

## Essential Reference Paper B

| Issue                          | Representations made   | Officer comment   |
|--------------------------------|--|---|
| <p>General Points.</p>         | <p>The Town Council (TC) <i>acknowledged its appreciation of the Conservation report and the work that had gone into it.</i></p>   | <p>Noted. Similarly the District Council appreciate the very detailed consideration given by the TC to the document.</p> <p>Additionally the TC has identified minor spelling errors and incorrectly recorded street names. These have been rectified as track changes in the revised document without further reference in this Paper. See above reference the TC's careful consideration of the document.</p> <p>In the interests of brevity very minor details have not been noted in this report.</p> |
| <p>Working in partnership.</p> | <p>Importantly the TC advise they wish to meet with the District Council to consider the 'jobs list' (7.17) to consider what role the Town Council might play in undertaking aspects of this.</p> <p>The TC considers to have been a consultee rather than a partner as stated in the appraisal document.</p> <p>The Hertford Civic Society <i>very much welcomes the publication of this appraisal and management plan and congratulate...for producing such a thorough and comprehensive report.</i></p> <p>Importantly they add that if the essential quality of Hertford is to</p> | <p>Noted. Such a discussion can assist in ensuring that positive outcomes are achieved in partnership together.</p> <p>Noted. .It is hoped this document provides an impetus for future and ongoing partnership as suggested by the TC (see previous).</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and agreed.</p>   |

|                             |  |   |
|-----------------------------|--|---|
|                             | <p>be preserved it is important that all parties in the development process – owners, architects, builders and planners – understand and respect the character of the town’s buildings and spaces....</p> <p>They also consider it is important to generate maximum support for conservation objectives.</p> <p>One respondent considers the appraisal to be a comprehensive review but raises the question of length of time that may be needed to undertake the necessary recommended action and accepts in part this may be consequential on due process. Another respondent acknowledges and considers the document in positive terms.</p> | <p>The preparation of this appraisal is very much part of seeking to achieve this objective.</p> <p>The appraisal contains a large number of enhancement proposals many of which it is hoped can be undertaken by individual owners. It is hoped Council resources can be made available so that many other aspirations become a reality.</p>   |
| <p>Informing residents.</p> | <p>The Hertford Civic Society consider residents should be alerted to the fact they live in a conservation area and that property owners and residents should be <i>individually informed that their address has been added to the conservation area.</i></p>  | <p>Noted. A general individual notification to all residents in East Herts advising they reside in a conservation area would be a significant task. As appraisals are undertaken there is a process of consultation involving advertisement or in the smaller communities the delivery of a flyer to each household. Up to date boundary data is available for all to see on the Council’s Conservation web page. When a property in a conservation area is sold it is identified as a land charge so all incoming residents will be aware. There is no legal requirement to inform residents individually regarding changes to conservation area</p> |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   |   | boundaries. However some other authorities do so advise. In summary this has not been undertaken to date but is something worthy of future consideration when next reviewing the conservation areas.   |
| Achieving a satisfactory outcome to Management and Enhancement proposals.                                 | The Hertford Civic Society considers these proposals should be subject to regular review and that possibly a Members working party could assist in this respect.  | This is something which could be considered but can be resource intensive. There is a generally accepted view that appraisals should be conducted at 5 year intervals.   |
| Relationship between Neighbourhood Plan and conservation area considerations.                             | The Hertford Civic Society considers Neighbourhood plans should identify measures to preserve and enhance conservation areas where appropriate.   | Noted.   |
| Identification of other unlisted buildings that make an Important Architectural or Historic Contribution. | <p>The TC welcomes the inclusion of the large number of such buildings so identified.</p> <p>The TC advise of their concern regarding Leahoe House and request that <i>the District Council consider this building for listing.</i></p> <p>Whilst not considering Leahoe House to be of <i>the greatest historic importance</i> the Hertford Civic Society nevertheless considers it to be distinctive and should not be neglected and considers the appropriate local authority take the lead regarding refurbishment.</p> | <p>Noted. .Any proposal involving the demolition of these unlisted buildings is unlikely to be approved. Many such buildings also have features worthy of retention. See reference to Article 4 Directions below.</p> <p>The appraisal identifies Leahoe House as an important unlisted heritage asset being <i>an imposing 19<sup>th</sup> century property most worthy of retention.</i> The appraisal also suggests discussions take place with the owner, Hertfordshire County Council, regarding its future. A Listing would afford maximum protection but such a request might fail. Being within the Conservation Area permission is required to demolish. The current state of the building is noted. Discussion between the</p> |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   |   | parties is recommended.  |
