

Essential Reference Paper B

Issue	Representations made	Officer comment
General Points.	<p>The Parish Council (PC) describes the document as ‘an excellent’ draft’ and table various minor amendments to the text to tighten up the language and make certain points more explicit. (See points relating to the draft document at 1.3, 2.7, 3.9, 3.11, 5.1, 5.2, 5.5, 5.7, 5.13, 5.14, 6.5, 7.2, 8.4, 8.15 in Essential Reference Paper C).</p>	Noted. The text has been amended appropriately.
	<p>The comments of the PC were ‘fully endorsed or supported’ by two residents.</p>	Noted.
	<p>The PC is understandably anxious not to offend residents and is concerned at the use of the word ‘harmful’ to describe certain negative traits.</p>	<p>‘Harmfulness’ is the test within the National Planning Policy Framework that Local Planning Authorities are required to apply when considering developments or proposals within conservation areas. As a tool at appeals it is important that the document uses the correct NPPF language. No amendment proposed.</p>
	<p>The Conservation and Environment Team for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan tabled various minor amendments to the text to tighten up the language and make certain points more explicit.</p>	Noted. The text has been amended appropriately.
	<p>A number of residents complimented the EHDC Conservation Team on a ‘great piece of work’, ‘detailed and thoughtful’. One commented that ‘the balance of protection is just</p>	Noted.

	right' and commented on those minded to 'paint every field as protected land'.	
	One resident and business owner supported a small amount of development as increasing necessary custom. They commented that 'the Braughing Conservation document is excellent and just perfect for the needs of Braughing', 'it is 'well thought out and very fair to all' and offered ' a big pat on the back for the hard work of the EHDC and the Braughing Parish Council.	Noted
	Two residents asked that the village was not described as a commuter 'dormitory' as it had an active social life. One resident, on the contrary, noted that many new residents showed little interest in Braughing life.	Noted. Text amended to remove 'dormitory'.
Management Proposals - General	The PC 'looks forward to working with [the District] on taking forward the Management Proposals which need some further work to develop them into a detailed set of actions.	Noted. See comments on Article 4 direction below.
	The PC did not table any further Management Proposals for inclusion in the document.	Noted.
	One resident described the Management Proposals as 'fair and just about right'. He strongly supported the views of the Parish Council.	Noted
Character Analysis Map.- General	The PC found difficulty is differentiating between some colours on the map.	Noted. We acknowledge that the printed map, especially at A4 size, is difficult to read. It is easier to read when the map is viewed digitally and

		exploded to a large size. Colours have been altered to make them more distinct.
--	--	---

<p>Character Analysis Map. – Trees and open spaces.</p>	<p>The PC notes that the large tree in the grounds of The Gables is not indigenous.</p>	<p>Noted. Permission has previously been granted for substantial reduction or alternatively felling. As such, it has been removed from the map.</p>
	<p>The PC and five residents (one an archaeologist) expressed surprise the field behind the Post Office and houses up to Fleece Lane is not included as open space. One resident thought that the field should be included as open space but that some development might be allowed along Malting Lane.</p>	<p>This area is surrounded by tall hedging and banking and is not visible to any appreciable degree from the public realm. As such it has no visual amenity value, makes little contribution to the CA and is not considered 'important open space'. Archaeological potential is not a relevant criteria for the designation of CAs. No amendment required.</p> <p>The Area of Archaeological Interest in the existing and emerging District Plan includes this area, so there is no loss of relevant protection.</p>
	<p>The PC asks if there is a legal duty attached to listed buildings requiring owners to control the overgrowth of vegetation.</p>	<p>No, there is no duty to maintain in this regard.</p>
	<p>The PC ask if s.154 of the Highways Act 1980 (relating to overhanging trees etc.) could be better enforced.</p>	<p>This is a matter for the County Council as the Highways Authority.</p>
	<p>Two residents at the same address questioned the annotation of the hedge on the south side of Hull Lane as 'making a positive contribution'.</p>	<p>These comments are made in the context of proposed development along this side of Hull Lane which the protection of the hedge could inhibit. The site has been resurveyed and the original view with regard to its value is maintained. These issues can be resolved should a planning application be made. No amendment required.</p>

<p>Character Analysis Map – proposed new boundaries - General</p>	<p>The PC ‘has no specific objection to the proposed boundary changes’. It advises that some residents have concerns and that perhaps further explanation and reassurance may be required.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>See other comments below. The document has been amended at 4.11 and 5.15 to add a full explanation of the NPPF and other policies that require the proposed changes. The Executive Report also explains the underlying requirement and logic behind the boundary changes.</p>
	<p>A resident commented that ‘the reduction in area will leave our beautiful village open to housing developers’. A small but vocal number of residents expressed similar views including some non-residents.</p>	<p>There is an understandable concern in this regard which the document seeks to address, as recommended by the PC. The proposed boundary changes will not, as feared, remove the appropriate controls on housing development in and around the village – these planning controls lie within the existing Local Plan, the emerging District Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan, not here.</p>
	<p>The Conservation and Environment Team for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan commented that ‘We have no specific objection to the proposed boundary changes, we are mindful that some residents have expressed concern.... Perhaps further reassurance is required’</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The suggested reassurance has been added to the document at 4.11. and 5.15.</p>

