

# **KEMBLE AND KEMBLE STATION CONSERVATION AREAS APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE: REPORT ON SECOND CONSULTATION**

## 1. Introduction.

At the request of Kemble and Ewen Parish Council a second limited consultation on the Kemble and Kemble Station Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Guidance (CAAMG), as revised by Montagu Evans (ME) after the first consultation, was undertaken between the 1<sup>st</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> September 2016. The consultees were the Parish Council and Cotswold District Council. The Parish Council considered that this might be a useful exercise in the light of the full comments received from some of its members/contacts and also to ensure that any factual inaccuracies were identified following the ME revisions.

## 2. The Consultation.

The ME revised CAAMG and the Report of the First Consultation was sent to the Parish Council and the District Council on 30<sup>th</sup> August 2016 with a request for responses to be received by 30<sup>th</sup> September 2016. This was considered a reasonable period in the light of the earlier extensive consultation that had taken place. No requests were received to extend the period.

## 3. Responses to the Consultation.

The responses to the consultation were limited and consisted of a two written responses and one oral response. The responses together with ME's comments are set out in the Appendix to this report. Any necessary revisions to the CAAMG have been made by ME. The CAAMG was finalised in October 2016.

**Montagu Evans.**  
**October 2016**

## **Appendix**

### 1. Comments from Mr Lester Napper via Kemble and Ewen Parish Council:

"My main criticism is still that though the authors of the report state that the boundaries of the conservation areas are 'tight' they still won't agree to any extension to the railway station area. The 1900 OS map in appendix 1.0 of the report shows how the station complex was isolated from the village and surrounded by fields. In addition, Gordon would not allow the junction to become a railway station and only the occupants of Kemble House, and passengers changing trains were allowed to catch a train there. It was forty years before the station was built. To help recognise this physical isolation of the setting for the station complex, I still feel that the boundary should be extended out from the station in all directions, to prevent unsympathetic developments, such as Old Manor Gardens, from taking place again. I did resent the fact that it read in the report on the feedback from the consultation as if one of the main reasons I had for extending the railway conservation area was the protection of the Kemble Community Gardens. It wasn't. To me protecting the railway complex and its setting is the priority.

Robert Gordon did his best to keep the railway away from Kemble House and to hide its impact from view; the tunnel was built to hide the smoke and noise of the engines. Much is made in the report of the tunnel and the idea of Gordon protecting the landscape, almost suggesting that he was an early conservationist! I would suggest that self-interest and an element of snobbery was a more likely reason for this. Yet the new conservation extension fails to include one of the most visible architectural features of his activities, the portal at the northern end of the tunnel and the cutting leading to it from Brunel's stone bridge. If this bridge is worthy of a grade 2 listed status then so is the portal, which would fit the criteria given for the bridge. So why then as I suggested originally isn't it in the conservation areas either for the village, or for the railway station? The latter would be more feasible.

I finish with the quote I gave in my contribution to the consultation, from David Verey,

Kemble: 'A place best known for its railway station', and suggest that for many from outside the village that still applies."

Response: Mr Nappers comments are noted and in particular the case made for the extension of the railway area of the CA. We have previously said that the boundaries of the CA's have been tightly drawn but this does not of itself make the case for extension of the CA in the absence of any area over which extension is proposed having the necessary attributes for being included in the CA. We note what is said about the bridge portal and its inclusion in the CA and agree that a case for extension could be made in that area. The bridge is however separately listed and protected and the extension would not achieve, in terms of the protection of heritage interests, any real benefit. We remain of the view that the appropriate way to proceed here is for the Appraisal to note the tight boundaries and the importance of the setting of the CA's being protected.

### 2. Comments for Cotswold District Council:

I discussed your CA document with one of my colleagues who is involved in mapping and Ordnance Survey issues for the Council and he pointed out to me that the document contains maps which do not appear to comply with OS and other mapping copyrights, for

example there is copy on page 4 of a map of the Conservation Area which comes from our web-site. On the web-site it is “fixed” so that it cannot be printed, I assume that your consultants must have used a screenshot to obtain a copy. He has told me, that without resolving the copyright issues we should not put the document on our web-site as OS tend to be fairly robust in their approach with Local Authorities. Your consultants may be able to provide us with assurance that there are no OS issues but I thought it best to draw this to your attention as soon as possible.

Response: We have been through the CAAMG document and can confirm that the OS data has been bought through ProMap with the exception of the Council’s conservation area map. This was created using a screenshot in order to ensure accuracy. In the light of the Councils comments we have created our own as a reference for Plate 2.1 to ensure there is no conflict.

To be absolutely certain with regard to the copyright issues, we have updated the mapping to ensure there are no such issues and would be happy to provide evidence of the purchased mapping data if that is required at any stage.

3. Comments received orally.

The photograph on page 6 is not a representative view of the CA and should be changed.

Response: With regard to the photograph a more appropriate view will be inserted.