

Appendix A: Summary of Consultation Responses to Boundary Change

The following sets out responses to issues raised in response to the consultation responses.

One response was received via the online portal. One letter was received (see Monopro letter below) as a result of the letters sent to notify interested parties about the proposed boundary change. No one attended the virtual public meeting held on 16 June 2020.

Total responses: 2

Total comments made: 3

Legal advice was also sought regarding changing the boundary.

Online consultation (10 June – 8 July 2020)

Section/Paragraph	Representation	Response
1. Are you a. Owner b. Leaseholder c. Resident d. Other	Other	None
2. Do you agree with the proposed boundary change?	Yes	None
3. Do you have any further comments?	No comments made.	None

The Monopro Pension Fund Letter: 7 July 2020

The Monopro Pension fund own 40-48 Guildford Street. They made the following comments:

Section/Paragraph	Representation	Response
General	Firstly, we do not believe that the buildings that you intend to include along Guildford St are of high architectural value and are in keeping with the characteristics of the rest of the Hat District Conservation Area. In particular we would consider the 1960s part of Alexon House to be of poor architectural value.	This is the most significant example of the post-war period of factory construction in the Conservation Area, so it completes the story. The windows have been replaced, but higher quality windows could be reinstated at a future date. This building, and the older buildings to the south-west, add to the special architectural or historic interest of the Conservation Area.

General	Secondly, we object to the inclusion of the north side of Guilford Street but exclusion of the south side. It would seem extremely odd that our buildings would be restricted in terms of aesthetic but that any development that happens directly opposite would not.	<p>The south side of Guildford Street is not of special architectural or historic interest, so it is difficult to see how it could be added into the Conservation Area. Indeed, it is of poor urban quality.</p> <p>Redevelopment of the south side of Guildford Street would still be affected by the proximity to the Conservation Area. The special statutory duty relating to planning decisions affecting conservation areas would apply (Section 72). In addition, Section 66 would apply to development affecting the setting of listed buildings. So a high standard of redevelopment would be necessary for the south side of Guildford Street, even though it was outside of the boundary of the Conservation Area.</p>
General	I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt of my comments and I would be very happy to discuss this in further detail. You can find my contact details below.	The letter was acknowledged.