

**Daventry District Council**

**Harlestone Conservation Area  
Appraisal and Management Plan  
Supplementary Planning Document**

**Statement of Consultation**

**Adopted July 2017**



## Introduction

This report sets out the consultation undertaken on the Harlestone Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). This report is required by regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012.

At its meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> March 2017 the Council's Strategy Group resolved that consultation could take place on the document.

## Consultation

Consultation commenced on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2017. Developers, Parish Councils, other consultees and local residents who had asked to be so, were notified.

## Publicity

The draft SPD could be accessed from the Planning Policy and Consultation pages of the Daventry District Council Website.

Copies were available in libraries as well as the Council Offices at Lodge Road, Daventry.

The Council placed a notice on the Council's website, a copy of which is included at Appendix A.

## Consultation Period

Consultation took place with organisations referenced above and local residents on the document for a period of 6 weeks until 5.00pm on the Monday 24<sup>th</sup> April 2017.

## Comments received.

Responses were received, some via letter or email and some via a questionnaire. These are set out in appendix B.

## Consideration of Responses

The Council carefully considered all of the comments received. A number of changes were made to the document as a result of these responses. These changes are set out in appendix B.

The representations were reported to the Council's Strategy Group on 6<sup>th</sup> July 2017 followed by Full Council on 27<sup>th</sup> July 2017 when the document was adopted.

## Appendix A

### **Harlestone Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan**

#### **Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012**

#### **Regulation 12, 13 and 35 – Consultation Statement regarding Supplementary Planning Document**

Daventry District Council is consulting on a Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan for Harlestone. The document will, when adopted, provide advice on the special architectural and historic significance of the conservation area and will supplement the saved policies from the Daventry District Local Plan and the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

The Council hereby welcomes comments from any interested party on the document. The document will be available during the consultation period for inspection at Daventry District Council, Lodge Road, Daventry and the libraries at Brixworth, Daventry, Long Buckby, Moulton and Woodford Halse during normal opening hours.

A copy will also be available on the Council's website:

<https://www.daventrydc.gov.uk/ConservationAreas>

The consultation commences on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2017 and closes at 5pm on Monday 24<sup>th</sup> April 2017.

Comments in writing should be forwarded to Rhian Morgan, Heritage Policy Officer, Daventry District Council, Lodge Road, Daventry, Northamptonshire, NN11 4FP or e-mail [heritage@daventrydc.gov.uk](mailto:heritage@daventrydc.gov.uk) by **5pm on Monday 24<sup>th</sup> April 2017** at the latest.

Comments cannot be accepted after this time.

Rhian Morgan  
Heritage Policy Officer

## Appendix B Schedule of Comments, Agreed Responses and Actions

Comments made via letter or email

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b> Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
Northampton Golf Club Company Limited	<p>Firstly may we begin by thanking Sasha and Rhian for meeting with Barry Randall of Northampton Golf Club (NGC) and me to discuss the possible implications for the golf course to be included in the proposed new Conservation Area. Indeed the whole experience has been very enlightening as neither NGC nor the landowner of the property. Northampton Golf Club Company Limited (NGC Co Ltd), had any idea that part of our land was already included in the existing Conservation area.</p> <p>Regarding this information we thank you for enquiring further as to how and when the clubhouse, Ha-Ha and dam were included in the currently designated conservation area and we are</p>	<p>Comments welcomed</p> <p>There is and was no requirement to consult directly with landowners regarding a conservation area designation. The</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b> Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
	<p>subsequently concerned of your findings especially given the impact such decisions may have on a business. We therefore feel we need to query the legitimacy of allocating this area in a conservation area without direct consultation with the landowner or tenant of the land concerned. Please confirm if under legislation such a decision is therefore valid and if really this new proposal should also include this area as well?</p> <p>That said and concentrating on the new area proposed, then both NGC Co Ltd and NGC have had very long discussions relating to the impact this will have on both parties. I know that NGC have written to you directly and in addition to this please see below the position of NGC Co Ltd.</p>	<p>necessary procedures were followed, and the timescale within which any legal challenge could have been pursued has long since passed, therefore the existing boundary is legitimate.</p> <p>The current review process has complied with current legislation, policy and guidance.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No change</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b> Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
	<p>Before we go into our findings we would like to state the following as we feel it is very important such facts are taken into account before any decision is made.</p> <p>Firstly the land bought from the Althorp Estate stipulates that NGC Co Ltd can only use it for a high quality golf course for NGC.</p> <p>Secondly, NGC Co Ltd's main objective is to provide a golf course and facilities for NGC.</p> <p>Thirdly since the land has been developed as a golf course some 29 years ago, NGC has received positive feedback from villages and visitors alike of how the course has been so well landscaped and cultivated into the existing condition and appearance. This obviously has been achieved with NGC and NGC Co Ltd currently working within the current legislation.</p>	Comments noted.	No change

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b> Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
	<p>Currently there is a formal legal lease between NGC and NGC Co Ltd so any change to the land designation would undoubtedly incur additional costs and Indeed agreement from both parties to accommodate such a change. In the very competitive market place that NGC operates such unnecessary costs and indeed the additional costs incurred in the operational costs required in the day to day running of the club in complying with Conservation legislation would have a financial impact to its ability to compete. This would have a detrimental affect on its members and its business in attracting golfers and visitors to the club.</p> <p>We therefore hope that the deciding body understand that it is of paramount importance that both entities can retain their dynamism, ability to develop and</p>	<p>Planning permission may need to be sought for processes undertaken by NGC, irrespective of the conservation area designation.</p> <p>There are no fees required for planning applications for listed buildings or to works to trees in conservation areas or Tree Preservation Orders.</p> <p>Comments noted, the designation as a conservation does not stop change, its purpose is to</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b> Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
	<p>change, and to react as the market dictates and that to put more protocol and restrictions in the business would hinder this and indeed possibly question the whole viability of running a successful golf business in the area.</p> <p>Please remember that as a business we already have to finance expenditure that isn't associated directly in the running of a golf course such as compliance to the Reservoirs Act, the Environmental Agency and other bodies outside our control. We accept that such costs are a necessity for the safety of the environment, buildings and people but would not want to incur more costs especially as our main asset ie the golf course is by its own existence of paramount importance to us to maintain and develop it thus improving the situation for all concerned without the</p>	<p>ensure that any change is appropriate in the context of the historic interest in the area.</p> <p>Comments noted</p>	<p>No change</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b> Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
	<p>necessity of more legislation to govern it.</p> <p>At present we believe the whole relationship works well between NGC Co Ltd, NGC and village community with NGC social membership for villagers free and hence for their enjoyment of what the club has to offer.</p> <p>Taking all the above into account and the answers provided by yourselves where possible, then we would like you to reconsider the inclusion of the golf course land in the new conservation area and omit it from the final plans. We appreciate the pressure DDC must be under and can understand why we are still awaiting answers to some questions and indeed contact from others but feel we have had more than enough feedback to come to this decision.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>The justification for the extent of the proposed boundary is outlined in the appraisal. It is appreciated that whilst there is no charge for applications to listed buildings or works to trees within a conservation area, applications can incur some costs and time implications. These costs have to be balanced against the benefits of conservation</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Agreed response	Agreed action Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
	<p>With all the above we hope that Daventry District Council will take our concerns very seriously in determining the outcome for this proposal and indeed omit the golf course land from the new Conservation area.</p> <p>If more dialogue regarding this would be deemed favourable to come to a decision then please feel free to contact me on behalf of NGC Co Ltd and Barry on behalf of NGC.</p>	<p>area designation.</p> <p>See above response.</p> <p>Comments noted</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
Northampton Golf Club	Further to the receipt of the Harlestone Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan Proposal, and along with our subsequent meeting on Tuesday 21st March 2017 to understand in more detail, I would like to advise that this has	Comments noted	No change

