

ANNEX C - Schedule of Responses to Strensall Three CAA Consultations (10/12/10 - 28/01/11)

Origin	No.	Comment - Q1 qualities not mentioned?/ Q2 boundary correct?	Officer Response	Officer Recommendation/ Proposed Amendments	
CYC Commons Registration	1	I have reviewed the proposed changes and there is no impact on and registered Village Greens or Common Land.	Noted.	No change	
Conservation Area Advisory Panel	2	Conservation Area Advisory Panel	Noted.		
		Strensall Railway Buildings: the panel supported proposals to amend the boundary to include Station Yard and drew attention to previous proposals for a new station stop in this location. Officers will seek clarification from Transport Planning (TP3) and from Network Rail	See 15 and 20.	para 7.05 to be amended see 20	
		Towthorpe: The panel were supportive of conclusions that would recognise that the character of the CA was of farm buildings disposed in open space and that the importance of the space between the buildings must be recognised - recommendations should make clear how the character of the CA can be retained.	para 7.02 suggests an approach. The area is washed over as greenbelt and CYC policy SP2 would apply including sequential testing of uses	No change	
		The panel highlighted the importance of the last section - "Future Management Suggestions" and recommended that proposals were more specific in each area e.g. which elements should be covered by Article 4 directions?	para 7.04 (Towthorpe) wording to be more directive. Suggestions for general items to be covered in other conservation areas considered adequate. River Lock to be included for Strensall.	Towthorpe 7.04 Article 4 (2) directions should be introduced to cover roofs, doors, windows, porches, boundary walls and gates. This would provide additional protection to the essentially agricultural character of many unlisted buildings within the area. It would also prevent the use of unsympathetic materials/styles. and allow control over design and materials used against the highway. For Strensall - also see no27	
Member of Public	3	To help protect the environment and strengthen the character of Strensall this could be an opportunity to include the areas bounded by Ox Carr Lane and Flaxton Road encompassing the properties that front these roads running from Pasture Close and up to Lords Moor Lane. One side of Ox Carr Lane and Flaxton Road sits Strensall Common a SSSI (A Site of Special Scientific Interest) owned by the MOD and under the direction of Natural England. Could this area be given consideration? - separate conservation area of linear form as shown on the attached MAPS, I have include the area of woodland to the rear of Whitewalls, I think this would be an ideal opportunity to preserve the heritage and landscape of the area for future generations.	These areas are outside the village envelope and their protection is adequately covered by green belt policies and the SSSI status of the Common. Conservation Area legislation was introduced to protect the man-made environment and is therefore not appropriate in this instance. For the buildings to be included they should be of special significance to the socio-economic development area or to be of a character which reinforces the special appearance of the area. Please also see no23.	No change	
Member of Public	4	No other qualities.	Correct boundaries.	Noted.	No change
Member of Public	5		Conservation area should be extended to include open fields - open space and trees (see map - fields between railway and village).	Please see no3 above. In any future development proposals planners are duty bound by law to take account of the effect of proposals on the setting of conservation areas. English Heritage have brought out specific guidance on setting. The area between the railway lines and the village is within the greenbelt and part of it is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)	No change

Member of Public	6	No, the reports have covered in depth the attributes of the respective areas.	No, the houses in Northfields currently in the CA are modern and out of context for a CA.	Initially these houses were proposed for removal but the site lies close to the heart of the historic village settlement and any redevelopment should be highly controlled due to its potential effect on the church and wider conservation area. So this proposal was reconsidered due to the historic significance of the area and the contribution of the mature trees within it which provide amenity for the wider area. See para 5.06	No change
Member of Public	7	The character appraisals are accurate.	I support the proposals to extend the conservation area.	Noted.	No change
Member of Public	8		My opinion is that as many areas as possible should be included in the Conservation Area.	Noted. Areas proposed for inclusion must be of special architectural or historic interest or be of high townscape value.	No change
Member of Public	9		Yes, I agree the boundaries are correct, especially the proposed boundary in Moor Lane.	Noted	No change
