

Daventry District Council

**Chapel Brampton Conservation Area
Appraisal and Management Plan
Supplementary Planning Document**

Statement of Consultation

Adopted February 2020



Introduction

This report sets out the consultation undertaken on the Chapel Brampton 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.

Two periods of public consultation have been undertaken for the Chapel Brampton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan. At its meeting on 23rd May 2019 the Council's Strategy Group resolved that consultation could take place on the first draft document.

A subsequent, focused consultation was undertaken on design guidance for Cedar Hythe. At its meeting on 12th September 2019 the Council's Strategy Group resolved that consultation could take place on the focused consultation material.

Consultation

The first consultation commenced on 3rd June 2019 for six weeks. The second, focused consultation commenced on 7th October 2019 for six weeks. The Parish Council, District Councillors and other consultees and local residents who had asked to be so, were notified of both consultations.

Publicity

For the first consultation, the draft SPD could be accessed from the Planning Policy, Conservation Areas 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.

For the second consultation, the focused material was made available on the Council's website, as well as hard copies in libraries.

Consultation Period

The first consultation took place with organisations referenced above and local residents on the document for a period of 6 weeks until 5.00pm on Monday 15th July 2019. A public exhibition was held at The Bramptons Primary School on Thursday 20th June 2019.

The second, focused consultation took place with organisations referenced above and local residents on the document for a period of 6 weeks until 5:00pm on Monday 18th November 2019.

Comments received.

Consultees were invited to respond letter, email or online questionnaire. There were no responses to the first consultation. The responses to the second, focused consultation 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.

No representations were received during the first consultation, which was reported to the Council's Strategy Group on September 12th 2019.

The representations received during the second, focused consultation on the Cedar Hythe design guidance were reported to the Council's Strategy Group on 6th February 2020 followed by Full Council on 20th February 2020 when the Appraisal and Management Plan document was adopted.

Appendix A- Chapel Brampton Conservation Area Consultation Notices

Chapel Brampton 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 Chapel Brampton. The document will, when adopted, provide advice on the special architectural and historic interest 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 at 10am on Monday 3rd June 2019 and closes at 5pm on Monday 15th July 2019.

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 by **5pm on Monday 15th July 2019** at the latest.

Comments cannot be accepted after this time.

Rhian Morgan
Heritage Policy Officer

**Chapel Brampton 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 draft design guidance for inclusion in the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (2019) for Chapel Brampton. The document will, when adopted, provide advice on the special architectural and historic interest 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 at 10am on Monday 7th October 2019 and closes at 5pm on Monday 18th November 2019.

Comments in writing should be forwarded to Anna Wilson, Heritage Policy Assistant, Daventry District Council, Lodge Road, Daventry, Northamptonshire, NN11 4FP or e-mail heritage@daventrydc.gov.uk by **5pm on Monday 18th November 2019** at the latest.

Comments cannot be accepted after this time.

Anna Wilson
Heritage Policy Assistant

Appendix B- Chapel Brampton Conservation Area Consultation Schedule of Responses (Written and Survey Responses)

First Consultation Response

No written or survey responses were received during the first consultation.

Second Consultation Response

No survey responses were received during the second consultation. The written responses are shown in the table below.

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
Nathan Makwana, Anglian Water Services Limited	Thank you for your email and the opportunity to comment on the Cedar Hythe - Chapel Brampton Conservation Area Appraisal consultation currently being undertaken. Having reviewed the proposed amendment to the Chapel Brampton Conservation Area of I can confirm that Anglian Water have no comment to make.	Comments welcomed.	No change
Anonymous	<i>Alterations to rooflines that preserve and enhance the appearance of dwellings that and /or garages will be encouraged. Over time, a number of properties have infilled the space above the porches, in most cases by continuing the roof line to meet the side elevation of the house. Future development which provides the opportunity to re-open this space and</i>		

