

Comments by the Laverstock and Ford Parish Council on Draft Old Sarum Conservation Area Management Plan (MP) - 6731 CMP RevA11 Jun 2014.

Comment Ref	Page Ref	Section	Remarks
1	Page 4	Background	Reference is made here to the Conservation Plan dated 6 Dec 2013 that purports to set out general principles for the airfields conservation. The MP and this other document require to be reviewed together.
2	Page4	Conservation	The definition makes no mention of preservation (and it is not mentioned anywhere else in the document), which must be an essential element when considering any form of conservation. The document seems to major on 'management of change in a sustainable manner' instead.
3	Page 5	'Overview – Parameters for Change'	Reference is made to the local plan – which document is this?
4	Page 5	'Development Framework'	The second para states that this document proposes a Development Framework. This is blatantly not true – what it offers is a long wish list and tries to justify considerable development, e.g. approximately 470 houses', on the airfield.
5	Page 5	Summary at bottom of page	If by 'airfield owners', the document is implying OSAL (or indeed their predecessors in name) enabled the Boscombe Museum to move into Hangar 2, this is incorrect. The Museum is renting the Hangar from the owner who is not OSAL and who has paid to have the Hangar renovated recently.
6	Page 5	Summary at bottom of page	Reference is made to funded air shows. There have been very few air shows at the airfield within the last few years to our knowledge. Who has funded these?
7	Page 6	Development iaw Core Policy 9	<p><u>General</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Core policy 9 confirms there are opportunities for development within the current airfield site. It is understood that the area is a potential area for development only to be permitted subject to facilitating Core Policy 9.</i> - <i>If the development goes ahead in the 3 areas as indicated, the airfield itself will no longer look like the old WW1 airfield. The perimeter will be significantly changed – very obvious from the air – and some 65% of the historic perimeter which survived after the modern poor quality industrial buildings were constructed during the latter part of the 20th century</i>

			<p>will be lost. Furthermore, this airfield is unique at this moment in time as it is the only WW1 airfield, which does not have a hard perimeter track around the original flying field. It has to be remembered that the historic perimeter of the airfield, which survived after building of the modern industrial buildings, was one of the 4 significant criteria considered when awarding conservation status.</p> <p><u>Bullet 4</u> Evidence that the development in Area C will not be seen from the listed buildings (hangars) has yet to be produced. An earlier visual assessment was referred to in a document in 2008. However, the WC advised they did not hold a copy. If the sightline is an important factor, the same criteria should apply to the historic WW1 gun butts, which are located on the NE perimeter.</p>
8	Page 7	Summary in bold	The PC in whose Parish the airfield sits have not been consulted nor would it appear have the freehold owners of the airfield. In addition, several owners of properties in the area would also appear not to have been consulted and some owners listed no longer exist. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that the list is not comprehensive.
9	Page 8	2 nd para	Again no evidence is held by the WC from any acoustic survey carried out on the airfield. As in Comment 7 a similar assessment was referred to in 2008 but WC does not have a copy. Based on aviation experience, it is hard to believe that housing built in Area A will not suffer considerable noise from aircraft taking off in a westerly direction. At the point of passing this Area, aircraft will be at full power until they reach circuit height. Moving the runway 50 m is unlikely to reduce the noise level significantly.
10	Page 9	3 rd para	The fly-ins have been planned; however, the take-up of such events is unclear. There is little publicity given in the local area to either type of event, which might attract other visitors to the airfield.
11	Page 9	5 th para	Encouraging historic aircraft to visit would be laudatory action. It is gratifying that this aspect is acknowledged as 'the key to its (the airfield's) long term conservation'!
12	Page 10	5 th bullet point	This will be major construction of considerable size if it is going to contain a control tower, a visitor centre, a larger café/restaurant plus a base for the existing flying training school! What would be the intention for the future of the old Air Traffic Tower?
13	Page 10	6 th bullet point	There is little chance that civil bodies, or indeed the RAF with its own museum at Hendon and Shawbury, will transfer any irreplaceable archived material to Old Sarum. It also has to be remembered that the Boscombe Down Museum is in the process of building up its own archives relating to aviation Test and Evaluation.
14	Page	1 st bullet point	How have the airfield owners supported the Boscombe Down Museum?

