

Appendix C

comments on proposed boundary?	comments on content of draft appraisal?	additional comments	Precis of attached letter
PARISH COUNCIL: A majority of the Parish Council members would like to see the Conservation boundary increased		The Parish Council would also like to ask for all the individual comments from Parishioners to be considered fully and for the CDC officers to come to a professional conclusion of those findings.	
ENGLISH HERITAGE: It is very clear that these two settlements are of considerable historic interest and distinctive character and English Heritage therefore strongly supports the principle of designation as a conservation area in this case. We are generally content with the proposed boundaries, although the exact position and extent will of course be decided following the results of public consultation and the need to ensure that they are logical and related to obvious features or land ownership on the ground.	The general structure of the document is clear in providing a definition of the special interest as recommended by national guidance and it is well illustrated. However I suggest that a few of the paragraphs could be re-ordered to assist with the logic of the analysis. My major recommendations are that the detailed architectural descriptions within Section 6, both for listed and unlisted buildings could usefully be an appendix to the rear of the document. This information is detailed and an overview of the architectural history as relevant to special character is really all that is needed.	I also suggest that because of the distinctive topography of the settlements the analysis of views should be more detailed, cross referenced to the text and a summary of the significance of each view to special character should be provided. This could follow the methodology set out in the latest English Heritage Guidance " <i>Seeing the History in the View: A method for assessing heritage significance within views</i> " by establishing the viewing points, describing the type of view (eg panorama, glimpsed, formal, or townscape) and what it reveals about the character of the settlement. This would then assist both applicants developing proposals and the local authority when assessing them as to what is the important characteristic of a view that requires preservation or enhancement.	
	It is an interesting report which highlights the case for the area to be a Conservation Area. I amazed myself by enjoying reading the report.		
	Apart from one or two minor errors (which I reported to one of your officers at the exhibition) I think you have done an excellent job. I particularly liked the inclusion of views from various points in the parish.	I have now reconsidered my opinion and am in favour of the Conservation Area proposal for the following reasons: 1- Assurances given in the leaflet, and by the Chairman of the meeting, as to the effects of CA designation. 2- The number and placing of unlisted but congenial buildings in the proposed Conservation Area, coupled with the difficulty of securing further listings.	
	I appreciate the concerns of residents within the area but I feel I would like the central older part of the village conserved. It is all a matter of balance.		

	Thought the general content was excellent but just a few mistakes - very interesting and well worth preserving for future generations, despite present residents keeping it up very well, but in the future?	I would like to thank the entire panel of Design and Conservation team- An excellent presentation - very well handled. I support the proposed Conservation of Shenington and Alkerton.	
	Excellent document. Very well put together. Excellent presentation from the team at the meeting held at the school.		
Generally fine	accurate		
My property is on Mill Lane in the proposed area my house is out but my garage is in. Can I have a property which is half in and half out?	All the stone walls that run through the village within the boundary should be included also the verges.		
Would it be difficult to include the whole village entity in a conservation area?		I was already in favour of Shenington becoming a conservation village prior to attending the meeting on 2nd October. My house is at the end of a small group of houses. It has views to the west of rolling country, and hills. To the east there are views of valleys in winter, screened in summer by tall birches and other trees in full leaf.	
We are very pleased with the proposal	We live at the 'Old Bakery' and it was mislabeled as 'The Orchard'		
It should embrace the land behind Rattlecombe Lane towards the school.	thorough		
We believe in the inclusion of Anderton's Barn at the crossroads into Alkerton from Banbury. 1. This building originally was part of the working farm to our house and only ceased in 1935. 2. As it is currently on the market, there is a potential threat to its use, preservation and possible development.	Yes - public footpaths incorrectly marked - please see attached corrected plan of Oxfordshire County Council maps	We would greatly welcome the extension of the conservation boundaries to prevent further expansion of the recycling centre and any other potential spoiling of the area around the two villages	
	Commend you on the depth of research and presentation which sets out an overwhelmingly compelling case.	As a retired professional planner and Shenington property owner since 1989 I have always found it quite amazing that the villages have remained undesignated since the inception of Conservation Areas in 1968. I sincerely hope that the proposition will be accepted by your Council as Planning Authority without further delay.	
		I have read your draft Conservation Area Appraisal and feel that, on balance, the village would benefit from the protection of such status and would therefore ask that your proposals are accepted.	

