

Proposed Building/Structure	Contributor	Comments	Response
<p>Dullingham Signal Box &amp; Platelayers Hut Station Road, Dullingham</p>	<p>Network Rail</p>	<p>Network Rail strongly objects to the proposal for the inclusion of Dullingham Signal Box and Level Crossing on the Buildings of Local Interest Register.</p> <p>Network Rail are of the opinion that if these structures are included on the register it will likely impose future restrictions on any plans that we may have for rationalisation of the property estate following redundancy of systems and equipment. As the inclusion of these structures will ultimately impose additional pressure on Network Rail to maintain these structures and result in difficulties should we wish to undertake any work at these locations.</p> <p>Furthermore, it will result in future expenditure to maintain redundant assets and possibly future listing by English Heritage. As such, we strongly object to them been included on the register</p>	<p>Comments noted, the initial letter explained that permitted development would not be affected by inclusion on the register. Concerns that they should be required to maintain structures within their ownership would not be a material consideration as they should be doing this anyway.</p> <p>There is no intention to put any of the structures on the local register forward for inclusion on the statutory list.</p> <p>Members are asked to determine whether to proceed with inclusion of these buildings on the register</p>
<p>Old Wesleyan Chapel The Green Dullingham</p>	<p>Mr J Lida Old Wesleyan Chapel The Green Dullingham</p>	<p>Thanks for your letter. As you might know this chapel was in a derelict state for decades. A few years ago it benefited from an ECDC planning permission which meant that the corrugated sheets on three sides and the roof were replaced with materials specified by the planners.</p> <p>Of course the facade is as shown in your attached photo. Visitors who may like to see a typical chapel might well be misled. Thus I cannot see the benefits of such an inclusion in the local interest register.</p>	<p>Thank you email sent.</p> <p>Whilst this property has been altered significantly, its historical and social significance remains and it remains an important feature in the village townscape.</p> <p>It is proposed to proceed with inclusion on the register at this time.</p>
<p>Old Mission Hall Dullingham Ley Dullingham</p>	<p>Dr C Beech Old Mission Hall Dullingham Ley Dullingham</p>	<p>The building has lost much of its initial character due to significant changes to the external appearance of the building. It was converted to residential use during the 1960s with a large extension to the back completed in 1994. In 2007 the character has been further altered by the addition of a side extension...</p> <p>Although we understand the intention of the identifying and listing assets that contribute to local identity...the significant amount of extensions and alterations...means the property no longer retains either its original purpose or is the original building a significant part of the whole footprint of the building.</p>	<p>As a result of the significant alterations to the property and in order to maintain a consistent approach it is not proposed to include this property in the final register.</p>

30 Cambridge Road Ely	Cllr A Bailey	<p>The description for Croylands needs updating - suggest as shown in bold:  The building was originally designed as the vicarage for Holy Trinity Church for the Rev. George Bulstride. The vicarage became redundant in 1929 and the building was sold as a private residence. In the mid 20th century the building became an orphanage and then a home for the blind, it was then used as an administration centre and patient consultation facility for Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust, then as offices by Cambridgeshire County Council until it was sold at auction in 2014 and went into private ownership.</p> <p>It may be worth checking the date of actual sale - am pretty sure it was 2014, but worth checking!</p>	Amendments made to the entry description
Langdale House Silver Street Ely	Mrs L Sayers Langdale House Silver Street Ely	<p>In response to your letter of 28 July, I note that I am just in time before the deadline for comments on ECDC's 'Buildings of Local Interest Register'. I am delighted that my property, Langdale House, Silver Street, Ely, has been proposed for inclusion.</p> <p>From pill boxes to water pumps, parish halls to family homes, you've compiled a fascinating register that certainly helps reinforce 'local distinctiveness and sense of place'. I appreciate all the work that must have gone into the preparation and congratulations to you and everyone involved in such a worthwhile initiative.</p>	Thank you email sent, no further action required.
Highflyer Hall New Barns Ely	Church Commissioners (owners)	Submission of a Historic building analysis on the property, providing additional information on the history of the property.	Thank you email sent, amendments made to the list entry.
Cathedral Centre The Gallery Ely	Ely Cathedral	Letter and building analysis demonstrating why the building should not be included on the register (see end of this report for copy of letter)	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Members are asked to determine whether to proceed with inclusion of this property on the register.</p>
Cathedral Centre The Gallery Ely	Cllr Coraline Green	<p>I would like to object to the inclusion of the following buildings in the Buildings of Local Interest List:</p> <p><u>BL12 - Ely Cathedral Conference Centre</u></p> <p>I consider this building a poor example of the architecture of the period and have knowledge that the building itself does not provide the functionality that is required of it. It is not of merit historically or architecturally.</p> <p>I also have a personal view that it is unattractive and detracts from</p>	The issue of inclusion was discussed during a telephone conversation where it was reiterated that inclusion on the register would not prevent owners of these buildings undertaking works that were regarded as permitted development. Where planning permission is required for works, the fact that the building on the local register would be a material planning consideration to ensure that any proposal was appropriate, sympathetic and of a high quality.