	<p><i>return the building to its original form or retain the open space will be encouraged.</i></p> <p>I refer to the infilling of the space above the porches described in the excerpt above. To suggest that residents may potentially wish to reverse the already costly infills, which they have invested in at significant expense or to encourage the removal of same or to even discourage remaining infills to be carried out, is at odds with the current and essential eco-friendly thinking and at the expense of the universally desired lowering of the EPC ratings trend yet to encourage property owners to consider restoring the design to its original form in this area of the design, is a fanciful notion. Almost every property within the Cedar Hythe development, (with of course the exception of the more conventionally designed No's 1 and 27) has had this flat-roof area infilled and in many cases it has further enhanced, rather than hampered, the original concept, being largely in keeping with the original design cues. Neither should this improvement be discouraged in the light of existing precedents which have been set, as in almost every case, this flat-roof conversion/refurbishment has</p>	<p>It may seem unlikely that property owners will want to remove the infill extensions and reopen the spaces between vertical walls but whilst a possibility remains it should be included in the design guidance.</p> <p>Regarding energy efficiency, this is something that forms part of the wider objective to achieve sustainable development, and most older or historic buildings can accommodate improvements when a good balance is struck between maximising energy benefits and minimising harm to the historic environment. Often small changes, in accordance with best conservation practice, can make a difference.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	---	--	-------------------

	<p>proved to be sympathetic to the original concept both visually (i.e. still conspicuously retaining a strong asymmetrical appearance) and from a practical perspective thereby previously making provision for growing families and in keeping with a heat retaining mind-set due to the fact that original flat roofs originally haemorrhaged heat loss on a monumental scale. These initiatives have not proved to adversely affect the intrinsic character of the general unique design characteristics of the Cedar Hythe properties which has almost certainly continued to be successfully retained.</p> <p>On another note, consideration should be made to the thought and possibility that the exposed infill may have been originally arrived at in order to maintain affordable costs at the time and within an attainable asking price for these new properties. This is worthy of consideration especially as, in the late 1960's, the price range for these new-builds was in the region of £8,000 to £14,000 compared to a well-appointed detached 3 bedroom family house just down the road in Kingsthorpe by the same builder, which were selling for £3,000 to 4,000 by 1972. It may be</p>	<p>Comment noted. Although this is a possible explanation for the original design of the buildings, it is impossible to say for certain that this was the case because evidence documenting the thinking behind the original designs is not available.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	---	--	-------------------

	<p>considered by some that the overriding reason for the original lack of original infill, may well have been one of keeping the properties with a certain price range rather than one of ground-breaking aesthetics.</p> <p>Over many years, the design of almost all of the properties has, through further careful subsequent development, evolved to be more in keeping with practicality and eco-friendly modern living, and to return to the original pre-infill form would be untenable given the sizeable investment already made by property owners either reflected in their original purchase price or in their hefty subsequent building costs.</p> <p>In any view, it seems rather late in the day to suggest limitations on infilling the space between the vertical walls on any remaining properties, given that most properties have now had the flat-roof area in-filled at great expense and that a subsequent benefit has been achieved by dispensing with this part of the design which I must reiterate, formerly would have allowed vast amounts of heat to escape upwards from the hallway whilst the gas boiler is chugging away merrily. Something</p>	<p>See previous comments above.</p> <p>It is agreed that it would be unfair to reject proposals to infill the space between vertical walls on the few properties that still retain this as open space, since many of the properties have already made this change. This approach is not suggested in the draft Design Guidance. All proposals will be assessed on their individual merits.</p> <p>See previous comments above relating to energy efficiency measures.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	--	---	-------------------------------------

	<p>which is certainly not in line with modern eco-friendly or green values.</p> <p>Regarding the apparent ‘framed’ view which is referred to also in this section, one can only achieve a vague sense of this if observing from a very limited and specific place on the pavement outside the example shown at fig 25. Any sense of countryside beyond is lost if one is to step forward or backwards only a very short distance, whereby it is obscured by the angles of the vertical walls on either side of this gap. (As per photos below)</p>	<p>Although the view between the vertical walls is visible from a limited area, it nonetheless makes a positive contribution to the character and visual interest of this part of the conservation area and, therefore, merits inclusion in the draft Design Guidance.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
		<p>Any future planning applications for the infilling of space between vertical walls</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Any infill applied to the remaining properties which potentially are still to</p>			

