're also forbidden from removing hedges, maintaining the character of the estate. Yet the satellite dishes have gone up and hedges have been removed. In some cases front gardens have become car ports, interesting as the cars don't fit and stick out on pavements. Of course once the residents of one house removes their hedge and erects a satellite dish, the neighbours invaribly follow. Do you have powers of enforcement? I sincerely hope that it's not too late to halt the decline. Perhaps in the near future you could leaflet all house on the estate reminding residents that they could be prosecuted for removing hedges and placing satellite dishes below the gutter on the front of houses. In thirty years, I don't believe I've received any notice from Haringey Council regarding residents' obligation not to contravene planning regulations. I've surveyed the whole estate and can forward the results if they would help.	Tower Gardens	Concern is noted. The new appraisals record the current condition of the conservation areas in some detail, including where unauthorised or inappropriate development has had a detrimental impact. The management plans include a commitment to enforce against inappropriate change in line with the Council's adopted development charter, and outlines specific enforcement priorities (section 2.4). The updated appraisals will be an important tool in ensuring effective enforcement going forward. They will highlight key enforcement issues and provide a sound basis for enforcement action that is defensible on appeal. The appraisals include design guidelines about what works are appropriate in the CA and when consent is required, communicated in an accessible way. It is hoped that this will help prevent inappropriate works being carried out without consent in the future. It is not practicable to provide a copy of the document (which is quite large) to every resident. However, if the new appraisal is adopted, a short colour leaflet highlighting the special interest of the CA and design guidelines will be mailed to residents alongside notification of the adoption. New

				residents looking to buy a house in the area would be made aware of the conservation area designation and Article 4 as these would be revealed in a standard land charges search.

Tower Gardens Residents Group	Residents group	Please find attached a response to the draft Tower Gardens CA appraisal. In doing this I've been gathering views from as many interested parties as possible, including CAAC members, and this is noted in the letter. We have made quite a number of observations, including about green spaces, CA boundary and Article 4 designations. Residents are also very concerned about the fate of the area to the immediate north of the CA, in particular Waltheof Gardens, which they consider to be an integral part of the estate's design and on which it is feared there may be future development pressure. 25th February 2019 All groups consulted have welcomed the new Appraisal and hope that helps conserve and enhance the estate for residents, now and in the future. <u>General Comments</u> Mention could be made of origin of some road names on the estate – most are former lords of the manor of Tottenham. There is no mention of the fact that street signs in Tower Gardens say that it is a conservation area – we believe these cast iron signs were made when the CA was designated. Mention could be made of the fact that the estate has featured in London Open House/Open City for at least the past 15 years. Page 4 – this refers to Tottenham Cemetery Conservation Area when it should be Tower Gardens Conservation Area. Page 7 – Section 1.3 'The setting of the conservation area' section is misleading. "1907" repeated twice. Says Lordship Lane 'not within conservation area'- but Nos. 132-458 are in the conservation area, as noted elsewhere within the draft. Page 8 – It is unclear what "Other images 4" means. Page 9 refers to the opening of Risley Avenue School in 1912. The draft should also mention nationally listed St Benet Fink church, immediately to the south of the CA, which was built at the same time	Tower Gardens	<u>The Conservation Area Boundary</u> Concerns about the area to the north of the CA are noted. The area between Risley Avenue and the Roundway was developed after the war and did not form part of the original phase of development. It was designed along very different lines to the older part of the estate, and notably lacks the Arts and Crafts influenced architectural character and quality of the earlier phase. A comprehensive review of the boundaries of the conservation area has been undertaken in preparation of the document, and it is not considered that this area has sufficient heritage interest to warrant designation. The green corridor forms part of the setting of the estate but is not considered to have any particular heritage interest in its own right. It is not considered appropriate to include this within the designation. <u>General Comments</u> The text has been amended to include reference to street names (amendment TG2). Various errors have been corrected as appropriate. Concern about notice boards is noted. Concern about condition and enforcement is noted. The new appraisals record the current condition of the conservation areas in some detail, including where unauthorised or inappropriate development has had a detrimental impact. The management plans include a commitment to enforce against inappropriate change in line with the Council's

		also to serve the new population of the estate, and which was derived from an ancient foundation in the City of London. Page 9 – the draft says "now roughly 50% owner occupier and 50% Council owned." We think that these figures need to be checked. The estate is comprised of privately owned and occupied, privately owned and rented, owned by social landlords and rented (housing associations) and owned and rented by Homes for Haringey. 50/50 split is not accurate enough. Page 22 – notice boards on the estate – the residents' group has petitioned the council for new boards that are an asset to the CA. It is acknowledged that there have been some negative alterations to houses and gardens in the CA that it is hoped may be reversed by more sensitive restoration in future, and through clear and robust advice to home owners and enforcement where necessary. <u>Trees and Open Spaces</u> Page 7 'Trees and open spaces' refers to 'Tower Gardens Recreation Ground' and page 8 overleaf refers to 'Tower Gardens'. We suggest consistent use of 'Tower Gardens Park', which is what the open space is known as. The draft should include more detail about trees generally – paragraph 2 on page 8 is contradictory about street trees on the estate. The draft does not mention the avenue of limes on Waltheof Ave, some of which are original planting, and which has been reinforced with two subsequent plantings in the early 21st C. This will soon appear as an almost continuous line of trees. Street trees on Gospatrick Rd, many of which are large old specimens including Caucasian maples, should be noted. There are also very large old London plane trees on Awlfield Avenue. Additional trees on the estate are unusual – for example false acacias, some original specimens of which survive on Tower Gardens Road and which could be used to inspire new planting on the estate.		adopted development charter, and outlines specific enforcement priorities (section 2.4). The updated appraisals will be an important tool in ensuring effective enforcement going forward. They will highlight key enforcement issues and provide a sound basis for enforcement action that is defensible on appeal. The appraisals include design guidelines about what works are appropriate in the CA and when consent is required, communicated in an accessible way. It is hoped that this will help prevent inappropriate works being carried out without consent in the future. <u>Trees, Open Spaces, hedges and gardens</u> The appraisal includes some detail on trees and green landscaping, as does the management plan. The paragraph referenced on Page 8 is not contradictory: the comments refer to the pre-war estate and post-war estate respectively. The appraisal notes the important contribution that landscaping, planting and green space makes to the special character of the area in section 1.2 Summary of special interest and 1.3 Location and setting. Section 1.6 Condition and development pressure notes the poor condition of some hedges and gardens, as well as the detrimental impact where hedges have been replaced. Design guidance contained in the management plan states that loss of front gardens and boundary treatments for the creation of parking spaces will not be considered acceptable. It is