		<p>the beautiful surroundings of the Cathedral, Old Palace and Cross and Palace Greens.</p> <p>It is in a highly sensitive part of the City which is protected by Conservation status and therefore any plans to significantly alter or demolish it would be subject to close scrutiny anyway.</p> <p>I do not see any benefit in including it in the list and indeed would not wish possible future plans to improve the area being inhibited by inclusion of this building on the list.</p>	<p>Members are asked to determine whether to proceed with inclusion of this property on the register.</p>
<p>Ely Railway Station Station Road Ely</p>	<p>National Rail</p>	<p>Network Rail strongly objects to the proposal for the inclusion of Ely Railway Station on the Buildings of Local Interest Register.</p> <p>Network Rail are of the opinion that if these structures are included on the register it will likely impose future restrictions on any plans that we may have for rationalisation of the property estate following redundancy of systems and equipment. As the inclusion of these structures will ultimately impose additional pressure on Network Rail to maintain these structures and result in difficulties should we wish to undertake any work at these locations.</p> <p>Furthermore, it will result in future expenditure to maintain redundant assets and possibly future listing by English Heritage. As such, we strongly object to them been included on the register</p>	<p>Comments noted, the initial letter explained that permitted development would not be affected by inclusion on the register. Concerns that they should be required to maintain structures within their ownership would not be a material consideration as they should be doing this anyway.</p> <p>There is no intention to put any of the structures on the local register forward for inclusion on the statutory list.</p> <p>Members are asked to determine whether to proceed with inclusion of this property on the register.</p>
<p>Ely Railway Station Station Road Ely</p>	<p>Cllr Coraline Green</p>	<p>I would like to object to the inclusion of the following buildings in the Buildings of Local Interest List:</p> <p><u>BL23 Ely Railway Station</u></p> <p>Whilst the building is attractive, it is not of great significance architecturally and there are other examples of similar age and style that are more important elsewhere.</p> <p>The building functions as a passenger and ticket hall and needs significant work, even now, to bring it up to an acceptable standard for its current use.</p> <p>Ely and the surrounding area is expected to grow significantly in the next years and decades bringing a corresponding increase in people using the station.</p> <p>I would not like to see the loss of this building however the site is</p>	<p>The issue of inclusion was discussed during a telephone conversation where it was reiterated that inclusion on the register would not prevent owners of these buildings undertaking works that were regarded as permitted development. Where planning permission is required for works, the fact that the building on the local register would be a material planning consideration to ensure that any proposal was appropriate, sympathetic and of a high quality.</p> <p>Members are asked to determine whether to proceed with inclusion of this property on the register.</p>

