

## A.7 APPENDIX I

### Brightlingsea Seafront Conservation Area

Name/Organisation	Comment	Action/response
Historic England	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>Thank you for your consultation of 3 October 2022 requesting comments on the new Conservation Area Appraisals for Harwich Old Town, Frinton and Walton, Manningtree and Mistley, Brightlingsea, and Great Bentley.</p> <p>Historic England provides advice when our engagement can add most value. In this case we do not wish to offer advice. This should not be interpreted as comment on the merits of the application.</p> <p>We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers. You may also find it helpful to refer to our published advice at <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/find/">https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/find/</a></p> <p>It is not necessary to consult us on this application again, unless there are material changes to the proposals. However, if you would like advice from us, please contact us to explain your request.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Sheila Stones Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas</p>	No action required
Natural England	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p><b>Natural England does not consider that the Tendring Conservation Area Appraisals &amp; Local List Criteria Consultation pose any likely risk or opportunity in relation to our statutory purpose, and so does not wish to comment on this consultation.</b></p> <p>The lack of comment from Natural England should not be interpreted as a statement that there are no impacts on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may wish to make comments that might help the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to fully take account of any environmental risks and opportunities relating to this document.</p>	No action required

**A.7 APPENDIX I**

	<p>If you disagree with our assessment of these Character Appraisals/Management Plans as low risk, or should the proposed Plans be amended in a way which significantly affects the impact on the natural environment, then in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, please consult Natural England again.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Tessa Lambert</p>	
<p>C Bailey</p>	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>Please find my comments on this recent bit of work by Essex CC place services which we are forced to pay for</p> <p><b>CAAMP comments</b></p> <p>The greatest threat to the historic’s environment is not UPVC windows and car parking. It is loss of economic viability to pay for upkeep and maintenance.</p> <p>The recommendation in the Management Plan part of the CAAMP to engage in mass planning enforcement against householders who have UPVC windows will have a significant negative effect on property values once the enforcement program becomes known and householders are faced with expensive replacement using “traditional” wooden windows on the cheapest properties in the area. This will lead to a downward spiral of falling prices discouraging investment and upkeep.</p> <p>Separately, the LPA is going to cause merry hell by proposing to include Silcott St and Colne Road within the CA when it tries to implement the management plan recommendation to enforce against the use of UPVC windows in the CA. Most of the buildings on Silcott St and Cone Rd already have UPVC windows. The LPA cannot take enforcement action against use of UPVC windows that are already installed at the time of designation. The LPA will therefore be faced with enforcing against UPVC windows in buildings that are to all extents and purposes are identical to ones on which it will not be able take enforcement action. Residents will be justified in asking for review of consistency.</p> <p>Separately, many of the UPVC windows have been installed for many years. Google Street view confirms installation prior to 2009. That is now 13 years since. The LPA has chosen to not</p>	<p>I assume the enforcement only relate to those of a particular date (ie 3 years), so we will need to clarify in the document so as not to cause panic to homeowners. This is in place to protect existing fabric mainly.</p> <p>Added a mention on the timescale on page 73, and a link to the Enforcement guidance within the appendix.</p>

## A.7 APPENDIX I

	<p>enforce during that time. In effect the LPA has been setting up people for entrapment if they now enforce against unauthorised installation of UPVC windows.</p> <p>Someone really needs to think this through.</p> <p>Separately, the proposal to restrict car parking in the historic victorian streets which will make it impossible for people to access work outside Brightlingsea. Again this will have a negative effect on property prices as people will be unable to access work and be forced to move away. New occupants will not be economically active as they won't have access to work leading to loss of income and a downward spiral of property values leading to neglect and deprivation.</p> <p>It must be noted council staff have been promoting public transport as the solution to transport for over 30 years. during that time the planning system has delivered an urban form that cannot be served by public transport with increasing reliance on private motoring. It is grossly irresponsible and unprofessional to continue suggesting something with a track record of proven failure that cannot work.</p> <p>Regarding the CA boundary The draft area appraisal recognises the Waterside development on the old James and Stone shipyard is out of keeping with the character of conservation area. Accordingly it, proposes to remove Waterside development from the conservation area.</p> <p>Elsewhere in the document, St James's Court on Duke St is described as out of keeping with the character of the conservation area on account of scale and massing. To be consistent, the appraisal should exclude St James's Court from the proposed extension to the conservation area. By a similar token, numbers 23 and 25 Duke Street are modern buildings that are out of keeping with the historic Victorian terraced streets. It must also be recognised that No's 2 through 18 Duke St are also modern construction out of keeping with the Victorian terraced streets that form the majority of that part of the conservation area 5 on Page 40.</p> <p>For consistency therefore these parts of Duke street should not be included in the expanded conservation area.</p>	<p>These are within the main boundary, rather than the edges, so for ease of management it is proposed they are retained and highlighted as neutral/negative as they have been, to aid in future preservation and enhancement of the CA as a whole.</p> <p>Sentence added to Duke street on p43</p>
--	---	---

## A.7 APPENDIX I

	<p>C Bailey</p> <p>Management Plan, Parking Needs</p> <p>In terms of a parking assessment that is recommended by the document, there is no need beyond counting the number of cars parked on a weekend. Recent changes in legislation make it an offence to keep an untaxed car on the public highway. Thereby every car parked in the conservation area is, by definition, a legal vehicle. People will always park their car as close as possible to home. In other words no one from North Road will park in New Street if they can avoid having to walk that far. Thereby all cars in the Victorian streets are in use by local residents. It follows that any reduction in parking in one part of town will cause a ripple effect into neighbouring roads causing a problem that only arises because of heavy handed implementation of a poorly thought through idea.</p> <p>C Bailey</p>	<p>Parking is only commented on due to the impact it makes to the character of the historic town – it is a frequent factor of town CAs/terraced streets. It is not for the CA to suggest or enforce changes on this, but noting it as a baseline is intended to help outline the character and what impacts it at this time.</p>
C Richmond	<p>Good morning;</p> <p>This is a really interesting document, and very well put together. Recommend a further proofread as there are a couple of minor typos.</p> <p>The only addition I'd like to see is a description of the 'Brightlingsea Type' - it is referred to (p42) as a planform described in the CAA of 2006, but no further detail is given that I could find.</p> <p>Kind regards</p> <p>Clare Richmond RIBA (DC&amp;B Architects)</p>	<p>Further proof read has been undertaken, minor grammatical changes etc made throughout</p> <p>Unfortunately, despite further research, I could find no more details of the Brightlingsea type – agree though I also wanted to understand more!</p>

## A.7 APPENDIX I

Public consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Noted a significant wall – contains early material</li><li>• Mastermap requires updating – a lot of development has occurred in the setting</li><li>• Addition to the boundary to the east, medieval lane. Add the cottages and discuss the lane within the setting</li></ul>	Boundary alteration following public consultation to the east, and basemap updated.  The medieval lane was not added, but recommend that it be considered within the local list project
---------------------	---	---