Could be extended in many directions	Particularly appreciated Appendix 1 outlining the relevant policies which guided your work.		<i>Outlines positive vistas, buildings, characteristic boundary walls, trees and green spaces which are currently not included. Support the areas listed for Enhancement and suggest a wider, more comprehensive CA would incorporate more for future projects. Inclusion for Stocking Lane, Mill Lane & The Level supported as a unifying measure. Comparisons drawn to Drayton and Wroxton.</i>
The proposed boundary is far too tightly drawn. CA status should be designated for the whole of Shenington with Alkerton and its rural setting. The need to unify the village by this action cannot be stressed too much.	appreciate the work carried out	Drayton and Wroxton provide a precedent. The 1970 designations cover the whole of these villages and the CA status of Drayton has recently been reviewed and the area of its setting included in the designation has been increased	<i>Inclusion of Stocking Lane, Mill Lane and The Level suggested as being relevant due to inclusion of Drayton & Wroxton's areas of 'low quality' housing and proximity to village green.</i>
Yes, it should also take in the fields bounded by Rattlecombe Road and Stocking Lane, and should include the old stone wall along the north side of Rattlecombe Road. These are beautiful when viewed from Rattlecombe Road.	Excellent, and very thorough	Please act quickly, to prevent any further demolition of historic features before the Conservation Area comes into effect. Your proposals have our full support.	
Yes it is adequate	No		

		<p>On the north east side, the proposed boundary line does not extend to Alkerton Barn Farm which I feel is an integral part of the village. This property is currently on the market for sale, and without the protection of conservation any subsequent redevelopment may not be in keeping with the rest of the village. The barns of this property, I would have thought were of architectural interest and deserve protection accordingly. Further areas on the west side of the village i.e. Stocking Lane, Mill Lane, The Level & Rattlecombe Road, have also been excluded from the proposed conservation area, and these too I would consider to be a vital part of the village. Any applications for development here would have an impact on the character and appearance of the village as a whole. I would propose that the above-mentioned areas are included within the boundary line of the conservation area. These areas are the most likely to be developed, and need the protection afforded by being within a conservation area.</p>	
	Fascinating and well researched		<p><i>Appraisal as it stands is stark contrast to others, e.g. Wroxton & Drayton, which appear to regard setting more highly. 3 areas proposed for inclusion: Anderton Barns, Lynchetts & valley, and Rattlecombe Road. Concerns for views in and from village periphery. Areas which are most under threat from inappropriate development e.g Stocking Lane town houses. Essential to protect entrances to villages.</i></p>
Additions - see letter	Thank the team for their effort in producing the document		<p><i>Detailed letter outlining several areas for inclusion, particularly the extremities. Reminds the council of their responsibility to designate under the Act. Weighting of opinions should be given consideration.</i></p>

Cannot understand why the area is not larger	Thanks for the hard work and enthusiasm		<i>The boundary as currently drawn encompasses significant open agricultural land to the south of the village. Popular walking routes pass through the area & afford good views in all directions. Mill Lane appears modern but is old route to southern mill with defining walls, hedges & trees. Good view towards Shutford. Rattlecombe Road also worthy of inclusion. Need to prevent wilful demolition.</i>
Extend further down Rattlecombe Road to protect vista - boundary drawn far too conservatively	Most excellent document		<i>9 points listed to support inclusion of Rattlecombe Road and western entrance into the village. If the whole village was included, this would be supported.</i>
Extend in two areas.			<i>Conserve the open spaces, which are actually on all sides of the villages. Attention drawn to Anderton Barns and northern valley (Macmillan Way). Inclusion of whole village supported.</i>
Boundary is far too tightly drawn	First rate		<i>Protection of setting is essential, whole villages plus immediate surrounding land needs to be included. Will also stop divisions within the villages. Fail to see justification for not including whole villages. Anderton barns particularly mentioned.</i>
We believe it should be extended	Excellent piece of work. We <u>Support</u> the villages becoming a conservation area	Thankyou for the excellent document, the team have a real passion for their work, and I support the CA designation. Request the boundary be extended down Rattlecombe Road to protect the vista from the west. There are more lynchestts are the west end, the first property at the west village entrance is positive (High Fields). Properties there stand on the old quarry site. The boundary has been drawn far too conservatively, and if the whole village were included, I would support this.	