		strategically very important for the development of Ely and, within the safeguards of Planning, I would not like to see the potential for longer term development of the Station and the Station Gateway area of Ely inhibited by the inclusion of this building on the list.	
Ely Cemetery Chapels New Barns Ely	City of Ely Council	Members considered your letter dated the 28 July, at the Full Council meeting on the 22 <sup>nd</sup> August. Members unanimously agreed to these being included within this register.	No action required
Laburnum House 1 Queen Adelaide Way Ely	Mr G Lockhart (owner)	Thank you for your letter of the 28 July 2016. I have not objections whatsoever in the above property being included in the 'Buildings of Local Interest register'. Could you just note the correct spelling of Laburnum House, and my name. If there is anything further you need from me please let me know.	Thank you email sent – amendments made to the entry description
Old Drill Hall Barton Road Ely	Cllr Coraline Green	I would like to object to the inclusion of the following buildings in the Buildings of Local Interest List:  <u>BL24 – Former Drill Hall, Barton Road</u> This building is a much valued and well used Community Centre. It is of some architectural interest but, in my view, not particularly significant. As Ely grows and there is more demand for Community spaces it may be that this is a site that could be re-developed to provide more services/spaces for the community. Inclusion on the list may make it difficult to redevelop this site for the benefit of the community in the longer term and I therefore object to its inclusion on the list.	The issue of inclusion was discussed during a telephone conversation where it was reiterated that inclusion on the register would not prevent owners of these buildings undertaking works that were regarded as permitted development. Where planning permission is required for works, the fact that the building on the local register would be a material planning consideration to ensure that any proposal was appropriate, sympathetic and of a high quality.  Members are asked to determine whether to proceed with inclusion of this property on the register.
Old Baptist Chapel Butcher's Row Ely	Ms B Hickish (owner)	Thank you for sending us the information regarding the buildings of local interest. I was interested to see which buildings were in the draft document.  We don't have any objection to our building being included. The entry states that the Chapel was converted to residential use in 2013. The first time it was residential was actually nearer 2000 when it was reordered inside as a dwelling but it reverted to commercial use in between being used as various things including offices and a music shop.  We are pleased to see that our neighbour Walsingham Chambers is not on the list. I don't think there could be a more inappropriate building for that location. It is truly horrible.	Thank you email sent, no further action required.

War Memorial Main Street Prickwillow	Prickwillow Village Council	After our meeting yesterday evening, I can confirm that Prickwillow Village Council is happy for our war memorial to be included in a Buildings of Local Interest Register.	No action required
Old CoE Burial Ground Haddenham	Haddenham Parish Council	Further to your letter dated 28th July regarding the inclusion of the Church of England Burial Ground, Church Lane, Haddenham, in the Buildings of Local Interest Register, I write to advise that Haddenham Parish Council has no objections to this.	No action required
20 High Street Aldreth Haddenham	Mr S Stirrup 20 High Street Aldreth Haddenham	We were pleased to hear that our cottage has been proposed for inclusion on the 'Buildings of Local Interest Register'. We fully support this proposal. We were informed by the previous owners that it was possibly the oldest building in the village.	No action required.
Church of St Matthew Wisbech Road Littleport	Mrs R Jenson (owner)	<p>This is a follow-up to our telephone conversation yesterday, regarding the letter we received on the proposed inclusion of our home in the 'local interest register'.</p> <p>As I explained, the building and land stipulations that were outlined are already covered by the covenant deeds with the Church of England, so nothing new has been added that we are not already aware of, and fully consent to. We only wish the same stipulations had applied to the adjacent vicarage, which was built at the same time. Extensive re-development has brought the now Italianate property to within yards of our front door.</p> <p>Our main concern about the proposed register is the problem of privacy. As I explained, we have already had a couple of visits from filming crews (1 of them American) who had obtained our information from some on-line list, as well as a few private individuals who were just interested in taking photos of a church conversion. Because we are not gated, we do expose ourselves to lorries and other vehicles that use our broad drive to reverse in, and all this adds to our vulnerability. To be placed on a local interest register will only compound the problem.</p> <p>We welcome any genuine inquiries regarding the church and its local history, and have learned as much as we could about it from our neighbours, who are former church wardens and members of the former St Matthews Church. Indeed, we are ourselves both employed by the Church of England, and as a former design consultant for historical properties myself, do value the</p>	<p>Discussed in depth with owner over the phone.</p> <p>As a result of the information provided in regards to the covenant on the property and security concerns, the recommendation has been made to remove this property from the register at this time.</p>