| <p>The use of Article 4 Directions.</p> | <p>The TC strongly endorses the sentiments of paragraph 2.7 of the document and supports the introduction of Article 4 Directions in Hertford. In this respect the TC particularly draw attention to the importance of selected features identified in the Appraisal as being candidates for protection by Article 4 Direction.</p> <p>The TC note the very large numbers of properties so identified and welcomes this. The TC also identifies that Ware Road, Hertingfordbury Road, Bengoe Street, Folly Island, Lower Bengoe, Townshend and Villiers Streets should be prioritised if such prioritisation was needed.</p> <p>The TC particularly supports reference to the qualities of The Folly.</p> <p>The TC suggests that the cottages '<i>before 109-119 Bengoe Street should be included</i>'.</p> <p>Nos.14-46 Queens Road. The TC seeks clarification as to whether or not these properties are proposed to be subject to an Article 4 Direction.</p> <p>The Hertford Society welcome the introduction of Article 4 Directions as suggested and regrets they have not been used previously. However they imply the additional restrictions should</p> | <p>Noted. The Council has recently agreed the general principal of introducing a pilot scheme in a selected community in the District to assess implications and impact on staff resources.</p> <p>Folly Island consists of The Folly, Thornton Street, Old Hall Street and Frampton Street. Overall this area is a most delightful area that retains many original features.</p> <p>The specific properties are not defined and were not revealed in a follow up enquiry made of the TC. However the fieldworker has looked in and around this area and is of the opinion that there are no nearby properties which should be so identified.</p> <p>These properties are so proposed and an appropriate additional reference to the text of the document has been made.</p> <p>Noted and agreed. The Council has recently approved the principle of introducing a pilot scheme at a location yet to be determined. Its details will</p> |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>not be <i>applied heavy handedly</i>. They endorse the use of a pilot scheme and suggest it may be unwise to impose such a Direction where extensive changes have already taken place.</p> <p>One representation from Tamworth Road supports such restrictions to the front of properties but not to the rear and draws attention to some possible cost implications. Also raised was the issue of conveyancing implications and owner notification. Attention was also drawn to the potential of easing traffic congestion by converting some front gardens to parking areas.</p> <p>Another resident from Tamworth Road expressed concern the imposition of an Article 4 Direction might have in relation to the use of solar panels and double glazing.</p> | <p>respect government advice which in summary advises that removal of Permitted Development Rights should be limited to situations necessary to protect local amenity.</p> <p>Members will decide the extent of any such restrictions introduced and there is due process of consultation and notification. Such an introduction is a land charge that would be revealed on any property sale. Similarly any approved extension to the conservation area would be similarly revealed. The fieldworker agrees such restrictions, if introduced should not normally affect rear elevations to properties. It is recognised that introducing an Article 4 Direction to control parking in front gardens can be both advantageous (removing cars from the street) or damaging in terms of visual impact particularly where a boundary wall or railings contemporary with the house needs to be demolished.</p> <p>An Article 4 Direction in itself does not prevent development but means permission will be required. As advised above Members have recently agreed the principle of introducing a pilot scheme for evaluation. The impact of solar panels can result in significant visual damage which has to be balanced against the advantages of solar generated power. There will be many situations where roof</p> |
|--|---|--|

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   |   | <p>mounted panels will not cause visual damage for example where they are mounted on rear roof slopes. that are not visible from the public realm.</p> <p>The use of differing window types selected by individual residents particularly on a terrace of historic properties can be most damaging. An Article 4 Direction would be most helpful in limiting such a detrimental impact by achieving a common solution. Some window types involving double glazing are better than others.</p>  |
| <p>Proposed boundary changes to the Conservation Area.<br/><b>General.</b></p>  | <p>The TC Is generally content with the proposed additions and deletions with several exceptions set out below.</p> <p>The Hertford Civic Society generally supports the proposed extensions.</p>   | <p>Noted but see below.</p> <p>Noted but see below.</p>  |
