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Part 1 Character Appraisal

1 Summary

1.1 Key characteristics

This Character Appraisal of the London Road Conservation Area concludes that the following are the key characteristics of the conservation area:

◆ It follows the line of a Roman road, whose construction some time between AD 71 and AD 80 was integral to the founding of the Roman city of Gloucester (Glevum Nervensis);
◆ It takes in one of Gloucester’s earliest suburbs, including the very rare survival of two medieval hospital chapels, built in the early 12th-century and administered by St Peter’s Abbey (St Margaret’s) and Llanthony Priory (St Mary Magdalen);
◆ It has a substantial number of listed buildings surviving from the late 17th century onwards, including well-preserved Regency terraces and Victorian villas, as well as historic almshouses, public houses and shops;
◆ It has two landmark churches that are important focal points for views into and out of the city: St Peter’s Roman Catholic Church at the western end and St Catharine’s Anglican Church at the eastern end;
◆ It includes an attractive suburban park, formed from the former gardens of Hillfield House, with two historic gazebos made up of pieces of medieval and 17th-century architectural fragments and sculptural friezes;
◆ And an interesting brick-walled back lane – Royal Lane – which forms the southern boundary of the conservation area for much of its length;
◆ Streetscape and public realm improvements have been achieved as a result of the Worcester Street Townscape Heritage Initiative.

1.2 Key Issues

Based on the negative features identified in Section 8 (Issues), a number of problems have been identified that have a negative impact on the character of the conservation area. These form the basis for the Management Proposals in the Part 2 of this document and are summarised below.

1.2.1 Negative buildings

There are several mainly post-WWII buildings that have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. These are all marked on the Townscape Appraisal map. They are judged to be negative because of their inappropriate design, scale or materials and their adverse impact on the setting of adjoining historic buildings.
2 Introduction

2.1 The London Road Conservation Area

This conservation area follows the line of the Roman London Road (today’s Upper Northgate Street and London Road), which dates from the first century AD. The road was constructed to link Cirencester (Corinium), the Roman administrative capital for the west of England, and the military fort at Gloucester. The road was lined by cemeteries, as was traditional in the Roman world, and it is possible that early Christian mortuary chapels evolved into the medieval chapels that are now a significant feature of the conservation area.

There is a historical continuity in the use of these chapel sites as leper hospitals, almshouses and pilgrimage hostels and the current use of many buildings along London Road and Horton Road as almshouses, residential homes for the sick and elderly, social housing, nurses hostels, doctors’ and dentists’ surgeries and buildings ancillary to the very large Royal Gloucestershire Hospital complex that stands immediately to the south of the conservation area.

Variety is a keynote of the conservation area’s character, with every kind of building style, from early medieval to contemporary, reflecting the constant reuse and reinvention of a key suburb and commercial thoroughfare, serving as gateway and exit to the city, and a transitional zone from the city centre to the suburbs and the countryside beyond.

2.2 The purpose of a conservation area character appraisal

The London Road Conservation Area includes parts of the previous London Road Conservation Area, which was originally designated by Gloucester City Council on 22 February 1984. The boundaries were revised as part of a comprehensive review of conservation area boundaries within the city which were subjected to an informal period of consultation between 4 April 2006 and 2 May 2006.

Conservation areas are designated under the provisions of Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. A conservation area is defined as ‘an area of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance’.

Section 71 of the same Act requires local planning authorities to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of these conservation areas. Section 72 also specifies that, in making a decision on an application for development within a conservation area, special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

In response to these statutory requirements, this appraisal document defines and records the special architectural and historic interest of the conservation area and identifies opportunities for enhancement. The appraisal conforms to English Heritage guidance as set out in Guidance on Conservation Area Appraisals (August 2005) and Guidance on the Management of Conservation Areas (August 2005). Additional government guidance regarding the management of historic buildings and conservation areas is set out within Planning Policy Guidance Note 15: Planning and the Historic Environment (PPG15). Government advice on archaeology, which is relevant to the London Road Conservation Area, is set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note 16: Archaeology (PPG16).

This document therefore seeks to:

◆ define the special interest of the conservation area and identify the issues which threaten the special qualities of the conservation area (in the form of Part 1: Character Appraisal);

◆ provide guidelines to prevent harm and achieve enhancement (in the form of the Part 2: Management Proposals).

2.3 The planning policy context

This appraisal provides a firm basis on which applications for development within the City can be assessed. It should be read in conjunction with the wider development plan policy framework produced by Gloucester City Council. That framework is set out in a number of documents, including:

◆ Gloucester Local Plan Second Stage Deposit August 2002
  - Policies BE.22, BE.23, BE.24 and BE.25 (Listed Buildings)
  - Policies BE.29, BE.30 and BE.30a, (Conservation Areas)

◆ Gloucester’s emerging Local Development Framework Development Plan Documents:
  - Core Strategy
  - Development Control Policies
  - Central Action Area Plan
  - Allocations and Designations
Some large gardens have been redeveloped to provide trees and the conversion of gardens to car parks. Institutional ownership and multiple occupation has been accompanied by the loss of boundary walls and hostels for nurses and local government offices. The conservation area’s western boundary starts at the site of the Roman North Gate of the city, which marks the boundary between Northgate Street and Upper Northgate Street, the latter being a medieval extension to the Roman street grid. The eastern end of Upper Northgate Street marks the site of the medieval city gate, beyond which lies London Road, starting with St Peter’s Roman Catholic Church and the railway viaduct, and extending for 1.3 km eastwards. The conservation area stops where London Road meets the inner ring road, at the point where the Victorian and Edwardian suburbs stop and late twentieth-century development begins. At this eastern end, the conservation area also takes in parts of Denmark Road, Kenilworth Avenue and Horton Road.

The conservation area is linear, taking in the properties that lie on both sides of the Upper Northgate Street/London Road exit from the city. As might be expected of a transitional zone between the historic city centre and the more recent suburbs, the area has a mix of uses, with offices and shops most dominant in the western portion, nearest to the city centre, while dwellings, pubs, almshouses, parks, gardens, chapels and churches are to the fore in the eastern portion, furthest from the centre.

The commercial end of the conservation area includes a number of large office blocks, providing premises for a variety of service-sector businesses, including BBC local TV and radio and Fortis Insurance. Several buildings here are occupied by of local government services. There are also industrial buildings associated with the railway, used until recently as retail warehouses but currently empty and unused.

Constant traffic passing along London Road means that it is not as desirable a residential area as the quieter Victorian and Edwardian suburbs that lie to the north of London Road. Many of London Road’s larger 19th-century villas have been converted into flats, or are used as doctors’ and dentists’ surgeries, as day centres, residential homes for the sick and elderly, hostels for nurses and local government offices.

Institutional ownership and multiple occupation has been accompanied by the loss of boundary walls and trees and the conversion of gardens to car parks. Some large gardens have been redeveloped to provide high-density housing.
The southern side of the conservation area has long narrow plots leading to a back lane; the back plots are also used as car parks and for garaging and storage, and in some cases they have been developed for housing. Very few front or rear plots survive as gardens. The back lane itself forms a well-defined footpath running almost the whole length of the conservation area, bounded on the southern side by a high brick wall, which is an attractive feature, serving to separate the conservation area from the sprawling Royal Gloucestershire Hospital site that lies on the other side of the wall.

The conservation area also includes the northern end of Horton Road, with its large late 19th-century villas, almost all of them now in use as day centres or residential homes. There is also a small cemetery here of c. 1852, and the large Redcliffe College complex, a training centre for Christian missionaries occupying the elegant Wotton House of c. 1707, and its 1930s neo-Georgian extensions.

3.2 Topography and geology

As with the whole of central Gloucester, the conservation area is located on a terrace of lower lias clay and gravel, just above the floodplain of the River Severn, at an average height of 15m above sea level. Travelling eastwards (out of the city) London Road starts to rise from the vicinity of the almshouses from 15m to 24m at the summit of Wotton Hill, by St Catharine’s church, before it falls again at the eastern end, descending to 16m or so above sea level at Wotton Brook.

This rise of 9m or so does not sound significant, but it is sufficient to affect the views into and out of the conservation area (see Section 5.2: Landmarks, focal points and views).

