

## Essential Reference Paper B

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Representations made</b>	<b>Officer comment</b>
General Points.	A resident wrote to say that 'I can see what you're trying to achieve and I agree with the changes.	Supportive comments noted.
	One resident was concerned that their property was shown as a listed building yet they believed it had been delisted. As this building is outside the proposed new boundary, this is a moot point. Nevertheless, upon checking the building is still shown as listed on the Historic England website. It is for the resident to seek any further clarification from Historic England.	Noted. No further action.
	One resident objected to the reduction in the Conservation Boundary, concerned that this would allow the building of 1,408 new properties and the widening of Downfield	The areas proposed for dedesignation lack any special architectural or historic interest and, in line with Historic England's guidance, should be removed

	<p>Road.</p>	<p>from the CA.</p> <p>There is no correlation between the dedesignation of the proposed areas and any future potential house building. Any new housing provision must accord with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and EHDC District Plan. There are no such proposals at present, nor any proposal to widen Downfield Road.</p> <p>No further action.</p>
	<p>One resident wrote making three points:-</p> <p>1/ Querying the TPO attached to their property. They believe this to be 'redundant'.</p> <p>2/ Querying the rationalisation of the boundary to cover the rear of their garden.</p>	<p>1/ The TPO is a matter of record. The query was forwarded to Operations within the Council for consideration. They conclude there is no reason to revoke the TPO.</p> <p>2/ The methodology for setting the boundary is explained in detail in the document. In this instance the</p>

	<p>3/ Contends that more of Downfield Road should be included as the properties are of local interest.</p>	<p>rationalisation is to align the CA boundary with property ownership boundaries.</p> <p>3/ Our surveys show that the scattering of undesignated historic buildings in this road have been so altered as to have lost their special character. The many new buildings lack any special interest. As such the road does not warrant inclusion.</p> <p>No further action.</p>
	<p>One resident wrote expressing their fears that the reduction in the Conservation Area was to allow major housing development (at Amwell Farm) and that the village will be ruined by 'carbuncle development' and that Hertford Heath should not be 'turned into a London Borough'.</p>	<p>There is no correlation between the dedesignation of the proposed areas and any future potential house building. Any new housing provision must accord with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and EHDC District Plan.</p> <p>No further action.</p>

Management Proposals - General	<p>The PC did not table any further Management Proposals for inclusion in the document.</p> <p>No further Management Proposals were submitted by the public.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--------------------------------	--	-----------------------------