		On the Roundway, there are some large original surviving red flowered hawthorn trees. Privet Hedges The draft should make a stronger the case for protection of hedges on front boundaries (section 3.1). The loss of hedges and poor maintenance of them has been one of the most important issues discussed in the residents' group over the past 15 years. For most parts of the estate, hedges have been carefully conserved or replaced over the past 15 years. Gardens The draft could include more information about the important back gardens of the estate, for example the very long back gardens in Gospatrick Road. In addition, the allotment gardens in Risley Avenue could be described (including their gates). Views and vistas The view down Waltheof Gardens and Avenue frames the gates of Lordship Rec beautifully and links the gardens (as they were once) with the Recreation Ground; the view from De Quincey Road along Morteyne Road is also beautiful, with the terrace being symmetrically placed at the end. Conservation Area Boundary It is noted that it is not proposed to change the boundary of the conservation area. We would like to raise the option of extending the conservation area boundary in the northeast of the estate, to include the Roundway boundary with the large green corridor noted on page 8. This would make a neater and more logical boundary to the estate and balance it with the western boundary. The CA could also include the very fine houses on Bedwell Road, which lies to the north of the Roundway. The houses in Bedwell Road have more in common with the oldest parts of the estate and we think that this should be visited and analysed. Article 4 Boundary Maps in the draft do not show where the Article 4 boundary lies in		also note that the retention and maintenance of hedges is encouraged. However, works to hedges (as well as other gardening and planting works) do not fall under planning control. Comments have been passed on to the Council's Nature Conservation officer for consideration, and will be taken in to account in development of the Council's forthcoming Parks and Open Spaces Strategy and Biodiversity Action Plan as well as other relevant projects. The text has been amended to make reference to 'Tower Gardens Park' instead of 'Tower Gardens Recreation Ground' (amendment TG6). Article 4 Boundary The management plan includes recommendations to update the existing Article 4 Direction and extend it to include the whole of the conservation area. It is the Council's intention to bring this forward as a priority, but the changes would not come in to effect upon adoption of this appraisal. Changes to the Article 4 Direction would be consulted on separately in line with the statutory process, and further detailed information would be provided to residents at that time. The document has been amended to include a map at section 1.3 (Location and setting) showing the current boundary of the Article 4 Direction as well as the conservation area boundary (amendment TG1). Views and Vistas

		relation to the whole CA. The differing boundary of the CA and the Article 4 boundary has caused endless confusion over many years, and is only understood by a very small number of people. It is understood that there is a question about the quality of the conservation area outside the Article 4 boundary. However, if the two boundaries were coterminous, this would give vital clarity and protection to all areas of the estate, and in our view lead to sustained improvements. The draft does not seem to enumerate in full those features that are protected by the Article 4 designation. Is this deliberate and where will these features be listed? <u>Area boundaries A-E</u> Four double fronted houses at the north end of Waltheof Ave. We think these should be in Area E, not Area A, as the document itself says that they are from the 1919-23 period and are stylistically closest to Gospatrick and Henningham Rd (fenestration, brick, roofing, gardens). This would also reinforce the views about the Article 4 boundary above, and the importance of the coherent junction and long views in this part of the estate, which contributes hugely to its character. There would be no detriment to Area A in transferring these four houses to Area E. We hope that these views are useful and please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like further information on any point. Yours sincerely, Matthew Bradby Secretary, Tower Gardens Residents' Group and Chair, Tottenham Conservation Area Advisory Committee		The appraisal text has been amended to include specific reference to the views noted in this comment (amendment TG7).

AM		I am writing in response to the Bruce Castle Conservation Area Appraisal and Management plan draft and the Haringey Local Heritage List Consultation draft. I would like to make 3 points which relate to the north and north east boundaries of Bruce Castle Park. 1) Regarding the exclusion of William Atkinson House and William Rainbird house from the conservation area as per the map on page 45 of the Bruce Castle Conservation Area Appraisal and Management plan draft (section 2.7.1): The exclusion of William Atkinson House and William Rainbird house from the conservation area represents a weakening of the conservation area as a whole. It is located strategically on the border of Bruce Castle Park and as such falls in an area which Haringey council should maintain full powers of enforcement with regards to planning. By removing this area from the conservation area, over half of the north side border of Bruce Castle park will fall outside of a conservation area. Given the historic importance of Bruce Castle Park, perhaps unequaled in Haringey, this seems an unnecessary concession which will reduce the council's control over the destiny of this side of the park. I would argue that the immediate setting around the park impacts massively on the park itself. The view out from the park is just as important as the view within the park. The loss of these sites from the conservation area weakens both the council's control over the appearance of this part of the park's boundary and local Haringey residents' ability to object to developments which would in future fall within permitted development rights, such as demolition. 2) The inclusion of houses along the north boundary of Bruce Castle Park currently outside the conservation area : Relating to the existing conservation area along the north boundary of Bruce Castle Park that includes the terrace houses numbers 158 to 166, and also the cottages on Prospect Place and cottages on Cemetery Road. I would ask that the terraced houses that run from number 126 to 136 Church Rd be included in the conservation area along with the single house on the north east corner of the park	Bruce Castle	There is a statutory duty to review conservation area designations from time to time (Planning, (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, 69) and the Council must ensure that designated conservation areas are of sufficient special architectural or historic interest, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 186) and Historic England guidelines. The area in question is not considered to have any special heritage interest warranting designation. Restrictions to certain permitted development rights would no longer apply to the area following the boundary change. However, any development likely to have a significant impact on the setting of the CA would still require planning consent. Relevant planning legislation and national and local planning policy require that any impact on the setting of heritage assets is taken in to account when assessing planning applications. The Council is required to give considerable importance and weight to any harm to the setting of a designated heritage asset. The Council's consultants have undertaken a comprehensive review of the conservation area boundary as part of the appraisal. This included consideration of buildings adjacent to current boundary. The houses at 126-136 and 83 Church Rd were not considered to have sufficient heritage interest to warrant designation. The backs of houses on Bruce Castle Road form part of the setting of Bruce Castle Park,