3.3 Relationship of the conservation area to its surroundings

The London Road Conservation Area adjoins three other conservation areas at its western (city centre) end.

The conservation area starts at the site of the North Gate of the Roman city, which also marks the western boundary of the City Centre Conservation Area (CA No. 5). From here the conservation area takes in all the properties that front onto Northgate Street eastwards (Nos 53 to 113 and Nos 62 to 114 Northgate Street).
4 Historic Development and Archaeology

4.1 Historic development

In the grid-shape layout of Roman and medieval Gloucester, London Road (Upper Northgate Street and London Road) is an aberration because it does not align with the cardinal streets of the city, but turns north-eastwards through 45 degrees. The change in alignment dates from the earliest years of Gloucester’s Roman history, when London Road was originally built to link Corinium (Cirencester) with the legionary fort at Kingsholm. The change in alignment occurred when the Kingsholm fort was dismantled some time after AD 70 and a new city founded with its centre 1.5km to the south. The original route of the Roman Ermin Way is still in use as the A417 from Cirencester to Birdlip, over the Cotswold escarpment, through Hucclecote and Barnwood to the Denmark Road / London Road junction, where Denmark Road represents the original alignment and London Road the later one.

The conservation area starts at the site of the Roman city’s North Gate, beyond which there was likely to have been considerable extra-mural settlement during the Roman period, as well as numerous cemeteries, mausolea and funerary monuments. Recent excavations in Southwark and York, for example, have proven that roads leading into and out of Roman walled towns were the site of commercial and industrial activity.

Certainly this was an inhabited suburb in the Saxon period, because one of the more significant changes to the layout of the Saxon city that occurred in the immediate post-Conquest era was to build a new circuit of walls with gates and a moat to enclose this inner north-eastern part of the city. According to the Victoria County History (page 63): gates were built on the northern branch of the River Twyver (also known as the Full Brook) to mark the limits of the suburbs which had grown up in late-Saxon times on Hare Lane and along the London Road. Medieval documents refer to the suburbs built around Upper Northgate Street as being ‘between the north gates’ – that is, the Roman gate and the Norman one.

Excavations in the 1970s by Henry Hurst established that Upper Northgate Street and London Road directly overlie Roman London Road and that a series of timber framed buildings occupied both sides of the road from the 10th century, replaced by buildings with stone footings in the late 13th century; those on the south side of the road were used as tanning yards in the 15th century.

New suburbs continued to extend along London Road beyond the medieval gate. The Victoria County History (page 67) records that roadside suburbs expanded rapidly during the 12th and early 13th centuries, which is when the alignments of the plots on both sides of the road were established: the unity of the back property lines is very marked on both sides of the road, and especially on the south side where the footpath along Asylum Lane / Royal Lane marks the probable boundary between house plots and medieval fields.

Fifteenth-century documents refer to London Road as lined with ‘diverse tenements’, but all trace of these disappeared when the suburb was largely destroyed at the siege of Gloucester in 1643. There are, however, two significant survivors from the medieval suburbs, in the form of the chapels of St Mary Magdalen’s Hospital and St Margaret’s Hospital, both early 12th century in date and both built on the outer edge of Gloucester to treat people suffering from contagious diseases (generically known as ‘leprosy’).

After the Civil War, it seems that the roadside suburbs were rebuilt only slowly. On Hall and Pinnell’s map of 1796, London Road is shown as having only a few scattered houses. The Victoria County History attributes this slow growth to the high cost charged for leases by the landowners (the city corporation and the cathedral dean and chapter). Northgate House (No. 19 London Road), a late 17th-century building refronted in the mid-18th century, survives from the post-Civil War reconstruction, period, as does No. 92 (now the Edward Hotel), a town house of c 1790.

Eventually, land taxes levied to fund the Napoleonic Wars forced the cathedral chapter and the city corporation to sell plots, which were then developed by local entrepreneurs leading to the construction of Parkfield (No. 115 London Road) around 1800, the terrace in Wellington Parade in 1814, and Nos 18, 20 and 22 London Road in 1815.
In 1827, Joseph Roberts, the printer, planned a development of thirty-five terraced houses on both sides of London Road opposite and either side of St Margaret’s Hospital, though only those on the south side of the road (Nos 78 to 86 and 100 to 118) were constructed.

By 1843, on the eve of the arrival of the railway, much of London Road had been developed, along with the first stretch of Denmark Road (known as Gallows Lane until it was gentrified in 1863). By the 1850s, the number of prominent people living along London Road — including MP John Ward (living at Bohanam House, located just outside the conservation area), the banker Thomas Turner (at Hillfield House) and several city clergymen — indicates that this was a favoured middle-class suburb, albeit with two large almshouses and a mental hospital (Wotton Asylum, which opened in 1823, again just outside the conservation area). As the old city-centre churchyards began to fill up, a number of new cemeteries were opened around edges of the city, including the small cemetery on Horton Road, which appears to have been in use from 1851, judging by the dates on the headstones.

In 1861, the ancient hospitals were merged under one management, with the inmates being housed in the newly built United Almshouses of 1862, located alongside St Margaret’s Chapel. The ancient almshouses were demolished, leaving only their medieval chapels still standing. Even these suffered from truncation, for the nave of St Mary Magdalen’s Chapel was demolished in 1861, leaving only the chancel, while St Margaret’s underwent comprehensive internal refurbishment in 1846 (gaining its king-post roof trusses) and again in 1875 (gaining its encaustic tiles and Clayton and Bell stained glass).

Whilst the almshouses were being rebuilt, Hillfield House, on the opposite side of the road was also remodelled around 1867 for the timber merchant Charles Walker, to the Italianate design of John Giles. Following the completion of the railway, St Peter’s Roman Catholic Church was built right up against the viaduct in 1860–8. The Presbytery to St Peter was added c 1880. By contrast, the Old Rope Walk on the opposite side of the road to the church was redeveloped to become the handsome Edwardian brick showroom of the Gloucester Railway Carriage and Wagon Company.

New villas in generous grounds were built from the 1860s, stimulated by the development of Heathville Road, Denmark Road and Horton Road to the north and east of London Road. Dating from this period are the neo-Gothic villa with pyramidal roofed angle tower at No. 2 Heathfield Road (A W Maberly, 1863) and its neighbour at No. 4 Heathfield Road (Maberley, 1870), No 144 London Road (Wotton Lodge, by W B Wood, 1890) and No 146 (J P Moore, 1889).

New villas were built along London Road from the 1860s.

Opposite these late 19th-century houses, St Catharine’s church was built in 1912–15, relocated here to be closer to the centre of its parish than the older St Catherine’s church in Priory Road (see the Cathedral Precincts Conservation Area), which was then demolished. The completion of this church was marked by the installation in 1915 of fleurs-de-lys gates and railings round the churchyard.

The 1930s saw the considerable enlargement of Wotton House (now Redcliffe College), in Horton Road, originally built for Thomas Horton c 1707. In 1925 the house and garden were acquired by Gloucestershire County Council as a hostel for the Gloucestershire School of Cookery and Domestic Science and its large neo-Georgian extension was built to the north in 1931 to the design of R S Phillips.

In the 1930s a deliberate plan to increase the number of parks and playing fields in the city led the corporation to acquire Hillfield House, whose extensive gardens were then opened to the public. In 1936 the King’s Board was re-erected here and in the following year this was joined by Scriven’s Conduit (for both structures, see Section 5.3: Open Spaces, Trees and Landscape).
Post-WWII infill has resulted in some large office blocks at the western end of the conservation area, while most of the area’s villas and terraces are now subdivided into flats or used for a variety of commercial and institutional purposes.

4.2 Archaeology
Areas of high archaeological potential within the conservation area include the sites of the Roman and Norman North Gates, and of the medieval hospitals of St Margaret and St Mary Magdalen. Roman graves have been found along both sides of the London Road and traces of early roads dating from the city’s Roman foundation, are also known to survive below ground. Given what is now known about the extent of Roman extra-mural suburbs, it is highly likely that Roman commercial and industrial premises were located within the conservation area. There is therefore a strong possibility that archaeological remains survive below ground in all parts of the conservation area.

