

Comments Received on the Cumnor Conservation Area Appraisal and Officer Recommendations

Paragraph reference	Summary of comment	Officer Response and Recommendation
general support	Cumnor Parish Council, Jacqui Ratcliffe & James Baker, R.B. Cross & Janet Cross, D.G. Crook, Margaret & Keith Eddey, Martin & Sue Law, Peter & Iris Lever, Edward Impey, Dr.J.Impey, Paul Dixey, Stella Dixey, Graham & Margaret Robb, Philip Pullman, Dr.D.Swaine, P.Hawtin, Mary Fear, Mr. H.P.Powell, Tim & Sue Rhodes, Robert Gee, John Stenton-Putt, Tracey Iles & Ralph Wiskin, Rev.Brian Stops, Harry Dickinson, GEM Smith & EWM Smith, Claire Tyrell-Williams all welcome the conservation area appraisal and in principle support the proposed extension to the boundaries of Cumnor conservation area which will help to retain the traditional character of the village. People particularly support the inclusion of the Vine Public House grounds, the north corner of the village and fields surrounding the village.	The support is welcomed.
general objections	John Stenton-Putt, R. Boyles, Pam Gee, Edward & Catherine Mott, Robert Gee, Rowland W.Wastie comment that the proposed extended conservation area is too large, lacks logic and coherence and is unwarranted because of the existence of the Green Belt. Conservation area designation is seen as a burden and it should be the prerogative of the owner to insert dormer windows or cut down trees.	The proposed amendments are made on the basis of a detailed study of the village. The areas included are considered by the council to contribute to the special character or appearance of the Cumnor conservation area. The purpose and function of the Green Belt is different to conservation area designation. Recommendtion: No change.
general	Edward & Catherine Mott question who is behind the proposed changes? Do they stand to benefit? Do they live in the areas concerned? Are they imposing measures on others? What are the benefits or constraints for owners of properties concerned?	The council is required to review from time to time its conservation areas in accordance with the requirements of the (Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The effects of conservation area designation are outlined in section 2.3 of the appraisal. Recommendation: No change.
general	G.J.Boyles is concerned that newcomers appear to be influencing matters to further their own vested interest.	Noted. Recommendation: No change.
general	Margaret & Keith Eddey express deep regret over the council's recent decision to permit a new property near the Tithe Barn in the centre of the conservation area.	Noted. In assessing that planning application the council gave full consideration as to whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. Recommendation: No change.

Comments Recieved on the Cumnor Conservation Area Appraisal and Officer Recommendations

general	Edward & Catherine Mott have low confidence in planning in the Vale and feel Councillors are ignored. As a result, the desire of the community to maintain conservation areas has diminished.	Noted. The publication and consultation on this document highlights the council's determination to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Cumnor conservation area. Recommendation: No change.
general	Robert Gee is concerned that since the conservation area has existed in Cumnor significant changes have occurred contrary to your document proposal - removal of the red telephone box, stone bus shelter, stonessfield slate roof at Cumnor Old School, stucco on Manor Farm and increased wirescape - are these things under your control?	Many of these matters are outside the scope of planning control. Nevertheless the appraisal sets out features which it would like to see retained where policies allow. This may help to persuade statutory undertakers not to install inappropriate service equipment such as overhead wires. Recommendation: No change.
general	Robert Gee objects to Cumnor being referred to as dormitory to Oxford as until recently the Timbmet/Chawley brickworks was an area of commercial employment. If this had not been lost it would have conserved the use of the historic site whilst offering the potential for a number of smaller businesses to offer employment in the community.	The comments about Timbmet/Chawley are noted but are not considered to be relevant to the description of the Cumnor village conservation area. Recommendation: no change.
general	Rowland W. Wastie is concerned that since this review was announced, the air has been filled with the noise of chainsaws and trees are being felled and topped everywhere in Cumnor.	Noted once the extension to the conservation area has been agreed certain works to trees will require permission. Recommendation: No change.
general	English Heritage suggest including page numbers when referring to maps.	Agreed. Recommendation: Amend text to include page numbers when referring to maps.
general	R.B.Cross and Janet Cross ask to avoid confusion in future that The Old Vicarage, now called Archangel House, is referred to as Archangel House (The Old Vicarage).	Agreed. Recommendation: Amend mentions of The Old Vicarage to read 'Archangel House (The Old Vicarage)'.
2.3	Rowland W. Wastie is concerned about what conditions the council will require for planning to be granted for modern portal type farm buildings in a conservation area and the cost implications of this.	The designation of the conservation area does not exclude the granting of planning permission for such buildings. The primary concern will be that the design and materials used preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area. Recommendation: No change.