<p>I do not believe the designation is shown sufficiently wide enough. The setting of the villages is much wider than shown in the draft.</p>		<p>The valleys and lynchetts to the north are just as important as the vally to the south. Many historic and contemporary stone buildings and boundary walls have been excluded in Mill Lane, Stocking Lane and Rattlecombe Road and should be included. The 'setting of the villages is much larger than shown in the draft and I suggest it should reasonable be extended to cover both villages in their entirety. The barns (Andertons Barns) at the crossroads to the east of the village should be included. The lynchetts should be included. Views into an out of the villages and between them are important - the designation should therefore pick up much more of the wider setting and open spaces, including the frontages to Top Farm Field (Stocking Lane and Rattlecombe Road) and the open space that is Top Farm Field. This affords views across from different parts of the village and is part of the historic rural character of the villages.</p>	
<p>The proposed Conservation Area boundary should take in the whole of the village, including Top Farm Fields.</p>	<p>The draft Conservation Area Appraisal was well thought out and I approve the content</p>		
<p>The boundary is drawn far too narrowly. The whole village should be included as well as some of the surrounding fields etc. The whole village merits conservation area status and by designating the whole village the Council will be doing its (overdue) duty.</p>	<p>Excellent and interesting document. Many thanks to those who put in all the hard work</p>	<p>I am very much in favour of conservation area status for Shenington and Alkerton. As members of the public at the meeting said, the whole village should be designated. The villages taken together are (to use the words of Dr Todd at the meeting) 'gems'. It is important that an opportunity is not missed in restricting the area to be designated. As the Council is only too aware, there is opposition within the village (albeit a small & vocal minority) and I think that this would be most effectively dealt with by designating the whole village. Once this is done people will recognise and accept the benefits and wonder what all the fuss was about.</p>	

<p>I would like to see the boundary extended in the following areas: Lynchetts to SW of village beyond The Level; Views into the village from the approach from the west & the local view along western Rattlecombe; Top Farm Field - views from rattlecombe Road/Stocking Lane; Western Shenington - workers cottages on Rattlecombe Road because of their age/social history; Views from Old Mill Lane; barns on entrance into Alkerton - superb ashlar stone barns with fine pointing; Trees & stone wall to Long Acre site - fine feature; Lynchetts & land to east linking thru with Alkerton - part of the setting of the villages & have shaped them from a historical perspective</p>	<p>No. Very good document</p>	<p>Overall - I would like to point out the precedents set in Drayton and Wroxton for total village inclusion & ideally I would like the same applied to Shenington with Alkerton. This is a consistent message from many parishoners, who either do or don't support this activity in principle.</p>	
<p>Boundary should be extended to included the entire area of the villages</p>			<p><i>Detailed letter including photographs, outlining 7 particular areas to the north, west and east of the proposed boundary. Possible extension map included with positive vistas. Includes Stocking Lane, Rattlecombe Road, Mill Lane and Anderton Barns.</i></p>
<p>The boundary should extend further west along Rattlecombe Road. Also further WNW along Kenhill Rd to include the allotments & rear plots of Stocking Lane development - the view should be protected.</p>	<p>Apart from minor detail (re: dates of certain buildings) - a thorough, objective and well produced report. We support the aims of the assessment</p>		
<p>We both wholeheartedly support the proposal for a conservation area and the proposed boundary and rely on the duty placed by the Act to formally make the designation.</p>	<p>Well produced and well researched document of invaluable interest to those of us living here and to visitors too.</p>	<p>The Level may well be of architectural interest too as an example of the era in which it was built? Walls should be maintained. We may own houses currently but we hold them, in essence, in trust for future generations. We would certainly like the non-listed buildings to be altered in sympathy with the overall ambience; walls to be protected as boundaries and maintained as a feature and would with the overall features to be maintained and the landscape.</p>	

