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**Issue 2.1**

*7 Is the overall approach to development set out in Policies CL1 and CL2 justified and based on a proper understanding of the character and architectural qualities of the Borough?*

A large proportion of the Borough either lies within a conservation area or is part of the setting of a conservation area and, for most of the Borough, identifying the context and character to be respected can be found in the existing CAPS (Conservation Area Policy Statements) or hopefully in the emerging CAAs (Conservation Area Appraisals). These should be referred to in the Policy as the basis for understanding the context and character of an area. We believe that the implementation of the locally listed buildings category would help where there are individual structures of special character or appearance which are not located in conservation areas.

8 *Will policy CL1(g) provide an effective framework for considering the development of backland sites including private gardens?*

We consider that the following should be added at the end of the sentence from ‘enhance the character and appearance of the area and the amenity of surrounding buildings’

*10 To be effective do policies CL1 and CL2 need to be more explicit about the effects of the change of use of buildings on the character and appearance of an area?*

The uses to which buildings are put can have a significant impact on the context, character and appearance, whether it be the level of activity (buzzy places contrasted with tranquil ones), the risks of light pollution or loss of privacy, the disturbance and pollution from vehicular traffic or the need for signage. Many building types such as public houses have a distinct appearance which contributes to the awareness of the diversity of amenities in the area. This should be covered by paragraph 34.3.2 which refers to the functionality of an area, by 34.3.14 which refers to good design taking functionality into account, and by 34.3.15 which emphasises that architecture is about more than just aesthetics. The actual policies however are silent on these matters and need to be amplified.

11 *Is the* *approach to the redevelopment of ‘eyesores’ consistent with other policies in the core strategy and will it be effective in delivering the vision and strategic objectives?*

We support the revised version of the Policy in which CL2(c) is deleted. We were concerned that the degree of flexibility was not clearly defined and could have been manipulated without having general support.