

**APPENDIX 1****STAFFS & WORCESTERSHIRE CANAL CONSERVATION AREA  
CONSULTATION RESPONSES**

<b>Name &amp; Address of Respondent</b>	<b>Method of response</b>	<b>Respondent Comment</b>	<b>WFDC Response and Recommendation</b>
Rod Fox	Email	Generally supportive, but questioned about the amount of dog waste present on the towpath, and how the issue of rubbish in the canal was to be addressed.	Little could be done with regards to the dog waste. Rubbish in canal was addressed by British Waterways on a regular basis, especially in areas where this identified as an issue.
Sarah Jordan 4 Upper Lea Cottages	Email	Generally supportive, but raised a question of the presence of TPO 223. Issue was that it was felt that, whilst this was a fine specimen tree, the site and position of it was not congenial to the character and appearance of the Canal Conservation Areas, nor the adjacent buildings. Requested that this be looked at for removal.	Request for removal to be passed onto new Arboricultural Officer
Kidderminster Car Dismantlers	Letter	Agrees that the scrap yard, by its very nature, does not sit easily with the Canal Linear Conservation Area and it seems sensible to remove and delete it from the conservation area	Progress with deletion of scrap yard from the boundary of the Conservation Area.
Councillor Paul Harrison	Email	Supportive of the Appraisal, and as none of the proposed amendments affected Greenhill Ward, then this was not of an issue relating to his Ward.	No recommendation necessary

<b>Name &amp; Address of Respondent</b>	<b>Method of response</b>	<b>Respondent Comment</b>	<b>WFDC Response and Recommendation</b>
Stephen Braggington, Kidderminster Civic Society	Letter	Generally supportive of proposals and Appraisal, including the removal of the scrap yard from the Conservation Area.	Progress with deletion of scrap yard from the boundary of the Conservation Area.
Steven Bloomfield Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	Letter	No objections and support the Management Proposals	No recommendation necessary.
Mr and Mrs Jarvis	Reply slip	Trees require regular maintenance Road side barriers (Lea Lane) badly need repair Litter-Big problem particularly below St Mary's church alongside Sainsbury's presenting a squalid welcome for tourists	Discussion to be held with Worcestershire Highways Authority regarding the maintenance of trees and roadside barriers. British Waterways are aware of issue problem with canal.
DG & KE Dumbrell 28 Round Hill Wharf	Letter	Inappropriate to classify "traditional" canal features such as projecting crane lofts as Alien Features. Character Appraisal makes no mention of health and Safety or Security Issues, in particular with regard to lighting. The plan should comment on plans to improve security and reduce crime in the area of the canal, particularly in the urban sections. Disappointed that there is no mention of how the Council intends to tackle the true Alien Features of the canal, namely litter and graffiti.	Conservation officer does not agree that projecting crane lofts are traditional feature within this area, therefore recommends that no alteration to this. Whilst lighting may increase security, there are other issues relating to this, especially with regard to wildlife and good design. Proposals to remain unaltered. Rubbish is discussed above. Graffiti – Conservation Officer to discuss with CLACS to see if this can be addressed.

Name & Address of Respondent	Method of response	Respondent Comment	WFDC Response and Recommendation
Michael Taylor, English Heritage	Email	No issues with regards to content of any of the documents.	No recommendation necessary.
Elizabeth Turner, Heritage Advisor, British Waterways	Letter	British Waterways welcomes the research and assessment undertaken in the appraisal and the policies in the Management Plan. Is it possible that the Council may seek to liaise with English Heritage to reconsider the existing Statutory list as it relates to the canal corridor, and where appropriate include further structures?	Conservation Officer agrees that many of the structures within the canal corridor are worthy of being included on the statutory list, and will discuss with Forward Planning Manager to incorporate this element of work into work-load in future.
MJ Cotton, Conservator, Staffs. & Worcs Canal Society	Letter	Generally in agreement with the changes indicated on the draft plans; we note that some structures are not highlighted i.e. the retaining wall adjacent to Mitton Railway Bridge, which should be retained.	Whilst not included within these proposals, this element is included on the boundary of the original designation.

<b>Name &amp; Address of Respondent</b>	<b>Method of response</b>	<b>Respondent Comment</b>	<b>WFDC Response and Recommendation</b>
Vaughan Welch, Branch Chairman, Inland Waterways Association	Letter	IWA supports the proposals, and asks that the Council includes the following points within the final proposals: 1) that Cookley Ironworks, as the last working foundry alongside the Stour be included within the boundary of the Area; 2) that Wilden Ironworks Arm to include the river and the 20 ft of both banks between the wharf and the former Ironworks, linking Platts Wharf and the River Stour be included within the Area; and 3) that as well as the Falling Sands footbridge, the river both upstream and downstream of Falling Sands Footbridge be included as a focal point.	It is the Conservation Officers opinion that the inclusion of these elements will start watering down the meaning and strength of the boundary of the Conservation Area. Furthermore, whilst these areas may have historically been associated with the canal and the local industry, the only remains would be largely archaeological. It should also be noted that the River Stour has been re-routed adjacent to the Wilden Ironworks. Apropos the Falling Sands footbridge, and the river banks to each side, there are only some footings left of this bridge, and whilst these may show some historic relationship between the river and canal, it is considered that this the quantity and quality of the remains are such that there is little merit in their inclusion in the Conservation Area. It is therefore the Officer recommendation, whilst recognising the principal behind the response, that these elements should not be included within the Area.