	<p>undertake this conversion would certainly be sympathetic to the angular rooflines and quiriness of the original design, as many others have successfully achieved, and would respect the all-important compliance with eco-friendly guidelines and modern heat-retaining regulations in equal measure. This outweighs any virtues of the vague and highly inconspicuous 'framed views' and in many cases this benefit has been largely realised in Cedar Hythe, yet to 'encourage' owners to attempt to revert to restoring the 'infill' would satisfy none of these positive ecological advantages and furthermore, would represent a considerable expense to property owners if this rather backwards step were actually carried out.</p> <p>10.9 Public Realm Finally, some more senior residents may well remember that the original tarmacadam on the entire road leading to all properties in Cedar Hythe and terminating at the junction of the A5199 Welford Road, was coloured in a light red hue which was not uncommon during the time of construction and some remnants of this, albeit now faded, can still be seen in parts of</p>	<p>above porches will be assessed on their individual merits. The draft Design Guidance is aimed at enabling applicants to make proposals that are in keeping with the character of Cedar Hythe as well as assisting decision makers to decide whether any proposals are appropriate in terms of retaining and enhancing the character of the conservation area.</p> <p>It is recognised that highways contribute to the character of conservation areas but controls over highways are not within the remit of Daventry District Council. Northamptonshire County Council is responsible for the majority of highways matters. It is agreed that areas of historic surface materials are vulnerable to damage or removal during utilities work. The Management Plan section of the</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	---	---	-------------------

	<p>Cedar Hythe. This attractive feature survived throughout the 1970's and most of the 1980's. In the spirit of originality and uniqueness which pervades this development, consideration should be made to restore this appearance and furthermore, any utility companies who make the road surface good again following their various future installations or repairs to supplies of water, electricity, gas and broadband should be in full compliance with the need to restore its appearance should this become a retrospective design recommendation as part of this consultation.</p>	<p>Chapel Brampton Conservation Area Appraisal May 2019 includes a recommendation to reinstate historic surface materials after works to highways and pavements by utilities companies.</p>	
James Osborn	<p>Complaint 1 - Document failed to recognise 70 years of continual development</p> <p>1.i. My first issue with this document is the principle of its use. Although within a conservation area it is extremely important to recognise that the estate has been an area of continual development for almost 70 years - for every single point raised in this entire document there is an example to contradict it – from window colours, to roof shapes, lawns to skylines I do not believe there to be a single design</p>	<p>1.i. Comments noted. It is recognised that, as with any conservation area, over time changes do occur. Conservation area status is not intended to 'preserve everything in aspic' but rather to manage any future changes to ensure they are in keeping with the overall character of Cedar Hythe. Text will be added to highlight that the area has been subject to change since it was first built in the late 1960s but that examples still exist of the</p>	<p>p. 1, para 4, change text to the following: “1960s architecture is characterised by bold shapes, the use of glass to enable light interiors and designed landscaping surrounding buildings. <u>Whilst alterations to the form and design details of a number of properties in Cedar Hythe have taken place since the</u></p>

	<p>principle which holds true for the entire estate. Many of the properties are in fact now being developed and renovated for the 3 or 4th time. This is not reflected in the Design Guide.</p> <p>1.ii. It is a gross simplification to say that there are '4' designs' of houses of Cedar Hythe. This Design Guidance document must begin with a recognition of the current state of the estate and formally recognise the history of rich and varied development which has taken place since its construction rather than hark back to something which, quite frankly, hasn't existed for the best part of half a century - house designs have been adjusted so much so that there are now barely two houses the same. On a visual inspection of the street I note that in my opinion there are at least 18 different designs of home. I would go as far as to say that even the dwellings used as examples of 'unaltered' buildings have actually had work(s) completed to them.</p>	<p>various design elements from that period.</p> <p>1.ii. Acknowledgement that there have been changes to properties since they were first built has been dealt with through the suggested changes to the text outlined above (1.i). The intention of the draft Design Guidance is to show that when originally built, there were four designs of houses within the development. Images of buildings that still resemble, as closely as possible, their original design in terms of their plan form, front elevations and detailing illustrate the four designs. In the case of 'house design 2' (Figure 22), the draft Design Guidance text makes it clear that the space between the garage and the side elevation of the house is a subsequent change and originally it would have been an open space. The text will be amended to acknowledge that in a number of cases there has been subsequent development that has altered the original elevations of buildings.</p>	<p><u>estate was first built, it still retains many distinctive features that make it easily recognisable as a development of this period."</u></p> <p>p. 1, para 5, change the text to the following: <u>"Figures 21 to 24 show the four house designs four properties that most closely resemble the original house designs in terms of their plan form and principal elevations in the Cedar Hythe Development."</u></p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>1.iii. Introducing this Design Guidance document into an estate that is now so fundamentally adrift from the principles that it sets out puts an onerous risk on every property owner. It is an unacceptable burden on the owners of properties (that through no act of their own) do not comply with a scheme that is introduced in the future but it also hugely unfair to force the owners of properties that have not been greatly developed to now comply with a set of principles that their fellow neighbours have not had to comply with.</p> <p>Complaint 2 - Reference to 'Design Principles' which are subjective and not evidenced</p> <p>2.i. Throughout this Design Guidance document there are reference to the 'original' design principles for the estate. To the best of my knowledge there is no clear documentation from the architects of the estate to provide clarity as what constitutes 'design principles' and what is in fact just part and parcel of a standard construction process.</p> <p>2.ii. Therefore, If evidence cannot be</p>	<p>1.iii. Cedar Hythe has been within the Chapel Brampton Conservation Area since 2000 and has, therefore, been subject to the additional planning controls that the designation brings for almost 20 years. The purpose of the draft Design Guidance is to assist residents who wish to undertake development of their property so they can do so in a way that maintains and enhances the distinctive character of the area, by setting out the special features of Cedar Hythe.</p> <p>2.i. and ii. The use of the phrase 'design principles' on the first page of the guidance, second paragraph, refers to the current guidance for future development. It is correct to say that documents from the architects of the site are not available. Consequently, the draft guidance has been arrived at by looking at the properties in Cedar Hythe and noting common features that a number of buildings display and which are, therefore, likely to be part of their original design, for example eight properties have oriel</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	---	--	-------------------------------------