	13		
15	Page 13	2 nd bullet point	To which Conservation Plan does this refer?
16	Page 13	6 th bullet point	The idea of the Boscombe Down Museum providing detailed displays giving explanation and interpretation of the site seems to conflict with Page 10, 5 th bullet point (Comment 12 refers.)
17	Page 13	'Creating a Centre of Excellence'	Nice idea but the concept offered here is very much looking to the future – not really something to form part of a Conservation Management Plan.
18	Page 14	'Improved Entrance to Site'	How would this be financed?
19	Page 14	'Inclusive Public Access'	<u>Bullet 4</u> . The pathway suggested offers a long walk, which is unlikely to be very popular.
20	Page 15	'Improve the road behind the hangars'	This section provides an interesting concept. Have all the owners of the road 'bought' into this initiative? One disadvantage of opening up the road would mean that there would be access to the industrial buildings at the eastern end, which might be undesirable. It is the intention to reopen the vista along the road and manage the trees as part of a cohesive landscape improvement plan for the airfield as a whole. Who is going to pay and maintain this?
21	Page 16	'The Green Lane'	<u>Bullet 4</u> . The suggestion of buses running along Green Lane was considered several years ago and was rejected by the majority of the residents in the road – at both ends. It is unlikely that with no new development at either end of this stretch of Green Lane, the outcome of any new poll would produce different results. <u>Bullet 5</u> . This is an understatement if public transport was allowed to use the lane as major road works would be required – and would have to include the whole length from Roman Road in Ford to the Portway.
22	Page 18	'Explanation and Interpretation'	Is the intention to have an Interpretation Centre or an Exhibition? Both terms are used in this section. On page 11 this is referred to as a visitor centre, which 'will' and not 'possibly' be part of the proposed café/restaurant/flying club. Also page 11 refers to a 'flying school' where as this section refers to a 'flying club' - which is it?
23	Page 19	'Remove Negative Impacts'	<u>Bullet 4</u> is not applicable to development on the south side of the airfield – there are no 'intrusive buildings' to view here. <u>Bullet 5</u> is not understood – what will mirror the effect of the Officers' Mess? <u>Bullet 7</u> says that the view from Ford is currently marred by the modern industrial development on

			the north side. What is not made clear here is that the view from Ford across the airfield is uninterrupted currently. However, the proposed would totally destroy this view across the airfield from Manor Farm Road and a significant portion of Green Lane! The proposed development in Area C would therefore, in itself, provide a massive negative impact of Ford.
24	Page 19	'Remove Negative Impacts'	The diagram marks up the agriculture on the old flying field as unsightly. Who says it is unsightly? Furthermore, what is preferable - animals grazing on land, which allows the old flying field to maintain its historic perimeter and shape or a considerable new development, which destroys a significant portion of the perimeter?
25	Page 19	'Remove Negative Impacts'	The summary in bold at the bottom refers to mitigating negative impacts being a way of sustaining and enhancing the heritage of the site and its surroundings. How does a large new development in Area A or Area C with many houses enhance the heritage of the historic airfield?
26	Page 20	'Manage Agricultural Activity'	Do the pig arks outside the airfield have a negative impact on the historic setting of the airfield (or indeed the Conservation Area)? This is questionable. Furthermore, it would appear totally unreasonable to expect the activity outside the airfield boundary to be 'managed more effectively'.
27	Page 21	'Historic Buildings'	<u>Bullet 4.</u> Careful thought and consideration will need to be given prior to the demolition of any building within the Conservation Area. Demolition is not part of a conservation plan. <u>Summary in bold.</u> This hanger (Hangar 3) has been in need of attention for many years but the freehold owners, ie OSAL and their predecessors in name, have let it deteriorate to its present state.
28	Page 22	'Hangar 3'	<u>Bullet1.</u> Assuming the other 2 hangars were fully refurbished prior to being sold by the Mod, the condition of Hangar 3 would undoubtable have be reflected in its purchase costs. <u>Bullet 2.</u> Very little work appears to have been done on it since it was purchased in the 1980's – as indicated in Comment 27. <u>Summary in Bold.</u> The reason this hangar, and not the others on site, was so badly affected by this last winter's bad weather was because of the very poor condition it was in prior to the winter.
29	Page 23	'The Rifle Range'	<u>Bullet 2.</u> Agreed - there are very few if any historic WW1 Gun Butts which still exist according to Wessex Archaeology and are therefore exceedingly rare. Consequently, it would be sensible to consider giving them listed status. This would then raise their profile to that given to the hangars. However, since they are in a Conservation Area they should already be accorded the same priority as the hangars, e.g. the sightline to and from the Butts must be considered. In addition, it would be extraordinary to place any housing near to a rifle range. No evidence has been produced to suggest that the shooting club is in any financial difficulty as suggested in the document.

30	Page 26	'Community Benefits'	<p>Bullet 1. The wording here does not make sense. <u>Summary in bold.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It would appear that the degree of housing development suggested (the enablers?) is far in excess of what is required to sensibly conserve – and hopefully preserve - the airfield. - Reference has already been made in previous comments regarding the impact on the 3 development areas on the historic airfield perimeter. However, the Conservation Area focusses on an historic flying field and, therefore, the visual effect of any development has to be considered from the air and not limited to ground observations only. The appearance and shape of the historic flying field would be changed totally if development in Areas A and C were to go ahead.
----	------------	-------------------------	---