		(Number 83 Church Rd). This would mean the entire north boundary of the park falls within a conservation area. Number 83 Church Road appears on the same map of 1864 as the terrace comprising numbers 158 to 166 Church Road, cottages on Cemetery Rd and cottages on Prospect Place (pg 14 of the draft plan). It represents the last surviving house in that terrace and as such should be given further protections. I would argue it has at least equal historic value as other houses within the current conservation area. Numbers 126 to 136 Church Road appear on the 1896 map (pg 14 of the draft plan) alongside other houses which currently fall within the conservation area along Beaufoy Rd. I would also argue that (at least) the rear of the properties along Bruce Castle Road that back onto the park also be included. Views of these properties are seen from many points within the park. The current ramshackle development along the rear of the properties on Bruce Castle Road presents nothing more than an eyesore within the historic context of the park at large. In summary: I am concerned about a weakening of the council's powers with regards to planning regulation and enforcement along the north and north east boundaries of Bruce Castle Park. By retaining number 158 to 166 Church Road on the Local Heritage List, by keeping William Atkinson House and William Rainbird House within the existing conservation area, and by extending the boundary of the current conservation area to include Number 83 Church Rd, Numbers 126 to 136 Church Rd and (at least) the rear of the properties on Bruce Castle Road the council will strengthen its control over all buildings that either face onto or back onto Bruce Castle Park. Haringey council will be able to enforce correct and appropriate planning procedures in arguably the most historically important open public space in Haringey and preserve its continuity for future generations.		but do not have sufficient heritage interest in their own right to warrant inclusion in the CA. Alterations to these houses affecting the setting of the conservation area would be required to preserve or enhance its special interest in line with national and local policy and legislation.

Historic England	Statutory Consultee	Dear Design and Conservation Team Bruce Castle, Peabody Cottages and Tower Gardens Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plan Consultations Thank you for consulting Historic England on Haringey's Draft Conservation Area Appraisals Management Guidelines. In order to avoid unnecessary repetition this response covers: Bruce Castle; Peabody Cottages; and Tower Gardens. Tottenham Cemetery is subject to a separate response dated 8 February 2019. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Accordingly, we welcome the opportunity to comment upon the above draft consultation. We have reviewed these documents against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and its core principle that heritage assets be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations. NPPF Policy 186 sets out that when considering the designation of conservation areas, local planning authorities should ensure that an area justifies such status because of its special architectural or historic interest, and that the concept of conservation is not devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest. Historic England supports the Haringey's proposals to provide up to date appraisals and management guidelines for these conservation areas. <u>Historic England General Advice</u> Historic England welcomes the publication of this document, which will help to provide a positive framework for the management of the conservation area and listed buildings. We consider the documents to be comprehensive and to provide a balanced assessment of significance and condition. We do therefore have any substantive	Tower, Peabody, Bruce Castle	Support is noted. The documents have been amended to include guidance on development affecting the settings of Bruce Castle and Tottenham Cemetery Conservation Areas (amendments BC2 and TC1). The map contained in the Bruce Castle Appraisal has been amended to accurately reflect the designation of The Elmhurst Public House (amendment BC4). Section 2.6 Heritage Lottery Funding in the Bruce Castle appraisal has been updated (amendment BC5).

		comments but can offer the following minor comments and recommendations: Bruce Castle Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan **Boundary Changes**: We note the recommendation to remove the post-war flats at the Cemetery Rd/Church Road junction. We would agree that while these are not over-scaled they do not demonstrate qualities which would make a case for inclusion in the conservation area. As such we are content for this change to be determined by the Council on the basis of advice from its specialist conservation staff. **Comments on text**: Page 37 and Page 38: The Elmhurst PH is shown as Statutory Listed and Locally Listed on the Positive and Negative Contributors Map and the Townscape Map. The principal designation should be identified. Page 44 Heritage Lottery Funding. It may be useful to refer to the wider opportunities for funding in respect of opportunities arising from S106 and Historic England. Also HLF has changed its name to National Lottery Heritage Fund and has re-prioritised grants programmes. It would therefore be sensible to update this section prior to adoption. Peabody Cottages Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan The significance of the Cottages is well defined, lying in their social history and the consistent architectural approach to the provision of charitable housing. As such, they have wider regional significance as a reflection of the developing concepts and typologies of suburban social housing, contrasting the denser urban approach of the Peabody Trust and LCC in inner London. As such they are of clear architectural and historic significance, the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance. The conservation area is clearly defined and coherent and as such we do not consider it necessary to comment further. Tower Gardens Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan The variety of picturesque architectural approaches and rich social history of Tower Gardens makes this one of the borough most notable		

		conservation areas. There have been concerns over the gradual erosion of the architectural qualities through inappropriate changes for a number of years. Historic England therefore strongly supports the proposals to produce a detailed appraisal and guidance, and the recommendations set out in Section 2.6 of the Management Plan. We consider the draft appraisal to insightful and well detailed and do not consider it necessary to offer detailed comments on the text. <u>Conclusion</u> Historic England supports the publication of these documents and we hope the above comments will assist in its delivery. If you require clarification or wish to discuss any specific issues raised please do not hesitate to contact me. Finally, it must be noted that this advice is based on the information provided by you and for the avoidance of doubt does not reflect our obligation to advise you on, and potentially object to, any specific development proposal which may subsequently relate to this or later versions of the Guidance, Appraisals and Management Plans, and which may have adverse effects on the environment.		
Historic England	Statutory Consultee	<u>Tottenham Cemetery Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Guidelines</u> Thank you for consulting Historic England on Haringey's Draft Tottenham Cemetery Conservation Area Appraisal SPD and Management Guidelines. As the Government's adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process. Accordingly, we welcome the opportunity to comment upon the above draft consultation. We have reviewed these documents against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and its core principle that heritage assets be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they	Tottenham Cemetery	Support is noted. The documents have been amended to include guidance on development affecting the settings of Bruce Castle and Tottenham Cemetery Conservation Areas (amendments BC2 and TC1).

		can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations. Historic England General Advice Historic England welcomes the publication of this document, which will help to provide a positive framework for the management of the conservation area and listed buildings. We do not have any substantive comments but can offer the following comments in respect of the recommended boundary change and issues of setting. Boundary Changes We note the recommendation to alter the existing area boundary to exclude the allotments from Sub-Area C. NPPF Policy 186 sets out that when considering the designation of conservation areas, local planning authorities should ensure that an area justifies such status because of its special architectural or historic interest, and that the concept of conservation is not devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest. Given that the prosed reduction removes an area of land designated as Metropolitan Open Land but not associated with cemetery use we are content that the proposal can be justified on such terms, and as such we are content for this to be determined by the local planning authority based on advice from its own specialist conservation staff. Setting Given the opportunity for long views across the Cemetery it would be beneficial to set out the potential sensitivities in respect of the potential impact of development within its setting which affects its significance. Our advice is available at: https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/ Conclusion Historic England supports the publication of this document and we hope the above comments will assist in its delivery. If you require clarification or wish to discuss any specific issues raised please do not hesitate to contact me.		

