

Issue Number	Policy/Paragraph Number	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>General</b>				
20.1	20	Where site allocations are proposed, the requirements for landscaping, green space, local Green Infrastructure and SUDS are fully supported, and will provide useful 'hooks' upon which to secure considered landscape solutions within these schemes.	Support noted and welcomed	<b>No amendment in response to this issue</b>
<b>Introduction</b>				
20.2	20.1	East Herts remains one of the most rural areas of Hertfordshire, largely because of the undeveloped nature of the district and the largely farmed nature of its environment. There should be reference to this significant landuse which affects the existing landscape character, whatever its biodiversity or other characteristics.	Agreed. <u>Hedgerows are also an important landscape feature.</u>	<b>Amendment to text (new para 20.1.2)</b> <u>The rural landscape is of great significance to the character of East Herts. The district has a rich undulating landscape of open fields and parklands shaped by river valleys and arable plateauxs. Woodland accounts for 9% of total land cover, half of which is classified as being ancient. Hedgerows are also an important feature throughout Hertfordshire, reflecting the historic enclosure of agricultural fields and defining land ownership boundaries. Many hedgerows throughout the district are ancient and are</u>

Issue Number	Policy/Paragraph Number	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
				<u>classified as Local Wildlife Sites. They are also key elements of green corridors, contributing towards wider ecological networks</u> The Council's Landscape Character Assessment has identified 63 landscape character areas that seek to capture the distinctiveness and variety of the local landscape.
<b>Landscape Character</b>				
20.3	LAN1	The Canal and River Trust supports this Policy.	Support noted and welcomed	<b>No amendment in response to this issue</b>
20.4	LAN1	Natural England supports this Policy, and welcomes the requirement for a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.	Support noted and welcomed	<b>No amendment in response to this issue</b>
20.5	LAN1	LAN 1 Part I should specify the size of development for which LVIA is required. Blanket requirement on all applications is disproportionate. Suggest requirement is limited to major applications.	Agreed that blanket requirement is disproportionate.	<b>Amendment to Policy LAN1:</b> I. Development proposals must demonstrate how they conserve, enhance or strengthen the character and distinctive features of the district's landscape. <u>On</u>

Issue Number	Policy/Paragraph Number	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
				<p><u>applications where there is a potential adverse impact on landscape character</u> a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be provided to ensure that impacts, mitigation and enhancement opportunities are appropriately addressed</p>
20.6	LAN1	Part III- The entire District is covered by Landscape Character Assessments so this statement is inappropriately worded. Suggested rewording - "the relevant Landscape Character Assessment will be used to assess proposals".	Not agreed. The LCA does not cover the towns and therefore the current policy wording is considered acceptable.	<b>No amendment in response to this issue</b>
20.7	LAN1	Policy is weak in the linkage to the Landscape Character Assessments. Part I merely states 'Development proposals must demonstrate how they conserve, enhance or strengthen the character and distinctive features of the district's landscape' without reference to LCAs.	Policy should be read as a whole. There is clear reference to LCAs in Part III of the Policy.	<b>No amendment in response to this issue</b>
20.8	LAN1	Policy LAN1 should explicitly reference the key characteristics and strategy and guidelines for managing change and require development proposals to do so.	Policy LAN1 clearly requires reference to the relevant LCA where appropriate. This would include all aspects of the LCA including location, landscape character, key characteristics, distinctive features, physical influences, historic and cultural influences, visual and sensory perception, accessibility, community views, and strategy and guidelines for managing change.	<b>No amendment in response to this issue</b>

