

# **Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area Management Plan**

## **Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)**

### **CONSULTATION STATEMENT**

#### **1. Introduction**

This statement is the 'Consultation Statement' for the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area Management Plan SPD as required by the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. This statement sets out how the public and other stakeholders were consulted upon the SPD.

#### **2. Consultation regulations**

The SPD is produced in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The relevant regulations relating to the consultation process are explained below.

Regulation 12: Regulation 12(a) requires the Council to produce a consultation statement before adoption of the SPD, this must set out who was consulted, a summary of the issues raised, and how these issues were incorporated in to the SPD. This statement is the 'Consultation Statement' for the adopted SPD as required by Regulation 12(a).

Regulation 12(b) requires the Council to publish the documents (including a 'consultation statement') for a minimum 4 week consultation, specify the date when responses should be received, and identify the address to which responses should be sent. The consultation statement that accompanied the draft SPD set out that information.

Regulation 13: Regulation 13 stipulates that any person may make representations about the SPD and that the representations must be made by the end of the consultation date referred to in Regulation 12. The consultation statement that accompanied the draft SPD set out that requirement.

Regulation 35: Regulation 12 states that when seeking representations on an SPD, documents must be made available in accordance with Regulation 35. This requires the Council to make documents available by taking the following steps:

- Make the document available at the principal office and other places within the area that the Council considers appropriate;
- Publish the document on the Council's website.

These measures were undertaken as part of the draft SPD consultation.

#### **3. The Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)**

The SCI was adopted in 2018 and reflects the 2012 Regulations, set out above, together with related regulations and policy including the NPPF 2018. It also specifies additional measures that the Council will undertake in consulting upon draft SPDs and these have been reflected in the

consultation process for the SPD. As per the SCI, the Council has involved key stakeholders in the preparation of this draft SPD for consultation (as set out in the SPD).

#### 4. Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area Management Plan SPD Consultation Information

Consultation on the SPD is been carried out in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The draft SPD was made available for inspection by the public for a six week period between 5<sup>th</sup> November to 17<sup>th</sup> December 2018. Copies of the draft SPD were available during normal office hours at the following locations:

- Cannock Chase Council principal offices at the Civic Centre, Beecroft Road, Cannock
- Public library at Rugeley
- Public Library at Brereton

A copy of the draft SPD was available to view on the Council's website at [www.cannockchasedc.gov.uk/planningpolicy](http://www.cannockchasedc.gov.uk/planningpolicy) .

Further information was available by contacting the Planning Policy team by email at [planningpolicy@cannockchasedc.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@cannockchasedc.gov.uk) or by telephoning 01543 462621.

The following measures were undertaken to inform persons of the draft SPD consultation and document availability:

- Notification letters sent to all properties in the Conservation Area, stakeholders including Historic England, Staffordshire County Council, the Inland Waterways Association and the Landor(Local History) Society and local ward Members.
- A short presentation was made to Rugeley Town Council and Brereton and Ravenhill Parish Council.
- A Press Notice was posted in local papers.
- A press release was issued.
- The draft SPD and details of the consultation were posted on the Council's website.

#### 5. Summary of issues raised and how incorporated into the SPD

5 representations on the draft SPD were received from external parties, including Parish and Town Councils, the Inland Waterways Association and local residents. In summary, comments received broadly expressed strong support for the SPD, suggesting only relatively minor amendments and additional information to be referenced. Many of the requested changes have been taken forward in the adopted SPD.

A full schedule of representations received to both the accompanying Appraisal and the Management Plan SPD is set out in Appendix 1 together with the Council's response. Appendix 2 details the amendments to the draft SPD.

