

**Summary of responses to the Draft Shenley Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation: 14<sup>th</sup> Nov 2011 – 9<sup>th</sup> Jan 2012**

<b>Name</b>		<b>Representation</b>	<b>Council response</b>	<b>Recommended change</b>
Mr & Mrs Love	1.1	Supports extension of the conservation area along London Road	The Appraisal proposes the extension of the boundary further along London Road.	Extend CA along London Road
K Price	2.1	Supports extension of the conservation area along London Road as protecting the approach to the village.	The Appraisal proposes the extension of the boundary further along London Road.	Extend CA along London Road
	2.2	Objects to removal of the Cricket Club from the conservation area. The grounds are part of Shenley's heritage.	Removal was an option put forward. However, there is a recognition that historical links exist and that the Cricket club grounds should remain within the CA.	Retain Cricket Club grounds within the CA
F Lancer	3.1	Objects to removal of the Cricket Club from the conservation area. It has historic significance and is leased from the Shenley Trust.	As 2.2 above	Retain Cricket Club grounds within the CA
N Hibbert	4.1	Agrees with removal of Mulberry Gardens, Rowan Close, Juniper Gardens & Andrew Close from the conservation area as this is an area of modern housing.	Removal was an option put forward. See paragraph 1.3 of the Draft Appraisal.	Amend CA boundary as per option consulted
	4.2	Does not agree with removal of the Cricket ground as this is a key local feature.	As 2.2 above.	Retain Cricket Club grounds within the CA
B Kennedy	5.1	Supports the removal of Mulberry Gardens, Rowan Close, Juniper Gardens and Andrew Close as all are new & there is nothing to be conserved.	As 4.1 above.	Amend CA boundary as per option consulted
	5.2	Similarly, The Lawns area in Porters Park could be removed as it is modern and there is no justification for its inclusion though this would make the boundary an unusual shape.	The Lawns occupy an area between key buildings such as the Chapel, and Shenley Park buildings near the walled garden and are opposite the setting of the Mansion. The appearance of The Lawns is therefore important and excluding this area could be counter-productive.	No change

	5.3	Removal of The Dell site would seem sensible as it now only contains a building less than 12 months old.	Removal was an option put forward. See para 1.4 of the Draft Appraisal	Amend CA boundary as per option consulted
	5.4	Supports removal of the Cricket Club from the CA as it needs to be able to grow and adapt to modern standards of the sport.	Noted. However, see 2.2 above	Retain Cricket Club grounds within the CA
	5.6	Does not support the London Rd extension as buildings here were not part of the original village but grew along the road over time.	Within the London Road extension option, Pursley Farm is 17 <sup>th</sup> century and 15 London Road is 18 <sup>th</sup> century. Many of the buildings and roads within the existing conservation area were not part of the “original” village but grew “later”. The London Rd extension is in any case, is now an important visual component of the village.	Amend CA boundary as proposed
D Raggert LL.B for Shenley Park Trust	6.1	No objection to removal of Mulberry Gardens, Rowan Close, Juniper Gardens & Andrew Close.	As 4.1 above	Amend CA boundary as per option consulted
	6.2	No comments against the removal of the Dell from the conservation area.	See 5.3 above.	Amend CA boundary as per option consulted
	6.3	Recommends against removal of the cricket ground for the following reasons: Long history of cricket use; The use and setting are consistent with the Park; The permission for redevelopment of the pavilion has not been and might not be implemented. Redevelopment of the pavilion would not in itself mean its continued inclusion within the conservation area was inappropriate; Loss of conservation area status for the Ground would reduce the protection it enjoys from potential further development; and Considering the whole of a conservation area, not every part of it need contain something of special architectural or historic interest.	As 2.2 above.	Retain Cricket Club grounds within the CA

L Bodell	7.1	Events at the Cricket club already disturb residents. Removing it from the CA would allow the complex to grow to the further detriment of residents.	Relates to noise disturbance due to a licence for amplified music. Noise is subject to non-conservation area related controls. See 2.2 above.	No change
	7.2	Concern that the old Doctor's Surgery on Porters Park Drive should not be developed for commercial or domestic use and this would be easier if this area was removed from the CA.	This building faces Porters Park Drive near the junction with Radlett Lane and was constructed by Shenley Hospital as nurse's accommodation. Its re-use is not precluded by inclusion or exclusion from the CA. <i>It should not in any case affect the larger boundary change proposed</i> as this could go ahead with or without this building as it is on the edge of the relevant area of housing. However, the building itself is unattractive and unused and is not considered to add noticeably to the character or appearance of the CA.	No change