

Appendix 3: Summary table of consultation responses

Respondent	Summary of comments	Officer response
Mike Green	Supported the inclusion of the site of the shrunken medieval village. Generally supportive of Conservation Area Appraisal.	The shrunken medieval village has been included in the re-appraised boundary.
Leszek and Orla Wolnik	Supported the inclusion of the site of the shrunken medieval village. Concern raised regarding introduction of Article 4 Directions.	The shrunken medieval village has been included in the re-appraised boundary. Article 4 directions will be consulted on as a separate process.
Jackie Morrow	Supported the inclusion of the site of the shrunken medieval village. Provided historic images and confirmation that two TPOs on Figure 19 had been removed with consent.	The shrunken medieval village has been included in the re-appraised boundary. The TPO information has been amended to remove the two trees.
Fiona Skinner	Generally supportive of Conservation Area Appraisal. Concerned about derelict property. Encouraged a time limit on the time an unsightly derelict property can be left empty. Sought financial help with the Church's responsibilities to maintain the retaining wall to Main Street.	The Conservation and Design Team are working with Enforcement and the Empty Properties Officer to bring the derelict house back into use. A recent planning permission should address the issue of the unsightly tarpaulins. The Council do not have any grants but the Oxford DAC should be able to help with information for trusts and grants for repairs to churches.

<p>William Mansfield</p>	<p>Supported the inclusion of the site of the shrunken medieval village if the boundary was to extend at the east.</p> <p>Was against the removal of the modern sheds to the south boundary.</p> <p>Requested a 1-1 meeting which looked at the proposed east boundary.</p> <p>Surface water drainage and concerns with the Hethe Brook (Wundedbrook) were also discussed.</p>	<p>The shrunken medieval village has been included in the re-appraised boundary.</p> <p>The site has no historical or architectural significance and the 1993 boundary was no longer robust, as it cut through the modern sheds.</p> <p>A site meeting took place.</p> <p>The issue with surface water was reported to Fix My Street. The Environment Agency monitor the brook.</p>
<p>Susan Mansfield</p>	<p>Was supportive of extending the boundary with the addition of the shrunken medieval village site.</p> <p>Did not support the reduction of the boundary to omit the modern agricultural sheds as considered this could lead to further development behind Hethe House and suggested that all the modern barns be included within the boundary.</p> <p>Did not support Article 4 Directions due to additional burdens on homeowners and considered conservation status was all that was needed.</p>	<p>The shrunken medieval village has been included in the re-appraised boundary.</p> <p>The site has no historical or architectural significance and the 1993 boundary was no longer robust, as it cut through the modern sheds.</p> <p>Article 4 directions will be consulted on as a separate process.</p>
<p>Robin Parker</p>	<p>Generally supportive of the Conservation Area Appraisal.</p> <p>Was supportive of extending the boundary with the addition of the shrunken medieval village site, providing the south boundary.</p> <p>Was not supportive of the proposal to omit the modern agricultural buildings. Considered the farm development to the south was proceeding with free rein and was detrimental to the village.</p> <p>Considered Article 4 Directions were contrary to the Government's simplification of development management controls. Considered</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The shrunken medieval village has been included in the re-appraised boundary.</p> <p>The site has no historical or architectural significance and the 1993 boundary was no longer robust, as it cut through the modern sheds. There is a saved policy (AG2) from the 1996 Local Plan for agricultural development.</p> <p>Article 4 directions will be consulted on as a separate process.</p>

	conservation area status was enough to protect the village.	
--	--	--

<p>Summary from exhibition and meeting</p>	<p>General feeling that important green space should be included in the boundary, to include the shrunken medieval village and not to reduce the southern boundary. The removal of the agricultural sheds was generally not supported.</p> <p>Article 4 Directions would be consulted on as a separate exercise, and cannot be retrospective.</p> <p>The tarpaulins in the centre of the conservation are an eyesore and something needs to be done.</p> <p>The Environment Agency should be notified of any concerns regarding Hethe Brook (Wundedbrook) being dammed.</p> <p>Any consultation comments received will be reviewed and a summary report will be sent to Councillor Clark.</p>	<p>The shrunken medieval village has been included in the 2021 boundary. The agricultural shed site has no historical or architectural significance and the 1993 boundary was no longer robust, as it cut through the modern sheds.</p> <p>Article 4 directions will be consulted on as a separate process.</p> <p>The Conservation and Design team are working with Enforcement and the Empty Properties Officer to bring the derelict house back into use. A recent planning permission should address the issue of the unsightly tarpaulins.</p> <p>The Environment Agency monitor the brook.</p>
--	---	--