Member of Public	10		I do agree that Southfields Road should be reorganised according to the new boundary line shown on the plan Area B1.	Noted.	No change
Member of Public	11	I agree with the appraisals.	I am in full agreement of all the additions, in particular down Princess Road and Moor Lane. I would also like to include and protect all the tall trees on the southern boundary that closed the vista part way down Moor Lane.	Noted. Also trees are covered in Strensall CAA para 11.06	Strensall 11.06 management suggestion to be referred to DCSD section for action
Member of Public	12	No, all plain houses (i.e. rest of Strensall?).		Noted - though the appraisal describes some special qualities of the houses	No change
Parish Council/ River Foss Society	13	Keen to see if the canal locks could be looked at for possible inclusion in the appraisal and addition to the CA. See plans and elevations of New Bridge and Lock chamber drawn for the River Foss Society.		Please see no 27 below	To be referred to English Heritage for specific inclusion in list description for Strensall New Bridge
English Heritage	14	Towthorpe This is a succinct, readable and carefully analysed summary of the special interest of the hamlet of Towthorpe and we are supportive of its approach and summary. We particularly endorse its conclusions that the residential conversion of the farm buildings would be detrimental to the character of the hamlet. Their use for commercial purposes is sensible in our view. We also endorse the need to review the listability of the unlisted historic buildings and secure an A4D to assist in the retention of the less tangible historic features such as hedges, fenestration and the like. We support the retention of the present boundary.		Noted	para 7.04 to be amended as in no2 above
		One practical suggestion includes - It would help in getting to the heart of the special interest if the certain statements were to be made in bold. For example at 3.02 I suggest that "The setting.....is dominated by open agricultural land" is the essence of this paragraph and in my experience planners will need to be able to quote such statements in reports etc.. and thus need to find them with ease in the document. One final point, has there been pressure for conversion of the outbuildings and if so would a Development Brief approach be helpful to be sure of retaining the special interest?		The appraisal is succinct and it has been divided into small sections. We would be cautious about highlighting some aspects in case this is taken as meaning that other aspects are of lesser significance.	DCSD officers will discuss with relevant officer in City Development whether there would be any benefit to producing a Planning Statement. Development Briefs are normally reserved for larger urban sites.

		<p>Strensall</p> <p>This too is readable although the size and scope of Strensall makes this a much more detailed assessment. Again some form of highlighting would be beneficial especially as the pressure for development and infill is strong. The management proposals are sensible and given that much of the suggested scope for visual improvement lies within the control of the council (highways, lighting, planning enforcement) we hope that these can be secured by an agreed protocol within the Council.</p> <p>Finally I am attaching for your interest the two summaries of the condition of these two conservation areas. We commissioned this research following the submission of returns to our CA@R survey of 2009 when both Strensall and Towthorpe were considered to be at risk. I am not sure that we have shared this information with council's for which I apologise and hope that you will find it of interest.</p>	<p>The appraisal is succinct and it has been divided into small sections. We would be cautious about highlighting some aspects in case this is taken as meaning that other aspects are of lesser significance .</p>	<p>DCSD to explore relevant aspects of management with Highways. The English Heritage survey summary reports will be placed on the general conservation area file EC67 for future reference.</p>	
CYC Transport Planning	15	<p>A York North East Rail Scheme (YNERS) was proposed several years ago, which advocated rail 'shuttle' services between Strensall and York, calling at Haxby and York Hospital en route. However, the advice from the (then existing) Strategic Rail Authority was to concentrate on building a new station at Haxby for existing York Scarborough to call there.</p> <p>Although the new station at Haxby as proposed in LTP2 hasn't been built it is expected to be a medium-term project in LTP3 (commencing 2019 ish). Ultimately, this could be the precursor to the full YNERS, which would include Strensall, so a proposed extension to the Strensall Railway Buildings Conservation Area to include the former station yard may have a material affect on this.</p>	<p>Noted. The appraisal should be reworded to accommodate this possibility in future. Please see no20.</p>	<p>Strensall Railway Buildings para 7.05 to be amended. See no20</p>	