5 Spatial Analysis

5.1 Plan form and layout
The London Road Conservation Area owes its origins to ribbon development along the Roman London Road. The arrow-straight character of Roman roads gives a strong linear quality to the layout, with views that stretch for the whole 1.3km length of the conservation area, and a strongly unified property line on both sides of the road. The back boundaries run parallel to the main road and also have a marked degree of unity. Kip’s 1710 topographic view of Gloucester suggests that open fields lay beyond these back boundaries. Only in the 19th century were side roads constructed to the north and south of the main road, starting with Worcester Street, Oxford Street and Wellington Parade in the 1820s.

5.2 Landmarks, focal points and views
In section 3.2: Topography and geology, it has already been noted that London Road climbs from 15m to 24m at Wotton Hill, at the eastern end of the conservation area. This rise of 9m or so does not sound significant but, combined with the arrow straight character of London Road, it does have an impact on views into and out of the conservation area. Entering the city from the east, there is a perceptible sense of descending from the ridge of Wotton Hill with long westward views that take in the church spires of St Peter’s and St John the Baptist. Travelling in the other direction, out of the city, the mature trees in the grounds of St Margaret’s Almshouses and Hillfield Gardens form a green tunnel when in leaf, and this leafy character continues through to the junction at St Catharine’s church.

Occasional glimpses of the distant cathedral tower are caught from Wotton Hill, and of the entrance tower to Hillfield House. Less attractive are the occasional views to the south of the Royal Gloucester Hospital tower, bristling with antennae and satellite dishes, and of the chimney of the hospital incinerator.

5.3 Open spaces, trees and landscape
Hillfield Gardens is a large area of sloping lawns with planted borders and many large and attractive mature trees (cedars, horse chestnuts and evergreen holm oaks), which was acquired by the City Council in the 1930s, having previously formed the gardens of Hillfield House, originally laid out in the 1820s. Set within the park are two historic structures. The King’s Board is a late 18th-century gazebo, originally located in the grounds of Marybone House, near the Quay. It is made up of reused 14th-century arcading and other monumental masonry (including scenes from the life of Christ carved in relief) said to have come from the King’s Board, a medieval market house in the centre of Westgate Street, demolished in 1780.
Along Bruton Way, the row of six trees in front of the Gloucester Railway Carriage and Wagon Works and along the railway embankment to the rear of this building;

Along Great Western Road, the belt of trees helping to create privacy for the terraced housing in Wellington Parade;

In front of 65 to 69 London Road, softening the impact of the bulky late 20th-century office blocks set back from the street, and also enhancing the architecture by mirroring the vertical emphasis of No. 69;

In the gardens of St Margaret's almshouse, Hillfield Garden and St Mary Magdalen, lending a green and leafy appearance to the upper end of London Road as well as being important components of the park and garden planting.

In many of the gardens along the upper end of London Road and in Horton Road, mature trees (including fruit trees such as mulberry, bullace, apple and pear) spill over the boundary walls of these very large late Victorian villas and help to perpetuate a garden suburb atmosphere and absorb deflect the impact of traffic noise on the residents;

Rows of trees (mainly lime) along the eastern and southern boundaries of Wotton House help to define and shelter the grounds and to separate it from the large hospital complex next door;

In the Horton Road burial ground there are deliberately planted yews, hollies and evergreen shrubs appropriate to a cemetery; there are also self-sown tree seedlings that could, in time, swamp the original planting and that need to be managed.

5.4 Public realm

The western end of the conservation area (Upper Northgate Street and the Worcester Street junction) has benefited from Townscape Heritage Initiative funding, with streetscape restoration on both sides of the road, and public realm works that have greatly enhanced the wide pavements, which are now flagged with sandstone, with granite kerbs. Regrettably, the Northgate Street / Worcester Road junction has been damaged by builders on the western side: the pavement here is covered in spilled paint and plaster from building works carried out in adjacent properties.

The pavements at the city centre end of London Road are largely paved with a mix of textured concrete pavours and grey concrete paving slabs. Side streets and the upper end of the London Road have tarmac surfaces and concrete curbs. The Royal Lane footpath has a tarmac surface at the city centre end but is largely unsurfaced at the upper end.

Street lighting is modern and utilitarian.

The eastern end of Upper Northgate Street is closed to traffic, and has a memorial in the form of a rubbed brick and blue-glazed seating area, inscribed: ‘In memory of Rt Revd Mgr Canon M J Roche, St Peter’s Parish Priest 1934–1993’.
and use of decorative ironwork being similar to contemporary buildings in nearby Cheltenham and Bath. Wellington Parade in Gloucester is a very fine example of the style, made more significant for the fact that this terrace retains nearly all of its original decorative ironwork, including area railings and gates. Quite a number of the listed buildings of this period in the conservation area have an attractive fanlight pattern known, because of the shape made by its glazing bars, as ‘bat’s wing’.

From the 1860s, vacant plots along London Road began to fill with large family houses and semi-detached pairs in the several styles that were fashionable in the mid-Victorian period, including domestic neo-Gothic. One of the best examples of this style is Peter Scott House, at the corner of London Road and Heathville Road, the latter being a new road developed from 1865 by the local architect, A W Maberly, and the houses along Horton Road.

Another splendid example of neo-Gothic architecture in the conservation area is the 1862 United Almshouse complex (now St Margaret’s), designed by Fulljames and Waller in Picturesque Domestic Gothic style, set on three sides of an irregular courtyard, with a large centrally placed square tower with a steeply pitched pyramidal roof. The almshouse complex has much good polychrome brick detailing and verandas supported on moulded timber posts with attractive wrought-iron lanterns.

By far the grandest house in the area, and Gloucester’s most elaborate Victorian House, is Hillfield House, now home to local government offices, built in 1867–9 to the designs of the London-based architect John Giles, in the Italianate style made popular by Sir Charles Barry. The grand front elevation has a recessed and balustraded loggia and a balustraded porte cochère fronting a three-stage tower. In a similar style is the entrance lodge to the grounds of the house, now Hillfield Gardens.

By contrast, the area has a few examples of artisan housing, built to a much smaller scale, but clearly modelled on grander houses in the area, especially in the use of stucco front elevations with eaves mouldings and parapets (in Oxford Street) or the characteristic Gloucester detail of flat-arched window heads of five raised-and-stepped stone voussoirs (in Oxford Terrace and Newland Street).
Bridging the late 19th and the early 20th century are several examples of neo-Tudor architecture, marked by half timbering, corner turrets, ornate brick chimneys and mullioned and transomed windows with hood moulds (The Gate public house at No. 53 Northgate Street, the excellent corner shops at Nos. 40a and 40b London Road, and villas at Nos. 3, 7, 9 and 11 Horton Road). The Queen-Anne style makes an appearance at No. 100 Northgate Street, which has two very fine oriel windows and a big bracketed eaves cornice decorated with both egg-and-dart and dentilled friezes, and at both Horton Road (No. 5) and Denmark Road (Nos 2 and 10), with Arts and Crafts (Guild House, Denmark Road) and neo-Georgian (the well-designed extensions to Wotton House on Horton Road).

Post-WWII infill has resulted in some large office blocks at the western end of the conservation area, including Nos 55 to 57 London Road (Portland Court), built in 1988 with big post-modern pediments to the design of Dancey & Meridith, and No 69, the Fortis Insurance building of 1974, by Williams, Mills & Headley, of brick with recessed ground and first floor and four projecting upper storeys supported on slender concrete stilts.

Very recent developments include large blocks of apartments built around courtyards at Charlton Court (Nos 50 to 52 London Road) and The Courtyard (Nos 122 to 130 London Road).

6.2 Listed buildings

A listed building is one that is included on the government’s Statutory List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest. These buildings are protected by law and consent is required from Gloucester City Council before any works of alteration, extension or demolition can be carried out. Further information can be found in the City Council’s publication Listed Buildings in Gloucester.

The London Road Conservation Area contains 81 listed buildings, of which six are Grade II*.

The Grade II* buildings are mainly ecclesiastical (St Peter’s Church) and / or medieval (St Margaret’s Chapel, St Mary Magdalen’s Chapel, the King’s Board), but they also include the 1862 United Almshouses and 1636 Scriven’s Conduit.

The Grade II buildings largely consist of Regency terraces and villas, all buildings with pre-1800 fabric, including some buildings that encapsulate medieval timber framing within their roof structures.