## Appendix 1

### Draft Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan

#### Summary of main issues raised during consultation

Name	Comments	Officer recommendation
Brereton & Ravenhill Parish Council, Brereton & Ravenhill Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee and Brereton & Ravenhill Heritage Committee	<p>Welcome the draft documents subject to the following comments:</p> <p><u>Appraisal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P3 – while welcoming in principle improved cycle links via the canal corridor it is important to minimise the potential for conflict between cyclists and pedestrians.</li> <li>• P6 last complete para – final sentence should begin ‘In Rugeley and Brereton’</li> <li>• P7 first line – we suggest replacing ‘control of British waterways’ with ‘guardianship of the Canal and River Trust’</li> <li>• P14, 29 and Appendix 3 – we wholeheartedly support the proposed extension of the conservation area to include the site of the former canal basin at the bottom of Thompson Road.</li> <li>• P19 – we suggest identifying the relevant parts of the disused concrete bridge as negative boundaries.</li> <li>• P19&amp;21 – we firmly believe that 1760’s bridge 65 should be clearly identified as a significant building</li> <li>• P25 2<sup>nd</sup> para – we suggest adding at the end of the penultimate sentence ‘which impedes use by disabled and less able people and by parents with pushchairs’.</li> <li>• P25 last complete sentence – we suggest adding ‘ which now form a valuable and valued feature of the canal’.</li> <li>• P26 1<sup>st</sup> complete para – we suggest replacing ‘which should aim to preserve its character whilst at the same time facilitating use by disabled and less able people, parents with pushchairs and cyclists’.</li> <li>• P27&amp;28 – the disused concrete former railway bridge should be identified as a negative feature.</li> </ul> <p><u>Management Plan SPD</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P4 5<sup>th</sup> box 1<sup>st</sup> sentence – we suggest replacing this with ‘ The Council will seek the repair and maintenance of towpath surfacing and waterway edging using appropriate materials and methods in conjunction with</li> </ul>	<p>Noted and support welcomed.</p> <p>Text updated accordingly to cover these matters.</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Plans updated.</p> <p>Plan updated.</p> <p>Text updated</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>Plan updated</p> <p>Text updated</p>

	<p>Brereton and Ravenhill Parish Council (which has obtained funding for this in its area) and the Canal and River Trust.’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P4 6<sup>th</sup> box final sentence – we suggest replacing this with ‘ careful removal of vegetation growing in wall crevices and ivy overgrowth will reveal the attractiveness of the structure to view, avoid damage and loss of integrity from root growth and facilitate proper maintenance’</li> <li>• P5 sec 1 – we suggest adding a final box ‘ the Council will be prepared to use its powers under the Planning Acts where neglect threatens the survival of historic structures or harms amenity’</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P6&amp;12 – we wholeheartedly support the proposed extension of the conservation area to include the site of the former canal basin at the bottom of Thompson Road.</li> <li>• P10 – we suggest identifying the relevant parts of the disused concrete railway bridge as negative boundaries.</li> <li>• P10&amp;11 – we firmly believe that the 1760’s Bridge 65 should be clearly identified as a significant building.</li> </ul>	<p>Text updated</p> <p>The Council’s adopted generic Conservation Areas Management Plan SPD 2014 should be read in conjunction with the individual Management Plans and contains measures available to the Council to apply to all of its conservation areas, including enforcement.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Plan updated.</p> <p>Plan updated</p>
<p>Inland Waterways Association</p>	<p>IWA responded to the previous consultation in 2011 and we note that many of the changes suggested previously have been incorporated, including extension of the conservation area boundary to take in the Talbot Basin. We are generally content that these two documents provide a sound basis for the protection and improvement of the conservation area. Detailed comments as follows:  <u>Appraisal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• p6 1<sup>st</sup> para last line – add Canal after Caldon</li> <li>• p6 2<sup>nd</sup> para 2<sup>nd</sup> line – change ‘costed’ to ‘cost’.</li> <li>• p6 3<sup>rd</sup> para sentence beginning ‘in 1948...’ change to: ‘In 1948 the canal was nationalised and since 2012 has been under the control of the Canal and River Trust, a charity, which exists to maintain and develop the canal and the inland waterway network to fulfil its economic, social and</li> </ul>	<p>Noted and support welcomed.</p> <p>Text updated accordingly to cover these matters.</p> <p>Ditto</p>