Member of Public	16	<p>No, these look great as they are! Especially if it stops further developments, e.g. no housing estates on Towthorpe</p>	<p>We agree that boundaries should be altered. Of note, the recent Hogg development is not detailed on 'Strensall Railway Buildings' map, although not in conservation area, the map ought to be amended.</p>	<p>Towthorpe is within the greenbelt and this designation places restrictions on the extent and type of development</p>	<p>The maps for Strensall Railway Buildings have been checked and they appear to be correct within the appraisal document</p>
CBA/ Public	17	<p>Thanks for this information, having looked at the plans the only comment that I have on the draft plan relates the Strensall Railway Buildings plan and specifically to the signal box.</p> <p>Section 4.03 - Strensall Signal Box – the current signal box is of a later pattern of North Eastern Railway box and dates from 1901. It is possibly the second signal box on the site, the earlier one was probably mid 1870s. When the York and NM built the line it did not have signal boxes as such so there would not have been one contemporary with the station buildings.</p> <p>The North Eastern Railway built signal boxes on this line from 1873 onwards.</p>	<p>Thank you for clarifying this. The signal box is noted as being a landmark and also a building which makes a positive contribution to the area.</p>	<p>para 4.03 to be corrected to include the information supplied. Wording to be agreed with the consultant</p>	
Member of Public	18	<p>I write in response to your proposal to extend the conservation area to include 101 The Village. In my humble opinion the house is of poor architectural merit, it is lacking in features and has its proportions all wrong. The house is a poor example of architecture of the period and should not be afforded Conservation Area status which would ultimately prevent the owner from making any cosmetic changes to improve its appearance. The house could benefit from a total makeover to improve the kerb appeal of the street and would benefit even greater from being demolished and another more fitting house to be built in its place. I oppose the move to extend the CA in this direction and laugh at the fact that you also want to preserve a derelict builder's yard!</p>	<p>The house has been included also for its significance to the village community as the former doctor's residence - please see para 5.05 for information. Conservation Area controls would not prevent the sort of changes you suggest being made, though Conservation Area Consent would be required if demolition was proposed. The reasons for including Area A (Strensall Railway Buildings), the former station stop, are explained at 5.04. Inclusion of this area is important to the rationale behind the designation of this area. The poor buildings associated with the "builder's yard" are noted as being of negative value to the conservation area in map 4, so there is no intention to preserve them.</p>	<p>No change</p>	

Member of Public	19	SRB - There are a few houses along Brecks Lane associated with the old brick and tileworks, are these worthy of inclusion in the plan (2 cottages and 1 house).	I approve of the extended boundaries from Strensall Railway Buildings area.	Conservation Area designation was introduced mainly to protect the special qualities of areas rather than of individual buildings. The Works has gone and the buildings, which have been altered, are not special in their own right. They are also separated from the village by the new bus terminus	No change
Network Rail	20	Network Rail have concerns over the extension to the east (designated Area A within the CAA) on the following grounds: · As an active (and soon to be re-let) part of Network Rail's commercial estate Network Rail would resist any alteration in designation which would place undue planning controls on this site.		Reasons for including the area in the Strensall Railway Buildings CAA have been outlined in 5.04. Its historical significance is intrinsic to the conservation area though the existing poor quality buildings relating to its use as a builder's yard are marked as being of negative value to the area.	No change to the proposed boundary extension
		· We are concerned that the proposed designation will have a negative impact on Network Rail's ability to develop the site and to maximise its commercial usage.		It is not the intention to prevent development but any development should respect the special historic features of the site and the site's potentially huge contribution to the streetscape as the it provides the termination to the vista looking east from the main village street (The Village)	para 7.05 - omit reference to open character and wording of paragraph to be replaced by "Any future proposals for the former station site should allow for a new station stop to be created in accordance with the latest Network Rail or CYC Transport Planning initiatives. In addition proposals should demonstrate how existing historic features of the site have been incorporated into the scheme. Use of a landscape boundary should be considered in order to reinforce the site's relationship to existing trees and to the countryside beyond."
