

## **Appendix 2 - Summary of the responses to the second public consultation on the Englefield Green Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (3<sup>rd</sup> July – 18<sup>th</sup> August 2023)**

<b>Response number</b>	<b>Name / type</b>	<b>Summary of response / main points raised</b>	<b>Response from SCC</b>
1	Transport for London	I can confirm that we have no comments to make on the draft Englefield Green Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan.	No response required.
2	Private individual	<p>As a resident of Clarence Drive, I am sorry to hear that the cul-de-sac may be removed from the Conservation Area.</p> <p>I feel that although there are a number of trees with TPOs in this road there are still many others which may be worthy of one. Being in a Conservation Area protects these trees as planning consent must be sought before work is done on them.</p> <p>Not sure why Clarence Drive is no longer considered worthy of being in a Conservation Area. Most of the houses are over 65 years old, not qualifying for listing of course but not, in my opinion, suburban.</p>	Consideration was given in the document to the criteria for adding or removing areas from the Conservation Area. The cul-de-sac in question does not reveal the historic or architectural interest of the area which is why it is proposed for removal. The justification for removal is set out within section 10.3 of the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan.
3	Private individual	The CAAMP is excellent. My single comment is to consider including the Cricket Pavilion as a Locally Listed Building (6.3). The Conservation Area is certainly enhanced by the Pavilion, not only by the building's architecture and position on the Green, but also by the feeling of community and culture that the building represents.	The importance of the cricket pavilion for views and leisure usage in the Conservation Area is noted. The purpose of the document is not to put forward buildings for local listing so this point has not been considered any further. The respondent could submit the building as part of a future review of the Runnymede Local List and has been provided with details about how to do this.

Response number	Name / type	Summary of response / main points raised	Response from SCC
4	Private individual	<p>The date for the horse trough could be double checked and referenced if the CAAMP?</p> <p>Egham Museum should be referred to as 'The Egham Museum' in the document.</p> <p>Does the revised boundary next to the ornamental lake include the Temple in the grounds of Castle Hill? If not, it should be included.</p> <p>The amendment marked as number one on the existing and proposed boundaries map around Crown Farm Cottages should be retained as it formed part of the wider collection of Crown Farm buildings so should remain in the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Could the previous pond that used to be on The Green be re-instated as part of an enhancement of the Conservation Area?</p>	<p>The date of the horse trough has now been included in the document at paragraph 4.3.5.</p> <p>The document has been corrected to ensure all references refer to 'The Egham Museum', rather than just 'Egham Museum'.</p> <p>The proposed boundary has been revised to include the small temple next to the ornamental lake in the grounds of Castle Hill.</p> <p>The boundary has been amended to retain Crown Farm Cottages owing to their historic association with Crown Farm.</p> <p>Consideration was given to reinstating the pond as part of the management plan. It was decided not to put this forward because of the impact this may have on leisure uses which are deemed to make an important contribution to the character of the Conservation Area.</p>
5	Private individual	<p>Northcroft Road was referred to as Northfield Road in the CAAMP and this should be corrected.</p> <p>The reference should be changed from 'Poet Mary Robinson' to Actress Mary 'Perdita' Robinson to highlight the historic interest of that person.</p>	<p>The document has been reviewed and these errors have been corrected (paragraphs 5.7.6, 7.1 and 7.1.4).</p>

<b>Response number</b>	<b>Name / type</b>	<b>Summary of response / main points raised</b>	<b>Response from SCC</b>
6	Natural England	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan.	No response required.
7	Surrey Gardens Trust	The proposed changes to the existing Conservation Area boundary do not have a direct effect on the nearby surrounding Registered Parks and Gardens of Windsor Great Park and Runnymede. The principle of proposed inclusion of gardens and yards where the existing Englefield Green Conservation Area boundary had been drawn too tightly is supported.	No response required.
8	National Highways	Based on the information available currently, we do not anticipate significant impacts on our SRN's operation.	No response required.
9	Surrey County Council Minerals and Waste Authority	<p>The proposed amendments to the boundary of the Englefield Green Conservation Area A, B, and C extend to within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) for concreting aggregate.</p> <p>There are no proposals to extract minerals from the relevant MSA and the same does not include any Preferred Areas for mineral extraction. However, it may be helpful for the Draft Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, either in Section 2.1 'Policy Context' or Section 8 'Issues and Options', to acknowledge the presence of the safeguarding designation in the context of the NPPF and the SMP.</p>	Note has been made within new paragraph 2.1.5 of the Mineral Safeguarding Area. It has been made clear there are no current proposals for extraction and the fact it is not a Preferred Area for extraction.