	<p>environmental potential’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P7 1st para – delete ‘because the technology to build skew arches had not then been developed’ and replace with ‘to minimise the length of the aqueduct and the embankment where the canal crosses the river valley from the north side to the south’ (explanation: whilst it is true that skew arches had not then been developed, it is most unlikely they would have been used at this location’.</li> <li>• P7 2<sup>nd</sup> para – delete ‘most recently’ from ‘and has most recently been used as the South Staffordshire Water Museum’ (explanation: the museum items are a private collection that has in the past been open to visitors by appointment, but rarely in recent years.)</li> <li>• P8 1<sup>st</sup> para – consider deleting ‘It is said that as her body was pulled from the water her blood ran down the flight of steps and the spot is still rumoured to be haunted to this day’ (explanation: although much repeated this is no more than a fanciful myth, and perhaps therefore not appropriate for a serious conservation area appraisal. A drowned body would not leak blood when carried up steps. In any case the present steps are a relatively modern concrete replacement for the original red sandstone steps, partly on a different alignment. An IWA excavation in 20011 uncovered the bottom two steps still in situ although these appear to be the only ones remaining. They are still there under a shallow protective covering of soil. The redness of the local sandstone may have given rise to the myth about blood stains. Suggest adding ‘the modern concrete steps are a replacement of the original sandstone steps of which only the bottom two survive below ground’.</li> <li>• P8 3<sup>rd</sup> para – change ‘is believed to have been’ to ‘was’ a cobbled yard and wharf... (explanation: this was visible until largely destroyed by excavation for the present swimming pool in 2008. You might also mention the stone wall still visible behind the pool building with its 3 large arched openings, which it is believed were for underground storage or stables. The distinctive and attractive Churchdale Cottage facing the canal was extended in 2008 but in</li> </ul>	<p>Ditto</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>Consideration will be given to extending the Conservation Area boundary in a future update when this proposed inclusion can be advertised. In the meantime text updated.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>a closely matching style. Although the Cottage and arches are outside the conservation area you might consider including them for their historic interest.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.20 3<sup>rd</sup> line – correct typo ‘scheme leading’</li> <li>• P.23 – the parapets of Leathermill Lane Bridge (66) have been rebuilt and capped with incongruous concrete slabs in place of the original sandstone coping stones. This should be a priority for replacement with authentic materials, in conjunction with repairs to the bridge wing wall.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.29 – if ‘copies were sent to British Waterways’ is describing the current consultation (use of past tense makes this unclear) then this should be changed to Canal and River Trust.</li> <li>• Appendix 1 p.33 – in ‘the pumping station is situated close to a branch of the Trent and Mersey Canal, delete ‘a branch of the’ (explanation: the pumping station adjoins the main canal, there is no branch.)</li> </ul> <p><u>Draft Management Plan SPD</u> IWA suggests that section 4 of the Plan should also include the following specific potential enhancement objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moorings – the main moorings for visiting boats used to be north of Leathermill Lane where mooring rings still exist, but the canal bank has now deteriorated with wash holes and collapsed sections such that most boats can no longer moor here. Although boats can moor south of the bridge where the bank is sheet piled, this section often gets congested and the towpath here is very narrow. Repairing the bank and reinstating the moorings between Leathermill Lane and Station Road, using sheet piling but topped with original stone copings recovered from the collapsed wash wall would both respect</li> </ul>	<p>Text updated The canal bridges are understood to be the responsibility of the Canal and River Trust (CRT) so this matter will be brought to their attention. The Council is aware that damage is occurring due to large vehicles attempting to turn at the top of Leathermill Lane so will be referred to Staffordshire County Council (SCC) Highways too. An item will be added to the Management Plan SPD Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Text updated</p> <p>Text updated</p> <p>Text updated and matter will be referred to CRT. Item added to Management Plan SPD Delivery Plan.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>the heritage and provide an improved facility for boaters to stop, visit and shop in Rugeley. The Council should work with the Canal and River Trust to identify additional third party funding for this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leathermill Lane Canal Bridge (66) – Now that the bridge has been pedestrianised, funding should be sought to rebuild the parapets by replacing the modern facing brickwork with heritage bricks that match the original c.1771 hand made bricks of the main arch. The incongruous concrete slab copings should be replaced with sandstone blocks to reinstate the original appearance of the bridge as an important heritage feature of the canal and of Rugeley. The damaged wing wall (fig 9 of Appraisal) should also be rebuilt in a way that facilitates the improvement of the towpath access ramp to remove the steps and provide disabled access.</li> <li>Outside storage – the external storage of materials behind industrial units, such as vehicle tyres at the Starco and Granurite sites, is visually intrusive and damaged the setting of the conservation area. Enforcement action should be taken where appropriate to prevent this, or other interventions made to screen such sites with reinforced planting or new fencing.</li> </ul>	<p>Text updated and matter will be referred to CRT and SCC Highways. Item added to Management Plan SPD Delivery Plan</p> <p>The Council’s adopted generic Conservation Areas Management Plan SPD 2014 should be read in conjunction with the individual Management Plans and contains measures available to the Council to apply across all of its conservation areas, including enforcement. A landscaped buffer zone to the canal boundary formed part of development approvals for all recent commercial sites along Wheelhouse Road. The case will be investigated.</p>
<p>Harry Thornton Local resident</p>	<p>The new documents are welcome because of the several changes that have taken place since the previous Appraisal of 2012, and the major changes that are likely to take place in the near future when the Power Station site is redeveloped.</p> <p><u>Draft Appraisal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>p.16 – as a matter of interest, Love Lane is shown on the 1815 parish map (WSL Ref. 14/19/45) as Hodgley Lane and extends to provide access to fields behind the Mossley area.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted and support welcomed.</p> <p>Text updated accordingly (on p.10).</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.19 – plan 6, add the redundant concrete railway bridge should be a negative boundary</li> <li>• P.23 Bridges – the disused concrete railway bridge is deteriorating and could eventually become dangerous.</li> <li>• P.27 1<sup>st</sup> para – as a matter of interest the lime kiln at Mossley was owned by John Cox, who used it to produce lime for processing leather after he bought the Bryans Lane tannery at auction in 1820, following the bankruptcy of its former owner Walter Nixon (SRO Ref, D603/X/5/30) It was in use from at least 1840 (No 1184 on the Tithe Map) until at least 1889 when conveyed by later Cox family members to another owner (SRO Ref D4244).</li> <li>• P.31 Note 6 – consider adding the need for demolishing the redundant concrete railway bridge.</li> </ul> <p><u>Draft Management Plan SPD</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.4 – retention and enhancement of buildings, boundaries and characteristic features: I would suggest an additional box is required solely to deal with the future of the listed Bridge no. 64 which appears to be ownerless and in need of systematic maintenance, in particular, the immediate removal of vegetation growing into the brickwork.</li> <li>• P.7 &amp; 12 – the inclusion of the former ‘Talbot Basin’ into the Conservation area would be desirable because of its past close connection with the canal and by being the only visible reminder of the old Brereton Colliery in the locality. The proposed location of the linkage over the Armitage Road is logical as it coincides with the former bridge under the road and draws attention to the reason for the canal side railings at that point.</li> <li>• P.7 table 4 – it would be beneficial if the redundant and truncated concrete bridge was removed as it is already deteriorating and may eventually become dangerous.</li> <li>• P.10 – the map should show the redundant concrete bridge as a negative boundary.</li> </ul>	<p>Plan updated.</p> <p>Ownership of this bridge will be investigated.</p> <p>Text updated in summary.</p> <p>See note above</p> <p>Text updated accordingly. This bridge is understood to be in the ownership of the CRT so the matter will be brought to their attention.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>See note above.</p> <p>Plan updated</p>
Lesley Jewkes Local resident	I read the reports with great interest, the historical and contemporary information showed considerable and detailed work, and the Council is to be commended for this. However I think that the report	Noted and support welcomed.