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b> Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
	<p>now been discussed in great depth by both the Management Committee of Northampton Golf Club and the landowners, Northampton Golf Club Company Limited.</p> <p>We are both now in full agreement that we will be objecting to any inclusion of the Golf Club, in its entirety, under the provision that any restrictions put in place could severely affect our operating procedures to function and remain as an established Golf Club for the Members and Visitors of Northampton Golf Club.</p> <p>We have been trading as a Golf Club since 1893 and have firmly cemented our position as part of the local community when we relocated to our current location at Harlestone in 1990 for the provision and longevity of golf for many years to come.</p>	<p>See above response to NGC Ltd regarding the objection to the inclusion of the golf club land.</p> <p>Comments noted</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b> Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
	<p>Unfortunately, after looking at the correspondence and information supplied by you, we feel that the obligations and restrictions that would be imposed on us by the proposal could greatly affect our day to day operations and decision making along with our progression in an industry that has a significant amount of fierce local, regional and national competition</p> <p>.</p> <p>As a Private Members Club, I can assure you that we are here for the long term and our Constitutional set up and Code of Practice is to ensure that golf is continually played at the site of Harlestone for many years to come whilst keeping the natural beauty and</p>	<p>Conservation area designation is used as guidance for determining planning applications, based on the assessed architectural and historic interest of the designated area. This designation must be fit for purpose for the future taking into account the possibility for local business to change.</p> <p>As suggested in our correspondence, the early agreement of a Tree Management Plan with DDC which takes the proposed conservation area designation into account</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b> Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
	<p>environment that we know well managed and maintained as it has done for the past 27 years since our relocation.</p> <p>I would request that you please accept this letter as our official notification of an objection to the proposal and if there is anything further you wish from us on the matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	<p>would be expedient to the workings of NGC.</p> <p>Comments noted. Please see above response.</p>	<p>No change</p>
Helen Donald	<p>I agree with all your proposals listed in the Appraisal Document for Harlestone whole heartedly.</p> <p>The only additions I would suggest would be to include the field Known as Switzerland opposite the ten cottages in Upper Harlestone, because of its undulating geomorphology as this would also act as a buffer to the 2,500 new homes planned, just down the road at Port Road.</p>	<p>Comments welcomed</p> <p>The proposed conservation area boundary has been drawn taking into account the historic parkland boundary. The NPPF and Historic England guidance both stress the necessity to ensure designation is</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Agreed response	Agreed action
	<p>Also in Lower Harlestone the site of the old Mill and Farm House which also add historical interest as Mill Farm was built in 1861, should be included in the conservation area.</p> <p>Would it be possible to include the boundary of Upper Harlestone to be extended from Vera Lows up to Cottherstone lodge which is a building of historical interest and the undulating field leading up to it.?</p>	<p>justified based on architectural and historic interest. The land referred to does not satisfy this requirement. The setting of heritage assets, including conservation areas, is protected under policy BN5 of the West Northants Joint Core Strategy.</p> <p>Agreed that the mill and farmhouse are recognised as having historic interest with reference to the development of the village.</p> <p>The boundary line in Upper Harlestone has been drawn with respect to the historic former Harlestone Park boundary. It is recognised</p>	<p>Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u></p> <p>Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version</p> <p>The conservation area boundary will be drawn to include the site of the old Mill and Farm House.</p> <p>No change</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Agreed response	Agreed action
	<p>Would hate to see any sign of kerb stones or street lights as we haven't got any and this would ruin the rural feel of this very special scenery.</p>	<p>that Cotherstone Lodge has architectural merit and associated historic interest, however, it is listed at grade II and protected under this separate designation. The setting of the listed building and the conservation area are afforded protection under legislation and the West Northants Joint Core Strategy Policy BN5.</p> <p>The impact of highways work is noted in the Management Plan, and the rural setting is recognised in the Appraisal. Works to highways and lighting do not fall within the remit of DDC but are the responsibility of the</p>	<p>Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u></p> <p>Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version</p> <p>No change</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b> Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
	The report you have written is excellent in all ways.	Highways Authority.  Comments welcomed	No change
Historic England	While we do not provide detailed advice on every appraisal due to resource implications, if there are specific issues that would merit our closer involvement on this occasion, please advise us of this. The policy considerations relating to conservation area designation and appraisal are dealt with extensively in the NPPF and its associated guidance. For general advice, our publication Understanding Place: Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management is available online from our website.	Comments noted. The guidance referred to has been taken into account in preparing the Conservation Area proposals.	No change
Jenny Cross	With the official consultation period coming to a close, there has been much discussion amongst villagers as to the final outline to be chosen for the	Comments noted	No change.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b> Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
	<p>Harlestone Conservation Area.</p> <p>When it comes to putting pen to paper, I know people can be reluctant to put their views forward.</p> <p>Much of the discussion has centred around the possible inclusion of another 2 or even 3 fields on the Duston side of Port Road. This would further protect the views into the village but much more importantly the views out of the village from the high ground. In particular, when you walk along the footpath (CU12) from the notice board on Port Road across to the Institute, if you look to the right across the roof tops of 10 cottages, the field opposite (not currently included) forms an import backdrop. Likewise, the view towards the south/south west horizon from the Golf Clubhouse is currently entirely rural and may need even greater</p>	<p>Conservation area designation is tightly controlled by national policy and guidance. The designation is not an appropriate method of protecting open spaces with no direct historic merit. No historic interest in the fields referred to has been identified, therefore, it is not appropriate to include them in the designation. The setting of heritage assets is protected under Policy BN5 of the West Northants Joint</p>	<p>No change</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b> Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
	<p>protection than that given by the proposed boundary.</p> <p>We don't want to be greedy but it may be worth re-visiting this particular area.</p> <p>The fields in question are SP 6963 7747 Hopewells butting up to Workhouse Bank on the left of Port Road and on the right hand side - Switzerland/Sandpit Close farmed by Ivor Caswell which rolls down to the road by 10 cottages. To complete that "cushion" of land it would also be worth considering inclusion of Wheathill Close behind Swedish Houses. For some historical context I have included an extract of Barry Smith's reply to my quest for accurate field names. (I love reading these anecdotes which will all be lost in the course of time).</p> <p>I haven't completed the on line survey as</p>	<p>Core Strategy.</p> <p>See above.</p> <p>Comments noted</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Agreed response	Agreed action
	<p>I have more than had my say but I am happy to do so if you need it for your records - let me know please.</p> <p>That said, I do feel that Article 4 direction would only be a good thing to beef up existing measures contained in your appraisal, particularly as this may have to be fit for purpose for the next 20 years.</p>	Comments welcomed	<p>Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del></p> <p>Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u></p> <p>Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version</p> <p>No change</p>
Northampton County Council, Archaeological Advisor	<p>Thank you for consulting NCC on the above appraisal.</p> <p>The Historical Development section is generally good as far as it goes though I do think it would be a good idea to include in 6.3.1 some information on the large Iron Age site identified at the quarry on the southern edge of Lower Harlestone. This was a significant site excavated over a number of years in advance of quarrying and included a pit alignment, a landscape feature usually thought to date</p>	Comments noted. It is agreed that this information is important to the historical development and interest of the conservation area and wording will be included to reflect it as such.	<p>Additional wording, Section “6.3.1 Pre-history and Roman” immediately after Fig.6:</p> <p><u>“An Iron-age site has been identified at the quarry site on the southern edge of Lower Harlestone, with possible evidence of landscape features dating from the late Bronze Age. This is evidence of the long term occupation of the area, and enhances its historic</u></p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Agreed response	Agreed action
	<p>to the late Bronze Age or early Iron Age. The report is available via the Historic Environment Record.</p> <p>I also noticed that there seems to be a little confusion over the dates of the historic maps (Figs. 4 and 5). The text refers to a map of 1919 but the two illustrated are from 1829 and 1899 so this might need checking.</p> <p>There is a small error on p10 in the section headed “Existing Boundary Definition”, in the third paragraph there is a reference to the “damn bridge” which should presumably be “dam”.</p> <p>The other thing which I would mention is that in other districts, especially in South Northants, we have an agreed wording for the management plan which specifically covers the potential for development to have an impact on archaeological remains. This allows us to have a defined action within the management plan, and I would suggest wording along the lines of:</p>	<p>Thank you for pointing this out. The reference to 1919 should have said 1899. This will be corrected.</p> <p>Thank you for pointing this out. This will be corrected.</p> <p>Agreed that it would be helpful to include this suggested additional threat</p>	<p>Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u></p> <p>Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version</p> <p><u>interest.”</u></p> <p>Page 8 Section 6.1 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph Replace <del>1919</del> with <u>1899</u></p> <p>Page 10 Replace ‘<del>damn</del>’ with ‘<u>dam</u>’</p> <p>Include additional threat and recommendation in section 10 as follows: <u>Threat 7: Impact on Archaeology Upper and Lower Harlestone have been inhabited for many centuries and buried evidence for past occupation may survive within the modern</u></p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Agreed response	Agreed action
	<p>'Threat: Upper and Lower Harlestone have been inhabited for many centuries and buried evidence for past occupation may survive within the modern settlements. Development proposals have the potential to have a detrimental impact on these remains.</p> <p>Recommendation: Development which involves below ground excavation should have regard to the potential for remains of archaeological interest. Professional advice should be sought, and appropriate assessment undertaken.</p> <p>I hope that these comments are helpful.</p>		<p>Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del></p> <p>Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u></p> <p>Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version</p> <p><u>settlements. Development proposals have the potential to have a detrimental impact on these remains.</u></p> <p><u>Recommendation 7:</u></p> <p><u>Development which involves below ground excavation should have regard to the potential for remains of archaeological interest. Professional advice should be sought, and appropriate assessment undertaken.</u></p>
Althorp Parish Council	Object to the inclusion of Corner plantation in the Conservation Area. This area is within Althorp's historic parkland, within Althorp parish, and is enclosed by the park wall.	Comments noted. This area was included for fullness regarding the tree belts which contribute to the setting of Harlestone. However, as this land more naturally relates to Althorp it will be removed from this assessment. It may be	Re-draw the boundary at Fig.61 page 43 along the Harlestone parish boundary and Althorp boundary wall so as not to include the three corner plantation.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b> Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
		considered as part of an assessment of Althorp in the future.	
Gary Slinn	<p>I am in full agreement with the proposals and welcome the additional area. I live at The Quarries of Quarry Farm as you call it in the document. The House was actually built to house the Quarry manager and later used as a farm house as the quarry ceased production in the 1920's</p> <p>One point that I would like to raise is the ongoing quarrying operations currently have a big impact on the landscape with the restoration works. At one meeting the councillors themselves stated there distaste for the massive overfilling at the site near to the Garden centre. The area currently being restored which borders the newly designated area is</p>	<p>Comments welcomed</p> <p>Comments noted, the matters raised are for the County Council as Minerals and Waste Planning Authority and not the Conservation Area appraisal.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b> Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
	<p>once again being used to overfill for purely financial gain in my opinion with detriment to the landscape.</p> <p>You used to be able to walk along New Road towards Upper Harlestone and view the landscape for quite a distance over towards Duston. This is no longer possible as they have restored the ground levels to more than 2.5metres in height over the original levels.</p> <p>It was stated this was to aid drainage for new tree planting and using a ridge and furrow method. I have never seen a ridge and furrow used to this degree before in any agricultural landscape. Plus the fact there is already a good natural fall in the land towards a natural stream. This is why previously you had a good view. Too late for this piece of land but if the 2nd Phase is applied for again bordering the newly proposed Conservation area I would like to see a lot more consideration</p>		

