

APPENDIX i: TABLE OF REPRESENTATIONS, AND THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSE AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ANY CHANGES TO THE ASSESSMENT DOCUMENT IN RELATION TO THEM – FOR RE-DESIGNATING MILTON REGIS C.A.

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
1	Local resident	<p>I refer to your letter dated 9th November 2023, regarding the Public Consultation for the above. Although I no longer live in the High Street, I am fortunate enough to have purchased numerous properties in the area over the years.</p> <p>My first home was 102 High Street, behind the Court Hall, and I have always thought that Milton Regis had a great deal of potential. Since then, I have built up a portfolio of properties in the area including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1A Crown Road (purchased in 1995) • 71 & 71A High Street (purchased in 2006) <p>And in 2023 acquired;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 65A,B & C High Street • 67 High Street • 69 High Street • And the freehold of 1A,1B, 1C Crown Road & 61/63 High Street <p>The ones that we purchased recently were in very poor condition and some your have even considered at risk on your review! Unfortunately, these properties have been significantly altered over the years, but we are trying to preserve as much of their original character in our restoration & refurbishment works. Also, due to their neglect, water ingress has caused serious damp & rot issues as well which we are trying to rectify. Hopefully, you will have seen some substantial improvements since the</p>	Noted & welcomed	No change to the assessment document needed.

PROPOSED MILTON REGIS C.A. – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
		<p>review was written (especially 65 High Street) and further improvement in 2024.</p> <p>I have read through the review and agree with the majority of the points raised. However, there are some areas that I would like to comment on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree Management - From what I can see, the Council have not maintained the trees in public areas at all, especially the two outside 69 High Street. this has caused some significant issues to this property, as we found after purchasing it, as the leaves and branches had damaged leadwork & blocked gutters causing significant water ingress, dampness and rot. These must be maintained. • Proposed boundary change F - I completely agree that this area should be removed from the conservation area but could I suggest that this area be extended to include the rear sections of the gardens to 67, 69 & 71 High Street as well (plan attached showing the additional area in green). The reason for this is that we have found that in these gardens, numerous trees have either self-seeded or been poorly planted next to walls & fences causing them to collapse. As they currently fall within the conservation area, permission needs to be granted to carry out remove them or just cut them back and, as such, they have just been left to get out of control. 		

PROPOSED MILTON REGIS C.A. – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
2	Local Resident	<p>In response to the letter i recently received from yourself regarding the public consultation, Milton Regis Conservation area review.</p> <p>I agree with the purposed changes with regards to the boundaries but some of the comments regarding the bins/signs outside some houses i have some issues with, the houses, 48-50 High Street have no option but to have their bins outside their houses on the public highway.</p> <p>They cannot wheel their bins through their houses and as tenants they have no right of way across the back of the properties so I'm not sure what options are available to have them removed from sight.</p> <p>I thought the draft paper was well written and gave sound points.</p>	Noted and welcomed.	No change to the assessment document needed.
3	Local Resident	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed plans to insert my property on the Risk Register - and the substantial consequences this would have - as set out on the Consultation Area Review Report. This objection is on several grounds, as outlined below, in full. The overarching theme is that the Report is completely insufficient and lacking any explanation or basis for its findings in relation to Crown Road, as set out below.</p> <p>I further wish to object to the fact that I was never directly informed that a Consultation would take place and was only made aware of it in a letter addressed to the Owner on 9 November 2023, leaving little time to study the report and take advice, although some of the conclusions of the report may have very dire consequences for me as the owner and occupant of ...</p> <p><u>Defective Report</u></p>	<p>Noted and welcomed</p> <p>A number of issues raised in this consultation response are matters relation to law and order and traffic management.</p>	No change to the assessment document needed.

PROPOSED MILTON REGIS C.A. – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
		<p>The Report is badly written and wholly lacking in important information. It is an abuse of process to rely on the Report for the onerous action of listing Crown Road on the Risk Register.</p> <p>Bell states at the top of page 38 that four properties, including 5 Crown Road, are in “particularly poor condition”. He then immediately goes on to discuss solutions, with no explanation at all given as to how he came to this conclusion.</p> <p>Missing detail includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What scale is being used? - What criteria are being used? (i.e. what specific aspects of the architecture are an issue). - There is no reference to statute/policy/law on what constitutes “particularly poor condition”. - There is no detail on how this evidence was obtained (e.g. in person visit etc - only a certain level of inspection could have been achieved without trespassing illegally on the property). - There is no indication a second opinion has been sought or Bell’s work checked before publication. - On page 58, Bell listed desirable features of Crown Road. He could have used this section to dissect which features were falling into disrepair but failed to. There is no specific information on what is in “particularly poor condition” (e.g. brickwork etc). - There is no reference to Bell’s credentials - e.g. whether he has experience as a surveyor etc. There is no reference to the credentials needed to carry out the Report and whether these have been fulfilled. 		