	<p>does tend to convey a rather rosy picture of the canal and immediate environs. I take a particular interest in this much abused and neglected stretch of canal and would like to add the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bridge 66 (Leathermill Lane) is in a very poor state, it has been crudely and unsympathetically repaired, capping stones are missing (probably in the canal) and there are several deep cracks in the roadside brickwork and is possibly in danger of collapse. The access here to the canalside is a confusing, ugly and hazardous mess.</li> <li>• The ATS premises adjacent to the bridge are a neglected eyesore, and possibly an environmental hazard. The bank on their property and down to the canal is a scruffy overgrown mess. I have written to ATS about this; they don't care about their premises and do nothing.</li> <li>• The Old Mill nearby is up for sale at a price in excess of £1million. It remains unsold. It will I am sure, eventually collapse into the canal.</li> <li>• The towpath from Bridge 66 and away from the town is rarely used as moorings, the coir rolls along with other measures such as concrete filled sandbags are a temporary measure designed to preserve the path edge; however the bank continues to collapse and it is very difficult for boats to moor here because the water is so shallow. The consequence is that boats moor further away</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. A scheme of enhancement to this canal access is planned to be implemented by the CRT in partnership with the Council using S106 funds from the Tesco development. Matter of damage will be referred to CRT and SCC Highways. Item added to Management Plan Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Noted. Planning permission was granted for refurbishment of this site in 2018 but so far there has been no progress on development.</p> <p>Noted. The Old Mill is in private ownership and was the subject of a Feasibility Study for conversion to residential use under the recent Rugeley Town Centre Partnership Scheme. Whilst the site is being marketed and is on the 'Save Britain's Heritage' Register of available properties, so far there has been no progress on development.</p> <p>Canal maintenance issue to be referred to the CRT. Item added to Management Plan Delivery Plan</p>
--	--	---