| <p>Proposed exclusion from the Conservation Area-<br/><b>land at Mangrove Road to the north of Mangrove Drive.</b> This consists of open land to the north of Mangrove Drive; also Ashbourne Gardens and properties between the latter and footpath 78 (Nos. 30A-36 Mangrove Road).</p> | <p>The TC, following clarification, advise they wish to see this land remain in the conservation area interpreted as affording protection to existing trees.</p> <p>One representation lends his objection to those of others and objects to changing the status of the land as being part of the conservation area which is considered to be home to exceptional flora and fauna. The presence of a wide variety of animals and birds is identified by another representation.</p> <p>A representation objects to the development of Hert 5 as a residential area in the emerging DP due to access and</p> | <p>Ashbourne Gardens and the other properties proposed for exclusion are principally modern with limited historic or architectural qualities.</p> <p>The open land between Ashbourne Gardens and Mangrove Drive is identified in the emerging District Plan (DP) as a housing site. The emerging DP is scheduled to be adopted in 2017. The DP is scheduled for a further period of consultation (3 Nov.- 15 Dec 2016). As such there is potential for further formal representations.</p> <p>The objections received principally relate to removal of</p> |

|                           |  |   |
|---------------------------|--|---|
| <p>Trees on the site.</p> | <p>inadequate utility supplies.</p> <p>Another representation clearly considers development of this site will have a detrimental impact on the adjacent Green Finger unless the development is camouflaged (by trees) but seems to accept the inevitability of housing as the site is identified in the DP.</p> <p>A representation from the Council's Arboricultural Officer advise that <i>It is reasonably foreseeable that, if this development is removed from the designated Hertford Conservation Area then the removal of trees will swiftly follow...and in relation to the proposed development site removal...from the designated Conservation Area will leave trees vulnerable to removal to facilitate development.</i></p> <p>Several representations have been made in respect of the importance of trees on the site proposed in the DP for residential development. Some representations specifically seek assurance that appropriate trees be preserved by a Tree Preservation Order. There is a strong feeling that trees should be protected on the boundaries particularly so that impact on the adjacent Green Finger is minimised. One representation considers that if the conservation area designation is removed <i>the removal of trees will swiftly follow.</i></p> | <p>the land from the conservation area because of the perceived threat to trees in both areas.</p> <p>With some exceptions, trees in a conservation area are afforded limited protection as any person wishing to undertake works has to notify the Council who then has a six week period within which to make a Tree Preservation Order. (TPO).</p> <p>This opinion is noted. However had the proposal remained to exclude the land from the conservation area, trees would have been surveyed and as appropriate, made subject to a Tree Preservation Order prior to any such exclusion.</p> <p>For reasons set out below it is now proposed the areas remain within the conservation area and reviewed in the future.</p> <p>Within the areas proposed for removal in the draft appraisal there are a number of mature trees of considerable quality both within Hert. 5 area and elsewhere. Within Hert. 5 and indeed the Green Finger to the west natural regenerating of self-set trees is occurring and some of these which have become established are already of a size where they have become protected by conservation area legislation. Reference to the quality of selected trees is now acknowledged by a track change addition to para.</p> |
|---------------------------|--|---|

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>A representation was received to the effect that additional trees of importance needed plotting on the plan.</p> <p>Attention was also drawn to references in the emerging DP to public accessibility to the open space element of the site to which the representation considered to be inappropriate.</p> <p>The Hertford Civic Society considers that the tree belt on the western side of the proposed HERT5 residential area should remain inside the conservation area, to protect the integrity of the adjacent Green Finger.</p> | <p>5.330.</p> <p>At the time of original survey access to the site was limited but after follow up site visits involving entry onto private land, better access was obtained which has resulted in additional trees being plotted.in appropriate locations.</p> <p>Noted. Public access will not extend to a treed area to the west of Ashbourne Gardens which is in private ownership.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p><b>Overall consideration.</b> The TC and Hertford Civic Society and others are opposed to the removal of this site from the conservation area and consider that the trees should be protected.</p> <p>The HERT 5 site (historically dismissed on appeal in 1989) is identified as a residential site in the emerging plan. In this respect a further period of consultation will occur this year (end of 2016) and objections to its continued inclusion as a development site cannot be ruled out.</p> <p>It the site is developed the retention of selected trees, particularly those on the boundaries (but possibly</p> |