Issue Number	Policy/Paragraph Number	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
20.9	LAN1	LAN1 paragraph III could follow the lead of policy HA4 paragraph 1 (e) and be rewritten as "Conform to any 'Landscape Character Assessments' prepared by the District Council, safeguard the Key Characteristics of the area, and comply with the 'Strategy and Guidelines for Managing Change' for the area".	The current Policy wording is considered appropriate. Policy LAN1 clearly requires reference to the relevant LCA where appropriate. This would include all aspects of the LCA including location, landscape character, key characteristics, distinctive features, physical influences, historic and cultural influences, visual and sensory perception, accessibility, community views, and strategy and guidelines for managing change.	<b>No amendment in response to this issue</b>
20.10	LAN1	Policies LAN1 and HA4 are not linked in the draft Plan although the clear intention of the NPPF is that the designation of heritage assets is linked to Landscape Character (NPPF sections 169 and 170).	Where relevant the Landscape Character Assessment is used to inform the Conservation Area Appraisals.	<b>No amendment in response to this issue</b>
20.11	LAN1	Conservation Area Assessments must ultimately and explicitly be linked to LCA's; they should be updated to reference each other.	Where relevant the Landscape Character Assessment is used to inform the Conservation Area Appraisals.	<b>No amendment in response to this issue</b>
20.12	LAN1	'Setting' is mentioned in several places in section 21 and policy HA4 but is not defined. NPPG definition (para 013) should be included to make clearer how development may impact upon setting of heritage asset and be assessed.	The definition of 'setting of a historic asset' is set out in the glossary. See also comments on Chapter 21. Heritage Assets.	<b>No amendment in response to this issue</b>
20.13	LAN1	Support for purpose of policy – if a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LIVA) is required to justify development then it must follow that it should inform the scale of any Green Belt release in the first place. The Council should undertake a LIVA on the land adjacent to Great Innings North of Watton-at-Stone. This should not be left to the Parish Council as part of neighbourhood plan.	Noted. Further Green Belt assessment work is being undertaken.	<b>No amendment in response to this issue</b>

Issue Number	Policy/Paragraph Number	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>Landscaping</b>				
20.14	20.3	Recent changes at a golf club in the district have damaged the landscape. Strengthened wording could prevent this happening this again.	Policies LAN1 and LAN2 provide a strong basis for the consideration of landscape, including where appropriate the requirement for a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.	<b>No amendment in response to this issue</b>
20.15	20.3.2	With particular reference to rivers and their associated buffer zones only native species should be planted. The Environment Agency also requests the addition of a reference to the management of invasive species.	Agreed in part. Sentence to be added to the end of paragraph 20.3.2.  If the Council is aware of any invasive species in the determination of an application a directive would be attached to any permission to inform the applicant.	<b>Amendment to text (para 20.3.2)</b>  <u>Along rivers and their associated buffer zones, only native species should be planted.</u>
20.16	20.3.2	HCC supports this paragraph, including protecting landscape feature of biodiversity value and use of locally native species.	Support noted and welcomed	<b>No amendment in response to this issue</b>
20.17	20.3.3	HCC and others support this paragraph, including the recognition of trees and hedgerows in providing a range of beneficial functions.	Support noted and welcomed. <u>Sometimes it could be deemed necessary, where it is essential to maintain the character of the locality, that replacement planting is of mature trees/hedgerows and not saplings. In addition, it is important that replacement planting is successful and monitored to ensure that if any plants die that they are replaced accordingly.</u>	<b>No amendment to text (para. 20.3.2) in response to this issue</b>  ... In exceptional circumstances, where development would result in the loss of landscape features, appropriate compensatory planting or habitat creation will be sought. <u>In some cases replacement planting should consist of mature plants. It is important that such planting schemes are monitored over</u>

Issue Number	Policy/Paragraph Number	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
				<u>time and action is taken to ensure agreed landscaping plans are fulfilled.</u> Certain plants will be more suited to the physical conditions of the site and to the local landscape character than others...
20.18	20.3.6	The Environment Agency supports this paragraph.	Support noted and welcomed	<b>No amendment in response to this issue</b>
20.19	LAN2	The Environment Agency supports this Policy.	Support noted and welcomed	<b>No amendment in response to this issue</b>
20.20	LAN2	Natural England supports this Policy, and welcomes the reference to habitat creation.	Support noted and welcomed	<b>No amendment in response to this issue</b>
20.21	LAN2	Landscape design proposals should form part of the full planning application and not be delegated to a reserve matter. Landscape schemes should be promoted/encouraged to provide maximum wildlife value.	With an outline application landscaping can be a reserve matter, and it would then be considered by a reserve matter application. With a full planning application details of landscaping may be considered in the determination of the application or via a condition attached to a permission.  Policy LAN2 requires proposals to demonstrate how they will retain, protect and enhance existing landscape features which are of amenity and /or biodiversity value.	<b>No amendment in response to this issue</b>
20.22	LAN2	Policy should include wording that prevents the loss of front gardens and boundary features for the purpose of parking which has detrimental effect on the public	Not agreed. In many cases planning permission is not required for the hard surfacing of front gardens or the removal of	<b>No amendment in response to this issue</b>

Issue Number	Policy/Paragraph Number	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
		realm, ecology and availability of on-street parking. Support retention of existing features unless in exceptional circumstances.	boundary features.	