Comments Received on the Cumnor Conservation Area Appraisal and Officer Recommendations

section 3	English Heritage suggest re-ordering the list of key characteristics in section 3 to run from general to specific and question whether listed buildings and others of local interest are key characteristics?	The order does not affect the meaning or context. The listed buildings are mentioned because they contribute to the character of the conservation area. Recommendation: No change.
section 3	English Heritage comment that the village is described as having a predominant linear form in the list of key characteristics but section 4.2 describes the pattern as dispersed with clusters of farms.	There is a reference to clusters of farms in the key characteristics section. Agree that reference to a predominant linear form appears contradictory. However, most of the buildings are spread along the main roads. Recommendation: Replace reference to predominant linear form in key characteristics section with 'elements spread along main roads'.
4.3	English Heritage comment that section 4.3 on landscape setting would sit more comfortably between sections 4.1 on location and 4.2 on general character form.	Agreed. Recommendation: Re-order paragraph 4.3 to 4.2 and paragraph 4.2 to 4.3.
section 4 photograph on page 5	Tim and Sue Rhodes point out that the footpath shown is outside Westfield House, not Rockley Farm House. The path has always been known as Pond Lane.	Noted. Recommendation: Amend caption of photograph on page 5 'Footpath past Rockley Farmhouse' to read 'Pond Lane outside Westfield House'.
6.2, title.	Cllr Dudley Hoddinot points out that in the title of section 6.2, Map 5 should be Map 4.	Agreed. Recommendation: amend text on page 8 as suggested.
6.2	English Heritage comment that It would help if the views identified were cross referenced between text and map.	Key views and vistas are shown clearly on map 4. The text on page 8 refers to this map. Recommendation: No change.
6.2	English Heritage question whether the quality of the view could be described (e.g. panoramic, vista) and say what it reveals about the special character?	It is felt that the views are described in sufficient detail. Recommendation: no change.

Comments Recieved on the Cumnor Conservation Area Appraisal and Officer Recommendations

7.1	GEM Smith & EWM Smith do not feel that Cutts End House fits in with the Leys Road character area but rather a small community around the middle and southern sections of Appleton Road.	Cutts End House is at the southern end of the Leys Road character area and although there is a greater density of development in this part of the character area it still has a loose knit semi-rural character. Cutts End House is a building of interest and represents the start of the historic village on a main approach road into the village. Cutts End House on its own would not warrant designation as a separate character area. The proposal elsewhere to include Candle Tree House to the north will make its inclusion more logical. Recommendation: No change.
7.2	English Heritage suggest that the impact of traffic noise be kept separate and dealt with under section 7.1 but cross referenced as a negative factor in section 7.8.	Paragraph 7.2 refers to activity in the village so traffic is relevant to this section. Could make reference to paragraph 7.8 Negative Factors and add a bullet point in that section. Recommendation: Add sentence to paragraph 7.2 to read 'This and other negative factors are listed in section 7.8'. Add bullet point to section 7.8 to read 'The busy roads mean that Cumnor is spoilt by traffic noise and the frequent movement of cars and commercial traffic, such that it can no longer claim to be a peaceful rural settlement'
7.2 and 7.8	Andrew Lord comments that measures need to be taken to reduce the weight of vehicles passing through Cumnor. Although possibly out of your remit a request from the conservation officer to the correct department would help secure the weight restriction required to conserve the village. A second suggestion is to impose traffic calming measures at the entrance and exit of the village.	Such measures are the responsibility of Oxfordshire County Council as Highway Authority and the respondent is correct to suggest that it is not within the remit of the conservation officer. Recommendation: Refer this and other comments on traffic to Oxfordshire County Council.