|--|---|--|



|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>others elsewhere) will be an important consideration in the determination of any planning applications. There is uncertainty as to when this site will be developed or perhaps even whether it will be developed. In the unlikely event of the latter occurring the land will continue as a treed gap separating two blocks of residential development.</p> <p>However on the more likely hypothesis that residential development will occur in accordance with the principle set out in the emerging plan it is impossible to predict in advance the detail and quality of development other than to say it will be comprehensive, residential and have an important relationship with the extensive existing tree cover. Details of trees to be retained would be determined to some extent by the development proposals and the need to minimise the impact of development on the adjacent Green Finger and nearby residents. So if development occurs its relationship with the tree cover on the site will be a most important consideration, the precise details of which can best be decided at that time.</p> <p>Once development has taken place a decision as to whether or not to include the land in the conservation area will be easy. For example it would be appropriate to include a high quality residential development within the conservation area</p> |
|--|--|--|

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  |   | <p>whereas the converse might apply with respect of development of lesser quality (perhaps lost on appeal for example). In other conservation areas elsewhere in the District this exact decision making process has taken place with some recent residential areas remaining within the relevant conservation area whilst other developments of lesser quality have been omitted.</p> <p>On reflection and taking these factors into account it is recommended that the areas remain in the conservation area for the time being and the matter is again <b>reviewed</b> when development has taken place on HERT 5 or at the time of the next conservation boundary review, whichever is the most appropriate.</p> <p>If in the interim period notification/s are received regarding works to trees the Council has the option of protecting them by the serving of a Tree Preservation Order/s.</p> |
| <p>Trees on the eastern side of Mangrove Road (opposite side of the road to the above site).</p> | <p>A representation from the Council's Arboricultural Officer advises that consideration should be given to extending the conservation area to include a mature belt of trees which enclose the cricket club and also a prominent mature oak tree adjacent to White Lodge on the east side of Mangrove Road. The representation considers this treed approach to Hertford is important.</p> | <p>It is accepted these trees make a positive contribution to this approach. It is also accepted that from time to time other conservation areas have been extended to include belts of trees, such proposals often being as part of wider considerations. Extending the conservation area in part to protect a single tree is not considered to be appropriate. Following an on-site discussion the fieldworker</p>   |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  |   | <p>was advised the cricket club trees are not under threat. Should this situation change the serving of a Tree Preservation Order would be appropriate.</p> <p>In any event a consideration as to whether or not to extend the conservation area to the eastern side of Mangrove Road would be closely linked with the future consideration of HERT5 and Ashbourne Gardens and should jointly be reviewed in association with the latter.</p>     |
| <p>Proposed exclusion from the Conservation Area-gateway to the town site <b>corner of Gascoyne Way and London Road.</b></p> | <p>The TC raises no objection to the removal of this site.</p>  | <p>Noted. Careful consideration needs to be given when determining future planning applications in this area.</p>   |
| <p>Proposed exclusion from the Conservation Area.- similar gateway site <b>corner of Ware Road and London Road</b></p>       | <p>The TC considers this area to be an important gateway to the town and wish to see it <i>greatly improved</i>.</p>  | <p>Noted and agreed; careful consideration needs to be given when determining planning applications in this area. The TC's concerns add weight to the appraisal's recommendation to secure improvements to the EHDC car park in this location.</p>  |