		Finally, it must be noted that this advice is based on the information provided by you and for the avoidance of doubt does not reflect our obligation to advise you on, and potentially object to, any specific development proposal which may subsequently relate to this or later versions of the Guidance, Appraisals and Management Plans, and which may have adverse effects on the environment.		
Natural England		Thank you for your consultation request on the above, dated and received by Natural England on 14th January 2019. Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Natural England does not have any specific comments on the Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans for Bruce Castle, Tottenham Cemetery, Tower Gardens and Peabody Cottages Conservation Areas. For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk	All	Noted.
JR		I realise this is a draft document so some of the things I've mentioned below would no doubt be picked up. Best wishes, Joyce 1. Interesting history etc. Mention could be made of origin of some road names eg Waltheof 2. No mention of the fact that street signs in Tower Gardens say that it is a conservation area – I think the only Haringey conservation area where this is the case. 3. I couldn't see map or other information showing what is in Article 4 Directive area. 4. Page 4 – refers four times to Tottenham Cemetery Conservation Area when it should be Tower Gardens Conservation Area.	Tower Gardens	The Tower Gardens Appraisal has been amended to include reference to street names (amendment TG2). Various errors have been corrected as appropriate. Concern about notice boards is noted. The document has been amended to include a map at section 1.3 (Location and setting) showing the current boundary of the Article 4 Direction as well as the conservation area boundary (amendment TG1).

		5. Page 7 – “1907” twice. Says Lordship Lane “not within a conservation area”- Nos. 132-458 are in conservation area. 6. Page 8 – Unclear what “Other images 4” means. 7. Page 9 – Says “now roughly 50% owner occupier and 50% Council owned..” Should say “50% owner occupier and private tenants and 50% Council owned”. 8. Page 20 – a photo on this page appears again on page 29. 9. Page 22 – see photo of former community hall – another sad sign is the neglected yellow notice board. Perhaps this should be removed.		
JN		I am responding to the consultation on the draft appraisal for the Tottenham Cemetery Conservation Area, with the following two comments. 1. Paragraphs 1.6.1 and 1.6.2 on pages 21-22 of the draft appraisal address the current state of the cemetery, drawing attention to a "general appearance" of "abandoned decay" and noting that "many of the monuments are now at serious risk of being damaged or becoming lost to future generations ... the tarmac paths are in need of resurfacing ... Church Path has an unkempt appearance due to invasive buddleia and sycamore growth and rusting ironwork along its border ... The boundary railings to the cemetery generally are in need of repair and maintenance". It is not at all clear from the document what action might be proposed to rectify the problems they summarise, although in view of the fact that the overall management of the cemetery was some years ago passed to Dignity Funeral Services it is surely appropriate for the council to write formally to the firm to remind it of its responsibilities in this respect -- for both the safe maintenance of the cemetery and its monuments, for the repair and upkeep of its fences and paths, and for the day-to-day cleaning, weeding and litter-picking necessary for the presentation of a tidy, welcoming and attractive site. 2. The council may be aware, since the passing over of the management of the cemetery to Dignity Funeral Services, of a good deal of public disquiet about the manner in which this management	Tottenham Cemetery	The new management plans include a commitment to ensure that all departments work co-operatively to ensure the preservation and enhancement of the CA (section 2.3). The finalised document will be shared with all relevant departments and other stakeholders, and should provide the basis for a consistent management approach across departments. Where necessary, the conservation team will liaise directly with other departments and partners to address management issues. The management plan specifically recommends close future liaison with Dignity, to include agreement on a consultation process for categories of work that don’t come under the control of planning (such as landscaping and repairs). A number of issues raised during the consultation do not generally fall under planning control (such as gardening and landscaping, trees). Comments have been passed on to the Council’s Nature Conservation officer for consideration, and will be taken in to account in

		has been exercised, in particular with respect to the cutting down of several mature trees close to the southern entrance to the cemetery and the partial dredging of the lake in the northwest corner. These and other works appear to have been carried out without reference to the council or to the public who enjoy visiting or walking through the cemetery, yet when approached with comments about these actions and requests for advance communication before any such future work is undertaken -- indeed, with general expressions of a desire for continued dialogue with the firm -- the response has been at best dismissive and unconcerned. It is therefore surely appropriate for the council to write formally to Dignity Funeral Services reminding it that the cemetery is a conservation area and that in consequence no substantive work of any kind -- i.e. more substantial than repairs and general upkeep -- should be undertaken until and unless it has sought and obtained planning permission for same, and that such planning permission will only be granted for work which satisfies the general criteria and standards laid down in Conservation Area appraisals.		development of the Council's forthcoming Parks and Open Spaces Strategy and Biodiversity Action Plan as well as other relevant projects.
SB		I live in Topham Square in the Tower Gardens estate and got the letter about the new draft plan. I have no comments except to support it as a really excellent piece of work. It's such a lovely estate, and very nice to see it given the attention of a careful piece of work it deserves.	Tower gardens	Support noted.
JN		I am responding to the consultation on the draft appraisal for the Tottenham Cemetery Conservation Area, with the following two comments.I am responding to the consultation on the draft appraisal for the Bruce Castle Conservation Area (in future to be known as the Bruce Castle and All Hallows Conservation Area), with the following comment: I was advised, during a conversation with Conservation Officer Lucy Morrow at the public consultation exercise on Saturday 26 January 2019, that Bruce Castle Park was considered to be covered by the statutory listing of Bruce Castle Museum and the associated Round Tower as Grade I national heritage assets. I was given to understand	Bruce Castle	Bruce Castle Park is considered to be part of the curtilage of Bruce Castle itself and will be treated as such in the exercise of the Council's planning functions. Planning permission is required for development that includes alteration to gates, fences, walls and other means of enclosure that are within the curtilage of a Listed Building or surrounding a Listed Building.