Comments Received on the Cumnor Conservation Area Appraisal and Officer Recommendations

7.2 and 7.4	Cllr Dudley Hoddinot suggests clarification regarding the Old School and buildings on page 12 and 14. The Old School is not a Police House. The upper floor is used by Oxfordshire Coroner's Office. Suggest a replacement sentence for page 12 saying "Later buildings include the former Village School and the attached School Master's House of 1860. The Old School has been refurbished and is now used as a hall. The School Master's House is now used as a Post Office and shop, with the upper floor used as a Police Office".	Agreed. Recommendation: amend text as follows, page 12, para 7.2 delete 'which is now used as the Police House, Post Office/shop and attached hall' and insert 'The Old School has been refurbished and and is now used as a hall. The School Master's House is now used as a Post Office and shop with the upper floor used as a Police Office'. Also correct bullet point ten on page 14.
7.3	Jacqueline Bock points out that on page 13, the third line should refer to section 12, not 11.	Agreed. Recommendation: Amend text to read 'statutory listed buildings are listed in section 12 on page 23'.
7.3	English Heritage suggest that the last sentence of paragraph 1 should be clarified so that the impact of infilling is assessed as either preserving or enhancing the setting of the conservation area.	Agreed. Recommendation: Add sentence at the end of this paragraph to read 'and does not help to preserve or enhance the setting of the conservation area'.
7.4	Cllr Dudley Hoddinot and Jacqueline Bock point out that the bullet point about the Congregational Chapel refers to map 6, which does not exist.	Agreed. Recommendation: Reference should be made to map 4. Delete reference to map 6.
7.5	Rowland W. Wastie points out that the image on page 16 labelled 'Outbuilding at Leys Farmhouse' is not an outbuilding but part of the house.	Agreed. Recommendation: Re-label photograph on page 16 as 'Leys Farmhouse'.
7.6	Jacqueline Bock points out that there is a mix up of singular/plural in the second paragraph of section 7.6.	Agreed. Recommendation: Amend text to read 'a few buildings such as Stonehaven Cottage (No. 6 High Street) are of painted rubblestone'.
section 7.10	Rowland W. Wastie comments that a lot of walls in Cumnor are capped with mortar because local stone known as 'Cumnor Dumplings' does not stand on edge like Cotswold stone.	Noted. Recommendation: No change.
7.11	English Heritage comment that the last sentence of 7.11 should be amended to be more positive about tackling the issue of traffic impact to give it increased weight.	The conservation area appraisal can only seek to encourage traffic improvements, responsibility lies with Oxfordshire County Council. It would be misleading to suggest that the conservation area appraisal could give any greater weight to traffic issues. Recommendation: No change.

Comments Recieved on the Cumnor Conservation Area Appraisal and Officer Recommendations

7.12	Rowland W. Wastie comments that the stone setts in Leys Road, known locally as 'pitching stones' extend much further down the road but have been covered by soil and grass over the years.	Noted. Recommendation: No change.
8	English Heritage comment that there is a need to justify why new areas are being included in the conservation area (analysis of the contribution, not just a description).	The descriptions of the new character areas are sufficient to justify the reason for including them in the conservation area. The descriptions set out the special quality of the areas which contribute to the special character or appearance. Recommendation: No change.
8	EWM smith comments that the conservation area should be an area, not individual plots.	The area has been designated to be a unified whole, and not just a number of individual plots. Recommendation: no change.
8	EWM Smith & GEM Smith comment that the proposed extension to the conservation area is inconsistent. Why are more modern houses along the High Street included and older properties like Cutts End Point and Candle Tree House excluded? Suggest either including Candle Tree House and Cutts End Point or revising boundary to remove Cutts End House and Hurstcote.	Because a conservation area is designated as a whole rather than as individual buildings, some more modern buildings along High Street have been included since to exclude them would result in an illogical boundary. Elsewhere in this report it is recommended that Candle Tree House is included in the conservation area but not Cutts End Point. Recommendation: No change.
8	Jacqueline Bock, D.G.Crook, Harry Dickinson, Graham & Margaret Robb, Margaret & Keith Eddey, John Kenwright, H.P.Powell, P.Hawtin, Pam Gee, GEM & EWM Smith, Edward & Catherine Mott, Dr.D.Swaine, suggest inclusion of Candle Tree House for completeness of the conservation area and to avoid adverse development happening on that site.	Having revisited this part of Cumnor, the officers agree that Candle Tree House and the two adjoining properties to the north should be included in the conservation area. The hedges and trees along the frontage provide a unifying feature and soft edge along Abingdon Road which contribute to the appearance of the conservation area. Although this extension includes more modern buildings they are set within a landscape that enhances the conservation area and the setting of two adjacent listed buildings. Recommendation: The conservation area boundary shown on maps 4 and 5 are ammended to include Candle Tree House and the two adjoining buildings to the north.

