

Essential Reference Paper B

<p>Initial consultation on the Tewin Conservation Appraisal was undertaken in 2014. Further consideration, a mini consultation on an additional boundary issue and further discussion with the Parish Council has now taken place. A number of revisions have been made to the original document as a result.</p>		
Issue	Representations made	Officer comment
<p>Changes to the eastern extremity of the Conservation Area (CA) boundary, south side of Hertford Road. Removal of a narrow strip of land</p>	<p>The Parish Council (PC) has a 'very strong objection'. Representations fall within three broad categories.</p> <p>Firstly some consider removing the area from the CA leaves the roadside hedge at risk.</p> <p>Secondly the PC considers the reason for the removal of this small area has not been properly addressed. Others consider its removal does not preserve or enhance the CA, rather it weakens it. Another considers the land to be integral to the rural character.</p> <p>Thirdly its removal could encourage future development. The PC advises some residents regard the proposed change 'with great suspicion'. Such representations include reference to possible future</p>	<p>Whilst trees above a certain size (including trees in hedgerows) are afforded some protection in a CA this does not apply to hedgerows whose removal/retention would be determined by interpretation of the Hedgerow Regulations.</p> <p>The land in question is a hedgerow to the south of which is a small strip of grassland that is part of an extensive field visually forming part of open farmland. It is true its removal does not preserve the CA and indeed it is integral to the general overall rural character. On balance officers consider that its removal or indeed its retention is little or no strategic importance.</p> <p>It is a common misconception that land in a CA is protected from the principle of development but this is not the case. Whilst the emerging District Plan identifies Tewin as a Group 2 village, development is limited to up to 5 dwellings within the built up area</p>

	<p>loss of allotments and provision of an access to future housing. Some perceive this to be enhanced by Tewin's designation as a Group 2 village.</p>	<p>and local decisions can influence the outcome. Current and emerging plans show the land within the Green Belt and beyond the village boundaries, thus affording considerable protection.</p> <p>At least one similar small area elsewhere has remained as part of another CA. Should Members decide to retain it within the CA attaching greater importance to the strong level of local opposition expressed at consultation then the integrity of the CA will not be compromised by the retention of such a small parcel of land within it.</p>
<p>Changes to the eastern extremity of the Conservation Area (CA) boundary, north side of Hertford Road. Extension proposed to include all of roadside green. Subject to a subsequent mini consultation with the PC, Herts. CC and landowner of the adjacent paddock.</p>	<p>The Parish Council have no objections or comments.</p> <p>HCC who own the roadside verge have no comments.</p> <p>The landowner of the paddock (no. 13 Hertford Road) has no objection to the inclusion of trees and hedge but considers the fence (which he advises requires regular maintenance and replacement) that immediately abuts the hedge together with narrow parallel strip of paddock land should be excluded. He suggests the</p>	<p>This mini consultation also identified potential improvement which could include removal of surplus vegetation, some tree crown lifting and resolution of a parking/passing issue that has resulted in a muddy and unattractive area on part of the green. If such improvements could be implemented it would be an environmental gain.</p> <p>The fence and hedge are in immediate proximity to each other and distinguishing one from the other on a map would be very difficult indeed. In circumstance such as this where features (in this case trees) are afforded protection by CA legislation it is considered justifiable to extend the boundary slightly beyond the feature/s in question so as to avoid any future ambiguity in</p>

	<p>boundary should follow 'natural readily identifiable boundaries' - in this case the hedge.</p>	<p>interpretation. Maintenance improvement or alteration of the fence would be Permitted Development and would not require permission subject to height considerations. It is believed subsequent discussion with the landowner of the paddock has overcome his concern. Note the revised Appraisal plans identify additional trees and hedgerows.</p>
<p>Other boundary issues north side of Hertford Road.</p>	<p>The PC drew attention to differences of boundary alignment as shown on various EHDC publications, particularly drawing attention to the manner in which the CA was interpreted on the consultation Appraisal document as compared with the Conservation Area Statement produced in 1995 and the emerging District Plan.</p> <p>The owners of no. 13 Hertford Road point out the boundary to NW of their house appears to have been 'moved slightly'.</p>	<p>Some publications do indeed have variations in alignment. For example the outer boundary edge on the emerging District plan extends into the paddock (see above) whilst that of the adopted local plan in part is related more to the hedge alignment. Translating boundaries on small scale plans can sometimes be problematic. The alignment shown on the revised Conservation Appraisal document is an interpretation of that on the emerging District Plan and extended to include remainder of roadside green etc. for reasons previously expressed.</p> <p>The detail of this NW boundary is an issue associated with 'variations in alignment' referred to above and is appropriately shown on the Appraisal document in the correct position as subsequently discussed with the owner.</p>
<p>Important open spaces</p>	<p>The PC and others refer to original para 6.30 which described an area of land as</p>	<p>Whilst this may have been true at the time of original survey, the site is now being developed for a</p>

	<p>being an area of mixed woodland (now being developed).</p> <p>Rear garden area to 16 Hertford Road. The owner objects to its designation as an important open space as it is not within the public realm and is surrounded by houses.</p> <p>Other areas identified as being important open space in the original Appraisal. A number of such spaces were identified in the original draft. Two larger areas, including land to the south of Hertford Road (part of which included site referred to above) and another between the rear properties of Lower Green and Harwood Close and a number of other smaller areas were shown on the original Appraisal.</p>	<p>dwelling and because of these changed circumstances it is agreed that reference to the woodland be deleted.</p> <p>The garden in question forms part of the domestic curtilage and is to the rear of properties. Following site visit and access to the land it is not considered to be an open space which contributes to the general spatial quality and visual importance of the CA and that its designation as an important open space be deleted.</p> <p>The larger areas are to the rear of properties and on re consideration are not deemed to be open spaces which contribute to the general spatial quality and visual importance of the CA. Many of the smaller areas originally so identified are best described as incidental, some being to the rear of properties.</p> <p>The effect of the above exclusions leaves the important Lower Green and selected verges/green swards adjacent to roads as those identified as important open spaces.</p>
Other minor points	A number of typing errors were identified. Also an historic reference to Tewin Memorial Hall. Several trees have been referred to in the text as no longer existing and it is pointed out that the village shop is erroneously	The typing errors etc have been rectified and the track changes in red shown in the new document now before Members only relate to the more significant changes. Several additional viewpoints have been added, new references made to damage caused by

	<p>identified as a listed building. Reference has also been made to several viewpoints. The PC note the Tewin Conservation Area Statement of 1995 has not been referred to.</p>	<p>vehicles to edges of greens, property details added to the management section to be consistent with other parts of the Appraisal text and necessary administrative actions identified.</p>
--	---	---