| <p>Proposed boundary extension to the Conservation Area - <b>Tamworth Road.</b></p>  | <p>The TC requests the inclusion of Nos. 1 –International House (north side of road) to be included in the conservation area.</p> <p>A similar representation drew attention to the fact that some Victorian properties exist on the north side of the road</p> | <p>Nos. 1-3A are already within the existing conservation area. Nos. 5 -27 date from the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. These properties do contain some features of quality but there are a number of later additions such as porches which are visually disruptive. International House is a larger rectangular two storey block currently being converted to nine flats (see below). The area can perhaps be best described as neutral. On</p> |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>Another representation draws attention to the fact that no.20 Tamworth Road is not included as being of special interest whilst another similar one nearby was so identified. The same representation advises that some houses in the street were damaged by a land mine dropped in 1940. The same representation thought reference should be made to the ugly appearance of industrial buildings on the other side of the road and regretted that reference to parking problems was not addressed.</p> <p>In similar vein another representation drew attention to the fact that nos. 30-32 were replacement dwellings built in 1947 following war damage.</p> <p>A representation drew attention to new development in Tamworth Road involving conversion to eleven flats and nine parking spaces.</p> <p>The issue of parking permits for (residents) of Tamworth Street was raised.</p> | <p>balance officers consider it is appropriate that the conservation area remain unaltered on the north side of Tamworth Road.</p> <p>The fieldworker has re-evaluated the properties in this location identified as being of special interest and notes that in the process of transferring information from the field survey sheet, a plotting error occurred. The appropriate changes to maps and an updating of the text have been made. Reference to the land mine has been added to the text as this is of local historic interest. Other buildings on the north side of the road are not referred to as they lie beyond the conservation area.</p> <p>The fieldworker considers these 1947 replacement dwellings which are similar to others in the street that seemingly escaped damage and which have bay windows to both floors and recessed entrances with inscribed house names are of historic interest and should continue to be identified as such in the appraisal.</p> <p>This development is underway virtue of relaxed Permitted Development rights regarding change of use to residential. In fact the development consists of nine flats.</p> <p>It is accepted parking is a problem, which is common to streets dating from this period. Such streets were</p> |
|--|--|--|

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   |  | never designed to cater for current day levels of vehicle ownership.   |
| Land/buildings in control of local authorities. | The Hertford Society considers that in such circumstances the relevant council should set a <i>very public example</i> and cite Leahoe House and the green next to Hertford theatre as being cases in point.   | Noted. The appraisal identifies Leahoe House as an imposing 19th century property most worthy of retention. It is currently unoccupied and boarded up.<br><br>In respect of the open space referred to the appraisal suggests detailed landscaping proposals be prepared to enhance this important and centrally located urban space as its current condition is a poor advertisement for visitors to the town.  |
| Open spaces.                                    | The TC strongly agree that the Hertford 'green fingers' and open spaces identified by this appraisal are protected and not eroded. The TC specifically endorses the value of including that area beside the railway line at Beane Road. The TC strongly endorses paragraphs in the document relating to the clear distinction between built form and countryside and the importance of spaces between buildings.<br><br>The TC considers land to the west of County Hall <i>should be prioritised as an important green oasis as a woodland surrounded (by) open space.</i><br><br>Conversely Hertford Civic Society does not consider that the open land to the west of County Hall to be <i>so important that it should limit the vision as to</i> | Noted. The Green Fingers and other open spaces so identified perform most important visual, open space, recreational and ecological functions. Their retention in an urban area such as Hertford (characterised in part by dense late 19 <sup>th</sup> and early 20 <sup>th</sup> century development) is an essential planning consideration.<br><br>The land in part has been identified as an important open space and considered by the appraisal to provide an important setting for buildings including the listed County Hall. The woodland between the open space and the road network is identified in part as a wildlife site to be protected and the general location of trees to be protected within |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   | <p><i>the future of this part of the town.</i> (Their representations to the DP, inter alia) indicated that residential development might be an option worthy of consideration.</p> <p>The TC agrees with comments relating to the importance of the Bowling Club near to the EHDC. offices and similarly the importance open land west of County Hall.</p>   | <p>the parameters of legislation. It is considered this whole area is an important 'green lung' and additional comments to paragraph 5.358 have been made that reflect this. It remains officers' views that the whole area represents an important open space and one that is visually and environmentally important that should be retained as an open space and environmental asset.</p> <p>Noted and also see above.</p> |