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b> Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
	<p>to the overall affect on the natural landscape than has been given in the past.</p> <p>I hope that the granting of this newly created Conservation area would give the adjacent landscape some added protection.</p> <p>If you are out this way any time I would be happy to show you the changes to date and the effects</p>		
Anthony and Suzanne Banner	<p>We are residents of Upper Harlestone and have read with interest the Conservation Area Consultation Document which we found very informative and well structured. We both wholeheartedly support the application for Conservation Area Status for Upper Harlestone.</p> <p>We are most concerned by the proposed mass development proposed between Duston and our village. The potential increase in traffic through our village must</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The management plan recognises that traffic is a potential threat to the fabric</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b> Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
	be addressed and stopped both from a point of view of road safety and the damage that increased traffic would cause to many of the old sandstone houses in the village many of which front straight on to the road. Closing Port Road through Upper Harlestone would be an answer to this problem and is on that should be considered very carefully. The views, buildings and tranquility of our village should all be fiercely protected. We look forward to hearing further from you on the progress of this matter.	and setting of the conservation area. The transport implications of the future development (of the site allocated in the Joint Core Strategy) is a matter that will be addressed as part of the consideration of any future planning application, which will itself be subject to consultation. As part of this, the Council will take account of the views of the County Council as highway authority.	
Susie Holland	I would like to thank you for all the hard work you have done in helping to preserve our village and for all your helpful guidance at the meeting on 4th April, you were most informative.	Comments welcomed	No change