Comments Recieved on the Cumnor Conservation Area Appraisal and Officer Recommendations

8	Jacqueline Bock, Margaret & Keith Eddey, P.Hawtin, Edward & Catherine Mott, GEM & EWM Smith suggest including Cutts End Point for completeness.	The officers have revisited Cutts End Point and do not agree that it should be included in the conservation area. It is a modern building set well back from the road on its plot and does not contribute to the historic character of the village. Recommendation: No change.
8	Margaret & Keith Eddey, EWM Smith, GEM Smith, P.Hawtin suggest including the properties near to Moss Cottage for consistency and to avoid adverse development occuring on this site.	Agreed. See comment and proposed changes above.
8	Jacqueline Bock, Edward Impey, D.G.Crook, John Kenwright, Vivien Kenwright, Sandra Gee, H.P.Powell, Dr. John Rogers, Margaret & Keith Eddey, GEM Smith, suggest including all houses and gardens to the north of Appleton Road for completeness and to avoid adverse development that would detract from the character of the surrounding area. It is felt these houses are physically within the village centre and acknowledged as part of its historic core.	The officers do not agree that these properties should be included in the conservation area. The buildings are modern and do not reflect the traditional form and style of development found in the historic core of the village. Their inclusion would water down the value of the conservation area. Recommendation: No change.
8	EWM Smith & GEM Smith comment that all properties along Appleton Road beyond the Bear & Ragged Staff are in the Green Belt but outside the proposed conservation area.	Cumnor is an inset into the Green Belt and therefore is not covered by Green Belt policies. The Green Belt boundary is not relevant to the designation of the conservation area boundary as it is designated under different legislation. Recommendation: No change.
8	Jacqueline Bock, R.B.Cross & Janet Cross, Margaret & Keith Eddey, GEM & EWM Smith, Edward Impey, H.P.Powell suggest including the cricket field which adds to village atmosphere and affords important views to Besselsleigh. The field was originally the Vineyard of Cumnor Place and was once part of a medieval deer park. It is now locally known as 'The Winnows'.	The cricket ground is a modern playing field and is enclosed on one side by modern development and by hedges and trees on the other three. There are no views of the historic core of the village from the playing fields and therefore the officers do not consider it contributes to the character of the conservation area. Recommendation: No change.
8	Mary Fear suggests including the recreation ground as part of the original Glebe.	It is assumed that this comment relates to the cricket ground referred to above.

Comments Received on the Cumnor Conservation Area Appraisal and Officer Recommendations

<p>8</p>	<p>Edward Impey, H.P.Powell, Jaqueline Bock, Dr.D.Swaine, Margaret & Keith Eddey, Edward & Catherine Mott, EWM Smith, Robert Gee suggest including the area west of the cricket field and south of Appleton Road which show well preserved ridge and furrow. The western field of the two smaller ones south of the the footpath is the last flower rich meadow in the parish.</p>	<p>This proposed extension to the conservation area includes three parcels of land, two paddocks south of the footpath, and a field and the garden to The Farmhouse to the north. The two fields to the south of the footpath are part of the open countryside surrounding the village and do not contribute to the character of the historic built form of the village. The presence of ridge and furrow and/or wild flowers does not in its self justify inclusion in the conservation area. The field to the north of the footpath relates more to the modern development opposite rather than to the historic village. The poplar trees along the frontage are not native British trees. However, at either end of this field there are important groups of native trees which are viewed from within the conservation area. These trees are within the grounds of The Farmhouse to the west and the entrance to the cricket ground in the east. The trees are important features which contribute to views along Appleton Road and to the character of the conservation area and should be included in the designat</p> <p>Recommendation: The two fields to the south of the footpath are not included in the conservation area. The field to the north of the footpath also be excluded but the garden to The Farmhouseand the trees at the entrance to the cricket field be included.</p>
<p>8</p>	<p>Jacqueline Bock, Margaret & Keith Eddey, Edward & Catherine Mott suggest including all houses along Leys Road, including Long Leys House, Leys Cottage, Pond Farm, Chapel Close properties and the field with two ponds. This is a historic entrance into the village and emphasises Cumnor's rural/urban dichotomy.</p>	<p>It is considered that these areas do not contribute to the special character or appearance of the area and therefore should not be included. Recommendation: no change.</p>