	<p>presented to support statements from the authoring body then the guidance within it is no more than the subjective views and opinions of the authoring body and I strongly object to this on principle. A good example of where this ambiguity is apparent is in the wording of 10.8 which is highlighted later in this letter.</p> <p>Complaint 3 - 10.1 Alternations and Extensions</p> <p>3.i. There are now more examples of dwellings whereby the central ‘vacant’ space referred to have been infilled than not. It is not a reasonable position to take to expect any future work be undertaken to reverse this and I object to the statement <i>“Infilling the central structure of a span constructed building detracts from the original design principles of the estate”</i>.</p> <p>There are many period examples where the use of staggered mono-pitched roofs have been installed - it cannot be said that filling the open space makes any asymmetrical design less pronounced (it actually amplifies it).</p>	<p>windows with copper roofing; all properties have mono pitch roofs; most properties are partially clad.</p> <p>3.i. The draft design guidance does not seek to force property owners to open up the central space above a porch where it has been infilled but merely states that should this be part of a future development proposal it would be supported. The statement <i>“Infilling the central structure of a span constructed building detracts from the original design principles of the estate”</i> does not appear in the draft Design Guidance for Cedar Hythe.</p> <p>Agreed. The text will be amended accordingly.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Section 10.1, p. 3, para 2, change text to the following: “Over time, a number of properties have infilled the space above the porches, in most cases by continuing</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>3.ii. This whole section seems to be the opinion of the author and without the original design documents it is ambiguous.</p> <p>It also fails to acknowledge altogether the fact that many of the bungalows have already joined their homes to their garages, through the introduction of a new span structure. (Something that</p>	<p>3.ii. These documents are not available but aspects of the original building design have been deduced from those feature in existence that are common to a large number of the properties These include features such as the flat roofs over the porches, mono pitch rooflines, oriel windows with sheet copper covering, metal window and porch frames.</p> <p>The purpose of the draft Design Guidance is not to list all the changes that have occurred to properties since they were first constructed. The infilling of the space above the porches is mentioned because</p>	<p>the roof line of the garage to meet the side elevation of the house. This loss of the original form has had a detrimental effect on the appearance of the buildings by making the asymmetrical design less pronounced. <u>This accentuates the asymmetrical design but is a departure from the original form of the buildings concerned."</u></p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>was not in their original design). This is not referenced anywhere in the document but it is building work that has been carried out on the majority of the properties on the estate which also changes their original appearance.</p> <p>3.iii. As per the main point of complaint I strongly disagree with any future constraint on home owners being either discouraged or prevented from infilling the middle of their bungalows when most of the bungalows have already been converted. The introduction of this makes this harder for the few remaining bungalows to convert their central flat roof section into habitable space should they wish to do so and is grossly unfair.</p> <p>Complaint 4 - 10.3 Materials / 10.5 Windows</p> <p>4.i. Without the evidence referenced in complaint 2 the view that the particular materials and colours used are an important part of the design of the estate is just the opinion of the authoring body. There are neither sufficient historical photos provided nor original texts to back up these opinions and several of the statements are</p>	<p>it has a significant impact on the appearance of the properties. The infilling of the space between the bungalows and their garages has much less of an impact.</p> <p>3.iii. It is agreed that it would be unfair to reject proposals to infill the space between vertical walls on the few properties that still retain this as open space, since many of the properties have already made this change. This approach is not suggested in the draft Design Guidance. It merely states that should property owners wish to reinstate this as an open space or retain it this would be supported. All proposals will be assessed on their individual merits.</p> <p>4.i. The reason the particular materials and colours have been cited in the draft Design Guidance is because their characteristics and continued use provides coherence to Cedar Hythe as a planned estate dating to a particular period. Documentary evidence relating to Cedar Hythe is not available but the use of timber cladding, particularly painted white or stained brown, is a well-</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	--	--	-------------------------------------