Respondent	Summary of comments	Agreed response	Agreed action Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
	<p>I am writing to ask if restricted access could be created on Port Road allowing access for farm vehicles etc., horses and traps, walkers and cyclists, but preventing car traffic from the new development coming through Upper Harlestone. I would like this to be considered as the bend on Chapel Corner is quite dangerous at present and if there is increased traffic it will become even worse and the noise and pollution will spoil the tranquil setting that the village currently enjoys.</p> <p>I would also ask if the field, known as Switzerland is included within the conservation boundary that you have proposed. This would ensure that no new build is undertaken overlooking 10 Cottages and I believe it was part of the quarry at one time.</p>	<p>See response above</p> <p>See response above</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
Althorp Estate -	We would respond formally to the	Comments noted.	No change

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b> Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
response dated 14 <sup>th</sup> March	<p>consultation with our suggestions below. We will further comment on the proposal that has been put forward which we believe is excessive as it takes in Agricultural Farmland and Forestry Plantations.</p> <p>We would, therefore, on behalf of the Althorp Estate put forward the following:</p> <p>Harlestone has historically been one of the villages associated with the Estate. Many properties were built by the Estate or were owned by the Estate. Part of the reason Harlestone remains unspoilt is because of the Estate's influence over the last 500 years.</p> <p>The Estate continues to exert a modicum of control through the use of restrictive covenants. The Estate has to act reasonably and therefore, defers to the planning authority on planning issues, generally. Notwithstanding this, simple measures such as maintaining traditional paint colours are enforced.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The role of the estate in helping to maintain the character of the estate is recognised.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b> Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
	<p>Many of the buildings in Harlestone have listed building status, in any event, which gives them greater protection than being in a conservation area.</p> <p>The reason behind conservation areas is they are designated for their special architectural and historical interest and as such, agricultural land and woodland should not be caught up within these areas.</p>	<p>It is accepted that agricultural land and woodland are governed under separate planning controls. In line with Historic England guidance, the areas within the proposed designation which are currently used for agricultural land are included because of their contribution to the character of the conservation area, particularly with reference to key views and their potential to yield archaeology.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Agreed response	Agreed action
	<p>Conservation areas carry with them a greater degree of regulation, i.e. consent is required for demolition, building and extensions are under a greater regulation and trees within conservation areas, by way of a generality, have greater protection. It, therefore, follows that there is greater cost in administering buildings and property within a conservation area.</p> <p>Various reports have concluded that property in conservation areas has a higher capital value and no doubt, whilst this is important to householders who own their own property, the Estate is a long-term landowner and value is not an issue. On the other hand, research shows there is no distinguishable difference in rents for property in or out of a conservation area.</p> <p>As a generalisation, the Estate is against large conservation areas as it gives no</p>	<p>Noted. No fee is required for a Listed Building application, however it is accepted that there are costs of preparing an application and time involved in this. This has to be balanced against the benefits of conservation area designation.</p> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u></p> <p>Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Agreed response	Agreed action Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
	<p>benefit. Notwithstanding that, it recognizes the Parish and District Councils and locals wish to review the Harlestone Conservation Area.</p> <p>As you appreciate, Harlestone itself is quite spread out with pockets of old and newer residential property and the creation of one large conservation area would, in the Estate's view, be unwieldy as this would encompass too much agricultural land and woodland.</p> <p>The Lower Harlestone Conservation Area is well thought out and works and it is difficult to see how this can logically be extended as any extension would take in "new build" and already listed properties. The area as per Plan I should remain</p> <p>Our suggestion is that in addition to the Lower Harlestone Conservation Area, there should be an Upper Harlestone Conservation Area which runs from the Dovecote and Dovecote Laundry through</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comments in respect of Lower Harlestone noted. The case for extending this to include Upper Harlestone are set out in the appraisal.</p> <p>The support for a designation at Upper</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b> Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
	<p>Yew Tree Farm and through Rock Farm as per the attached Plan 2.</p> <p>Those buildings which have significant architectural interest, such as Park Farm and The Post Office, are of course, listed and as such, the protection already exists.</p> <p>You will be aware that the Estate has put forward Representations in Daventry District Council's "call for sites" in respect of the Builders Yard. We see this as a development site for residential use in the medium term, which would give a small amount of organic growth for the village of Harlestone in its centre. This is a mismatch of modern buildings and traditional ones that do not warrant being in a Conservation Area.</p>	<p>Harlestone is welcomed.</p> <p>The case for the conservation area including both Upper and Lower Harlestone, rather than two separate designations is set out in the appraisal.</p> <p>Noted – this is matter for the part 2 plan.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>Althorp Estate - response dated 20<sup>th</sup> March</p>	<p>Firstly, the Althorp Estate supports the principle of a conservation area that covers Upper Harlestone.</p> <p>We do, however, believe that the</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b> Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
	<p>proposed size of the draft area is rather excessive and disregards farming and forestry and the protection this land has under Planning Legislation.</p> <p>We are, therefore, concerned that the sheer size of the area encompassing, as it does, working and productive farmland and working woodland plantations, might lessen the overall essential quality of what you, as a Planning Authority, are trying to conserve.</p> <p>Please bear this in mind with particular respect to rural employment opportunities and the need for all communities to embrace change.</p> <p>We fully understand the beauty of this area (conserved, in particular, by the Estate); however, the locality cannot purely be a museum piece.</p> <p>Furthermore, the area includes listed buildings that already have greater protection than the Conservation Area</p>	<p>Comments noted. The case for designation as a conservation is set out in the appraisal</p> <p>Noted. The areas proposed for inclusion are all considered to be important elements of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Agreed response	Agreed action Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
	<p>gives.</p> <p>We understand the concept of wishing to include Harlestone Park, and which principally covers the golf course land, as it was formerly historic parkland.</p> <p>However, please note our comments because as custodians of this rural estate we are trying to ensure an appropriate balance between employment, agricultural and estate uses together with appropriate limited new employment and limited new residential uses.</p> <p>Therefore, we are somewhat concerned that the extensive proposed spatial definition of a very large conservation area might in the areas noted be inappropriate - hence our comments made.</p> <p>The Golf Club course is technically brown field land and its inclusion is completely understood. We believe the following areas should be removed/ reconsidered</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Agreed response	Agreed action
	<p>for removal as per the attached plan for the reasons given below:-</p> <p><b>A)</b> This is <u>agricultural land</u>, and not part of the historic Harlestone parkland as detailed in Figure 5 in the appraisal. This agricultural Land has no areas of special architecture or historic interest and therefore, should be excluded. Farmland has adequate protection under respective open countryside Planning Legislation.</p>	<p>a) The boundary edge is drawn using the historic turnpike road as its limit. This incorporates the fields directly to its west which form an integral part of the views of Lower Harlestone village and the former parkland. These fields lie closely to the prehistoric Scheduled Ancient Monument to the east of the village and HER records indicate the presence of prehistoric remains within the north portion of the area</p>	<p>Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u></p> <p>Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version</p> <p>No change</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Agreed response	Agreed action Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
	<p><b>B)</b> These are the Ten Cottages, all of which are listed Grade II which identifies them as having architectural, and historic interest, and gives them greater protection in any event than being in a Conservation Area.</p>	<p>shown as “a)”. They have therefore been included for their potential to yield important archaeology.</p> <p>b) High numbers of designated assets within an area is cited by Historic England as part of the justification for designating an area as a conservation area.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Agreed response	Agreed action
	<p><b>C)</b> These are forestry plantations, some of which is located on former quarry Land there are 4 residential properties, together with some agricultural land.</p> <p>The Forestry Plantations are in the Estate Woodland Management Plan agreed and endorsed by the Forestry Commission; this was agreed in 2015. It covers a 20 year period until 2035. (Daventry District Council will have been consulted by the Forestry Commission when the plan was prepared.) The Estate Woodland has always been in a series of Forestry Commission plans for management purposes.</p> <p>The onus of the management of Trees in a Conservation Area is on a tree by tree basis, whereas Forestry Management is on a Plantation basis. The two management techniques are</p>	<p>c) These plantations appear on historic maps and are directly associated with the historic parkland estates of Althorp and Harlestone. They contribute directly to the character and setting of the conservation area. The quarry landscape is evidence of the ongoing history of Harlestone, the development of which is directly linked to the quarrying industry.</p>	<p>Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u></p> <p>Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version</p> <p>No change</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Agreed response	Agreed action Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
	<p>incompatible. Woodland is heavily protected in planning terms in any event, and as such these Woodland areas in our view need to be removed.</p> <p>Some of the forestry land is former quarry and therefore, has no historic landscape value.</p> <p>The Appraisal under '10. Management Plan' (Point 10.6), we would comment the Althorp Estate have been long term land owners in the area for over 500 years. Many of the plantations and the trees in the district have been established by the Estate. The Estate Woodlands have been, and currently are, in a comprehensive long term Forestry Commission Management Plan.</p> <p>For the reasons in A) above the Agricultural land should not be included.</p> <p>With regard to the residential Properties, the Appraisal makes mention of 'The Pheasantry' and whilst this is of interest, it</p>	Comments welcomed.	No change