A full list of the conservation area’s listed buildings is given in Appendix 4.
6.3 Key unlisted buildings

In addition to listed buildings, the conservation area contains a large number of unlisted buildings that make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area. These are identified on the townscape appraisal map as ‘positive buildings’. This follows advice provided in English Heritage guidance on conservation area character appraisals, and within Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 (PPG15), both of which stress the importance of identifying and protecting such buildings.

The criteria used for selection of positive buildings are those set out in Appendix 2 of English Heritage’s Guidance on Conservation Area Appraisals (2005). Where a building has been adversely affected by modern changes and restoration is either impractical or indeed, not possible, they are excluded.

The following buildings in the conservation area are judged to make a positive contribution (*means the building is a landmark building occupying a prominent site):

**Northgate Street**
- *No. 53: a late 19th-century pub (The Gate) with half-timbered gables, oriels and corner turret*
- No. 61: Edwardian shop, with glazed brick with stone detailing
- Nos 79 and 81: Edwardian shops
- No. 101: Edwardian with a Dutch-style bell gable
- No. 113: late 19th-century with flamboyant terracotta swags
- No. 100: Queen Anne style with attractive oriels and eaves cornice
- Nos 106-114: Spread Eagle Court, purpose-built late-19th-century commercial block with shops below and chambers above, entered through a neo-Gothic porch with stone-carved floral motifs.

**Worcester Street**
- Nos 1 to 3b Worcester Street: though these are modern, they have been designed to match the listed buildings at Nos 83-85 Northgate Street, and they form an integral part of this important corner site.

**London Road north side**
- No 25: late 19th-century shop with terracotta shopfront brackets and friezes
- Nos 2 to 12 Alvin Street: terrace of 19th-century artisan houses
- Nos 33 and 35: late 19th-century shops
- *No 2 Heathfield Road: Peter Scott House, good Gothic Revival villa with turret*
- No 4 Heathfield Road: good Gothic Revival villa with terracotta and ceramic tile detailing
- No. 69a: Dutch-style arts and crafts villa
- 71 to 81: three semi-detached pairs of late-19th century houses (Nos 71 and 77 have good wrought-iron cast-iron porch supports decorated with urns and leaves)
- Nos 91, 93, 95, 97 and 99: detached mid-19th century villas
- *No 103: large detached Victorian villa, prominently sited on junction of Denmark Road and London Road with good boundary walls*

**Denmark Road**
- Guild House: arts and crafts villa
- No. 2: Queen-Anne villa with pedimented porch carved with heraldic and floral motifs
- Nos 4 and 6: mid-19th century houses with pilasters, eaves cornices and tripartite windows
- No 8: mid-19th century house with flat-arched door and window heads of five raised-and-stepped stone voussoirs
- No 10: Queen-Anne villa with pedimented windows

**Horton Road**
- No. 1: substantial late-19th century villa with half-timbered oriel
- No. 2: one of a pair of late-19th century houses
- No. 3: substantial early 20th-century villa with segment-headed window lintels and keystones
- Nos. 7: substantial late-19th century villa with bay windows and decorated bargeboards

**London Road south side**
- *Unnumbered: early 20th-century 13-bay brick factory/showroom of the Gloucester Railway Carriage and Wagon Company*
- *Nos 40a and 40b: purpose-built Edwardian shop block with polygonal corner turret*
- No. 48: substantial mid-19th century villa
- Newland Street Nos 1 to 16: late 19th-century artisans houses with flat-arched door and window heads of five raised-and-stepped stone voussoirs
- No. 66: England’s Glory Pub, 19th-century painted brick with dog-tooth eaves course
- Nos 74 and 76: 19th-century houses
- Nos 94 to 98: modest 19th-century brick houses
- Nos 132 and 134: neglected 19th-century houses with door canopies
- No 136: 19th-century house
- No 142: one of a pair of late 19th-century houses
6.4 Building materials and local details

Within the conservation area, the traditional building materials are as follows:

✦ Walls: of limestone ashlar, or of exposed red brick with limestone details, or of stucco-fronted brick painted cream;
✦ Roofs: hidden by parapets, of blue/grey Welsh slate, or plain clay tiles;
✦ Windows: timber sliding sashes, sometimes with semi-circular heads, but mainly rectangular;
✦ Doors: with stone steps and timber front doors, rectangular over door lights or semi-circular fanlights.

Local details include:

✦ Decorative ironwork to front areas on dwarf walls;
✦ Door canopies with decorative cast-iron supports;
✦ Front entrances with narrow glazed side panels either side of the door;
✦ So-called ‘bat’s wing’ fanlights, named after the shape made by the glazing bars;
✦ Windows and doors of finely gauged segmental brick or stone ‘keystone’ voussoirs.

6.5 Shopfronts

There are some well detailed historic shopfronts, mainly dating to the late 19th or early 20th centuries, which are all marked on the Townscape Appraisal map. Some, such as Nos 83 and 85 Northgate Street (the latter having a fine curved corner shopfront with original 1820s lantern suspended above the front door) are located in listed buildings and are therefore already afforded special protection. Others, such as Nos 79 and 81, Northgate Street, are in unlisted buildings which have been assessed as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Changes to all shopfronts within the conservation area should be guided by advice contained within the City Council’s Shopfronts Design Guide.

7 The Character of the Conservation Area

7.1 Character areas

The London Road Conservation Area can be divided into three areas of distinctly different character:

✦ Character area 1: Upper Northgate Street and London Road up to the railway viaduct
✦ Character area 2: London Road from the railway viaduct to St Margaret’s Chapel
✦ Character area 3: St Margaret’s Chapel eastwards

7.2 Character area 1: Upper Northgate Street and London Road up to the railway viaduct

This area, ‘between the two gates’ is still part of Gloucester’s city centre, with a strongly commercial atmosphere, the two sides of Northgate Street being lined by shops, cafés, pubs and supermarkets.

Key characteristics:

✦ Mainly commercial in character;
✦ One of the city’s first suburbs, located just outside the Roman walls and taken in to the defended medieval city in the 12th century;
✦ Interrupted half-way down its length by Worcester Street, built in 1822 as the main route out of the city for the Midlands (and a separate conservation area);
✦ A mix of buildings from listed late-medieval timber-framed to late 20th-century supermarkets;
✦ Including some fine historic shopfronts (eg Nos 79, 81, 83 and 85 Northgate Street, the latter with a good Regency wrought-iron lamp suspended from the wall above the front door)
✦ And individual buildings of merit (eg the ceramic-tiled Imperial Inn at No. 59 Northgate Street, the Queen-Anne style No. 100 Northgate Street, St Peter’s Church and Presbytery and the Gloucester Railway Carriage and Wagon Company showroom
Traffic calmed at the junction of Northgate Street and Worcester Street, with benches, street trees and bollards; and at the junction of Northgate Street and the inner relief road, with bollards and street art (brick and tile benches)

With wide pavements, flagged in sandstone with granite kerbs, improved through THI grant aid.

Negatives:

Many of the shops are trading at the margins of economic viability, or are closed and awaiting redevelopment (KwikSave site) or new tenants (Gloucester Railway Carriage and Wagon Company showroom);

The poor quality of many of the largest buildings, which dominate the streetscape by their scale and garish fascias (eg Wilkinson at 78 to 84 Northgate Street and the 1960s block at 87 to 97 Northgate Street);

Newly laid sandstone pavements damaged by building works, especially on the corner outside No. 85 Northgate Street;

Poor quality shopfronts (eg Nos 102, 104 and 113 Northgate Street).

Heavy traffic at the eastern end, where the inner relief road (Bruton Way and Black Dog Way) separates Northgate Street from London Road;

A grim street scene looking east, comprising the railway viaduct and modern extensions to the rear of St Peter’s church, but softened by street trees in front of the Gloucester Railway Carriage and Wagon Company showroom.

7.3 Character area 2: London Road from the railway viaduct to St Margaret’s Chapel

This area takes in the flat section of London Road, before the beginning of the rising slope of Wotton Hill, and it is the part of London Road most affected by the redevelopment of sites for modern commercial blocks or the reuse of residential buildings for offices

Key characteristics:

Mainly commercial or institutional, with much economic activity, ranging from small shops and restaurants, to corporate headquarters’ buildings to service-sector businesses (eg engineering consultants) and public sector services (eg probation services);

With some of Gloucester’s finest Regency and Victorian villas and terraces;

As well as historic inner-city artisan housing in terraces in Alvin Street, Oxford Street and Oxford Terrace and Newland Street;

Trees that help to soften and disguise the bulk of modern developments.