	<p>The Braughing Society do not agree with the proposed boundary changes and allege that the 'Management Proposals' are part of recent Government policy to remove protective legislation because of its constraint on development.' (A number of the objections made by the Society are also repeated by objectors in a personal capacity.</p>	<p>Noted. See comment above on the rationale for the proposed changes.</p> <p>There is no such Government policy. The conclusion drawn, that the changes are to enable significant housing development on these fields is not the case; such inappropriate development would be contrary to existing and emerging local policy.</p>
	<p>The Braughing Society and four residents object to the alleged removal of Gravelly Lane and the north hedgerow and the hazel hedgerow to the east of Gravelly Del....'This would allow for road widening, ugly street furniture to be installed, roadside curbing and footpaths to be introduced, together with unwanted street lighting'.</p>	<p>Due to the graphics used (the lines, in reality would be 1m thick), the consultation map is not clear in this regard. To clarify, the plan does not propose to remove Gravelly Lane from the CA, nor to remove the north hedgerow or the hazel hedgerow to the east of Gravelly Dell. In order to allay any fears, boundaries have been adjusted to make the retention of these areas clear.</p>
	<p>The Braughing Society object to the 'Planners making a clear distinction between inside and outside the conservation area'. It asks for further explanation as to why the changes are necessary'.</p>	<p>This is current Government policy and Historic England advice as described above.</p> <p>Further explanatory text has been added at 4.11 and 5.15 of the document.</p>
	<p>One resident provided a large response that covered Britain's housing crisis, the impact of immigration and post-Brexit farming.</p> <p>He alleged that the proposed boundary changes were to facilitate new Government legislation to allow 'rapid housing growth' and 'massive bolt on</p>	<p>This is largely irrelevant to the document.</p> <p>There is no basis in fact for this view.</p> <p>Other policies will remain in place through the emerging</p>

	<p>housing estates and 60% growth' on Braughing. The comments expressed on individual fields were very similar to those tabled by the Braughing Society and are included under that heading.</p> <p>He urges review of his 'Category Challenge Paper'</p> <p>His spouse supported the above views.</p>	<p>Neighbourhood and District Plans to protect Braughing from inappropriate housing development.</p> <p>See below.</p> <p>This relates to policies within the emerging District Plan – notably housing. Not relevant to this CA document.</p>
<p>Proposed exclusion from the Conservation Area- Stortford Lane and the area to the east of Ford Street Farm.</p>	<p>The Braughing Society describes the various merits of specific areas proposed to be removed (Ford Street Farm fields and Stortford Lane), noting their landscape beauty, trees and particular vistas. Six other consultees repeated this objection.</p>	<p>The qualities of these elements of the surrounding natural environment are not disputed. However, they fall outside the criteria to be used when designating a conservation area. Critically, the Society does not identify any 'special architectural or historic interest' in these fields which might justify their inclusion. There is an important difference between the conservation of the built environment (which is the purpose here) and the protection of the natural environment – a separate matter not covered under conservation area legislation.</p>
	<p>A local archaeologist was concerned that this exclusion would remove protection from this area.</p>	<p>The Area of Archaeological Interest in the existing Local Plan and emerging District Plan includes this area, so there is no loss of relevant protection. No amendment required.</p>
<p>Proposed exclusion from the Conservation Area- Glebe Field</p>	<p>The Braughing Society object to the removal of Glebe Field which it describes as a buffer zone'. It notes its ancient hedgerow and old pasture and significant and visible archaeology.' Again it is</p>	<p>Conservation Area legislation does not allow for buffer zones although the setting of a conservation area is a legitimate planning consideration. As above, the</p>

	<p>alleged that this will 'permit road widening, building, inappropriate street furnishings and urbanisation...'</p> <p>Four residents (one an archaeologist) expressed similar concerns.</p>	<p>landscape features and archaeology do not fall within the relevant criteria for designation. The Society does not identify any 'special architectural or historic interest' in this field which might justify its inclusion. The archaeology is already protected as an Area of Archaeological significance in the existing and emerging District Plan. No amendment required.</p>
<p>Proposed exclusion from the Conservation Area- Land to south west of the CA</p>	<p>The Braughing Society object to the removal of the beautiful Meads'.</p>	<p>Apart from a small sliver of the Meads behind the hedge on the west side of the B1368 they have never been part of the CA. Such landscape features fall outside the criteria for designation as a CA. No amendment required.</p>
<p>Proposed amendments to the Conservation Area boundary- Green End</p>	<p>The Braughing Society and one resident object to the removal of the hedgerow opposite Pound Close.</p>	<p>This area has been revisited. The hedge has been substantially thinned out by the owner since the original survey work. Replacement landscaping and hedging is included in the planning permission for residential development granted under 3/15/1691/OUT. Nevertheless the mature trees at the southern end of the hedgerow remain and the boundary has been amended to include them.</p>
<p>The use of Article 4 Directions.</p>	<p>This was supported by one correspondent. There were no objections.</p>	<p>Noted. This is a matter to be taken forward by the Council with assistance from the PC.</p>

Character Analysis Map – Unlisted buildings	The Conservation and Environment Team for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and one resident commented that ‘the protection of the outbuildings to the rear of the butcher’s shop... may constitute a serious obstacle to future sympathetic redevelopment of the site’.	This site has been revisited. It is agreed on assessment that the category is misplaced and the buildings are only neutral. Text and Character Analysis map amended.
	One consultee questioned the categorisation of his outhouse near the Ford. He intends to change its appearance to ‘make it more appealing’.	The building has been resurveyed and it is agreed that it is ‘neutral’. Text and Character Analysis map amended.
Modern development	Two residents agreed with the critical analysis of some modern development. Two others were critical of development at 7 and 7a Green End.	Noted. Once adopted this document will help Planners negotiate better schemes.
Congregational Chapel burial ground.	One response asked that the burial ground be designated an ‘important space’.	The burial ground is already included in the area annotated on the Character Analysis map as an ‘important open space’. It is accepted that the OS base map does not include the fencing so the map is easily misread. No amendment required.