Respondent	Summary of comments	Agreed response	Agreed action
	<p>is not listed; should you deem it worthy of Listing it is unlikely that the Estate would object</p> <p><b>D)</b> This is an area of Woodland, Agricultural land, Playing Fields and listed Buildings plus two other Residential Properties. The Woodland is in the Estate's Forestry Conservation Management plan and for the reasons explained earlier, should not be included Likewise the Agricultural Land. Park Farm House is listed and has greater protection than being in a mere conservation area. The Playing Fields are leased on a 20 year lease to the Parish Council; they have the right of extension under Landlord and Tenancy Act 1954.</p>	<p>d) For reasons explained above, the trees in this area directly contribute to the character and setting of the area. Equally, the presence of listed buildings enhances the architectural and historic interest on which conservation area designation is justified. The playing fields are equally significant for their historic link to the Althorp estate and their contribution to the character of the landscape. The former</p>	<p>Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u></p> <p>Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version</p> <p>No change</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Agreed response	Agreed action
	<p><b>E) F) and G)</b> these are odd areas of agricultural land that should be excluded for the reasons given in (A) above.</p> <p>In particular, "E" is a tongue of land that does not fit with the rest, the land at a Lower Level being former quarry to the surroundings.</p>	<p>brick kiln, although in disrepair, directly contributes to the historic interest of the settlement.</p> <p>E), F), and G) E has been included in the designation for the positive contribution the former small-scale quarry wall makes to the historical interest of the settlement. F) and G) have been included in the designation for several reasons; as important pieces of green space across which important views of clustered buildings may be seen; the appreciation of the</p>	<p>Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u></p> <p>Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version</p> <p>No change</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Agreed response	Agreed action
	<p>H) This is the Estate Yard with a mismatch of modern and traditional buildings, with no historic or Architectural significance and the Estate has promoted this for some appropriate development in response to the Daventry District Council and there has been informal tacit support</p>	<p>topography which contributes to the character of the conservation area; in order to efficiently manage and maintain the quality of the designation as a coherent whole.</p> <p>H) the estate yard continues to perform a vital local function, in line with its historic usage. The buildings contribute to the rural character of the village, and are clustered between a collection of listed properties. The presence of the conservation area designation does not preclude new development,</p>	<p>Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u></p> <p>Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version</p> <p>No change</p>

Respondent	Summary of comments	Agreed response	Agreed action
	<p>from members of the Parish Council.</p> <p><b>l)</b> This is a block of Woodland. This Woodland is encompassed by the Park Walt and within Althorp Park and part of Althorp Park. It is also within Althorp Parish.</p>	<p>and planning applications will be judged individually having regard to both local and national policy.</p> <p>Comments noted. As noted above, this land was incorporated into the proposed designation owing to the contribution of the historic plantation. This plantation is included within the grade II* Registered Park and Garden of Althorp Park, which is given protection under local and national policy. As this land more naturally relates to Althorp it will be removed from this</p>	<p>Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u></p> <p>Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version</p> <p>Re-draw boundary at Fig. 61 on page 43 to run along Harlestone parish boundary and Althorp boundary wall in the north, such that the three corner plantation is no longer included.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b> Text proposed for deletion is <del>struckthrough</del> Proposed new text is <u>underlined</u>  Page/paragraph number refer to the consultation version
		assessment. It may be considered as part of an assessment of Althorp in the future.	