		that this coverage applied to the area of the Park, the Park's boundaries and everything within the Park (trees, shrubs, flower borders, etc.). The Conservation Officer and other council officials will doubtless be aware of the proposals by Tottenham Hotspur Football Club to temporarily appropriate the Park for "NFL Tailgate events" on at least four occasions during a calendar year. An application for such an event in October 2018 was made last summer, but subsequently withdrawn because the football club's new stadium was not ready for use. The application included a proposal to "improve" the Park by making a new gate along its northern boundary, which among other things would involve the removal and levelling of (part of) the elevated bank along Church Road. Such, however, would amount to the deliberate destruction of an eighteenth century landscape feature. This and other of the Park's landscape features were investigated and described in the Bruce Castle Landscape History Study, a study completed and published in February 1994 which is available only in print form and is held in the archives at Bruce Castle Museum. In paragraphs 3.14 and 3.15 of this study, it was noted, firstly, that the bank and ditch on the northwestern and northern boundaries (i.e., along the eastern side of Church Lane at the point where it turns northwards opposite the eastern front of All Hallows Church, and along the southern side of Church Road to the junction with New Road) were visible on the 1864 Ordnance Survey map of Tottenham; and, secondly, that this bank and ditch were likely to be a remnant of the Mount Walk referred to in the 1789 Sales Particulars (when the Bruce Castle estate was put for auction by Henry Hare Townsend). Although not specifically addressed in the Bruce Castle Landscape History Study, it is likely that this Mount Walk was part of either a ha-ha, or a raised walk around the "home park" part of Bruce Castle's once considerably more extensive grounds. The Conservation Officer and other council officials will need to keep this history in mind when Tottenham Hotspur Football Club make a fresh application -- as it undoubtedly will, once its new stadium is		The entire park including its boundaries is also within the conservation area and makes an important contribution to its special interest. Any proposals that require planning consent would be considered against relevant legislation and national and local planning policy relating to heritage. The appraisal document, if adopted, would be taken in to account when deciding any future planning applications affecting the park. The appraisal already includes includes a very detailed description of the special interest of Bruce Castle Park incorporating insights from a wide variety of documentary sources (pages 20-22). This covers the history and evolution of the park, historic and current landscape features and their significance, and a detailed description of the layout and boundary treatments identifying their provenance and significance.

		ready for use -- to temporarily appropriate the Park for an "NFL Tailgate event", which may again include a proposal to "improve" the Park by removing and levelling (part of) the elevated bank along Church Road. It is likely that neither the football club nor the commercial firm engaged to run its "NFL Tailgate event" is aware that the Grade I listing of Bruce Castle Museum and the associated Round Tower applies to the Park, the Park's boundaries and everything within the Park, and will therefore need to be advised to reformulate the application accordingly.		
CS		No Comment: attached useful photo of church path	Bruce Castle	Noted.
JN		Is it therefore appropriate to request the council to write formally to Dignity to remind them that the cemetery is now a Conservation Area in its own right, and that in consequence no material, physical changes can be made to it without formal approval following a formal planning application?	Tottenham Cemetery	As above
CS		Chris, you are so right. Dignity has ruined the cemetery. I haven't felt able to go over to see my grandparents' and aunts' graves since they wrecked the lake. Carol	Tottenham Cemetery	As above.
CL		Did send over recently my view and concerns on Dignity's tenure ship in the cemetery. Main worry is physical changes " without planning notice or permission". Hence the destruction of a small woodland area and provision of a burial area. Fear is Dignity will seriously change the grounds further .without undue care or notice. The TCAAC at the time applied with success that the Cemetery be made into a CA to protect its future.	Tottenham Cemetery	As above.
JN		Tottenham Cemetery CA -- paragraphs 1.6.1 and 1.6.2 on pages 21-22 of the draft appraisal address the current state of the cemetery, although it's not at all clear from the document what actual action might be proposed to rectify the problems they summarise. Should	Bruce Castle	Concerns over he management of the cemetery are noted. The finalised document will be shared with all relevant departments and other stakeholders, and should provide the basis for a

		we perhaps ask what pressure Haringey can or will bring to bear on Dignity (the firm which now manages the cemetery) to deal with the issues raised? For reference, I paste in the relevant text herewith: "1.6.1 With the exception of the Garden of Peace and the war memorial areas, the latter maintained by the CWGC, the general appearance throughout much of the cemetery is one of abandoned decay. This is a problem common to very many older cemeteries since families, who are responsible for the upkeep of their monuments, have often dispersed. "1.6.2 Whilst the principal features of the Victorian cemetery remain and the overall layout is still intact, within this landscape sit many monuments that are slowly decaying. Although this romantic decay adds to the character of the area, many of the monuments are now at serious risk of being damaged or becoming lost to future generations. Many of the tarmac paths are in need of resurfacing. "Church Path has an unkempt appearance due to invasive buddleia and sycamore growth and rusting ironwork along its border. Graffiti detracts from the appearance of the Grade II listed tunnel beneath the pathway. The boundary railings to the cemetery generally are in need of repair and maintenance." Bruce Castle CA -- my comments (probably to be made on behalf of the Friends of Bruce Castle) will be addressed to threat to the bank-and-ditch along the northern boundary of the Park, which is thought to be an eighteenth century landscape feature but which (in last summer's application for an NFL Tailgate event) Spurs and its commercial partner wanted to level as part of their proposal to "improve" the Park by inserting a new gate in the northern boundary (to provide easier access for their trucks, of course -- nothing to do with what park users might desire). Lucy Morrow confirmed that the Grade I listing of the Museum and the Round Tower extended to the Park as well, so this deliberate destruction would not be possible without the express permission of Historic England and the SoS for the DCMS.		consistent management approach across departments going forward. Where necessary, the conservation team will liaise directly with other departments and partners to address management issues. Development carried out by the Council, Homes for Haringey, and other partners is subject to the same constraints and requirements as any other development, and proposals would be assessed and enforced against relevant planning policy and guidance in the usual way. The Council is keen for public landowners and property management organisations to be setting an exemplar for Conservation Areas. The management plan specifically recommends close future liaison with Dignity, to include agreement on a management plan and consultation process for categories of work that don't come under the control of planning (such as landscaping and repairs). Further detail on the scope of the proposed cemetery management plan is included at section 3.1. Bruce Castle Park is considered to be part of the curtilage of Bruce Castle itself and will be treated as such in the exercise of the Council's planning functions. Planning permission is required for development that includes alteration to gates, fences, walls and other means of enclosure that are within the curtilage of a Listed Building or surrounding a Listed Building. The entire park including its boundaries is also within the conservation area and makes an important contribution to its special interest.