Boundary should be extended to encompass the whole village - any changes/development affect us all and it seems unfair to weigh one opinion over another just because they come from inside or outside the boundary	Just surprised that such a beautiful village is not already covered by a conservation area. Inappropriate design and removal of important features has already been allowed to happen, and a conservation area is crucial to prevent further adverse impact.		
Fairer if both villages were included in their entirety, particularly Rattlecombe Road	Well executed, informative document, presenting strong case for CA designation		<i>Western end of village should be included, various features of interest noted incl. water pillar and views. Buildings along Mill Lane are of merit, Anderton Barns are impressive landmark. Strongly support designation, particularly whole of settlement area.</i>
Why isn't the area proposed much larger? The boundary as shown currently includes significant areas of open agricultural land to the south of the village. I feel that similar areas to north, east and west of the village should also be included. Views out of the village and into, from the public footpaths are very important	I have inspected the draft document and have been most impressed by the work that has clearly gone into its preparation	I would like to express my strong support for the designation of a Conservation Area. The area should also be extended to the west to include the beautiful valley, immediately to the west on leaving the village which must surely be protected.	
			<i>Suggest boundary to be enlarged - areas to north and west of the village. Rattlecombe Road in urgent need of protection. High landscape value of the open space mentioned in recently refused planning application. Precedent set by Drayton and Wroxton to include whole village in CA.</i>
I don't understand why its not larger?			
It's too small - it would be better for everyone to include all of the villages and the fields around them			
Should be larger to include all of the two villages	Well written		

I think a larger area should be included, specifically the fields bordering Rattlecombe Road and Stocking Lane up to the edge of the western speed limit sign. Also along Mill Lane.	I thought it was very thorough. Well done.		
I grew up in the villages and would like to see them protected as beautiful places. I think that a wider circle around the villages would help to protect the fantastic views and pretty valleys. I know that we are threatened by mining and the tip at the moment.	Yes - a lovely pictorial representation		
Yes. I think the area should be extended to include the whole village.		Other areas are worthy of protection & social inclusion of all villages would be good psychological factor. Particularly concerned that Rattlecombe Road be included & the Lynchetts.	
I think it is an excellent idea. It is essential to have something like this to preserve our village character. The boundary seems fine although I would like to see it spread further out to prevent the Alkerton tip taking more space.	None really, other than we need to implement this to stop developers ruining our village		
See attached sheets	This was an excellent and highly informative document. What a great pity it was not produced more than 30 years ago.		<i>Concerns raised regarding recent developments within the village. Greater area of CA needed, unify not divide village. Rural setting is paramount, suggest Lynchetts, western entrance, Mill Lane, Anderton Barns, Lynchett areas not covered by SAM</i>
I think it should be extended	An excellent read!		
none	well presented		
It should include the whole village not just the main central area	It seems to allow scope for major housing development at the contentious 'top farm' site off stocking lane. Is this proposal a 'bribe' so that we cannot oppose a housing development at top farm which the village does not need - despite the pressure being put on all of us by a manifestly corrupt parish council many of whom have a vested interest in seeing that development proceed.	It would have been helpful if the council had sent us this information and notification of meetings/exhibitions etc. somewhat sooner than one week beforehand!	