Comments made via the questionnaire

Respondent	Comments	Agreed response	Agreed action
<b>Do you agree with the proposed boundary for the conservation area?</b>			
Anton Viesel	Yes	Noted	No change
Ken Waller	No, The boundary change should also include two additional fields to the south. Fleetland field and Switzerland Field. The setting when approaching the village is of significant importance with the undulating approach from Port Road via Duston. The danger of Demonstrational damage to the setting will come from further development from SUE N4 and modern road structures. These fields are fundamental to the protection of Upper Harlestone.	Conservation area designation is tightly controlled by national policy and guidance. The designation is not an appropriate method of protecting open spaces with no direct historic merit. The setting of heritage assets is protected under Policy BN5 of the West Northants Joint Core Strategy.	No change
Martin Halsall and Maggie Walden	No, the boundary of the Northampton SUE shown at figure 3 of the consultation is not accurate. The correct boundary of the SUE extends from the field boundary immediately North of the Port Road entrance to Fleetland Farm in a North-Easterly direction taking in the fields up to and around Harlestone Heath Garden Centre and the corner of the A428 and Sandy Lane (north extension). The significance of the error in figure 3 in respect of the boundary of the SUE is that residents will not appreciate the true threat to the integrity of the villages of	Error noted. Whilst it is accepted that the boundary was not correct, the consultation regarding the conservation area boundary is not dependent on the extent of the allocation, therefore it is not considered necessary to extend the consultation. The boundary has been drawn with respect to the historic parkland boundary.	Boundary of the SUE will be corrected in the final version of the Appraisal

Respondent	Comments	Agreed response	Agreed action
	<p>Upper Harlestone and Lower Harlestone. I suggest that the figure 3 of the consultation is corrected and it is re issued and an appropriate extension of time be allowed for further comments.</p> <p>The following references accurately describe key characteristics of the village as comprising, not only views <u>into</u> the village, but equally importantly <u>views through and beyond the village to the rural landscape which surrounds it.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Joint Core Strategy paragraph 12.32, “Of particular importance is the protection of the villages of Harlestone and Harpole <b>in their countryside setting.</b>”[emphasis added]</li> <li>• References in the Consultation Draft of the Harlestone Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan:</li> </ul> <p>Spatial Summary, Page16 – “emerging views such as this are typical across the Parish”</p> <p>Spatial Summary, Page17– “Buildings nestle in closely massed groups in the contours of the landscape, creating typical glimpsed views of a variety of historic ridgelines.”</p> <p>Based on the above, <u>our comment on the proposed boundary change is that the</u></p>	<p>Conservation area designation is tightly controlled by national policy and guidance. The designation is not an appropriate method of protecting open spaces with no direct historic merit. The setting of heritage assets is protected under Policy BN5 of the West Northants Joint Core Strategy.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The designation can only</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Respondent	Comments	Agreed response	Agreed action
	<p><u>proposed boundary around Upper Harlestone is drawn too close to the houses to protect the key essential characteristics of the village. In particular, in Upper Harlestone it is drawn too close to the former Chapel, Victorian Ten Cottages and Workhouse Bank cottages.</u></p> <p>As the Consultation Draft notes, the character of the village of Upper Harlestone is under threat from housing extending West from Duston as part of the various Northampton SUE initiatives.</p> <p>To protect the characteristics of the village of Upper Harlestone, <u>we propose that the Conservation Area boundary must be re drawn in order to protect views through and beyond the village, i.e.encompassing the views to the ridgelines that are visible from the first floor of dwellings at the edge of the village.</u> The area comprising those views should be carefully surveyed and the boundary set to ensure that potential future roof ridgelines of properties sited in SUE development areas are not visible from the first floors of properties at the edge of the village of Upper Harlestone. The topography of the countryside around Upper Harlestone is such that the boundary of the proposed Conservation Area may in some places need to be contiguous with the boundary of the</p>	<p>incorporate areas which have a proven architectural or historic interest. The boundary around the south of Upper Harlestone was drawn with reference to the historic park boundary.</p>	

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b>
	potential SUE development areas.		
Russell Francis	No, The proposed boundary excludes the ancient Yew tree (reputed to be one of the oldest in the country) to the East of Yew Tree farm. This tree is in poor condition, being undermined by a rabbit warren and has self set elderberry bushes around its base. I is in need of protection or it will be lost.	Protection of a single tree does not justify extension of the boundary. Ordinarily, it might be more appropriate to place a Tree Preservation Order on it, however, it is not possible to place Tree Preservation Orders on trees if they are dead, or dying.	No change
Tim Cross	Yes, One ex council house excluded by mistake. Could the Yew tree be included near Yew Tree Farm please.	Nos. 133 and 132 Upper Harlestone have not been included in the designation as they do not meet architectural interest criteria. Nos.3, 4, 5 and 6 The Green are included for the positive contribution of their group value and setting. See above in reference to the yew tree.	No change
Elizabeth Dyball	No, as talked about at the meeting I also think the boundry line on port road should be moved back along port road towards Duston to help contain the new build that is going to head near the edge of upper harlestone.	The boundary in Upper Harlestone has been set with respect to the former parkland of Harlestone Park, and the historic built environment. It is not	No change

Respondent	Comments	Agreed response	Agreed action
		appropriate to include fields which have no historic interest. The setting of heritage assets is given protection under Policy BN5 of the West Northants Joint Core Strategy.	
Neil Mitchell	Yes	Comments welcomed.	No change
<b>Do you think this Appraisal captures the special interest of Harlestone? Please use the text box to refer to any specific features which you believe either have or have not been captured</b>			
Anton Viesel	Yes	Noted	No change
Ken Waller	<p data-bbox="495 699 1046 1066">Yes.</p> <p data-bbox="495 762 1046 1066">I agree that the golf course should be included in the conservation boundary for the reasons outlined in the document. Protection of the village from SUE N4 is insufficient as this is the overwhelming threat to the village hence my recommendation to include Fleetland field and Switzerland Field in the conservation area boundary.</p> <p data-bbox="495 1102 1046 1265">Traffic will increase and Upper Harlestone will become a rat run for vehicles and this needs to be given consideration not to destroy the fabric of the village. See recommendation 4.</p> <p data-bbox="495 1350 965 1382">All the rented houses (by the village</p>	<p data-bbox="1068 699 1442 802">Noted</p> <p data-bbox="1068 735 1368 802">Response to boundary extension above.</p> <p data-bbox="1068 967 1442 1382">The potential threat of traffic is addressed in the Management Plan. Highways matters are within the remit of the County Council as Highways Authority. Nos. 133 and 132 Upper Harlestone have not been included in the designation as they do not meet</p>	<p data-bbox="1464 699 1615 730">No change</p> <p data-bbox="1464 735 1615 767">No change</p> <p data-bbox="1464 932 1615 963">No change</p> <p data-bbox="1464 1086 1615 1118">No change</p>

Respondent	Comments	Agreed response	Agreed action
	green) in Upper Harlestone should be included within the conservation area.	architectural interest criteria. Nos.3, 4, 5 and 6 The Green are included for the positive contribution of their group value and setting.	
Martin Halsall and Maggie Walden	We agree with the identification of features comprising the special interest of Harlestone, but at times the emphasis placed on features is inconsistent or contradictory, so we disagree with some conclusions as to the proposed boundary of the Conservation Area, as follows: On Page 18 reference is made to the lower figure 13 “The distinctive loop shape of Upper Harlestone is clear, and steers its character.” However, this characteristic must not be over-emphasised to the exclusion of other characteristics as that would result in setting too small a boundary for the Conservation Area thereby missing the opportunity to protect the totality of characteristics that makes up the village. On page 19, 7.2 refer to a number of “views”. However, we take issue that many of the views and commentary (e.g. view 10) are ‘inward’ views of Upper Harlestone and in particular, we challenge	The appraisal takes note of the importance of views both within and into and out of the conservation area. It acknowledges that they are crucial to its character and setting.  Section 7.2 includes the wording: “...the overall setting of the historic villages of Harlestone is characterised by long, rural views of open landscape and heathland. The undulating line of the horizon and tree belts,	No change  No change.