				Any proposals that require planning consent would be considered against relevant legislation and national and local planning policy relating to heritage. The appraisal document, if adopted, would be taken in to account when deciding any future planning applications affecting the park. Historic England are a statutory consultee for planning applications affecting a Grade I Listed Building.
Canal and River Trust	Statutory Consultee	Thank you for your consultation regarding the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management plans for Bruce Castle, Tottenham Cemetery, Tower Gardens and Peabody Cottages Conservation Areas. The Canal & River Trust (the Trust) is the guardian of 2000 miles of historic waterways across England and Wales. We are among the largest charities in the UK. Our vision is that “living waterways transform places and enrich lives”. The Trust has reviewed the appraisal and management plans, and on the basis that they appear unlikely to have any impact on our waterways we have no comment to make at this time.	All	Noted.
AT		Thank you for your letter dated 10 January regarding the above. I hope the conclusion the Planning Department of Haringey Council will be to maintain the Tower Gardens Conservation Area as it is permitting people to undertake limited developments such as re-pointing brick work, installing windows in the same style as old wooden windows and doors while keeping the architectural character of the building. I hope in the above appraisal Haringey Council does not decide to de-conserve the Tower Gardens area. I note from plans sent round last year that a block of old flats on the Lordship Lane will be knocked	Tower Gardens	There is no proposal to amend or remove the existing conservation area designation. The Council’s guidelines on preserving and enhancing the houses of the historic estate have not changed substantially, but it is hoped that the new document presents the information in a clear and accessible format. All new developments within the conservation area or affecting its setting are required to preserve and enhance the area's special character in line with

		down and developed into luxury flats, I am aware of a proposed new development of luxury flats in Tottenham only 25% of which will be affordable housing. There is the new development around the new Tottenham stadium. There are proposed new developments along Wood Green High Road, and a proposed development (now shelved along Station Road). By considering whether to de-conserve the Tower Gardens Area, Bruce Castle and Tottenham Cemetery I hope Haringey Council is not allowing these areas to become vulnerable to large developers such as the proposed development in Totteham Hale.What assurances can you give to residents of the Tower Gardens Conservation area that this will not happen?		legislation and national and local planning policy.
LM	Resident (owner)	Cars speeding through the cemetery are an issue. Can the signage for speed limits be reviewed?	Tottenham Cemetery	Concerns are noted. Traffic management is outside the scope of this consultation.
LM	Resident (owner)	Balliol Road (west side) boundary hedge in one front garden has been recently removed entirely.	Tottenham Cemetery	Design guidance contained in the management plan states that loss of front gardens and boundary treatments for the creation of parking spaces will not be considered acceptable. It is also note that the retention and maintenance of hedges is encouraged. However, works to hedges (as well as other gardening and planting works) do not fall under planning control. Comments on this issue have been passed on to the Council's Nature Conservation officer for consideration, and will be taken in to account in development of the Council's forthcoming Parks and Open Spaces Strategy and Biodiversity Action Plan as well as other relevant projects.
MP	Resident (Council Tenant)	There does not seem much change to the already existing planning policy, however, there is not much point in having a conservation policy if breaches of the conservation rules are nt enforced and are	Tower Gardens	Concern is noted. The new appraisals record the current condition of the conservation areas in some detail, including where unauthorised or

		also committed by the Council itself! For instance: 100 Tower Gardens Road is in breach by having a big yellow sigm outside the premises, gate sthat do not conform, and extension to the building that does not conform. No.220 Tower Gardens Road has had a UPVC front door put in by Homes for Haringey. Mo.17 Tower Gardens Road has had its roof replaced by Homes for Haringey and the tiles and tops do not conform. All these issues have been reported either by ourselves or by people we know but nothing has been done about it! Enforcement seem to concentrate on people who erect satellite dishes, and whilst I agree that the large size ones are a blight on the landscape, the small black ones are hardly noticeable and should be allowed. There are many other infringements of the conservation rules on Tower Gardens estate, not least the removing of hedges to be replaced by walls. If you want people to keep their hedges, more help should be given to people who ostruggle to prune them, and collection of green clippings should be free (haringey Council charge for this service now).Tower Gardens Estate should look really beautiful but it has suffered years of neglect from the Council and under-funding, and people do not feel supported in their efforts to keep the estate as it was intended. The Council ha a duty to make sure that the conservation area is respected and well kept, but they are not prepared to do a lot of the work that is needed to do so. If you really want to see how Tower Gardens Estate has become run down and te conservation rules flaunted, some by the Council themselves, all you have to do is have a proper walk about and note down all the infringements you see. I believe that the rest of Tower Gardens Estate should also become part of the conservation area as it causes a lot of consfusion for some people.		inappropriate development has had a detrimental impact. The management plans include a commitment to enforce against inappropriate change in line with the Council's adopted development charter, and outlines specific enforcement priorities (section 2.4). The updated appraisals will be an important tool in ensuring effective enforcement going forward. They will highlight key enforcement issues and provide a sound basis for enforcement action that is defensible on appeal. The new management plans include a commitment to ensure that all departments work co-operatively to ensure the preservation and enhancement of the CA (section 2.3). The finalised document will be shared with all relevant departments and other stakeholders, and should provide the basis for a consistent management approach across departments going forward. Where necessary, the conservation team will liaise directly with other departments and partners to address management issues. Development carried out by the Council, Homes for Haringey, and other partners is subject to the same constraints and requirements as any other development, and proposals would be assessed and enforced against relevant planning policy and guidance in the usual way. The Council is keen for public landowners and property management organisations to be setting an exemplar for Conservation Areas. A number of issues raised during the consultation do not generally fall under planning control, but are recognised as making an

				important contribution to the special character of the estate, such as front garden landscaping and hedges. Comments have been passed on to the Council's Nature Conservation officer for consideration, and will be taken in to account in development of the Council's forthcoming Parks and Open Spaces Strategy and Biodiversity Action Plan as well as other relevant projects. Specific enforcement complaints have been passed on to the Council's enforcement team who will determine the appropriate course of action.
JP	Resident (Council Tenant)	The Council Themselves have ridden roughshod over conservation rules for many years. Number 100 Tower Gardens Road has had a large wall demolished and an ugly iron gate put up instead.It has also disregarded rules on extensions as a very ugly modern extension has been built that is not only visible from the road but is dominant as you pass by the building. Acros sthe road, two houses were retiled with modern tiles not in keeping with the style of the houses and the Council themselves have used UPVC doors and windows (front doors) (take a look at number 220 Tower Gardens Road). When and every time we have informed or complained to the Council, absolutely nothing has changed, even when the works were incomplete and would have been very simple to address. What is the point of having a conservation area if the very people who are supposed to enforce it are themselves oe of the main offenders in contravening it? P.s. Take a look at 100 Tower Gardens Road and try to justify the vandalism the Council have done to the building. it is beyond any hope of justification as it is now an eyesore.	Tower Gardens	Concern is noted. The new appraisals record the current condition of the conservation areas in some detail, including where unauthorised or inappropriate development has had a detrimental impact. The management plans include a commitment to enforce against inappropriate change in line with the Council's adopted development charter, and outlines specific enforcement priorities (section 2.4). The updated appraisals will be an important tool in ensuring effective enforcement going forward. They will highlight key enforcement issues and provide a sound basis for enforcement action that is defensible on appeal. The appraisals include design guidelines about what works are appropriate in the CA and when consent is required, communicated in an accessible way. It is hoped that this will help prevent inappropriate works being carried out without consent in the future.The new management plans include a commitment to ensure that all departments work co-operatively

