

Great Clacton Conservation Area

Name/Organisation	Comment	Action/response
Natural England	Natural England does not have any specific comments on these new Conservation Area Appraisals.	N/A
Historic England	<p>We welcome the production of these appraisals for the five named Conservation Areas which set out clear, robust and achievable proposals for their conservation and enhancement.</p> <p>Unfortunately, our capacity and existing commitments dictate that we are unable to comment on all the proposed appraisals in fine detail, but a review of the five documents shows they are clearly laid out, well written and nicely illustrated using photographs, other illustrations and cartography.</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>We are pleased to see that Historic England’s guidance notes for the Historic Area Assessment and Conservation Area Appraisal process (which can be found here: HE Advice Note 1 - conservation area designation, appraisal and management, and here: https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/understanding-place-historic-areaassessments/) have been referenced and made use of.</p> <p>We are also pleased to note that all the appraisals include a management plan to help guide the future conservation and enhancement of the areas. Management plan should contain clear, detailed, specific and achievable aims and objectives, setting out priority actions and long-term goals for management, including for any heritage at risk or areas that detract from the character and appearance of the area.</p>	N/A

	It is positive to note that the management plans reference use of Article 4 Directions to help manage inappropriate change, such as the insertion of UPVC windows, in Conservation Areas, and all consider how CIL or Section 106 monies could be targeted for enhancements within the conservation area.	
National Highways	The nature and location covered by this current consultation is unlikely to have an impact on the operation of the Strategic Road Network (SRN). Therefore, National Highways offers No Comment.	N/A
Comments from public consultation event	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns about the reason for the document. 2. Appendices need updating. 3. Logo changes size throughout the document. 4. One resident wanted to know if anything was changing and raised concerns about trees and green spaces. 5. Chairman of the history society questioned whether there is a local list. One was drawn up approximately 20 years ago. 6. Concerns about traffic and lorries going through the village. 7. Is Yew Tree House being used, or could it be used, for community shops or small enterprises? 8. Has the milestone at 315 Old Road been removed? 9. Concern raised about the building behind the pub next to 438 Ship Mews. 10. Concern raised about signage for the fish shop. 11. Alterations to the Methodist Church in the 50s and 70s. 12. Why are there houses included which have not been shown? 13. Valley Road and Sodbury? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Spoke to at the consultation event about the purpose of CAAMPs 2. Ceri/Meg to do 3. Ceri/Meg to do 4. Spoke to on the day 5. There is not, can pass comment onto Tendring 6. Noted 7. Not the remit of the CAAMP, but can pass on the comment 8. 315 Old Road is well outside of the Conservation Area boundary - having had a look on Google Streetview, the milestone is still there, outside a pair of dilapidated weatherboarded cottages. We do not mention it in our report as it's not in the CA or setting of the CA. 9. Noted, can pass on comment 10. Noted, this will be supported by the text on signage in section 4.5 11. Added a more specific ref to these alterations in the doc, page 35. Was

		<p>already included on page 19 so no change made there.</p> <p>12. Unsure what this means, in terms of images it would make the document too large to show every house</p> <p>13. Spoke o at the consultation event about this area</p>
--	--	---