Respondent	Comments	Agreed response	Agreed action
	<p>the omission from the Consultation Draft of any views towards the proposed SUE areas. This ‘inward-looking’ approach serves to limit the size of the proposed Conservation Area and risks failing to protect the full characteristics of this part of the village, namely the vital views to its rural setting situated as it is within the shelter of a natural Amphitheatre of historic ridgelines.</p> <p>Elsewhere in the Consultation Draft, there is proper appreciation that the character of the village rests to a great degree in its far-reaching views e.g. page 21, point 12 – “Retaining this strong visual distinction provided by the uninterrupted, rural views is crucial to maintaining the integrity and significance of the villages.”</p> <p>We therefore suggest part 7.2 of the Consultation Draft is revised to align with the appreciation elsewhere in the document of far-reaching rural views being one of the key characteristics of the village.</p> <p>In a similar theme, we take issue with the statement at page 38, Spatial Analysis 8.5.1, which says in relation to the Victorian Ten Cottages, Upper Harlestone, “This terrace creates a</p>	<p>discussed below, currently obscure development on the fringes of Northampton from views out of and into the village. Retaining this strong visual distinction provided by the uninterrupted, rural views in crucial to maintaining the integrity and significance of the villages.”</p> <p>Comments noted. As noted above, the boundary has been drawn with reference to the physical historic park boundary, but the appraisal acknowledges that the character of the conservation area is reliant on its setting, including the uninterrupted rural views assessed in Section 7.2.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Respondent	Comments	Agreed response	Agreed action
	<p>pleasing border to the conservation area boundary, following the historic street pattern." A focus on the "historic street pattern" serves to overlook and diminish the significance of the other characteristics of the village, in particular, the far-reaching rural views. The boundary of the proposed Conservation Area should not be set by reference to the Victorian Ten Cottage, but rather by reference to the views to the ridgelines that are visible from the first floor of dwellings at the edge of the village (as proposed in greater detail at point 5 of the Survey Form above).</p>		
Russell Francis	<p>I think that the Appraisal is very comprehensive and well thought out. However, I have one issue. It refers to the need to preserve historic walls and fences and specific mention is made of some stone walls, however, some which are under severe threat from neglect have not been mentioned. These are the wall to the quarry side of New Road and the wall that runs from the rear of Virginia Cottage up to Rock Farm. Both walls are dilapidated, overgrown with ivy, self-set saplings and weeds. They need urgent attention to save them.</p>	<p>The importance of historic walls is acknowledged in the appraisal directly at Section 7.6. Walls of a certain height within conservation areas are protected from demolition; however, their maintenance is the responsibility of the owner. Walls can be both statutorily listed and locally listed; however, in order to be placed on the local list they would need to be in</p>	No change

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b>
		good condition and visible from a public space.	
Tim Cross	OK	Noted	No change
Elizabeth Dyball	I would like a special order put on the well in the well yard Also the two cottages at the heart gates should be considered.	The pump in the well yard is already listed at grade II. Nos. 1 and 2 Heathgate Cottages have been assessed against the criteria and have met the threshold to be included on the Local List.	No change.  Add Nos.1 and 2 Heathgate Cottages to Local List for Harlestone.
Neil Mitchell	YES. The appraisal contains in clear detail an appreciation of the unique character, landscape and heritage of Harlestone.	Comments welcomed.	No change
<b>Do you agree with the candidates for the Local List (see pages 46-47 of the Appraisal)? Are there any other potential candidates which you would like to suggest? Please use the text box to identify specific candidates for the Local List, giving an address where possible.</b>			
Anton Viesel	Yes, I agree. There are no further candidates I would like to add.	Noted	No change
Ken Waller	No comment	Noted	No change
Martin Halsall and Maggie Walden	We agree with the candidates currently suggested for the Local List; however we suggest that all properties identified as “positive properties” from the Victorian era and earlier be added to the Local List.	Comments noted. Adding properties to the Local List does not increase planning controls. Those buildings nominated for the Local List have to meet criteria which sets them apart from other buildings, hence the majority of	No change

Respondent	Comments	Agreed response	Agreed action
	<p>In particular, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The Chapel in Upper Harlestone is an important reminder of the history of non-conformist worship in the history of Northamptonshire; and</li> <li>ii. The cottages comprising Workhouse Bank in Upper Harlestone are a reminder of the history of early strategies of poor relief in the County.</li> </ul>	<p>properties are unlikely to meet the threshold.</p> <p>The former Chapel in Upper Harlestone has been assessed against the Local List criteria and has met the threshold.</p> <p>Workhouse Bank in Upper Harlestone has been assessed against the Local List criteria and has met the threshold.</p>	<p>Add former Chapel to Local List for Harlestone.</p> <p>Add Workhouse Bank to Local List for Harlestone.</p>
Russell Francis	<p>Could the walls referred to above be made candidates for the local list?</p>	<p>Walls can be added to a Local List; however, it is not an appropriate form of protection for assets which are at risk. Rather, the addition of a supplementary "Threat" in the Management Plan at Section 11 would highlight walls which are particularly at risk, and encourage positive maintenance and repair. They would also benefit from being highlighted</p>	<p>Include new text in Section 9.5: <u>"5. Stone wall to the south of New Road abutting the quarry.</u></p> <p>1. <u>Stone wall leading from Virginia Cottage to Rock Farm."</u></p> <p>Include new Threat at Section 11 Management Plan: <u>"Threat 8: Walls at Risk Stone and brick walling within Harlestone Parish contributes positively to the character of the conservation area. The appraisal process has highlighted several walls within the conservation area</u></p>

Respondent	Comments	Agreed response	Agreed action
		within Section 10.5 “Heritage at Risk”.	<u>which might be at risk from biological growth and poor maintenance, and as such require attention to preserve their significance.</u> <u>Recommendation 8:</u> <u>Good maintenance of walls should be encouraged in order to preserve this aspect of the significance of the conservation area. The possibility of grant funding could be explored in the future should such funds become available.”</u>
Tim Cross	Agree	Comments noted	No change
Elizabeth Dyball	Also I think we could protect more trees	Comments noted.	No change
Neil Mitchell	Brcik barn north of Cross Hill, Upper Harlestone? I note that this building is classified 'at risk' but personally I consider it to be in reasonable and acceptable condition is much less prone to vandalism due to its proximity to housing, forms an integral part of local architecture/streetscene and is actually used occassionally for sheep farming. I am anxious that this building should not be subject to any potential change of use.	The brick barn has been assessed with reference to the Local List criteria and has met the threshold, and therefore can be added to the local list.	Add brick barn at Cross Hill to Local List for Harlestone.
<b>Do you think there is enough clear guidance regarding conservation areas for residents or anyone submitting or commenting on a planning application or application for listed building consent? Please use the text box to identify specific areas where guidance is either satisfactory or lacking.</b>			
Anton Viesel	Yes	Noted	No change