		importance of our architectural and cultural heritage. However, Old Church House is also our home. Security and privacy are basic to that. Please don't expose us to another public register.	
17 Bridge Road Mepal	Mr & Mrs Atkin (owner) – copy of letter attached	<p>We are writing to express our wish that our property and associated farm buildings not be included in the register and list our objections as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over the last 40 years we have had to make necessary changes/improvements to the farm house and surrounding buildings which has quite significantly altered the original appearance. Because of its very poor state the roof of the farmhouse was completely replaced in 1972 using concrete tiles. The original dormer windows also had to be removed.</li> <li>• A flat-roofed pre-fab construction adjoining the main farmhouse was added which is used as a kitchen;</li> <li>• Modern UPVC windows have been fitted;</li> <li>• A porch has been added to the farmhouse;</li> <li>• The surrounding farm buildings are in a very poor state of repair and quite dilapidated...most of the roofs have been repaired using galvanised steel.</li> </ul> <p>We have been trying to sell the property over the last few years as we need to downsize and move to a smaller, more modern and manageable property...we have been informed that the potential costs and work involved is a concern to potential purchasers and are concerned that inclusion on the local register could add to this.</p>	<p>Discussed in depth with the owner.</p> <p>As a result of the significant alterations to the property and in order to maintain a consistent approach it is not proposed to include this property in the final register.</p>
17 Bridge Road Mepal	Mepal Parish Council	Registration is not appropriate due to changes already made to the building. The building is not sustainable	<p>Thank you email sent</p> <p>As a result of the significant alterations to the property and in order to maintain a consistent approach it is not proposed to include this property in the final register.</p>
83 High Street Sutton	Mr J Chapman 83 High Street Sutton (owner)	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 28 July 2016. Further to our telephone conversation on 25 August, you may also be interested in the following features of this property:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building mark in the form of 'E*B' inscribed on brick to right hand side of front door (see attached picture).</li> <li>• Early, red brickwork to rear elevation providing possible evidence of earlier dwelling(s), upon which the house was built in its present form.</li> <li>• The original house name 'Columbia House' (ref 1:2500 OS map, dated 1887) is to be reinstated. Name-plate to be</li> </ul>	<p>Thank you email sent. Entry description updated to reflect the additional information received.</p>

		located in recessed arch above front door (there are remnants of early fixing holes here). Internally, the small cellar features a barrel-vaulted brick ceiling	
18 Sutton Park Sutton	Mrs M Forest 18 Sutton Park Sutton (owner)	Thank you very much for your letter regarding my house 18 Sutton Park, Sutton. I have tried and failed to locate the Architect Jerry Harrall. I had hoped he could have given you more details. I have lived here for 11 years and had sought his advice up to about 5 years ago.  The tarmac and grass to the front has been replaced due to the tarmac becoming an uneven surface due to the protruding roots from the large redwood trees. The grass was competing with the trees for essential water. One neighbour described the grassy area as a disgrace-fair comment! I sought a local Builders (Richard Hough) advice and he suggested the eco friendly honeycomb grid construction which creates a completely porous hard standing. Also the gravel does not drift onto the pavement. The wooden window frames and doors are French oak which had been oiled and painted over and looked a mess and it has taken me 9 years to find the right person to strip down and oil the wood properly. He is a local person -Trevor who trades under his late father in laws surname of Dennis. Woodwork to be reoiled (eco product he recommended) once a year. I hope this is helpful for you. I love living in this most beautiful area of abundant trees and feel I am living with the birds and great wildlife running through my open plan frontage.	Thank you email sent for additional information. No further action required and no changes made to the entry description
The Anchor Inn Sutton Gault Sutton	Mr A Pickup The Anchor Inn Sutton Gault	I wish to register my view which would be to object to the inclusion of the Anchor on the local register. Whereas I realise it is not the same as national listing, as a business, the inclusion would have an effect on the future of the property which may then have a significant bearing on our business needs and realistically devalue the property as future development may be hindered. I also wonder why suddenly after over three centuries someone has noticed the building may be of some interest.	Reply sent explaining the process and that there would be no additional planning constraints placed on the property.  No response received – therefore Members are asked to determine whether to proceed with inclusion of this property on the register.
Swedish Houses Maryland Avenue Swaffham Bulbeck	Mrs S Sherman 41 Maryland Avenue Swaffham Bulbeck	These houses are owned by Sanctuary Housing, except no 43 which has been privately owned for many years. I have lived at No 41 for 23 years, that's 23 years of cold, damp, mould, leaks and draughts. Sanctuary Housing are reluctant to carry out maintenance or improvement to these property's. They were to be demolished several years back to make way for new housing but it is rumoured	Response sent to owner explaining process and reasoning for project. Also advised that I had forwarded her email on to Sanctuary and asked that someone contact her in regards to her concerns.  As a result of the significant alterations to the property and in