<p>The boundary should at least be increased to include the entrances to Shenington and Alkerton, as these areas set the scene for the rest of the villages. Extension of the conservation boundary to include the villages as a whole should be considered.</p>	<p>No comment on current contents. See attached for additional buldings, wall and features of special interest that could be included</p>		<p><i>Arguments for full inclusion of villages: 1 - maintain & manage developments around villages. 2 - preserve settings of villages. 3 - preserve features of interest not already included. Have CDC investigated airfield buildings? Wills dating back to 1504 on national archives have links to Shenington.</i></p>
<p>The boundary seems to be just about right in that it excludes from the CA properties/trees etc that have no particular merit, but takes care of the rest</p>	<p>To suggest that young trees with a girth of over 15cm should come within the juristicition of the LA is unrealistic and calls for review. Do you seriously think that if I plant a sampling in my garden I need permission to move it when its girth reaches 15 cm+</p>		
<p>As it affects the whole village I think the whole village should be a conservation area</p>	<p>The appraisal was over-egged - too simplified, telling us things we already knew or didn't want to know. Too much money was spent and too many councillors etc. involved. Obviously conservation is a done deal because of excessive time and money spent by D&C Team</p>		
<p>The proposed boundary has been drawn far too tightly. I request that the whole of Shenington with Alkerton and as much of the rural setting as legislation permits should be included</p>	<p>The historical analysis and the Character Area Analysis clearly show that we need CA status and we need it now. It is incomprehensible that Conservation Areas were introduced by the Civic Amenities Act of 1967 and yet 41 years later Shenington with Alkerton does not have CA status</p>	<p>I understand that Drayton and Wroxton which were given CA status in the 1970s have designations encompassing the whole of the villages and a significant amount of their rural setting in most directions. Moreover, I understand that Drayton has recently been reviewed and CA status designated for an increased area of the setting. There is thus a precedent for my request. Drayton and Wroxton also include significant areas of ex-public sector housing and "low quality" housing in terms of character and appearance. There is no case therefore for excluding Stocking Lane, Mill Lane, and The Level. Given the deplorable level of verbal and physical abuse directed at residents who desire CA status, the village needs unifying by a comprehensive CA, not dividing by a CA boundary line through the village.</p>	
<p>Neutral Response</p>			
<p>TONY BALDRY MP:</p>			<p><i>Past experience shows that such events can divide a community. Suggests a further poll before a final decision is taken (Letter dated 1 October, prior to CDC undertaking public consultation 2 - 24 October).</i></p>

<p>1 - Rattlecombe Road, its C17 workers' cottages and the positive vistas over Top Farm Field should be included. 2 - The Lynchetts and the views across it should be included. Scheduled Ancient Monument status is clearly not protecting its setting, and should not be allowed to deteriorate. 3 - The barn at the top of Alkerton should be included.</p>	<p>If only the boundary was extended I would. You are missing some important and unprotected buildings! Compare the recently extended Conservation Area of Drayton!</p>		
<p>If a conservation area is to be established it would be desirable and appropriate to extend the boundary to include all the existing housing and a "green" buffer around it (as in the eastern part of the area) to give additional protection to the "core" character areas from excessive and insensitive future development and to preserve the open vistas which, although less striking than elsewhere, are a valuable asset to the village.</p>	<p>The question of a conservation area has created serious divisions within the village community. For example the then Chairman of the Parish Council distributed a memorandum a few months ago noting that there were three types of person living in Shenington: those who lived in stone houses; those who lived in Council houses and "the rest". Creation of a conservation area that appears to confirm this division will exacerbate this newly arisen "caste system" of "them" and "us", to the detriment of the community.</p>	<p>The views seem to have been assessed from communal land only, eg p.33 col.3 "views are restricted". Surely, views from private houses should be considered? The view from a house is a factor in its value. The impressive views north and east from properties along the N side of the main road seem to have been ignored here on p. 33 and, more crucially, from the overall aims of the Conservation Area. The Appraisal document is a very valuable and useful collection of material which should be of great interest to all who live in the two villages. However, it contains a number of detailed errors [of spelling, punctuation, grammar and fact] and would benefit from their correction.</p>	
	<p>The Lynchetts should be included. Too much jargon - whatever does nucleate mean?!</p>	<p>1. Previously anti CA, we are now being told that the houses up Stocking Lane would not have been built that way if CA status had existed. If this is the case, fine. I would be interested to know if the houses had been outside the CA the designs would be different i.e. less intrusive. 2. As a hilltop village, in the past insufficient attention has been given to the skyline when new builds are proposed, and not considered all round. i.e. from all 4 sides. This has resulted in a row of houses which intrude into the skyline and can be seen for miles around. If CA status would ensure this did not happen we would be in favour.</p>	
<p>no</p>	<p>no</p>		
		<p>Presentation team would have been easier to hear if they had had an microphone/amp system. It is sad to see that government sees fit to impose conservation area on two villages which one member of the team admitted he had walked round and could not understand why it was not a C.A. already. Perhaps self rule since Doomsday shows that self regulation works without outside interference, works.</p>	