Negatives:

Institutional and commercial use means that most buildings have lost their front and rear gardens to parking;

Boundary treatments that are insensitive to the special historic interest of the conservation area;

Large and characterless rear extensions to many properties

Inappropriate alterations, including a number of pebble-dashed or rendered front elevations

Loss of historic window and door details

Historic inner-city artisan housing in terraces in Alvin Street.
7.4 Character area 3: St Margaret’s Chapel eastwards

This area takes the historic chapels and almshouses of St Margaret’s and St Mary Magdalen’s Hospitals, Hillfield House and Gardens, and the large Victorian villas of Denmark Road and Horton Road.

Key characteristics:

◆ Leafy character, thanks to many mature trees in the grounds of St Margaret’s Almshouse, Hillfield Gardens, and the gardens of villas along London, Denmark and Horton Roads;

◆ Well-kept open spaces, including Hillfield Gardens, with its Friends group and occasional outdoor concerts, the grounds of St Margaret’s almshouses and the churchyard of St Mary Magdalen’s chapel;

◆ St Margaret’s almshouses and their grounds are impeccably maintained;

◆ A good interpretation board at St Mary Magdalen’s chapel explaining the history of the site;

◆ The cemetery in Horton Road, a quiet oasis with potential for enhancement;

◆ The handsome and well-maintained Wotton House and its gardens in Horton Road;

◆ Several very large Victorian villas with good boundary walls and mature trees;

◆ Royal Lane providing a quiet pedestrian alternative to busy London Road;

◆ St Catharine’s church, a busy community church with nursery school;

◆ Modern high-density housing making good use of brownfield land, and built round courtyards to maximise privacy and quiet;

◆ Many larger houses with a viable economic use such as surgeries, residential homes and day centres.

Negatives:

◆ Busy and noisy traffic junction at St Catharine’s church;

◆ Horton Road is very busy with traffic using the hospital;

◆ Institutional use has led to unkempt areas, makeshift extensions and security screens and fencing (for example around the back of 103 London Road, intruding onto Hillfield Gardens and St Mary Magdalen’s churchyard);

◆ Conversion of large buildings into flats leads to loss of gardens to garages and parking, multiple bins and satellite dishes.

The conversion of large buildings into flats leads to loss of gardens to garages and parking, multiple bins and satellite dishes.

Part 2 Management Proposals

8 Introduction

8.1 Format of the Management Proposals

Part 1 of this document, the Character Appraisal, has identified the features of the London Road Conservation Area that contribute to the conservation area’s special character and distinctiveness, and that should be conserved and enhanced.

Part 2 of this document, the Management Proposals, builds upon the negative features which have also been identified, to provide a series of Issues and Recommendations for improvement and change, most of which are the responsibility of the City Council.

The structure and scope of this document is based on the suggested framework published by English Heritage in Guidance on the Management of Conservation Areas (2005). Both the Conservation Area Character Appraisal and the Management Proposals will be subject to monitoring and reviews on a regular basis, as set out in Section 10.

9 Issues and recommendations

9.1 Negative buildings

There are several mainly post-WWII buildings that have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. These are all marked on the Townscape Appraisal map. They are judged to be negative because of their inappropriate design, scale or materials and their adverse impact on the setting of adjoining historic buildings.

Most of these are located in Northgate Street and many already feature in regeneration plans for the city. Examples include:

◆ Nos 78 to 84 Northgate Street (Wilkinson’s store);
◆ Nos 87 to 97 Northgate Street: a tired and uninspiring 1960s shopping centre;
◆ Nos 103 to 111 Northgate Street (the KwikSave site);
◆ Nos 38 and 40 London Road.
9.2 Back garden development

Royal Lane runs all the way from Horton Road to Great Western Road, forming the southern boundary of the conservation area for most of its length. This part-footpath part-road provides access to the backs of land plots on the southern side of London Road and is subject to development pressure.

Some new properties have already been constructed on London road back gardens, while other plots have a variety of sheds, garages, stores and workshops. Some stretches are very well maintained (for example, to the rear of St Margaret’s almshouses) while others are unkempt and marred by graffiti, rubbish, parked cars and broken and potholed surfaces.

Policy CA9/5: The Council will monitor Royal Lane to ensure that the historic character of the lane is not compromised by unauthorised use or development.
9.4 Alterations to listed and unlisted properties

Most of the unlisted – and many of the listed – buildings in the conservation area have been adversely affected by the loss of original architectural details and building materials, including the replacement of original timber sash windows or doors with uPVC or aluminium, the replacement of natural roof slates with concrete tiles, the loss of chimneys, porches, doorways, overdoor lights and fanlights, window guards and balconies, and the rendering or painting of historic brick and stonework in inappropriate colours and materials (for example, repointing in concrete or facing with pebble dash).

In many cases, the removal of boundary walls, gates and railings and the loss of front and rear gardens, along with the construction of makeshift extensions, garages, fences and walls in inappropriate materials have further diminished the external character and appearance of the building and the local streetscape.

The sub-division of properties into flats or let for multiple occupancy can also erode external character through prominent fire escapes, poorly maintained gardens or gardens destroyed in order to ease maintenance.

Numerous examples of inappropriate alteration are to be found in the conservation area, including Nos 27 to 31 London Road, for example (originally listed, but delisted in 2004) and Nos 54 and 56 London Road (mid-Victorian but pebble-dashed), these alterations are particularly noticeable in contexts where the majority of the houses have retained original features and just one or two break the pattern. For example:

◆ In Oxford Street, most of the listed houses on both sides of the road retain sash windows, front doors and overdoor lights, but Nos 16, 22, 29 and 31 have rendered or pebble dashed front elevations instead of the stucco of the remainder.

◆ The terraces in Oxford Terrace and Newland Street are similarly varied, with some pebble dashed facades and one house where a previous owner seems determined to remove all detail from the front elevation, having chiselled the projecting door and window voussoirs flush to the brickwork, and then painted the whole façade.

◆ Nos 130 and 132 London Road have suffered from much alteration and their current appearance spoils what is otherwise a handsome group of Regency houses on the London and Cheltenham Road junction;

◆ Similarly, several houses in the otherwise unaltered terrace at Nos 100 to 118 London Road have replaced their front gardens with hard standing for cars.

◆ No 115 London Road is a fine listed 18th-century brick house but compromised by the modern garage block erected to the rear of the property, and by heavy handed repointing of what was originally finely gauged brick work;

◆ Modern timber fencing has been used to enhance the privacy of the gardens along the London Road and Horton Road junction, compromising the appearance of the original polychrome brick boundary walls.

Where single family dwellings are concerned, such alterations can normally be carried out without planning permission from the Council. Development of this kind is called ‘Permitted Development’ and falls into various classes which are listed in the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995.

Policy CA9/8: The Council will seek to consider the need for Article 4(2) Directions to protect buildings that retain original features from inappropriate alteration. The primary focus will be on dwelling houses in Northgate Street, London Road, Alvin Street, Oxford Street, Heathville Road, Denmark Road and Horton Road that have been identified on the accompanying townscape appraisal map as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. This might be considered to prevent the further erosion of historic character of residential properties, particularly where they form a coherent group of well detailed properties.

Recommendations:

◆ Policy CA9/8: The Council will encourage property owners to reverse unsympathetic alterations and to reinstate architectural features, such as windows, doors and boundary walls, on historic properties, with modern replacements in the style and materials of the originals.

9.5 Shopfronts

Several historic shopfronts have been identified on the Townscape Appraisal map and are worthy of conservation; they are located at 61, 79, 81, 83, 85 and 113 Northgate Street, at 25, 33, 35, 40a and 40b London Road, and at No. 2 Oxford Street. There are also several modern shopfronts which are badly detailed and use garish colours, modern materials and poor quality signage (including Domino’s Pizza, for example, at No 117, where an inappropriately designed fascia is superimposed on top of an earlier and better-designed version).
The conservation area also has seven public houses. The front and side elevations of The Gate (No. 53 Northgate Street) and tiled front elevation of the listed Imperial (No. 59 Northgate Street) are fine examples of late-19th century design and well worth preserving, because they are significant visual enhancements in the streetscape. Similarly, though its original stucco has been replaced by textured render, the Victoria pub in Oxford Street is a good example of a mid-Victorian corner pub, with original internal fittings, that enhances the streetscape.