| Hertford Urban Design Strategy.               | The TC endorses the Appraisal's comments in relation to the Urban Design Strategy's recommendations and accepts comments in relation to Maidenhead Street. The TC also considers that improvements to Maidenhead Street are a matter of <i>high importance</i> . The Hertford Civic Society cites this area as a prime example where authorities should take the lead by making improvements in the public realm. | Both the District Council and the Town Council have recently agreed to provide funding to secure improvements to the public realm in Maidenhead Street, The Wash and Bull Plain.   |
| Improving signage, shop fronts and facias.    | The TC support the appraisals suggestion that <i>investigation into best practice elsewhere</i> ' would be beneficial.  | Noted and agreed. The appraisal illustrates parts of the conservation area in need of improvement in these respects. Investigation into best practice elsewhere could be most beneficial and should be pursued within available staff or financial resources.  |
| Works identified as needing to be undertaken. | The Ashley Webb Shelter. The TC agrees that discussion and a decision including consideration   | Discussions to resolve this matter have taken place between the TC and EHDC.   |

|                          |  |   |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| Ashley Webb Shelter.     | for its retention is urgently needed. The Herford Civic Society supports its repair and refurbishment.   |   |
| Moat Garden.             | The Moat Garden. The appraisal considered landscape improvements could be made. However the TC considers it works effectively in its current format. | The comments in the appraisal are advisory and separate consideration is being given to the most suitable future management of the area.  |
| Gates to Hartham Common. | Gates to Hartham Common – the TC support the execution of such remedial works.   | Repair works should be pursued before further deterioration.  |
| Gascoyne Way car park.   | The TC support landscaping proposals to reduce the impact of the Gascoyne Way car park.  | The appraisal draws attention to the visual impact of this car park and puts forward several suggestions for improvement. The appraisal suggests independent advice be obtained. An additional track change reference within the enhancement proposals has been made. |
| St. Leonard's Garden.    | Works to St Leonard's Garden. The TC whose responsibility this is agrees some works are needed but consider screening to be unnecessary.             | Noted, however officers remain of the view that some limited boundary screening would be beneficial.  |
| Various tombstones etc.  | Chest tomb St Leonard's churchyard identified as being in urgent need of repair.   | The TC advises they are seeking quotations for its repair which is applauded.   |
|                          | Benson chest tomb, All Saints churchyard.  | As above. This tomb has now been included on the Council's Heritage at Risk Register, potentially eligible for grant assistance.  |
|                          | Comprehensive appraisal and restoration of other tombs, All Saints churchyard.   | The TC advises they will investigate. This is very much welcomed as this area generally and the tombs   |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Land adjacent Hertford Town Football Club.</p> <p>Mill Bridge open space.</p>                       | <p>Repair of listed lanterns County Hall.</p> <p>Improving the quality of untidy land surrounding Hertford Town Football club. The TC suggest contact be made to resolve this issue.</p> <p>The Hertford Civic Society are in complete agreement with the appraisal's view that this area need improvement and considers it to be another case where public bodies take a lead.</p> | <p>located therein are important in a particularly well used and accessible open space.</p> <p>Noted and agreed. The appraisal suggests HCC should be pursued to undertake this work.</p> <p>The Appraisal suggests discussion for improvements with owners. .A textural change suggested by the TC has been incorporated.</p> <p>Noted, hopefully detailed landscaping proposals will be drawn up and implemented, subject to availability of resources.</p>   |
| <p>Other points.</p> <p>Bengeo Association Sports Ground.</p> <p>Name of Hartford/ Hartham Common?</p> | <p>Retention of historic street name plaques. The TC considers all cast iron signage should be refurbished.</p> <p>The TC sought clarification regarding the location and name of open space at para 5.264.</p> <p>Hartford Common. The TC sought clarification as to whether this was an historic name.</p>  | <p>The appraisal draws attention to this and has now included a track change reference within the Enhancement proposals.</p> <p>The existing text refers to Bengeo Trinity football club. A sports building on the site refers to both football and cricket facilities and collectively refers to Bengeo Sports Association. This name and road address name have been added to the appraisal text for clarification.</p> <p>The first reference in the text is incorrect and has been modified from Hartford to Hartham. The name Hartham (without Common) appears on mapping from 1874. The book by Lewis Turnor <i>History of the ancient town and borough of Hertford</i> dated 1830 makes reference to</p> |