	<p>and beyond the '48 hour' limit to the detriment of possible boater trade in the town and to the annoyance of canal side residents. The canal here is in urgent need of piling, backfilling and dredging, thus restoring the canal to its proper width and depth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The towpath from the town and all the way to Shugborough is much used by walkers and cyclists and if properly restored could become a considerable asset to the town, its residents and visitors.</li> </ul> <p>If one compares the canal environment here in Rugeley to Stone or Alrewas, the contrast is significant, inasmuch as Rugeley is sorely neglected, repairs or restoration have been carried out in a haphazard and unsympathetic manner and as cheaply as possible. Having approached the Canal and River Trust, Rugeley Town Council and Cannock Chase District Council all to no avail, I sincerely hope that the report goes some way towards starting a significant improvement to the area.</p>	<p>Noted. The adopted Rugeley Town Centre Area Action Plan 2014 sought to raise the profile of the Canal within the town and realise the opportunity it presents.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>Rugeley Town Council</p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the conservation area consultation.</p> <p>As mentioned in the opening paragraphs of the plan the Old Chancel is a significant building when viewed from both the town and the canal. Its 'imagineering' into a destination for tourism and heritage should be positively directed and the support and specific input from Cannock Chase Council would be welcomed.</p> <p>With the development of the power station site, the canal can be viewed as either a boundary not to be crossed or more hopefully a corridor for pedestrians, cyclists, boaters in exploring and benefitting from the town of Rugeley. Works proposed to further enhance this important corridor are welcomed.</p> <p>The increased use of the canal/towpaths can be achieved through increased accessibility. The opportunity for pedestrians, cyclists and mobility</p>	<p>Noted and support welcomed.</p> <p>The Council is supportive of proposals for the Old Chancel which enable it to be brought into a viable use to secure its long term future following redundancy for ecclesiastical purposes.</p> <p>Noted. The Power Station SPD 2018 recognised this opportunity which will be considered in the course of development of proposals for the Power Station site. The Council will continue to work with CRT and SCC to enhance the canal corridor.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

	<p>scooter users to access the towpath would bring increasing enjoyment to residents and tourists alike.</p> <p>The Town Council agrees that some of the residences backing onto the canal are not caring for the boundaries and this is a negative visual impact. Are there opportunities to encourage private property owners to improve this aspect?</p> <p>Significant historical industrial buildings border the canal and their refurbishment should again be encouraged where the work undertaken adds to their unique location.</p> <p>We do not know if the following would fall into the concerns of a conservation area plan, but Rugeley Town Council are keen to see that the understanding of, and interpretation of the history of, the canal is maximised at every opportunity. This could be through talking posts, information boards, canal trails etc. Any opportunity to develop this aspect would be welcomed.</p>	<p>The Council has no powers but would adopt a conciliatory approach. The document seeks to raise awareness of issues affecting the Conservation Area generally and one option might be to embark on a publicity campaign to raise awareness targeted at property owners adjoining the Canal. Item added to Management Plan Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Noted. The document seeks to raise awareness generally.</p> <p>Noted and agreed. Interpretation forms an element of Council Local Plan policy towards the historic environment. Item added to Management Plan Delivery Plan.</p>
--	--	--

## Appendix 2

### Draft Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan

#### Proposed amendments following consultation

Document, section and page number	Proposed amendment
Appraisal – Introduction – p3	Add sentence to end of 3 <sup>rd</sup> para: <b>‘Consideration will be given to ways of minimising conflict between cyclists and pedestrians.’</b>
Appraisal – Development History – p6	Amend sentence at end of 1 <sup>st</sup> para: ...the Caldon Canal...’
Appraisal – Development History – p6	Amend sentence at start of para 2:...’as trips <b>cost</b> over two thirds less by canal...’
Appraisal – Development History – p6	Amend last sentence para 2: ‘In Rugeley <b>and Brereton</b> the coal mines were...’