By contrast, the front elevations of the listed Northend Vaults (86 Northgate Street), England's Glory (66 London Road), the York (76 London Road) and the Welsh Harp (36 London Road) are all tired and out of character with their historic surroundings (several are fronted by post WWII extensions, and all have their historic brickwork painted in a variety of colours). To help prevent further unacceptable changes, the Council has produced a Shopfront Design Guide with detailed advice on the general principles of good shopfront design.

Recommendations:

- Policy CA9/10: The Council will seek to ensure the retention of existing historic shopfronts and notable elements of historic shopfront design;
- Policy CA9/11: The Council will expect all applications for new or altered shopfronts to accord with the advice given in the publication Shopfronts – Design Guidance for Gloucester and in Policy BE.11 Shopfronts, Shutters and Signs in the Gloucester Local Plan Second Stage Deposit August 2002;
- Policy CA9/12: The Council will seek to ensure that all advertisement proposals relating to shops respect the character and appearance of the conservation area, in terms of siting, number, colours, materials and form of illumination.

9.6 Public spaces

The conservation area has several significant public spaces that are well worth enhancing.

The grounds of St Margaret’s almshouse are well maintained and few enhancements are necessary other than an interpretation board at the entrance to St Margaret’s church that would explain to passers by the significance of the chapel and almshouses and indicate if and when visits are permitted to the chapel and gardens.

The grounds of St Mary Magdalen already have a good interpretation board and the churchyard itself is well maintained, though the chapel itself is vandalised (broken windows, now boarded up) and there are broken perimeter walls and paving in need of repair. The security fence separating the churchyard from the Probation Service housed in Bewick House next door is an intrusive feature but is no doubt necessary for the good of the chapel.

Hillfield Gardens again seems relatively free of vandalism, litter and threatening behaviour. A Friends of Hillfield Gardens notice board, funded by the Liveability Fund, indicates that the gardens are much appreciated by local people, and are occasionally used for open air concerts and other social events. However, the Gloucester Buildings at Risk register notes that the two listed structures in the garden – Scriven’s Conduit and the King’s Board – have been subject to vandalism in the past.

The cemetery on Horton Road has a good boundary wall of stone topped by a cast-iron screen made up of quatrefoils and fleurs-de-lis finials; the screen is broken in several places and patched with wire mesh; its gates, in similar style, are also broken, with one gate consisting of just its hinges and a few scraps of decorative ironwork. Many of the monuments in the cemetery are overgrown or broken – though there are few signs of deliberate vandalism. The cemetery would benefit from sympathetic enhancement; a light touch would prevent further deterioration but not destroy the air of romantic neglect that is part of the cemetery’s character. It is understood that grant applications are in hand for the repair of the boundary walls and historic ironwork. Further study of the cemetery would make a useful contribution to our knowledge of the history of non-conformist religion in Gloucester – in particular it is recommended that a plan of all the surviving monuments is made, along with a transcription of all...
the surviving headstone inscriptions – a possible project for the pupils of the adjacent school or for the Friends of Horton Road Cemetery.

Recommendations:

◆ Policy CA9/13: The Council should work with the owners of the Horton Road cemetery and St Margaret’s almshouses to achieve the necessary improvements and should continue to work with the Friends of Hillfield Gardens to maintain this urban park. If appropriate, Heritage Lottery Funds should be sought for enhancements to these public spaces.

9.7 Public realm, pedestrian movement and traffic

Significant improvements have already been achieved in Northgate Street thanks to traffic calming, tree planting and the creation of wide sandstone flagged pavements. The only discordant note here is the damage inflicted on the paving slabs in front of No 85 Northgate Street by recent building work, leaving the pavement marked by paint spills and other stains; the Council might like to consider whether those responsible can be legally required to make good the damage.

Further public realm enhancements can only be considered in the light of future development plans: the development of the KwikSave site will have implications for traffic and pedestrian movement in and around this area, as will any future use of the empty retail warehouses on the eastern side of Bruton Way, including the Gloucester Railway Carriage and Wagon Works showroom, which already has seating, trees and cast-iron bollards, but is showing signs of neglect.

Recommendations:

◆ Policy CA9/14: The Council will consider publishing a Streetscape Manual setting out their design principles for the public realm, which should adhere to the guidelines described in the English Heritage publication Streets for All;

◆ Policy CA9/15: The Council will publish a Lighting Strategy to provide guidance on suitable improvements in street lighting and the illumination of listed buildings.

9.8 Street trees

Trees make an important contribution to the conservation area, and Council policy is to ensure that these trees are protected and maintained in a healthy condition.

Recommendations:

◆ Policy CA9/16: The Council should consider adding more trees and climbing plants to those that are already growing along the railway viaduct in Black Dog Way as a way to soften the impact of the rail way viaduct and create a friendlier environment along Black Dog Way.

10 Monitoring and Review

As recommended by English Heritage, this document should be reviewed every five years from the date of its formal adoption. It will need to be assessed in the light of the emerging Local Development Framework and government policy generally. A review should include the following:

◆ A survey of the conservation area including a full photographic survey to aid possible enforcement action;

◆ An assessment of whether the various recommendations detailed in this document have been acted upon, and how successful this has been;

◆ The identification of any new issues which need to be addressed, requiring further actions or enhancements;

◆ The production of a short report detailing the findings of the survey and any necessary action;

◆ Publicity and advertising.