<p>Generally well thought out, although the open field to the north of Alkerton does not appear to be very relevant. Also extending to the west of Shenington would devalue the conservation area concept.</p>	<p>Quite a lot of inaccuracies on dating of buildings and speculation on historical facts hopefully to be corrected by local input.</p>		
		<p>We and many other villagers are concerned more about further developments on the outside of the proposed conservation area than we/they are about those within the area. This is because planning decisions to date outside the area have failed to recognise that the settings is as important as the 'jewel' within. Examples are the awful school design and the 5 town houses in Stocking Lane. The approach to the conservation area from the north and the west is as important as that from the south and the east and is being marred by unsympathetic design and materials foreign to the area. One would like to think that the award of 'conservation area' status would have a design influence on development surrounding the area but there seems little confidence in the community that this is likely. One solution might be to include the whole of the two villages envelope within a conservation area then the same standards would have to apply throughout. Please note for future reference that the acoustics in the school hall are not good enough for your type of Q&A presentation.</p>	
<p>See attached representations</p>	<p>See attached representations</p>	<p>Representations made on behalf of Mr Dowdeswell by Oliver Taylor of Pegasus Planning Group</p>	<p><i>Three areas of land included within the proposed CA are challenged as areas which require more justification for inclusion. An alternative boundary is suggested which eliminates these identified areas.</i></p>
<p>Negative Response</p>			

no	no	<p>Excellent presentation by the chairman - far less so by other officers. Views expressed at the meeting were generally by a vociferous minority based not on conservation but on personal vendetta. Many old/inform inhabitants were unable/find it to difficult to attend the meeting - therefore as i expressed to the chairman of the meeting opinion and decision should be made and weighted towards those persons who dwell in the proposed zone and less to those like myself dwelling outside it. It seems to me that an someone with no real view as to pro/con conservation area - those who spoke loudest for it were those who dwelt outside the designated area and in many cases have altered their properties, felled trees and demolished outbuildings as infinituem. I was staggered by the sheer number of 'advisors' planners present at the school meeting and am concerned therefore about the cost involved in the whole exercise.</p>	
<p>If a conservation area is to be imposed it should include a wider area. It is inevitable that a conservation area can be demanded by those who will not be subject to the resulting costs and restrictions.</p>	Comprehensive document	<p>I am opposed to the imposition of CA status without a ballot restricted to residents who are within any imposed boundary and the results of the ballot being in favour of a CA. I am appauled that the issue of CA status has been raised again so soon after the ballot in 2006 resulted in a vote against CA status of almost 2.5:1. Having been born in Sherington and lived here for 50 years I see little evidence of the need for CA status and little evidence of inappropriate development that CA status would have prevented. If CA status conferred some presumption against future development in the parish as a whole then I could see merit in CA status, but it clearly provides no such protection. The imposition of CA status without a further ballot would result in much ill feeling against the individuals who repeatedly raise this issue, despite the clear result from 2006.</p>	
<p>Given that 32 houses/buildings are already listed and only 11 are not, I do not see the point of this exercise. The village is splendid as it is. I see this as yet more bureaucrazy and quite unnecessary</p>	It seems to be slanted for a "yes" vote.		