		· As a not for dividend company which provides the Country's rail infrastructure income from commercial operations (ie the letting of appropriate sites etc) is reinvested into the railway. Restriction on Network Rail's ability to achieve commercial returns through the imposition of restrictive planning control is thus not in the travelling public's interest.		Noted	see above
		· It is also the case that, in the longer term, City of York Council's aspirations as expressed in the current LTP for the development of a new station / halt at Strensall in this area could be affected by the proposed designation. We would be concerned that the CAA could end up with conflicting adopted Policy Documents.		It is not the intention to prevent this sort of development. In principle the development of a station stop would be compatible with the character of the conservation area.	see above
		In addition According to The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 in order to designate a conservation area the LPA must justify that it is 'desirable to preserve or enhance' 'areas of special architectural or historic interest'. The justification for the extension of the CA in this direction is that (page 7 of the CAA) 'In view of their historic association with the railway it is considered that the former station yard is worthy of inclusion within the designated area'. Whilst this association is not disputed Network Rail would suggest that a more substantial argument / justification should be provided based on the impact of this area on the CA.		The site's location in relation to its potentially high impact on townscape character is another reason for inclusion (see last 5.04 last sentence)	see above

		Of particular concern is the CAA statement that the site 'has an open character which needs to be retained should the site be redeveloped in the future'. The former coal yard is a working commercial site and has been so for a considerable period. There has been no association with the working railway for a significant period. The site does not have a wholly open character, containing a building and coal drops, embankments, fencing and vegetation / tree growth to the fringes. In addition development extends to the north and the east of the site and as such the site does not sit in isolation from surrounding building. It is clearly brown-field, developed land and as such its designation for retention as open space would be resisted. In addition the suggested "openness" of the site would be effectively undermined by the construction of a station/halt in the future. The condition and undistinguished quality of the existing building on the site also undermines the suggested historic association of the yard.		Noted. The existing building is noted as being of negative value to the area on map 4	wording of para 7.05 to be altered to omit reference to open character (see above)
CPRE	21	Thank you for inviting CPRE comments on the Draft Conservation Area Appraisals for Strensall. We believe that the proposals reflect the true character and setting of the individual areas and are pleased to give them our support.		Noted	No change
Member of Public	22	The report was comprehensive and professional. I agree with its contents and feel there is nothing to add.	I support the proposed changes to the conservation area, particularly the extension of Area C to include C1.	Noted.	No change
Member of Public	23	I value the open views of the village across the field. Open spaces, hedgerows and verges need protecting in addition to houses. Additional proposed area: the large houses on Flaxton Road, e.g. Windrush etc.	I support the proposed changes to the conservation areas. In particular the extension of Area C to include C1 on Moor Lane.	Please see no3 above. Also hedges should be covered by the Hedgrows Regulations Act 1997, and the Common is a Special Protection Area (SPA) in addition to its SSSI status. Part of the area between Southfield Road and the railway line has recently been declared a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). Additional views south should be indicated.	Additional views south from Southfield Road and The Village (SE end) should be indicated on map 6 Strensall CAA
Member of Public	24	Not to my knowledge.	We support the proposed amendments to Strensall's conservation areas, in particular the extension to Princess Road/ Moor Lane.	Noted	No change
Member of Public	25		We support the proposed amendments to Strensall's conservation areas, in particular the extension to Princess Road/ Moor Lane.	Noted	No change

Member of Public	26		I support the proposed amendments to Strensall's conservation areas, in particular the extension to Princess Road/ Moor Lane.	Noted	No change
River Foss Society	27	1. We strongly support the suggestion in Para 11.07 that the listing of the Strensall New Bridge be amended to include the associated walls along the River.		These walls are included within the conservation area boundary already.	DCSD to refer matter to English Heritage for review of list description
		2. The Conservation Area should also be extended to include the surviving remains of the other two locks dating from the time of the Foss Navigation Company, namely the one just north-east of the John Carr Bridge (grid reference 6346110) and the double lock at Lock House (645618).		The double lock at Lock House is several hundred meters outside the built-up area and it is within the greenbelt; so conservation area designation is not appropriate. The lock immediately to the north-east of the Strensall Bridge is within an area designated as open space (policy GP7). Nature has gradually filled in the water courses and landings, though there is some evidence of the locks and later sluice gates in ruined condition above ground an an animal watering place is still detectable to the other side of Strensall Bridge. The Strensall conservation area appraisal makes general reference to these works at para 4.07 and they are shown on the 1852 & 1911 OS maps. Conservation area designation protects townscape in its broadest sense and as the openness is already protected under GP7 conservation area status would not add further protection. Other mechanisms should be found to highlight the significance of this area.	Strensall CAA -para 4.07 reference work of River Foss Society for further infomation on this important industrial archaeology; para 8.5 replace third sentence with "The former lock walls remain to the east of the bridge, though they have been damaged by self-seeded trees"; (fourth sentence) should be amended to refer to the important series of river locks running NE from Strensall and their high significance in terms of industrial archaeology, though they are now partially buried. Exact wording to be agreed with the consultant. Locks to be referred to EH for consideration in respect of listing. Add 11.08 "It is recommended that a community archaeology project be prepared, in association with the River Foss Society, to assist in further revealing the high significance of the navigation system to the wider public". 11.06 Add "Trees should be carefully removed from the lock walls adjacent to Strensall New Bridge to assist with their preservation. Replacement trees should be planted close to he area in accordance with CYC arboriculturalist recommendations"
		3. We appreciate that the emphasis is on the conservation of the built environment but would like to suggest that the former towpath linking the three locks is also of historic interest and should be included in the Conservation Area. The former towpath now forms part of the Foss Walk and the Centenary Way, the public footpath which follows the north bank of the River Foss as it curves around Strensall. This would entail extending the present boundary of the Conservation Ares to the opposite side of the River Foss and would have the advantage of giving additional protection to the view of the listed John Carr Bridge from the riverbank.		The former towpath on the north bank is a clearly defined boundary and we agree that this should be included in the conservation area to protect the historic riverside setting, particularly where it runs through the tannery area which is not protected by greenbelt status. There are excellent views of the former Manor site from here as the land rises within the curve of the Foss, and the C19th church tower lies beyond (referred to in para 8.07)	Strensall CAA - the northern boundary line should be amended to include the path north of the river Foss within the area between the two bridges. Views from towpath south towards Manor House and church tower to be added to Map 6 (as amended in Annex E), and also views along towpath west towards Strensall Bridge to be added.