It is possible that this review could be carried out by the local community under the guidance of a heritage consultant or the City Council. This would enable the local community to become more involved with the process and would raise public consciousness of the issues, including the problems associated with enforcement.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objectives</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Likely Timing of Impact (Short, Med, Long Term)</th>
<th>Temporary or Permanent Impact?</th>
<th>Geographic Scale</th>
<th>Likelihood of Impact</th>
<th>Significance of Impact</th>
<th>Commentary (any cumulative, secondary, synergistic impacts?) &amp; Recommendations for Improvement/Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To protect the City's most vulnerable assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.a. Will it minimise the risk of flooding to people and property?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.b. Will it conserve and enhance natural/semi-natural habitats?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.c. Will it conserve and enhance species diversity and in particular, avoid harm to protected species?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>S/T</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Horton Road Cemetery &amp; Hillfield Gardens</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>There are policies to improve and maintain these which, as well as being important historically are havens for wildlife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.d. Will it maintain and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.e. Will it maintain and enhance cultural and historical assets?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>M/T</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Whole Area</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>The management policies seek to encourage property owners to replace negative buildings, reverse unsympathetic alterations, reinstate architectural features and repair buildings at risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.f. Will it maintain and enhance woodland cover?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To Deliver Sustainable Economic Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.a. Will it create new and lasting full time jobs particularly for those most in need of employment?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.b. Will it encourage both indigenous and inward investment?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>L/T</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Whole Area</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>It has been found that when the appearance of an historic area is improved more people want to live and work there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.c. Will it help to support and encourage the growth of small businesses?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.d. Will it help to improve the attraction of Gloucester as a tourist destination?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>L/T</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Whole Area</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Enhancing the character or this historic area will encourage more people to visit Gloucester and stay longer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objectives</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Likely Timing of Impact (Short, Med, Long Term)</td>
<td>Temporary or Permanent Impact?</td>
<td>Geographic Scale</td>
<td>Likelihood of Impact</td>
<td>Significance of Impact</td>
<td>Commentary (any cumulative, secondary, synergistic impacts?) &amp; Recommendations for Improvement/Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To minimise consumption of natural resources and production of waste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.a. Will it encourage the most efficient use of land and buildings?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>S/T</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Whole Area</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Maintaining the character of historic areas can mean resisting development on important open spaces and the curtilage to listed buildings. The sub-division of properties can also be detrimental to the character of an historic area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.b. Will it encourage development on previously developed land?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>L/T</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Negative buildings</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Document has policies for the Council to encourage the redevelopment of ‘negative’ sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.c. Will it minimise the demand for raw materials and/or encourage the use of raw materials from sustainable sources?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>S/T</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Whole Area</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>The retention of older buildings reduces the demand for new building materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.d. Will it increase waste recovery and recycling?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>S/T</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Whole Area</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Property owners will be encouraged to reinstate original features some of which can be obtained second-hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.e. Will it help to reduce the amount of waste that is generated?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.f. Will it positively encourage renewable forms of energy?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.g. Will it reduce water consumption?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objectives</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Likely Timing of Impact (Short, Med, Long Term)</td>
<td>Temporary or Permanent Impact?</td>
<td>Geographic Scale</td>
<td>Likelihood of Impact</td>
<td>Significance of Impact</td>
<td>Commentary (any cumulative, secondary, synergistic impacts?) &amp; Recommendations for Improvement/Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To ensure everyone has access to the essential services they require and that local needs are met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.a Will it help everyone access essential basic services easily, safely and affordably?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.d. Will it provide additional leisure facilities, green spaces and improve access to existing facilities?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>S/T</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Hillfield Gardens</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>There is a policy to carry out further improvements to the park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.e. Will it help to ensure that everyone has access to safe and affordable housing?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.f. Will it reduce homelessness?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To improve standards of health and education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.a. Will it improve health and people’s ability to engage in healthy activities?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.b. Will it improve access to health care facilities?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.d. Will it improve access to learning, training, skills and knowledge?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.e. Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people and adults?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Likely Timing of Impact (Short, Med, Long Term)</td>
<td>Temporary or Permanent Impact?</td>
<td>Geographic Scale</td>
<td>Significance of Impact</td>
<td>Likelihood of Impact</td>
<td>Commentary (any cumulative, synergistic impacts &amp; recommendations for improvement/mitigation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To make Gloucester a great place to live and work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.a. Will it help to reduce crime and the fear of crime?</td>
<td>L/HT</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>Whole Area</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Document recommends that a monitoring review be carried out in 5 years time and that this could be carried out by the local community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.b. Will it encourage community engagement in community activities?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Whole Area</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Encourages people to take pride in their area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.c. Will it increase the ability of people to influence decisions?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Whole Area</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Well maintained CA’s are attractive places to live.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.d. Will it improve community cohesion?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>M/T</td>
<td>Whole Area</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.e. Will it help to maintain and/or enhance the vitality and viability of a designated centre?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Whole Area</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.f. Will it increase access to and participation in cultural activities?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Whole Area</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.g. Will it reduce poverty and income inequality?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Whole Area</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.h. Will it reduce the number of unfit homes?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Whole Area</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.i. Will it improve the quality of where people live?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>L/T</td>
<td>Whole Area</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

London Road page 22
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objectives</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Likely Timing of Impact (Short, Med, Long Term)</th>
<th>Temporary or Permanent Impact?</th>
<th>Geographic Scale</th>
<th>Likelihood of Impact</th>
<th>Significance of Impact</th>
<th>Commentary (any cumulative, secondary, synergistic impacts?) &amp; Recommendations for Improvement/Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. To reduce the need to travel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.a. Will it reduce the need/desire to travel by car?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.b. Will it help ensure that alternatives to the car are available for essential journeys, especially to residents in areas of low car ownership?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.c. Will it help to achieve a reduction in road accident casualties?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.d. Will it increase the proportion of freight carried by rail and water?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.e. Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To improve environmental quality (air, water, land)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.a. Will it help to reduce any sources of pollution?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.b. Will it help to reduce levels of noise?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.c. Will it help to maintain and enhance water quality?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.e. Will it help to maintain and enhance air quality?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.f. Will it help to maintain and enhance land/soil quality?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.g. Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>L/T</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Negative buildings</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Document has policies for the Council to encourage the redevelopment of negative sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To reduce contributions to climate change</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.a. Will it reduce contributions to climate change?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.b. Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Temporary or Permanent Impact?:
- **Temporary**: Likely in the short-term (up to 2 years).
- **Permanent**: Likely in the long-term (more than 2 years).
- **L/T**: Likely to be a long-term impact.
- **0**: No impact.
- **-**: Low likelihood of impact.
- **+**: High likelihood of impact.
- **++**: Very high likelihood of impact.

Likelihood of Impact:
- **Low**: Likely in the short-term (up to 2 years).
- **Medium**: Likely in the medium-term (2-10 years).
- **High**: Likely in the long-term (more than 10 years).
- **0**: No likelihood.
- **-**: Low likelihood.
- **+**: Medium likelihood.
- **++**: High likelihood.
- **??**: Very high likelihood.

Significance of Impact:
- **Low**: Likely in the short-term (up to 2 years).
- **Medium**: Likely in the medium-term (2-10 years).
- **High**: Likely in the long-term (more than 10 years).
- **0**: No likelihood.
- **-**: Low likelihood.
- **+**: Medium likelihood.
- **++**: High likelihood.
- **??**: Very high likelihood.
Appendix 2 The Historical Development of Gloucester

Gloucester: history and development

The history of Gloucester has been written many times and in great detail. This account is not intended to duplicate what has already been said elsewhere. Instead it is aimed at summarising those key historical developments that have helped to shape the city that we know today, with particular emphasis on the street pattern and standing buildings.

Roman Gloucester

A Roman fortress was established at Kingsholm some time after AD 48 close to what must have been an existing ford across the River Severn. The Severn then formed the frontier between Roman Britain and unconquered Wales. By AD 70, the Romans had conquered south Wales and established a new army headquarters at Caerleon. The Kingsholm fort was dismantled and a new one established to the south. This evolved into a colonia, a city where soldiers retiring from the army were given land as a form of pension, once Gloucester ceased to be a frontline military station around AD 81.

This period saw the establishment of the rectilinear street pattern that underlies the historic centre of Gloucester. The Cross, marking the centre of today’s city, also stands on top of the focal point of the Roman city. Northgate Street and Southgate Streets lie directly on top of the main Roman road through the city. London Road also follows a Roman alignment, turning north easterly to join Roman Ermin Way (today’s A38 Barnwood / Hucclecote Road). Ermin Way itself is aligned on the original fort at Kingsholm.

Anglo-Saxon Gloucester

Gloucester continued to be a centre of settlement after the final withdrawal of Roman troops from Britain in 436. The Anglo-Saxon chronicle says that Gloucester (with Cirencester and Bath) fell to the Saxons after the Battle of Dyrrham, fought in 577, and thereafter was ruled by the Hwicce, as a sub-kingdom within Mercia. Osric founded a minster church (an early form of monastery) around AD 679, the forerunner of St Peter’s Abbey (today’s cathedral).

Ethelfleda (died AD 918), daughter of King Alfred and ruler of the Mercians following the death of her husband in 911, founded the new Minster of St Oswald in Gloucester shortly after AD 900, by when Gloucester was already an important commercial centre. Many of the streets, side lanes and alleys of the city centre were established at this time.

St Oswald’s was probably connected with the royal palace that was established at Kingsholm by the reign of Edward the Confessor (1003–66). Gloucester was a regular meeting place of the royal council during his reign and that of William I. At one such meeting in 1085 William I initiated the Domesday survey.

Medieval Gloucester

Under the Normans, Gloucester’s motte-and-bailey castle commanded the southernmost route across the Severn to South Wales and this was rebuilt in stone (on the site of today’s city prison) by Miles of Gloucester in 1110–20. Under Abbot Serlo (from 1089) the Saxon Minster of St Peter was rebuilt to create one of England’s greatest Benedictine abbeys (now the cathedral).

Hospitals were established on London Road in the early twelfth century whose chapels still survive (St Margaret’s and St Mary Magdalen’s). New churches and religious foundations were added – notably the richly endowed Llanthony Priory, begun in 1137 as a home for Augustinian canons fleeing from their original Welsh home. St Oswald’s Priory also became a house of the Augustinians in 1152; Greyfriars was established around 1231, Blackfriars around 1239 and Whitefriars around 1268. Of the parish churches that were established at this time, St Mary le Lode, in St Mary’s Square, St Nicholas, in Westgate Street and St Mary le Crypt, in Southgate Street, have survived.