<p>I am against CA status being imposed on Shenington/Alkerton. Our community has maintained a very high standard (apart from the horse trough/flower bath on the green) and we do not need another level of beaucracy telling us how to look after our villages.</p>	<p>I only had a chance to look at some pretty pictures in the draft at the village hall.</p>		
<p>no</p>	<p>We are not in favour of conservation and can see no justification for this proposal!</p>		
<p>Please see additional comment</p>	<p>as above</p>	<p>I have lived in Shenington all my life and am very strongly against the conservation area. The village has remained relatively unchanged over the last 100 years without the need for a conservation area. There is no reason why this wouldn't continue. Our family live in a grade II listed house already and resent further restrcitions being imposed on our daily live. Surely the money spent producing the appraisal and policing this policy could be better spent elsewhere.</p>	
	<p>We manage to look after our very pretty villages quite well without (<i>triple underlined</i>) the need for conservation area status. Why more regulations and bureaucracy? Use your resources where they are needed.</p>	<p>This is such a waste of public money when resources should be used elsewhere where abuse of the landscape and amenity is taking place. Why is everything having to be wrapped up in red tape? We have managed to evolve quite nicely since Anglo-Saxon times without (<i>triple underlined</i>) conservation area status.</p>	
<p>I am very much against the conservation area in any form, people who are all for it live in an area of the village which is not in the proposed area, which I feel is very unfair.</p>	<p>The outcome of the last referendum in 2006 should be considered more. 315 elegendible to vote. 199 against it. 52 for it. Surely this says something.</p>		

<p>We shouldn't be having a conservation area at all. Your representatives at the meeting congratulated the village on how well it has been kept. Therefore we can look after our village, as we have for hundreds of years without the need for council controls. Not one of your people could pinpoint what the threat to our village is. If you control people and property because of a so called future threat if new people move into the village then why hasn't it happened in the past? You can't ban buses because someone might get run over.</p>		<p>As a gardener of a property within the proposed conservation area with over 40 trees to look after why should I have to apply for permission every time I need to prune them. They have been well looked after in the past and will continue to be looked after. As for the draft appraisal, i'm sure the council and tax payer's money could be put to better use. This is another example of the nanny state. Don't forget you might be able to fine people for not complying with the rules but if a building is demolished or a tree cut down it is still lost forever. As Councillor Gibbard said after the meeting. Once the appraisal goes to the executive not one has been turned down so contrary to his comments during the meeting it is a fait-accompli.</p>	
	<p>My answer to the conservation area is a definite NO. I was born in the village eighty seven years ago and am living in a listed cottage which gives ample protection and the beauty of our village.</p>		
		<p>I do not want it to be a conservation area</p>	
<p>The proposed boundary is physically and equally importantly socially divisive, imposing restrictions on the old part of the villages but permitting less regulated development of the rest of the settlement. More recent building should also be included, not for its particular merit, but to preserve and develop the physical and social entity of the villages. The inclusion of the fields to the south of shenington is discriminatory. Fields to the north and west remain open to uncontrolled development. They have an equal value in terms of view or aspect. Either all surrounding fields should be included or all omitted.</p>	<p>Conservation area designation has been resisted in the villages because owners of property in the proposed area have acted and continue to act responsibly. People who live here are the best judges of the value of the asset in which they live; most of them neither need nor want the protection of conservation. Designation implies increased cost and trouble to residents in making and implementing applications. It implies increased cost to CDC in bureaucratic work and supervision and ultimately increase and unnecessary cost to Council Tax payers.</p>		
<p>As we aren't in the proposed conservation area we live on the outskirts of shenington and talking to a lot of residents that are. I can't see a need for it every one in the village cares about it.</p>		<p>We voted against conservation twice in the past and can't see what's changed I can't see any new building happening in the area covered and the areas that aren't covered already have one development that doesn't look like village houses at all more like town houses.</p>	