Member of Public	28	Not that I am aware of.	I support the posoposed amendments to the conservation area.	Noted	No change
	28a	I have returned the document supporting extension of the Strensall conservation areas. It prompts me to say to you, however, that my belief in the value of this is seriously diminished by the fact that the house at 5 Princess Road has not only been left unoccupied for many years but has been completely neglected and is now a blight on the area. What is the point of having a conservation area if an owner is permitted to do this?		Noted	Strensall CAA - paragraph to be added in future management suggestions suggesting that a Section 215 notice is pursued to assist in remedying the situation and other similar identified properties in Strensall village. Exact wording to be agreed with consultants and legal services
Member of Public	29	You appear to have covered them thoroughly.	We agree with the amendments shown to Strensall's Conservation Areas including the extension to Proncess Road/ Moor Lane.	Noted	No change

Member of Public	30	<p>By now you should have had from Tony the plans etc. which we have made from our survey of Strensall lower lock and the associated bridge. The two (upper and lower)locks in Strensall village are particularly interesting because they are the only two locks on the Foss navigation which were the responsibility of Mr William Scruton. The other locks to the south (between Strensall and York) were all built under Mr Moon's tenure and are of a different type to Mr Scruton's design (Moon was the first Superintendent of Works but was sacked as the Navigation approached Strensall. Scruton replaced Moon and brought the navigation into Strensall. The lower lock is the best preserved above ground of the two and,apart from the actual lock gates which have long since gone, still contains all the principal architectural elements and are clearly visible. The upper lock has largely been filled in but below ground there is probably much buried archaeology. We have not surveyed the above ground remains yet but an initial visit shows that a number of interesting features survive.</p>	Please see no27 above. Thank you for this information	The information should be referred to in para 8.05.
		<p>After the closure of the navigation the upper ends of the locks were closed by a brick walls containing sluices so that water could still be directed through the former lock chambers when the need arose (perhaps when water levels were very high). The majority of the Foss Navigation locks have this feature but the wall at Strensall upper lock is particularly interesting because it still houses the intact winding gear for the sluice gate. Near the lock was a landing on the Navigation where goods were loaded and unloaded, beyond its site to the west is the surviving late eighteenth century road bridge(from Sheriff Hutton) built by John Carr. Beyond again are the remnants of the former tannery. These features thus combine to make an interesting archaeological area. Above Strensall near Warbutts is a staircase lock (comprising two locks with one built immediately up-slope of its companion) constructed in the very early nineteenth century.</p>	Please see no27 above. Thank you for this information	Please see no27 above. Also refer to River Foss Society in para 8.05 Strensall CAA.
		<p>At this point the navigation ceased to follow the River Foss, and became a canal-like structure to Sheriff Hutton Bridge thereby avoiding the need to follow a massive and long bend in the route of the Foss. In other words the canal cut off the bend by being constructed across the latter's neck. The staircase (or double) lock took the the waterway up out of the flood plain and on to the top of the terrace above. We have not visited this part yet but from walking along the near-by footpath, it is clear that substantial remains survive of the double lock in what is now a private garden. This is the only lock of this type on the whole of the Foss Navigation. I trust the above is of interest</p>	Please see no27 above. Thank you for this information	See no27 point 2 above. Also document should give reference to work of River Foss Society in para 8.05 if the society agrees (Strensall CAA).