PROPOSED MILTON REGIS C.A. – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
		<p>It would be an abuse of process to rely on the above Report to list Crown Road on the Risk Register, when it is lacking any detail or basis for the conclusion to list Crown Road.</p> <p>Further, this lack of detail means it is impossible for me to defend myself. It is impossible to give a response defending my property against being put on the Risk Register when I do not know the grounds on which it is being put on the Risk Register. This also evidences a complete lack of willingness by the council to cooperate with or help private property owners. If specific details were set out in the report, then I could have attempted to find solutions to avoid my property being put on the Risk Register, or provided an explanation as to why this was not the case (e.g. bad photography may have portrayed aspects of the architecture as worse than they actually are, and I could have explained here if I knew what the problem was).</p> <p>Further, I note the following from Historic England: “an urgent works notice should generally be restricted to urgent repairs to keep a building wind and weather-proof and safe from collapse, or action to prevent vandalism or theft”. Bell’s wording of “particularly poor condition” seems disproportionate considering Crown Road does not fulfil any of these categories (and indeed, Bell could not have assessed these categories without trespassing, which I assume he did not do).</p> <p>Further, Bell has included some troublesome wording at page 37. He states “Historic England’s assessment of Milton’s condition as ‘poor’ and ‘deteriorating’ is not unreasonable. It accords with some of the findings in this</p>		

PROPOSED MILTON REGIS C.A. – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
		<p>appraisal. The appraisal has identified specific buildings and some other aspects of the conservation area that are in poor condition or poorly managed”. Bell seems to be tying his findings to Historic England’s findings. However, Historic England never references 5 Crown Road in their assessment of Milton Regis, which he tentatively appears to be suggesting.</p> <p>Further, 5 Crown Road, which has been constantly occupied since 1996, is visually in obviously much better condition than 2 other buildings listed (46 High Street - substantially boarded up over the original window; 65 High Street - substantially boarded up over the original window with very old paint on the door). In contrast, 5 Crown Road has no externally boarded up windows (there is a board behind the original plating of one window for privacy/vandalism reasons). Fresh paint has been applied to the blue door for weather proofing and the door was insulated. This can be clearly seen.</p> <p>Further, Bell only seems to only express his own opinions about what would constitute a desirable conservation zone, expressing, for example, his liking for the new bright colours used at numbers 68-70 without saying whether these colours were in line with English heritage and had been approved by the Council. Indeed, the entire report just seems to be one man’s opinion and personal preferences, with little reference to sources.</p> <p>Overall, the Report is severely deficient and the findings on 5 Crown Road should be removed from the finalised version, as no reasoning has been given for this description of “particularly poor condition”.</p> <p><u>Proportionality: private owners</u></p>		

PROPOSED MILTON REGIS C.A. – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
		<p>The Report makes no reference to the negative financial impact that Repairs Notices, Urgent Works Notices, Section 215 Notices and ultimately Compulsory Purchase would have on private owners. It makes no reference to whether the private owners could afford repairs, especially in the current recession.</p> <p>ME10 2AH is a deprived area and ranks 4/10 on the Index of Multiple Deprivation Decile, IMD 2019. 5 Crown Road was bought relatively cheaply in 1996. The cost of anticipated repairs would be unduly onerous on the owner. It is the council's duty to consider the welfare of its constituency. The timing of this Consultation and proposed measures of repair orders is completely insensitive considering the current cost of living crisis. There is no consideration of this in the Report.</p> <p><u>Description of Milton Regis</u></p> <p>The description of Milton Regis throughout the Report is wholly inaccurate.</p> <p>Crown Road has always been a very busy road. There is heavy traffic - including lorries, coaches and double-decker buses - so much so that the house vibrates regularly. Crown Road is also used as a racing track by people who do not want to use Mill way or just want to have fun. At the moment, there are a lot of motorbikes racing up and down the road. In the last twenty years, two of the owners' cars were written off by racing drivers. Another one was damaged and another three were vandalised (smashed windows). All the cars were parked in the bay in front of 5 Crown Road. The latest incident, witnessed by neighbours and reported to the police, dates back to last week.</p>		

PROPOSED MILTON REGIS C.A. – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
		<p>In addition, Crown Road is not cleaned regularly, and the road pollution is also dirtying the houses.</p> <p>There is a lot of anti-social behaviour, including from neighbours. 3 Crown Road has appropriated the public passageway between number 3 and number 5 and has been growing a very large sycamore tree whose roots are clearly damaging the foundations of number 5 outer building in the garden (also listed). The exterior wall adjacent to 3 Crown road cannot be inspected - despite the fact that 5 Crown road is a detached house - because the neighbour is not letting the owner in. I spent years asking help from the Council, police and English Heritage but had no support at all to protect my property although it is part of the conservation zone.</p> <p><u>Vandalism</u></p> <p>The rate of vandalism and crime in Milton Regis impacts the ability to carry out repairs to Crown Road. The door gets kicked regularly and the windows vandalised.</p> <p>The front windows to the house have been vandalised and smashed multiple times, posing a danger to anyone in the living room when the windows are vandalised. Due to this, the owner has placed a wooden board behind the window for protection (keeping the original window visible in front). Repeatedly replacing the windows is not viable due to the quick rate of vandalism.</p> <p>Further, the bricks running the bottom of the house are frequently kicked at and cannot be replaced at the rate they are vandalised.</p> <p>The vandalism means it feels obsolete for the owner to carry out constant repairs/replacements as soon as something is repaired/replaced, it is broken again.</p> <p><u>Summary</u></p>		

PROPOSED MILTON REGIS C.A. – REPRESENTATIONS, RESPONSE & RECOMMENDATIONS TABLE (Continued)

Rep. No(s).	Representation By	Summary of Representation	Officer Response	Recommendation
		<p>In conclusion, the section on Crown Road should be omitted from the Report and not included in the Consultation. In the alternative, the Report needs to be re-done or Bell (the original author) needs to provide substantial further information to clarify his reasoning, because as it stands there is a complete lack of information, so much so that it amounts to an abuse of process.</p>		