		<p>that this fell through because the then owner of 43 would not sell up; they were after all only ever meant to be temporary. There have been some internal alterations undertaken when the housing stock was owned by Hereward Housing. In my opinion they are long overdue for an external "facelift" and further improvements are needed to bring them up to current standards. There is no insulation in the walls, roof insulation was put in while I have been here but it is in no way satisfactory. To you they may be interesting but to us tenants they are something of a nightmare, it costs a fortune to keep warm in the winter and are unbearably hot in the summer. Would inclusion on the list require Sanctuary to carry out necessary repairs to maintain the structure of the houses and not allow them to rot while charging the same rent as for a modern warm insulated home? Otherwise there is no point in the houses being included on the list!</p> <p>Your records/photos are somewhat out of date as no 43 is currently undergoing major improvements/extension.</p>	<p>order to maintain a consistent approach it is not proposed to include these properties in the final register.</p>
<p>Swedish Houses Maryland Avenue Swaffham Bulbeck</p>	<p>Ms L Martin 43 Maryland Avenue Swaffham Bulbeck</p>	<p>I am writing to you concerning the above proposal and would like to highlight a number of points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Largely unaltered- this is not the case concerning number 43 of which we are the owners. In November 2015 we had a planning application number 15/01124/FUL granted for a two storey extension on the rear and side of the property. This involved the demolition of the single storey section of the property. I would estimate the new building and alteration's would now constitute 75% brick and block modern day construction bringing this up to current day building regulations and requirements.</li> <li>2. These properties were initially I understand built as a quick ten year fix to ease the housing situation post war and have clearly out lived that purpose. They are not fit for current day living and due to the alterations we have undertaken we have had to treat the whole property for wood worm which we discovered and then had to take the property back the bare structure to adequately treat the problem. The insulation of these properties is virtually nonexistent and the thickness of the external walls is 75mm with 10mm fibreboard "insulation". This means the properties are like ovens in the summer and freezers in the winter let alone the actual energy costs and carbon footprint these properties currently have which we all</li> </ol>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>As a result of the significant alterations to the property and in order to maintain a consistent approach it is not proposed to include these properties in the final register.</p>



		<p>need to reduce significantly. Modern day timber framed buildings require 120mm of foil backed celotex insulation which we have had to undertake a great cost.</p> <p>With regard to the full planning permission we have received our property no 43 is no longer identical to our neighbours and in fact has changed extensively.</p> <p>It is important that buildings of special historical and architectural interest are protected for future generations however I feel the inclusion of these properties as buildings of interest falls short of the general public's perception of such.</p>	
<p>White Horse Inn Silver Street Witcham</p>	<p>Mrs L Elbourne White Horse Inn</p>	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 28th July 2016. We would like to strongly object to the proposed inclusion of The White Horse Public House in the Buildings of local interest register on the following grounds:</p> <p>Examples of land which is not of community value and therefore may not be listed could be residential properties and land connected to a residential property. This is our sole main residence. The entire first floor is residential and so is approximately 30% of the ground floor. The property is set in 1/3rd of an acre which is private garden only opened at our discretion. In the recent past (approximately 4 years ago) the local community canvassed the relevant authorities to have the license revoked on the grounds of social nuisance. The licensing authorities gave us personally the opportunity to continue trading, therefore this pub cannot really be considered an asset for 'social wellbeing'</p> <p>I understand that each property will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. The village has recently renovated the village hall which provides a not for profit meeting facility to further the social wellbeing and interests of the local community including cultural, recreational and sporting interests therefore the pub is not the only village asset. The proposed application does not provide sufficient justification that the pub furthers the social wellbeing of the local community, other than the fact it is a pub. Less than 15% of the households in the village of Witcham use the pub.</p> <p>On a personal note I would like to state that 'CAMRA' have on numerous occasions attempted to canvas our regular, local</p>	<p>Email sent to advise that this is a different scheme to Assets of Local Interest which is aimed at public houses and community facilities to prevent them from undergoing changes of use without having been extensively marketed. Explanation as to what inclusion on the local register would mean in terms of planning regulations.</p> <p>No response received – therefore Members are asked to determine whether to proceed with inclusion of this property on the register.</p>