Appraisal – Development History – p6-7	Amend 3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence in 3 <sup>rd</sup> para: <b>...’the canal was nationalised and since 2012 has been under the control of the Canal and River Trust (CRT), a charity, which exists...’</b>
Appraisal – Development History North Section – p7	Amend 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence: <b>’...this crossing was made at 90 degrees to the River to minimise the length of the aqueduct and the embankment where the canal crosses the river valley from the north side to the south.’</b>
Appraisal – Development History North Section – p7	Amend 5 <sup>th</sup> sentence to delete: <b>’...most recently..’</b>
Appraisal and Management Plan – Plans 6 & 7	Shade Bridge 65 as a significant building; shade disused concrete railway bridge as negative boundary.
Appraisal – Development History North Section – p8	1 <sup>st</sup> para, delete 4 <sup>th</sup> sentence and substitute new sentence at end of para: <b>’The modern concrete steps are a replacement of the original sandstone steps of which only the bottom two survive below ground.’</b>
Appraisal – Development History North Section – p8	3 <sup>rd</sup> para: amend 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence to: <b>’...there was a cobbled yard and wharf for use of the Estate, and three large arched openings remain which it is believed were for underground storage or stables. The distinctive and attractive Churchdale Cottage facing the Canal was extended in 2008 but in a closely matching style.’</b>
Appraisal – Development History Central Section – p10	Insert additional para 5: <b>’Love Lane, which bounds the north-east side of the Canal at this point, is shown on the 1815 Parish Map as Hodgley Lane and extended to provide access to fields behind The Mossley area.’</b>
Appraisal – Character Analysis – p20	1 <sup>st</sup> whole sentence, correct typo: <b>’...scheme leading...’</b>
Appraisal –Public Realm – p25	1 <sup>st</sup> para amend penultimate sentence: <b>’..is inclined to be muddy which impedes use by disabled and less able people and by those with wheeled transport/pushchairs.’</b>
Appraisal – Public Realm –p.25	Amend last complete sentence: <b>’There are three replica cast iron mileposts... which now form a valuable and valued feature of the Canal.’</b>
Appraisal – Public realm – p.26	2 <sup>nd</sup> para: amend 5 <sup>th</sup> sentence to: <b>’...’which should aim to preserve its character, whilst at the same time facilitating use by pedestrians and cyclists, including disabled and less able people.’</b>
Appraisal – The Setting of the Conservation Area –p.27	1 <sup>st</sup> para: amend 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence to: <b>’...’a settlement of cottages with some lime kilns, in use from at least 1840 to at least 1889, and used to produce lime for processing leather after its owner bought the Bryan’s Lane Tannery.’</b>
Appraisal – Loss/Intrusion/Negative Features –	Add additional sentence at end of 3 <sup>rd</sup> para: <b>’The</b>

p.28	<b>disused concrete former railway bridge remains across the Canal though truncated just beyond the Conservation Area boundary.'</b>
Appraisal – Community Involvement – p.29	Para 1: update reference to 'British Waterways' to ' <b>Canal and River Trust</b> '.
Appraisal – Appendix 1 – p.33	Delete 'a branch of' from the List Description.
Management Plan SPD –Delivery Plan – p.4	Part 1 box 3: amend final sentence to: ...'the potential of the Old Mill and Listed canal bridge 64 will be explored, <b>both of which appear to be in need of maintenance.</b> '
Management Plan SPD – Delivery Plan – p.4	Part 1 box 5: amend final sentence to: '...will be sought, <b>and the Council will work with Breerton and Ravenhill Parish Council which has obtained funding for this in its area.</b> '
Management Plan SPD – Delivery Plan – p.4	Part 1 box 6: amend final sentence to:'...avoid damage and loss of integrity from root growth, <b>facilitating proper maintenance.</b> '
Management Plan SPD – Delivery Plan – p7	Box 1: expand text with additional sentence: <b>'The Council will work with property owners to encourage enhancement of garden and other frontages to the Canal boundary, including the use of planting to help screen 'clutter' and outside storage.'</b>
Management Plan SPD – Delivery Plan – p7	Split Box 4 into two: first box as existing first sentence on improving pedestrian/cycle links to the surroundings; second box as existing second sentence on improving boat mooring facilities with additional sentence: <b>' The Council will work with the CRT to secure the repair of boat moorings and the canal bank north of Leathermill Lane in a sympathetic manner to provide an improved facility for boaters to stop, visit and shop in Rugeley.'</b>
Management Plan SPD – Delivery Plan – p.7	Additional box: <b>'The Council will work with the CRT to secure repairs to Leathermill Lane canal bridge no.66 including repair of the parapets, using appropriate materials and methods.</b>
Management Plan SPD – Delivery Plan – p7	Additional box: <b>'The Council will encourage the provision of canal related information and interpretation including opportunities for links to the wider historic environment, town centre and footway/cycle routes.'</b>
Management Plan SPD – Delivery Plan – p7	Additional box: <b>' The Council will work with property owners and the CRT to seek the satisfactory solution of issues adversely affecting the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.'</b>