Comments Recieved on the Cumnor Conservation Area Appraisal and Officer Recommendations

8	Martin & Sue Law suggest including old watercourses (hedge and ditch) that link to the pond. These should be maintained wherever possible.	The watercourses that lead to the ponds within the centre of the village are included in the conservation area. Else where the existence of a watercourse in itself would not warrant designation as a conservation Recommendation :no change
8	Claire Tyrrell-Williams suggests including the land owned by St Johns College.	Land ownership is not a reason to designate a conservation area. Recommendation: No change.
8	Jacqueline Bock, Robert Gee, R.Boyles, G.J.Boyles comment that the proposed boundary runs through the property and garden of no. 55 Appleton Road and suggest amending the boundary to go between The Farmhouse and 55 Appleton Road. It is also suggested to take the boundary along the west side of Appleton Road to exclude access to the bungalows from the conservation area.	Agreed. Recommendation: rationalise the boundary to go between The Farmhouse and 55 Appleton Road and run along the western side of Appleton Road.
8	Ken Davis questions why the modern houses on Appleton Road and High Street are included in the proposed conservation area?	The modern development along Appleton Road is not proposed to be included in the conservation area. As mentioned above some modern development is included in the High Street in order to create a logical boundary. Recommendation: No change.
8	Robert Gee questions why the existing conservation area has been extended to include a section of Oxford Road and Denmans Lane?	This area of green verge is considered to contribute to the character of the conservation area and the setting of the adjoining listed buildings and has therefore been included. Recommendation: No change.
8	Dr. John Rogers questions why Cumnor Place Cottage (6 Abingdon Road) is included in the proposed conservation area?	Having revisited the site the officers agree that Cumnor Place Cottage should be excluded from the conservation area. Recent development such as the insertion of Upvc windows and the erection of a close boarded fence do not enhance the character of the conservation area. Recommendation: Cumnor Place cottage is not included in the conservation area

Comments Recieved on the Cumnor Conservation Area Appraisal and Officer Recommendations

8	Robert Gee supports the inclusion of Cumnor Place Cottage but suggests including the original plot boundary of substantial trees now located behind three modern houses, in order to protect its setting.	For comments on the inclusion of Cumnor Place Cottage in the conservation area see comment above. The three modern properties behind Cumnor Place Cottage do not contribute to the historic character of the conservation area. There are also only partial distant views of the trees behind the houses which do not warrant inclusion in the conservation area. Recommendation: No change.
8	Robert Gee suggests including a historic thatched cottage opposite Cumnor Place Cottage, and a listed farmhouse further out of the village.	The thatched cottage opposite Cumnor Place Cottage is an isolated cottage set within development which is modern in character and does not reflect the traditional historic development in the conservation area. A conservation area is designated as a unified whole and not individual plots. Recommendation: No change.
8	John M.Gee suggests excluding New Farm from the proposed conservation area because he wishes to make alterations without extra processes to go through. It has a listed farmhouse and is within the Green Belt and therefore has adequate protection against future changes.	It is not clear as to what processes the respondent is referring to. However the main change designation of a conservation area brings about is that when considering planning applications the council will pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the special character or interest of the area. Also conservation area consent is required for the demolition of unlisted buildings. As the council considers New Farm contributes to the special interest of the area it should be included. Recommendation: no change.
8	Pam Gee comments that the corn store in the north of the village has been included in the proposed conservation area because of its ridge and furrow but this is very bad farming practice.	It is not included just because of the ridge and furrow but because of the contribution it makes to the character of the area. Ridge and furrow may be bad farming practice now, but it is a historic farming technique and the ridge and furrow contribute to the character of the area. Recommendation: no change.

