

Appendix 3 – Table of consultation responses

Consultation responses 2020		
Respondent	Comments	Officer Response
Bloxham Parish Council	Concern raised regarding the section on setting which states that Bloxham has largely lost its rural, agricultural settings.	The final version of the appraisal has been amended to reflect these comments.
	Concern raised regarding section on character of Bloxham which states that it is largely urban in character. Suggested change to wording.	The final version of the appraisal has been amended to reflect these comments.
	Supportive of Article 4 Direction, but not retrospective action.	A retrospective Article 4 would not form part of the proposals.
Respondent 1	Provided correction for address proposed to be excluded from the conservation area boundary. 3 Strawberry Terrace should read 3 Strawberry Hill.	This has been corrected in the final version.
Respondent 2	Document does not mention flood defences or obtrusive lighting.	The final version of the appraisal has been amended to reflect these comments.
Respondent 3	Generally supportive of conservation area appraisal.	Noted.
	Supportive of Article 4 directions, providing consideration given to the detail.	Article 4 Directions would form part of a separate consultation.
	Consideration of tension between conservation and climate change.	A section on climate change has been included in

	Consider adding Clinton House to list of Local Heritage Assets.	the final version of the appraisal. Clinton House has been nominated for inclusion as a local heritage asset.
Respondent 4	Suggested an additional Local Heritage Asset – Dr Hyde’s Footbridge	Dr Hyde’s Footbridge has been nominated for inclusion as a local heritage asset.
Oxfordshire County Council	Concern raised about area of greenspace in Queen Street owned by OCC which has been designated ‘significant green space’.	Noted. Re-assessed and amended to ‘green space that contributes to the character and appearance of the conservation area.’
Respondent 5	No objection to proposed boundary amendments. Concern regarding large-scale housing development around the village and the impact it is having on conservation area.	Noted. This is beyond the scope of the conservation area appraisal.
Respondent 6	Concern raised regarding the section on setting which states that Bloxham has largely lost its rural, agricultural settings. Suggested change to wording. Supportive of enforcement action to remedy works undertaken. Supportive of Article 4 directions.	The wording has been amended accordingly. Noted. Article 4 Directions will be considered as part of a separate consultation.
Respondent 7	Raised two minor inaccuracies.	Minor inaccuracies have been

		amended accordingly.
	Raised issue of street clutter and improving green spaces.	Noted.
Respondent 8	<p>Additional view from of A361 suggested.</p> <p>Consideration given to including social housing and good quality modern housing in boundary.</p> <p>Inclusion of additional Local Heritage Asset – Clinton House.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to Article 4 Direction, but this would need a good consultation process.</p> <p>The Appraisal does not look at carbon footprint and business development. This should be addressed in the wording of the appraisal.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Clinton House has been nominated for inclusion as a local heritage asset.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. A section on climate change has been included in the revised management plan.</p>
Respondent 9	<p>Generally supportive.</p> <p>Concerns expressed re lack of enforcement in the settlement.</p> <p>Concerns regarding area of green space sold off for parking.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Not relevant to conservation area appraisal.</p>
Respondent 10	<p>Consideration should be given to include Dr Hyde's footbridge in the conservation area and as a Local Heritage Asset.</p> <p>Article 4 development would be effective in ensuring changes reflect</p>	<p>Dr Hyde's footbridge has been nominated for inclusion as a local heritage asset.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

	the existing street scene sensitively.	
Respondent 11	<p>Comprehensive and information report</p> <p>Tension between rapid change and preservation of the conservation area.</p> <p>Need greater consideration about the impact of climate change. Consider how to retrofit properties to reduce emissions, but how to keep sympathetic to their appearance.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. A section on climate change has been included in the revised management plan.</p>
Respondent 12	<p>Agree with proposed changes to boundary etc.</p> <p>Need to reinforce historic elements of the village and to stop unsympathetic development.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Consultation responses 2025		
Respondent 1	<p>Concerns raised regarding the exclusion The Croft, Micklegate, Chalcroft, Little Bridge Road from the conservation area boundary while the adjacent property on the corner of Stone Hill remains included.</p> <p>The former Park Farm buildings previously occupied the site. The current dwellings include surviving elements of the original structures and boundary walls.</p> <p>The surrounding features—verges, boundary walls, lay-bys, and planting—also remain</p>	<p>Noted. Following further assessment, the proposed boundary change has been removed. The Croft, Micklegate, Chalcroft, Little Bridge Road are to stay in the conservation area.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

	<p>consistent and contribute positively to the street scene.</p> <p>The dwellings serve as a physical and visual buffer between residential parts of the village and nearby institutional/commercial uses, particularly those of Bloxham School.</p> <p>The proposed extension of the conservation area to Park Close playing fields is supported.</p> <p>Consideration could also be given to including the verge and boundary wall opposite the playing field, along Little Bridge Road up to the corner of Courtington Lane (belonging to <i>Bridge Court</i>).</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The boundary wall has been nominated for inclusion as a local heritage asset.</p>
Respondent 2	<p>Concern that protecting the historic core of Bloxham does not solve the new building issue on the outskirts of Bloxham and the protection of the surrounding green space.</p> <p>Concern raised regarding traffic and congestion exacerbated by population increase, particularly to the side streets around schools.</p> <p>Concerns raised regarding urbanisation of Bloxham resulting in the loss of green space. Welcome amendments to include more green space within the conservation area.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

	<p>More consideration given to planning applications of listed buildings and of potential new homes in the form of large estates on adjacent fields.</p> <p>An Article 4 Direction would be supported.</p> <p>Concern raised that the view of the general public is very removed from those who have the power to change or maintain the environment.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Respondent 3	<p>Design of street furniture within the conservation area, particularly bins, needs careful consideration. Concerns raised regarding traffic and litter which are impacting the ambience of the area.</p>	<p>Noted. Concerns regarding street clutter are addressed in the management plan.</p>
Respondent 4	<p>The draft conservation area appraisal is well laid out and comprehensive.</p> <p>The amendments to the boundary of the conservation area to include Park Close is welcomed.</p> <p>Improving the appearance of the High Street is a priority.</p> <p>Welcome the introduction of an Article 4 Direction to manage change to windows and porches etc.</p> <p>Potholes and manhole covers (loose) are an issue.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted- this is addressed in the management plan.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>