	Doprocontationa made	Officer comment
Issue	Representations made	Officer comment
1/ 'Comment Form' handed in at the public meeting.	1.3 Harlow doesn't really have any effect on Walkern.It's more affected by Hertford and Hitchin	Para 1.3 is a summary of District- wide issues. No amendment required.
Factual accuracy and minor queries from a local resident.	1.10 The 'Rural Settlement Study' is not available at Hertfordshire Archives and Local Studies.	Text amended to include HCC's Historic Environment Unit (who do have a copy).
	3.1 Line 12, Froghall Lane is not at Finches End.	The section does not say this and the correspondent has misread the text.
	3.1 Last line, the search light was in Totts Lane not Beechcroft.	The section does not say this and the correspondent has misread the text. Useful information on the location of the searchlight. Text amended.
	p.27. 36 High Street Duplicated from Grade II* p.30. Dovecote duplicated	Text corrected.
	from Grade II* p.21 Millers Cottage duplicated from Grade II*	Text corrected.
	p.39 PV? Pls explain.	The entry refers to the unlisted building to its north. Text clarified.
2/ 'Comment Form' handed in at the public meeting.	My cottage is in the Conservation Area. It is <u>very</u> important to MAINTAIN the character of Walkern.	Support noted.
Support for the document and proposed boundary changes from a local resident.	The ROAD from 'Walkern' to 'WATTON AT STONE' is such an 'Area of outstanding beauty' – this must be preserved as well.	This area is not within the Conservation Area and is not, therefore, relevant to this report.
	I agree with taking the fields out and just keeping the	The support for the proposed

	village as the C.A.	boundary changes is noted. No amendments to the document required.
3/ Email dated 13 June 2016 from a local resident.	Clarification sought regarding a small development site on the corner of Beechcroft Lane and the High Street. Why is it shown on the map as worthy of protection?	The site in question was the subject of a recent planning application for a dwelling which was refused then successfully appealed. The Character Analysis map has been amended to reflect that new situation.
4/ Emails dated 15 and 16 June 2016 from a local resident.	Long and angry response about the large development site on Froghall Lane that had recently been allowed at Appeal querying the relevance and value of the Conservation Area document.	It was explained by email reply on the 16 June 2016, that the site in question was not within the Conservation Area and was not, therefore, relevant to the document and that the issues raised should be best addressed through the Neighbourhood Plan. No amendments required.
5/ Email dated 21 July 2016 from the Walkern Parish Council	The PC is in support of the proposals outlined in the draft report produced by East Herts District Council.	Noted.
	In particular they supported the proposals contained in section 8.15 – Schedule of Enhancement Proposals and look forward to their implementation in full.	Support noted. The PC did not suggest any further additions to the Schedule. Text amended to reflect this.