Gloucester was granted a charter in 1155 (giving the right to hold a market and to exercise jurisdiction). The economy was based on iron working but the city also had a large population of traders and merchants and the city played an important role as a market and service centre for the region. A quay probably operated along the banks of the Severn between Westgate Bridge and the castle.

Westgate Street was the longest and most important of the city’s commercial streets, the location of a market, several churches, the Guildhall and the mint. The abbey occupied all of the north-western quadrant of the city. The east end was the Jewish quarter until the Jews were expelled in 1275. New suburbs developed outside the town walls.

Among secular medieval buildings in Gloucester, the most remarkable are the late-twelfth century undercroft beneath the late-fifteenth century Fleece Hotel, the early thirteenth-century undercrofts to 47–49 and 76 Westgate Street and the New Inn, a complete timber-framed courtyard inn built around 1450 for St Peter’s Abbey.

Post Dissolution Gloucester

The Dissolution of the 1530s was a landmark in the city’s history, unlocking resources previously controlled by religious houses. The Minster church became the cathedral and with the founding of the See, Gloucester became a city in 1541. Cloth making led a revival in the city’s trading fortunes and by 1600 the city hosted specialist markets for the trading of cattle, sheep, grain and fruit.

Port status was granted to the city by Elizabeth I in 1580 and by the time the cloth trade declined in the seventeenth century, the city had evolved into a significant centre for the Severn-based grain and malt trade, though competition from Bristol prevented it from developing foreign trade contacts.
The Puritan city’s stubborn resistance to Royalist siege in 1643 is widely seen as the turning point in the Civil War. Large parts of the city were burned to the ground: most of the northern and southern suburbs were lost, as were half the city’s eleven medieval churches. Surviving buildings from this period include the timber-framed buildings at 6–8, 14, 26, 30, 33, 43–45, 66, 100 and 99–103 Westgate Street (the Folk Museum) and that at 9 Southgate Street (with a façade dating from 1664/5).

**Eighteenth-century Gloucester**

Wire and pin making, metal working, bell founding, wool stapling and banking led the city’s revival from the late seventeenth century. Gloucester also developed as a distribution centre for goods imported from overseas via Bristol and then forwarded inland to the west Midlands.

A number of medieval houses were refaced in fashionable brick (eg Nos 6–8 and 14 Westgate Street) and the city also became established as a social centre for the local gentry, with fine houses from this period at College Green and Longsmith Street, plus the eighteenth-century church of St John the Baptist in Northgate Street.

The County Infirmary was founded in 1755 and St Bartholomews’ Hospital almshouses, near Westgate Bridge, were rebuilt in Gothic style in 1790. Gloucester was active in the establishment and promotion of Sunday Schools from the 1780s (Robert Raikes, pioneer of Sunday Schools, was born in Gloucester in 1736). The County Gaol was rebuilt in 1791, as was St John the Baptist, Northgate Street, in 1734. Other notable buildings of the period include No 1 Miller’s Green (The Deanery), Bearland House in Longsmith Street (1740) and Ladybellegate House (1743).

**Nineteenth-century Gloucester**

Physical growth beyond the city’s medieval boundaries began after the Napoleonic Wars. Shire Hall (Sir Robert Smirke) dates from 1815/16. A pump room (demolished 1960) opened in Spa Road that same year, but this was rapidly eclipsed by the greater popularity of the spa at Cheltenham. Even so, several terraces associated with the spa have survived, including Gloucester’s only residential square, Brunswick Square (begun 1822), along with Christ Church, Brunswick Road (Rickmann & Hutchinson, 1823).

Two of the Severn’s watercourses were partly concealed, having been open since the Roman founding of the city: the Dockham Ditch (aka Old or Little Severn) was culverted south of the Foreign Bridge on Westgate Street in 1825 and completely filled in in 1854, and the Twyver (running beneath Station Road) was culverted in 1833.

The opening of the Gloucester and Berkeley Canal in 1827 gave ocean-going ships access to the city and the coming of the railways in the 1840s encouraged Gloucester’s expansion as a busy port for the distribution of foreign grain and timber to the Midlands, as well as stimulating locally based corn-milling and ship-building, and the manufacture of railway rolling stock (Gloucester Wagon Works opened in 1860) and matches (Morlands/England’s Glory).

Big increases in population saw the city’s boundaries extended in 1835 and 1874. The population doubled between 1851 and 1871 alone. Middle-class housing spread out along London Road while industrial development was heaviest in the area between the canal and Bristol Road and artisan housing grew up in the south and south east of the city. The 1870s and 1880s saw the city centre transformed from a mix of small shops and residential premises to a business and retail centre with banks, offices and large stores. Gas lighting in the city was completed in the 1890s and the new suburbs of Outer Barton Street, Tredworth, Bristol Road, Kingsholm and Wotton were brought within the city boundaries when they were extended again in 1900.

Other buildings of this period include the County Lunatic Asylum (1823), the Friends Meeting House, Greyfriars (1835), St James, Upton Street (1841), the former HM Custom House (Sydney Smirke, 1845), St Mark, Kingsholm (1845), the Mariner’s Church in the Docks (1849), the Cemetery, in Cemetery Road (1857), St Peter’s Roman Catholic Church (1859), the Wesleyan Church, Victoria Street (1870), the Public Library and Museum (1872), Whitefield Presbyterian, Church Park Road (1872), All Saints, Barton Street (Sir G G Scott, 1875), Coney Hill Hospital (1883), St Paul, Stroud Road 1883, the Public Baths, Eastgate Street (1891), the former Guildhall in Eastgate Street (1892), and St Stephen, Bristol Road (1898).

**Twentieth-century Gloucester**

As the docks declined in the late-nineteenth century, local engineering firms moved into the new industries of aircraft production, though this too ceased in 1960 (as did match making in 1976 and the wagon works in 1985). Gloucester’s role as the county town has since created employment in local government and in service industries.

Notable buildings of this period include St Catharine, London Road (1915), the Technical College (1936), St Oswald (1939), St Barnabas, Tuffley (1940) and St Aldate, Finlay Road (1964).
Speed's map of 1610.

Kip's engraving of 1710.
Hall & Pinnell’s map of 1780.

1805 map.
Causton's map of Gloucester, 1843.

1/2500 Ordnance Survey map 1902.
1/2500 Ordnance Survey map 1923.
Appendix 3 Scheduled Monuments

Scheduled Monuments are given legal protection against deliberate damage or destruction by being scheduled under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979. National policy guidance is provided by Planning Policy Guidance notes 15: Planning and the Historic Environment and 16: Archaeology and Planning.

The following Scheduled Monument lies within the boundaries of the London Road Conservation Area:

40 – 350 Scriven's Conduit

Further information on this and all of the city’s Scheduled Monuments can be found on the Gloucester City Council website at

www.gloucester.gov.uk/Content.aspx?urn=3247
Appendix 4 Listed Buildings

**Denmark Road:** Hillfield House

**Horton Road:** Wotton House (Redcliffe College)

**Northgate Street, north side:** Nos 59 (Imperial Inn) and 83–85 (with 1 Worcester Street)

**London Road, north side:** St Peter’s Church, St Peter’s Presbytery, 19 (Northgate House), 27 to 31 (delisted in 2004), 47 (St Nicholas House), 49–51, King’s Board and Scriven’s Conduit (both in the grounds of the Hillfield Garden), Entrance Gates to Hillfield Garden, 101 (gate lodge to Hillfield Garden), Chapel of St Mary Magdalen, St Catharine’s Church, and its perimeter wall, gates and railings, and 115 (Parkfield).

**London Road, south side:** Nos 18 to 22 London Road and 2 to 8 Wellington Parade and Picton House, 42 (Claremont House), 44 (The Elms), 78–90, 92 (The Edward Hotel), the Chapel of St Margaret, the United Almshouses, 100–102, 104–116 (Hillfield Parade), 118, 138 and 140.

**Northgate Street, south side:** Nos 62, 86 and 102

**Oxford Street:** Nos 1–17, 29–31, 2–20 and 22 (The Victoria public house)
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1: Upper Northgate Street and London Road up to the railway viaduct
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If you have problems understanding this in English please contact:
Tapestry Translation Services, Corporate Personnel Services, Herbert Warehouse, The Docks, Gloucester GL1 2EQ. Tel: 01452 396909.