|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Listed Signal Box to east of Hertford East Station (located just beyond the conservation area).</p> | <p>The TC advised they had written to Network Rail seeking improvements and that they were advised permission had not been granted for its removal.</p>  | <p>Hertford Common. Variations on the name are ancient.</p> <p>The signal box is on the Councils Heritage at Risk Register. The appraisal makes several suggestions. As a matter of fact consent was given for its removal to a new location in 2008 (to Epping and Ongar light railway) but this permission has expired. Discussions with the owners are needed.</p>  |
| <p>Suggested residential redevelopment site Chambers Street.</p>                                       | <p>Marchfield Properties site Chambers Street. A representation has been received regarding a business site in this location. The representation considers the site has a negative impact on the character of the conservation area and nearby listed buildings including the grade II Baptist Church. The representation makes a case for redevelopment of the site which could have a positive impact.</p> | <p>The area contains mid/late 20<sup>th</sup> century business light industrial units of brick construction, principally two storeys in height. The area is at the end of Chambers Street (a cul de sac) and not situated in a strategically visually important location. There is limited impact with listed buildings. In summary the site is considered to be neutral rather than negative in terms of visual impact. Having said that it is accepted that appropriate redevelopment could result in some visual improvements. However should such an option be pursued involving residential development the loss of an existing employment site would be a planning consideration to be taken into account.</p> |
| <p>Wall no. 8 Duncombe Close and adjacent to public FP 90.</p>   | <p>A representation has been received regarding this boundary wall advising it is partly ruined with fence created behind it. A question mark is raised as to whether or not the wall is within the conservation area and if it is not could it be reinstated within the conservation area? The</p>  | <p>The wall (about 1.5m in height) is adjacent to footpath 90 and is adjacent to, but beyond, the conservation area. As such it would not need consent for relevant demolition. Constructed of red brick and probably dating from the late 19/early 20<sup>th</sup></p>  |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Disused railway line running in east west direct from Port Hill, north of Port Vale, south of Nelson Street.</p> | <p>same representation is made by the Hertford Civic Society.</p> <p>A representation has been received from the owner (with whom the fieldworker has had discussion) who considers the site has scope for some <i>limited residential development</i>. The representation continues to advise this could include improvements such as landscaping and public access.</p> | <p>century part has been removed and about a 20m length remains. The circumstances surrounding its removal in part are unknown. Extending the conservation area to include the remaining partial length of the wall is not proposed. Ideally replacing the removed length would represent an environmental gain. Should the owner consider this option, officer advice can be provided.</p> <p>The site is essentially derelict overgrown and untidy and is identified in the appraisal as a site worthy of further consideration to resolve its current condition and secure improvements. There may be several opportunities where modest development could take place adjacent to existing streets and there may be an opportunity to secure some public accessibility. It is suggested this is an option worth pursuing and, without prejudice to the outcome, the owner is advised to prepare a proposal for further consideration.</p> |
| <p>No. 7 Ware Road.</p>   | <p>The Hertford Civic Society considers that this property with its <i>quirky tower feature... deserves a mention</i>.</p>  | <p>No. 7 forms part of a group adjacent to Tesco car park on the south west corner of Villiers Street and is three storeys in height with commercial retail uses on the ground floor. Facia signage is visually disruptive. On balance it is considered the properties are not of sufficient important architectural or historic quality to be identified.</p>   |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Advertisement boards.</p>   | <p>The Hertford Civic Society draw attention to the fact that many other authorities have taken steps to restrict the display of estate agents boards citing the fact they can remain long after the property has been sold or let. They urge EHDC to consider implementing such controls.</p> | <p>Noted; the Council will consider the use of additional controls with respect to this matter.</p>   |
| <p>Untidy area and buildings, Dimsdale Street.</p>   | <p>The appraisal identifies this rather untidy underused site as perhaps having complex ownership issues and that further investigation is needed. Hertford Civic Society implies agreement.</p>   | <p>Noted: this will be pursued. It is now understood that some issues have been resolved and that the County Council is a key stakeholder.</p>  |
| <p>Potential use of Folly Island to provide some limited car parking to relieve nearby congested streets</p> | <p>The Hertford Civic Society is opposed.to open land being <i>sacrificed to the car</i>.</p>  | <p>Their opposition is understood. The appraisal simply raised the issue as a question mark. Should use of the allotments fall into terminal decline the issue may still be worthy of debate in the future.</p> |