Member of Public	31	<p>Conservation area C and C1 I would like to add my support to the retention of and/or extension to the present conservation areas as outlined by the City of York Council in their leaflet published by the City Strategy Directorate in December 2010. In particular to the C1 extension along Princess Road/Moor Lane highlighting the importance of some of the properties and their relevance to the historic development of the railways in and around York. Many good buildings relevant to the railways have been allowed to be demolished and the land redeveloped in an unsympathetic way losing the visible and "walking" history of the development of our village. This should not be allowed to happen further and the extension of the conservation area should help to support that view.</p>	Noted	No change

		<p>COMMENTS FROM LOCAL INFORMATION SESSION 11/01/11 ~25 attendees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Definitly need to survey the village trees with a view to TPOs where necessary to preserve the village landscape. - Correct boundaries. - Agree with Princess Road extension/ Moor Lane. - Agree with Southlands Road extension. - Protect the trees within and adjoining the conservation area. - Retain the open space/ protect the openness between Southlands Road and the railway line. - Should the south side of Southlands Road also be included as it is a similar style of housing? - New area along Lord's Moor Lane from the golf club to the cattle grid at Moorside Caravan Park; lovely setting of established oak trees on each side, forms setting for SSSI Common, rural splendour (SEE MAP FROM EVENT). - Is it in the Parish's interest to pursue article 4 directions? - How will future management suggestions be implemented? - Listing of Strensall New Bridge (known locally as 'Humpy Bridge'), who will pay for maintainance, it is being damaged by self seeding ashes. - Extension A2 was previously proposed to be the site of a new railway station. 	<p>Several points noted. Works to trees within the conservation require notice. Southlands Road has been included as it marks the historic back lane of the village. Part of the land between here and the railway line is a SINC and the wider open area is designated as greenbelt - see no3 & no23 above. Article 4 Directions can be used to prevent incremental loss of some special features which currently fall outside planning control. They should be subject to public consultation to assess strength of support. Some management suggestions (eg signage, shop-fronts) would be controlled through the development application process and others in liaison with Highways (eg street lighting). Bridges are usually looked after by CYC Highway Engineers. Please see no20 for info re potential station</p>	<p>DCSD to consider tree survey for village and its setting. para 11.06 added re trees at Strensall New Bridge (see no27 above).</p>
Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council 08/02/2011	32	<p>The Parish Council considered the spreadsheet from City of York Council containing comments from members of the public and outside bodies on the three draft Appraisals and was heartened to note that the overwhelming response was positive. It is hoped that where action is needed, this will be taken.</p> <p>Of particular mention, comment 13, the suggestion for inclusion of the canal locks on The River Foss to be given Listed Status associated with Strensall New Bridge, but concerns were expressed about how this can be processed.</p>	Noted	The Local Authority will refer the matter of the canal locks to English Heritage. Please see 13 & 27 above.
		<p>The Parish Council would appreciate guidance on the procedures involved in Article 4 direction and enforcement as indicated in Comment 2 by the Conservation Area Advisory Panel. This issue was raised by members of the Parish Council, specifically about protecting the coal cells in the old Station Yard, now the property of Network Rail and, it is understood has been recently leased to a rail property maintenance contractor. However, Article 4 direction has a wider context and your views on extending such direction to cover each entire Conservation Area, is sought.</p>	Noted	An explanatory leaflet should be prepared to explain Article 4 directions and procedures, though this action has not yet been prioritized within the Design Conservation and Sustainable Development (DCSD) work programme. Network Rail will be contacted directly about the coal cells so their leasee can be advised.
		<p>Your views are also requested on the maintenance of the conservation area to ensure their preservation in the future.</p>	Normally a Managemnt Plan is prepared by the LA but current resources do not allow for such a comprehensive approach.	The relevant departments will be made aware of the management suggestions though.
		<p>The entire Appraisal process has proceeded very smoothly and the Appraisals themselves were conducted and delivered in a thoroughly professional manner. Can we assume that after formal approval by City of York Council, those residents who will then find themselves within the expanded boundaries of the Conservation Areas will be notified and the implications of the change drawn to their attention?</p>	We will distribute a copy of our 'A practical guide to living within a Conservation Area for householders' leaflet with a letter/ plan to those within the new extensions.	