It is divisive and unnecessary	Shenington is a lovely village and has remained so without the need for a formal Conservation Area status. Whilst the extra cost and inconveniences involved may or may not be marginal but why risk unintended consequences when the change is clearly not needed.	1. Many question whether this is a self serving activity for CDC and therefore whether it is objective. 2. Our understanding is that CDC were asked by the Parish Council to undertake an appraisal only. Para 2.1.3 on page 5 of the Appraisal document suggests that the PC also asked CDC to "designate" a Conservation Area. We therefore believe that CDC has deliberately overstepped its brief. 3 In these austere days no public body should be undertaking any unnecessary work to ensure all funds are allocated to priority tasks. Making Shenington/Alkerton a Conservation Area is a misuse of public funds as its an entirely unnecessary exercise. Such a use of scarce funds would not withstand any audit or investigation.	
			<i>Aware of the duty placed upon the council but feel that the situation is currently satisfactory. Appraisal has been divisive within the village and would be better for community if the designation does not take place.</i>
Certainly does not need extending	Poorly researched in some areas	Like the majority of residents I voted against a conservation area in 2006; in a democratic vote, and object to having a CA forced upon us by a minority who cherwell are paying lip service to.	
The boundary encompasses too large an area. I do not understand why this CA appraisal has been undertaken. I voted against in 2006 in a ballot organised via CDC. I do not think CDC should be in charge of conserving this beautiful village. All the inappropriate development here has been sanctioned through the planning process by CDC.	Full of errors, very intrusive. I believe an Englishman's home is his castle. What business is it of CDC of one's wall is damp? Or that foliage may damage a wall. MYOB		
NB. We do not wish to have a Conservation Area in the villages of Shenington and Alkerton!	No	We are against any "Conservation Area" in the village. It has been turned down in the past, the present proposal is causing "bad feelings" in the village too. We feel the villages are very well protected by the care and attention paid by the local residents at present.	
Both my husband & I wish to oppose the creation of a conservation area in Shenington			

<p>Why are houses that CDC have given planning for in the last 5 years not within the boundary? Why have you placed the fields in between the two villages within the boundary, that cannot be seen from the road at least a few hundred trees? Why have you left out the historic lynchets and then put in totally flat land with no historic interest? Why not put a conservation area around houses that CDC have been responsible for the 60s/70s tat and recent town houses?</p>	<p>Where are the photos of the Level? Or Long Acre? Or the village trough on the village green?</p>	<p>Nice to see Democracy taking place. There has been one fair ballot in this village and the result was 71% against a CA. FACT!! You received an unfair ballot in which people were bullied into signing and when members who signed asked for their names to be taken off were ignored. CDC over stated signatures on the petition. Learn to count. Why ballot a village if you just ignore the result when it doesn't go your way. Why should we sit back and let pen punching bureaucrats impose laws on how residents look after their gardens. With the propsect of high council tax to rub salt in the wounds. Bravo. Viva La Revolution. Also it is always standard practice to go behind the back of Parish Councils? If so what is the point in them. Surely you could employ a few thousand more people, after all the country is in such a financially sound position. But oh no it doesn't matter to you as you all work for the state. Job for life. Is that ok for a comment</p>	
<p>I am not sure that a CA is necessary, and hence object to its creation. I believe that with listings of buildings and TPOs the controls are in place to preserve the village. If the CA is to go ahead I think it is too large and shouldn't include the valley land between Shenington and Alkerton. Or the allotments at the end of Kenhill Road.</p>	<p>I think it should give more guidance to people living in the conservation area - a before and after would be good with some FAQs - e.g. I am thinking of taking down an internal wall upstairs, my house isn't listed but I am now in a conservation area. Before 'no need to apply', after 'permission needed, please pay £X and wait for 8-13 weeks.</p>		
<p>I question whether some of the green fields are necessary?</p>	<p>Yes. It is appaulingly crass and inaccurate. If this is what CDC does, God help villages under a CA</p>		