				to ensure the preservation and enhancement of the CA (section 2.3). The finalised document will be shared with all relevant departments and other stakeholders, and should provide the basis for a consistent management approach across departments going forward. Where necessary, the conservation team will liaise directly with other departments and partners to address management issues. Development carried out by the Council, Homes for Haringey, and other partners is subject to the same constraints and requirements as any other development, and proposals would be assessed and enforced against relevant planning policy and guidance in the usual way. The Council is keen for public landowners and property management organisations to be setting an exemplar for Conservation Areas.
SW	Resident (owner)	I support the purpose of the conservation area appraisals, particularly in respect to ensuring a 'robust policy framework for planning decisions'. It is encouraging that Haringey has a planning enforcement charter, but the extent of unauthorised works in conservation areas suggests that enforcement is not always as robust as it should be. Are steps being taken to improve the situation? There are also concerns that the Council sometimes ignores its own guidelines when it undertakes developments in conservation areas. Who scrutinises/polices the Council in such cases? It is most encouraging that Haringey is committed to 'preserving and enhancing' its valuable heritage assets, although financial constraints and powerful commercial interests can make this difficult.	Bruce Castle	Support noted. Development carried out by the Council, Homes for Haringey, and other partners is subject to the same constraints and requirements as any other development, and proposals would be assessed against relevant planning policy and guidance in the usual way. The new management plans include a commitment to ensure that all departments work co-operatively to ensure the preservation and enhancement of the CA (section 2.3). The finalised document will be shared with all relevant departments and other stakeholders, and should provide the basis for a consistent management approach across departments going forward. Where necessary, the conservation team will liaise directly with other departments and partners to address

				management issues. Development carried out by the Council, Homes for Haringey, and other partners is subject to the same constraints and requirements as any other development, and proposals would be assessed and enforced against relevant planning policy and guidance in the usual way. The Council is keen for public landowners and property management organisations to be setting an exemplar for Conservation Areas.
DC	Resident (Council tenant)	Great idea I fully approve since my house seems to be falling apart from the outside it is affecting the inside.		Support noted.
DL	Resident (owner)	Thank you for the information regarding the Conservation Are Appraisal and Management plans for Tower Gardens and the surrounding area - it all sounds positive and I'm happy to play a part in conserving the original features of the area.	Tower Gardens	Support noted.
PS	Resident (owner)	This seems to me a very thorough appraisal of the Tower Gardens area. Your rules regarding alterations to properties are clear and realistic and I believe are unaltered. However the problem has always been the policing of any rogue alterations. As council budgets get tighter, I would be very surprised if it is possible to provide designated inspectors. Recently it seems that it is down to local residents to "grass up" their neighbours and, unless the digression is very great, one is loath to do this. It is important that newcomers to the estate should be made aware of the conservation area rules, preferably before taking up a tenancy or buying a house. This could be done via Homes for Haringey, estate and letting agents. A copy of the conservation document could be sent to residents when they apply for council tax. In order that people respect the rules, it is necessary that "wrong sort of windows"etc. should be seen to be made to change. Unfortunately some of the worst offenses seem to be historical and one just has to accept them as part of life's wear and tear and not be too precious about living in chocolate box world.	Tower Gardens	Support noted. Concern over enforcement is noted. The new appraisals record the current condition of the conservation areas in some detail, including where unauthorised or inappropriate development has had a detrimental impact. The management plans include a commitment to enforce against inappropriate change in line with the Council's adopted development charter, and outlines specific enforcement priorities (section 2.4). The updated appraisals will be an important tool in ensuring effective enforcement going forward. They will highlight key enforcement issues and provide a sound basis for enforcement action that is defensible on appeal.

				The appraisals include design guidelines about what works are appropriate in the CA and when consent is required, communicated in an accessible way. It is hoped that this will help prevent inappropriate works being carried out without consent in the future. If the new appraisal is adopted, a short colour leaflet highlighting the special interest of the CA and design guidelines will be mailed to residents alongside notification of the adoption. New residents looking to buy a house in the area would be made aware of the conservation area designation and Article 4 as these would be revealed in a standard land charges search.
ST	Other	I have lived on Risley Avenue for 20 years, I grew up here. Bruce Castle park has played a large part of my childhood. I remember visiting Bruce Castle Museum and spending countless summer days after school playing in the park. I have a particular attachment to nature and strongly believe that we need to preserve it. Especially in our day and age where our environment is already suffering from all the damage we have caused. For this reason I would like Bruce Castle to remain as a Conservation Area.	Bruce Castle	Noted. There is no proposal to remove the conservation area designation.
AC	Resident (owner)	I totally disagree with the Draft it doesn't take into account the owners and residents views. I don't think it is a real reflection of the stage of the neighbourhood therefore I think it is a very dishonest report. It tries to give the impression that it is a well kept area and it is actually all the opposite. I straggle to believe 3 houses in a row are in a good stage and following the proposal guidelines. In many houses the low brick compliance walls are damaged and having missing bricks. It has been like that ever since I have moved to this area in 2007. According to your guidelines it is followed but really is it? Many houses they looked like if they were abandoned and in a terrible stage and you don't do anything to keep up the stage of the neighbourhood. You only seem to be bothered by those neighbours that decided to invest a bit of	Tower Gardens	Concern is noted. The new appraisals record the current condition of the conservation areas in some detail, including where unauthorised or inappropriate development has had a detrimental impact. The management plans include a commitment to enforce against inappropriate change in line with the Council's adopted development charter, and outlines specific enforcement priorities (section 2.4). The updated appraisals will be an important tool in ensuring effective enforcement going forward. They will highlight key enforcement