		<p>customers to register the asset; our customers have declined. When this failed they canvassed the Witcham Parish Council to register the asset, the Parish Council unanimously declined. I believe that The local CAMRA branch are using this application and the other numerous applications they have submitted to further their own marketing and this is completely unethical. They regularly advertise listed pubs as major successes for their organisation when we see less than a handful of their members on an annual basis.</p> <p>This is a Free House, owned solely by ourselves. We are in our 3rd year of trading and we struggle to make ends meet on a daily basis. Neither of us have yet been able to take a wage from the business and we both work here for over 70 hours a week. The listing will create further financial hardship in legal costs, marketing etc., at any time in the future if we decide to sell.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration</p>	
65 High Street Wilburton	Cllr A Bailey	Am pretty sure that parts of 65 High Street Wilburton are older than 18th century.	Have tried to ascertain if this is the case but no information has been found to substantiate this. Entry description amended to state 'possibly earlier remains survive'.
Witcham House Headleys Lane Witcham	Ms L Holdaway Witcham House Headleys Lane Witcham	<p>Having considered the letter, we do not in general have any objection to the inclusion of Witcham House on the register although would note that from our research the house is a Georgian country house rather than a Victorian farmhouse. The house originally included the outbuildings and barns now being the adjoining property Witcham House Farm and also Witcham Lodge and we are keen to reinstate at least one outbuilding.</p> <p>We will shortly be submitting a planning application for a stable block and hay barn and so would naturally welcome a discussion to reassure ourselves of any potential consequences of the local interest listing. It would also be useful to understand what help in the form of grants or otherwise might be available to restore original sash windows given the expense of replacing them on a like for like basis which would undoubtedly be required following the local interest listing.</p>	Response to customer to advise what this would mean in terms of planning. No further action required.
General Comments	Mr N Wilson	As requested I have looked through the proposed list and as regards the individual items listed I do not really have an issue	Response sent advising that condition was considered alongside a number of other issues. I also explained that due to the limited

		<p>apart from some of the modern buildings which are, in my opinion, ugly and uninspiring in the extreme. However the listing indicates that the panel appear to have little regard for the military heritage in and around Ely, especially the RAF and so I wonder what their terms of reference actually were. The buildings as listed seem to be in reasonable order whereas, for instance, the ones I submitted are largely requiring some TLC, I wonder if this counted against them?</p> <p>I also note that some buildings were not included as they "could not be found", if ECDC were serious on this issue, communication with the building(s) nominee would have swiftly resolved the issue I would suggest, I did in fact offer to actually show you the sites I nominated.</p> <p>Please strike off the "Old Barn" in Heaton Drive Ely, it was demolished last year. I undertook some research myself, showing some photographs of the brickwork to a work colleague who used to be a historic building officer for a county council, he confirmed it was Georgian.</p>	<p>resources that if buildings were not able to be easily identified from public viewpoints then we were unable to include them at this time. In depth nomination forms were supplied and if sufficient information was not provided we were unable to spend a lot of time also explained that the list will be looked at again in a few years and we can revisit some of those nominations that were missed as the resource implications will be less.</p>
General Comments	Mr G Reid The Granary Commercial End Swaffham Bulbeck	<p>I have reviewed the proposed list of Buildings of Local Interest. Although I am not personally affected by this, I object very strongly as a point of principle to any residential or privately owned properties being included in the list since this will impose obligations and restrictions upon owners who were not aware that this was a possibility when purchasing. Not only is this unjust, it amounts to retrospective legislation, and I hope that it will be challenged by those owners and proved to be illegal.</p>	<p>Similar comments were received by Mr Reid when the consultation on the proposal to establish a local register was undertaken. Customer lives in a listed building and does not believe additional constraints should be placed on property owners. The correspondence provided during the consultation on both the establishment of a register and the draft register clearly explained that inclusion on the register would not result in additional planning constraints being placed on any properties included. The fact that a number of owners have written in support of their properties being included on the register shows that in the most part the concerns raised by Mr Reid were somewhat unfounded. No action required</p>
General Comments	Witchford Parish Council	<p>Expressed frustration that none of the nominations put forward by the Parish Council were included in the draft register.</p>	<p>Response sent explaining that out of the 9 nominations, 7 were not buildings or structures and therefore did not meet the requirements of the criteria; 1 was already part of a listed building; and one did not provide enough information on the nomination form for it to be identified.</p> <p>In depth nomination forms were supplied and if sufficient information was not provided we were unable to spend a lot of time also explained that the list will be looked at again in a few years and we can revisit some of those nominations that were missed as the resource implications will be less.</p>