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b>
Ken Waller	Yes	Noted	No change
Martin Halsall and Maggie Walden	<p>8.6.2 / 8.6.3 and 8.6.7 all refer to “development” or “new development” which appears to give permission for new buildings, yet this conflicts with “Restraint Village” status. We suggest that the guidance is carefully limited to what is consistent with the Restraint Village status, or commercial housebuilders will challenge the meaning in court.</p> <p>8.6.3 The villages are of such importance that rules in respect of materials should require new materials <u>must match</u> those of existing properties, i.e. local ironstone for local ironstone, hand-made red brick for hand-made red brick. Repetition of aberrations in building materials such as the yellow brick council houses around the Green in Upper Harlestone should not be repeated. Expedient short-cuts in materials are also favoured by commercial housebuilders and our heritage is impoverished as a result.</p>	<p>Any application would have to take account of national and local policy in addition to the guidance in the conservation area appraisal.</p> <p>Development which affects the conservation area or its setting must have regard to its character and be sympathetic in terms of design in order to preserve and enhance the special interest. The conservation area appraisal does not seek to halt development, but to manage change in order to preserve and enhance the historic environment.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
Russell Francis	I think the guidance is satisfactory	Noted.	No change
Tim Cross	OK	Noted	No change
Neil Mitchell	YES	Noted	No change
<b>Do you think there are any actions missing from our Management Plan (see pages 43-48 of the Appraisal)?</b>			

Respondent	Comments	Agreed response	Agreed action
<b>Please use the text box to identify specific actions, giving justification where possible.</b>			
Anton Viesel	No	Noted	No change
Ken Waller	Yes	Although a yes response was given, no suggestions for further actions was provided.	No change
Martin Halsall and Maggie Walden	Referring to sections: 10.4, Strong consideration should be given to closing Port Road to protect Upper Harlestone from the inevitable increase in traffic resulting from 1500 houses expected to be built as part of SUE. If Port Road is left open, then traffic through Upper Harlestone will increase as drivers find alternative routes to and from Rugby and Daventry. We have already experienced huge increase in traffic whenever there is any road work or accident on the A428 or Sandy Lane north extension or road to Daventry via Nobottle. Increased traffic is particularly dangerous on narrow lanes that are shared with leisure users such as cyclists and horse riders. 10.1 Threat 1, Recommendation 1 refers to “new buildings” surely this is in conflict with the “Restraint Status” of the villages and should be revised to refer only to the extension and alteration of existing	The potential threat of traffic is addressed in the Management Plan. Highways matters are within the remit of the County Council as Highways Authority.  As noted above, the conservation area appraisal is written with references to local plan policies; however, this is done with the understanding that those policies may change in future before another appraisal is able to be	No change  No change.  Will refer respondent to Michael.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b>
	properties.  10.6 We would like to propose that certain trees forming part of the rural landscape be granted protection of Tree Preservation Orders, how can we do this?	carried out. It is recommended that the respondent get in touch with Mr Michael Venton, DDC Tree Officer, to discuss the possibility of further TPOs in the parish.	
Russell Francis	Action required in relation to the Yew Tree and the stone walls mentioned above. Increasing levels of traffic (and the threat of higher levels following the planned residential development) and speed of traffic through the village causing damage to the grass verges. Natural methods of slowing down traffic, by changing priorities, stopping traffic mounting verges, creating natural single lane sections with passing points etc should be considered. Impose a 20 mph speed limit. This will also reduce the village as a "rat run"	The potential threat of traffic is addressed in the Management Plan. Highways matters are within the remit of the County Council as Highways Authority.	No change
Tim Cross	Plan OK	Noted	No change
Neil Mitchell	NO	Noted	No change
<b>Do you think the proposed Article 4 Directions (see pages 44-46 of the Appraisal) would help to preserve special features within the conservation area? Please use the text box to identify specific locations or features at risk or permitted development rights which you feel should be removed.</b>			
Anton Viesel	Yes	Noted	No change
Ken Waller	Yes	Noted	No change
Martin Halsall and	We agree with the proposed Article 4	Comments welcomed.	

Respondent	Comments	Agreed response	Agreed action
Maggie Walden	<p>Direction and wish to suggest additions, please see below.</p> <p>We suggest consideration is given to prohibiting the storage of caravans, motorhomes and commercial vehicles at residential and commercial premises in the villages as these activities 'jar' with the visual amenity. This is consistent with covenants imposed by Althorp Estate, a measure that continues to be a positive contribution to maintaining the character of the village.</p> <p>We suggest removal of permitted development right of Class B – means of access to a highway.</p> <p>We suggest removal of the permitted development right that would allow land currently used as a garden to be converted to parking.</p> <p>We suggest removal of permitted development rights in respect of satellite and TV aerials.</p>	<p>Comments noted, in most cases the activities referred to would not require planning permission, therefore it is not possible to control this through removing permitted development rights.. The restrictive covenants are the most appropriate method.</p> <p>The Appraisal proposes Article 4 Directions to restrict the right to lay hard surfaces at Section 10, page 45.</p> <p>Permitted development rights with regards to satellite dishes and antennae on relevant highways are automatically</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b>
	As far as street lighting, we suggest the existing street lighting around Upper Harlestone is removed.	removed as part of conservation area designation.  The removal of street lighting is a matter for the Local Highway Authority.	
Russell Francis	Yes	Noted	No change
Tim Cross	Agree	Noted	No change
Elizabeth Dyball	I'm a little concerned that our parish council are proposing to change the signs in lower harlestone to just harlestone.	It is not clear what signage is being referred to. Most signage would not require the benefit of planning permission and therefore the Council has no control over this, however in cases where it did, the contents of the appraisal could be taken into account.	No change
Neil Mitchell	YES	Noted	No change
<b>Are there any other matters within the Appraisal and Management plan that you would like to comment on. Please reference any comments to the specific part of the appraisals where possible (using paragraph or section numbers) and, if seeking a change be clear what change is sought, providing justification for this where possible.</b>			
Anton Viesel	No	Noted	No change
Ken Waller	No	Noted	No change
Martin Halsall and Maggie Walden	We repeat the comments made at 6 above, in case this is the more appropriate section for making such comments.	Noted	

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Agreed response</b>	<b>Agreed action</b>
Russell Francis	No other matters	Noted	No change
Tim Cross	None	Noted	No change
Neil Mitchell	May I congratulate the authors of this plan on their presentation, accessibility and clear appreciation of the conservation needs of Harlestone. I am extremely impressed with the attention to detail contained throughout. Thank you	Comments welcomed	No change