		their resources in improving the look of their homes but nothing is done about those neighbours that are neglecting the stage of their houses making the neighbourhood looking terrible. If we speak about the bushes… they are so many kind of bushes, colours and shapes in the neighbourhood. The local council doesn't support owners regarding where to buy them at low price so we could comply with the guidelines. Also, there isn't any support in term of maintenance, replacement and growing. It is unfair this cost is forced onto owners. The council houses are the worse. In most of the cases the bushes are dying or ill and nothing is done to improve them or to look after them. I have personally looked after my neighbour's one as he didn't and this make the look of our houses very unkept which is not my way of being. If we speak about the chimneys. I am really worry about the stage of most of them. Especially my neighbour ones which are lose and any day they will fall and hopefully it doesn't on my family or a walking person. If this was to happen I will hold the council responsible for keeping their houses so unfit for the purpose and unsafe. I think the general state of the neighbourhood is neglected and look terrible due to the fact that people are not investing in keeping their house look good. Why is this? I believe it has to be with the fact that your guidelines are very costly and people leaving in this area are not able to spend this money and they don't have the time to maintain the bushes therefore they just ignore their front doors which is very sad as in many cases they look terrible. I think if people were able to decide the kind of front garden they would like to have without any restriction people will engage much better in making them nice and proud of but they cant as they can afford it and the guidelines don't meet our expectations. Also, owners we should be able to protect our families and home from the growing crime in our area. Many neighbours have reported drug related activity to the policy and council but nothing seems to be done to protect us. In few occasions I have observed fights related to drugs issues and these criminals have run through our gardens and back gardens without any difficulties as there isn't any physical barrier to stop them from doing so. I have a small boy who		issues and provide a sound basis for enforcement action that is defensible on appeal. The appraisals include design guidelines about what works are appropriate in the CA and when consent is required, communicated in an accessible way. It is hoped that this will help prevent inappropriate works being carried out without consent in the future. A number of issues raised during the consultation do not generally fall under planning control, but are recognised as making an important contribution to the special character of the estate, such as front garden landscaping and hedges. Comments have been passed on to the Council's Nature Conservation officer for consideration, and will be taken in to account in development of the Council's forthcoming Parks and Open Spaces Strategy and Biodiversity Action Plan as well as other relevant projects. The guidelines contained in this documents are not considered particularly onerous or expensive. Using inappropriate materials and techniques when doing work to historic buildings can damage the structure or introduce a maintenance burden. Following the design guidelines can help to avoid that situation and save money in the longer term. Extensions within the conservation area are not prohibited, and this document offers specific guidance on how best to extend houses without causing harm to the special character of the area.

		should be able to play in my front garden or back garden but I cant let him because I am afraid he can be in the wrong place at the wrong time. But how unfair is this? It is my house I pay a monthly morgate of £1300 since 2007. Don't you think I should have the right to protect my child? Well I cant because what would stop these people from running across our front gardens is not within your draft. Regarding extensions, again how unfair. If we get a new addition to our family in order to live comfortably the only way forward is to move as extensions are not allowed to make our houses biggest. This means young families are continually moving in and out the area. This doesn't support the good stage of the neighbourhood as owners cant invest in our front gardens as we must think of moving. Summary, I really think the draft is not a fair reflection of the area and it limits its owner to make the area a good area due to how many limitations which are very costly.		
GA	Resident (owner)	I THINK OWNERS SHOULD BE ABLE TO DO WHAT THEY NEED TO DO TO THEIR HOMES ACCORDING TO THEIR CULTURAL BELIEVES AND RESOURCES. THE DRAFT LIMITS PEOPLE ABILITIES TO LOOK AFTER THEIR HOMES IN THE WAY THEY BELEIVE THEY SHOULD DO. ALSO MANY HOUSES ARE NOT COMPLYING WITH THE POLICY, WHY SOME OWNERS ARE GETTING PRESSURED TO REMOVE THE CHANGES MADE AND OTHERS THEY HAVE BEEN LIKE THAT SINCE 10 YEARS AGO OR MORE. IF YOU WANT TEH AREA TO LOOK THE SAME WAY YOU SHOULD ENSURE ALL HOUSES (OLD AND NEW CHANGES) TO BE REMOVED AND THE HOUSES DAMAGED TO BE FORCED TO MAKE THEM LOOK UP TO A MINIMUM STANDARD. THE AREA DOESNT LOOK NEAT AND WELL LOOK AFTER AS YOU SHOW IN THE REPORT WHICH IS NOT A FAIR AND HONEST REFLECTION OF THE HOUSES AROUND HERE, CERTAINLY NOT THE TOWER GARDEN ROAD. FINALLY, OWNERS SHOULD BE ABLE TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT THE SAFETY OF THEIR HOMES AS THE POLICE IS NOT DOING MUCH TO STOP THE DRUG CRIME OF THE AREA.	Tower Gardens	The conservation area designation has been in place since 1978. There are no proposals to change this, and removal of the conservation area designation was not considered as part of this consulation. The Council has a statutory duty to identify and designate areas of special historic and architectural interest as per the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 69(1). This comprehensive appraisal confirms that the area has considerable heritage interest warranting designation. There is an existing requirement to preserve and enhance the special interest of the conservation area in line with legislation and national and local adopted planning policy. That requirement is outside the scope of this consultation. The guidelines contained in this document provide clarity on the best way to achieve this, and are not considered particularly onerous or

				expensive. Using inappropriate materials and techniques when doing work to historic buildings can damage the structure or introduce a maintenance burden. Following the design guidelines can help to avoid that situation and save money in the longer term.
AM	Resident (owner)	I note the proposed change of excluding "the post-war blocks of flats in Beaufoy Road (William Atkinson House and William Rainbird House), which form a discrete block at the edge of the conservation area, and which are of no architectural merit." In light of this proposal I need to stress the importance of keeping the park's boundaries on the north-western and northern side (Church Road), including the bank and the ditch within the conservation area due to their historical importance as outlined in the "Bruce Castle Landscape History Study", a study completed and published in February 1994 which is available only in print form and is held in the archives at Bruce Castle Museum (particularly paragraphs 3.14 and 3.15). these are important historical features that are essential to the overall history of the area and need particular protection.	Bruce Castle	This is noted. The appraisal already includes a very detailed description of the special interest of Bruce Castle Park incorporating insights from a wide variety of documentary sources (pages 20-22). This covers the history and evolution of the park, historic and current landscape features and their significance, and a detailed description of the layout and boundary treatments identifying their provenance and significance.