Comments Recieved on the Cumnor Conservation Area Appraisal and Officer Recommendations

8	GEM Smith & EWM Smith object to the inclusion of Cutts End House and its curtilage because it is not listed, does not provide vantage points to, from and within the Leys Road character area, and inclusion of the buildings to the front of the property (garage, workshop and shed) devalues the designation of the conservation area.	Cutts End House, because of its location and correlation to Appleford Road creates a sense of enclosure in the street scene which contributes to the special character of the area. Including the gardens of Cutts End House allows the conservation area boundary to follow logical and rational lines. Listing is not the only criteria for including properties in the conservation area. Recommendation: no change.
8	John Chaundy objects to the inclusion of the fields south of Leys Road because they have no special architectural interest, no buildings on the land, no particular views or tress worthy of preservation and no public access by footpath.	Although there is no public access to this land there are views across it to the historic core of the village. An important characteristic of this part of Cumnor is the cluster of farms dispersed around open fields. Recommendation: No change.
8	Edward & Catherine Mott object to the inclusion of Hurstcote and its curtilage because it is not a building of local interest, does not fall within any areas of important views identified on map 4, and does not contribute to the character of the village. Therefore its inclusion is contrary to PPG15.	The inclusion of Hurstcote is entirely consistent with government advice on the designation of conservation areas. It is considered that Hurstcote and its garden makes a contribution to the local scene and for this reason is included. Recommendation: No change.
9	Robert Gee, Pam Gee, John Stenton-Putt, Edward & Catherine Mott comment that there was insufficient time to consider the implications of the draft conservation area appraisal, and believe a decision had been made about the revised boundaries prior to the consultation. It was felt that people affected by the proposal were not listened to and there was a divergence between speech and action.	The council considers that sufficient time has been given for the consultation which initially ran for 8 weeks between 6 October and 28 November 2008. However, the deadline for comments was extended to 15 December to give sufficient time following the public meeting on 17 November. Consultation is an important part of preparing this draft appraisal and comments received will influence the final version. Recommendation: No change.
10	Mary Fear comments that residents should receive help with replacing uPVC windows if required.	Regrettably there is no grant aid for replacement of Upvc windows. Recommendation: No change.
12	Cllr Dudley Hoddinot comments that people will want to know if their property is included in the proposed enlarged conservation area. The lists on page 23 could be re-arranged to list listed buildings on each road as well as buildings within proposed conservation area, and other buildings.	People can look at maps 4 and 5 to see if their property is included in the proposed enlarged conservation area. Adding buildings to the list on page 23 would make the list over long and too detailed. Recommendation: no change.

Comments Recieved on the Cumnor Conservation Area Appraisal and Officer Recommendations

map 4	Martin & Sue Law would like to add the Oak tree at the corner of The South East boundary of the Closes recreation ground (rear of 84 Appleton Road) to the list of important trees.	This is too far away from the historic core of the village to be included in the conservation area. Recommendation: No change.
map 4	Edward & Catherine Mott comment that buildings of historical or architectural interest are the church, vicarage, manor, Bear & Ragged Staff and some old cottages in the heart of the village. All others are relatively modern.	This list includes some historic buildings in Cumnor but there are many other traditional buildings which contribute to making Cumnor a special place. Recommendation: No change.
maps 4 and 5	Cllr Dudley Hoddinot comments that it would be helpful if all house names and numbers mentioned in the text, as well as road names were shown on maps 4 and 5.	Main road names and main house names are already marked and it is felt any further information would clutter the maps. Recommendation: No change.
maps 4 and 5	Cllr Dudley Hoddinot comments that it would be helpful to name the cricket pavilion and the war memorial on maps 4 and 5.	Agreed. Recommendation: label cricket pavillion and war memorial on maps 4 and 5.
maps 4 and 5	Cllr Dudley Hoddinot points out that Cutts End Cottage and House are spelt with two t's throughout the text but the maps only use one. Document needs to be consistent.	Agreed. Recommendation: Correct spellings of Cutts End House, Cutts End Cottage and Cutts End Point on maps 4 and 5.
maps 4 and 5	Cllr Dudley Hoddinot points out that the pub is called the Bear and Ragged Staff but the maps call it the Ragged Staff.	Agreed. Recommendation: amend name of The Ragged Staff to read The Bear and Ragged Staff on maps 4 and 5.
maps 4 and 5	Cllr Dudley Hoddinot comments that the Green Belt should be shown on maps 4 and 5.	The Green Belt and conservation area boundaries are proposed under separate legislation and have different function and purpose. To include the Green Belt boundary on the maps could lead to confusion. Recommendation: No change.