	<p>simply incorrect. An example of this kind of error is to state that cladding was originally painted white. I don't believe this was the case at all talking to some of the older residents on the street.</p> <p>4.ii. I would further object that if the intention of this report is to make residents remove UPVC cladding and install timber cladding. In some instances it is highly likely that mixed materials may have been used for longer than the original cladding and this is an onerous responsibility.</p> <p>Compliant 5 - 10.8 Setting</p> <p>5.i. Again, without any original documentation there is no evidence to support the claims that the landscaping 'between and to the front of the properties' in Cedar Hythe is an integral part of the design. Almost all new estates when they are built do not have mature hedgerows and shrubbery and their front gardens are usually laid to turf. There is no evidence to suggest that the 'putting to lawn' of the front</p>	<p>documented, characteristic feature of domestic architecture of the 1960s.</p> <p>4.ii. As the draft Design Guidance states in section 10.3, the consistent use of materials such as the white and brown cladding provides coherence to Cedar Hythe as a planned estate. Should property owners wish to replace cladding in the future, the draft Design Guidance aims to provide clarity on the most appropriate materials to use in order to maintain or enhance the character of this part of the conservation area.</p> <p>5.i It is agreed that planting regimes for individual properties may not reflect the appearance of the estate when it was first built. However, this section of the draft Design Guidance is concerned with the open, spacious character of Cedar Hythe, which is created by the wide grass verges and large front gardens, many of which remain unenclosed by walls, fences or other boundary treatments. Along with mature trees that may have survived from</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The landscaping between and to the front of properties in Cedar Hythe is an integral part of its design. Properties are separated from the road by grass verges and large, unenclosed front lawns, giving an impression of space throughout the development. <u>A lack of boundaries between the</u></p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>properties in Cedar Hythe is no more than the standard new build construction process for properties at this time (and is still the case largely today). This section should be removed altogether unless it is supported with original design documents that explicitly explain that this is part of the design of the estate otherwise it is no more than the subjective opinion of the authoring body.</p> <p>5.ii. Notwithstanding this it is also clearly not the reality for many properties on the estate who have either expanded their drives, landscaped their front gardens, introduced fencing, built walls or hedged between neighbours. There are again, on balance, more examples of where front gardens have been landscaped and are at odds with this principle than comply with it.</p>	<p>the period when this area formed the grounds of Brampton House, shrubs and trees that have subsequently been planted now also make a contribution to the verdant character of Cedar Hythe. The text in this section will be amended to reflect the fact that current soft landscaping may not have been part of the original design of the estate but it does now make a contribution to its character, as does the layout of the estate.</p> <p>5.ii. These changes may well have occurred since the initial laying out of the estate, however, it is more a question of whether the area retains its 1960's character despite these changes and whether these subsequent changes enhance the conservation area. Although there may have been changes to soft and hard landscaping since the initial development of Cedar Hythe, it still retains its spacious, unenclosed character, particularly to the front of individual properties. Furthermore, the current planting and the mature trees within the estate enhance the verdant character of the conservation area, hence their designation as a Tree Preservation Order</p>	<p><u>pavement and gardens at the front of properties is characteristic of the layout of 1960s residential estates.</u> The <u>subsequent</u> planting on verges and in front gardens comprises a variety of mature shrubs and trees which soften the views of buildings. Views of some properties are largely obscured by trees which fosters a secluded and peaceful atmosphere.</p> <p>No changes.</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>Complaint 6 - Breach of trust / Bias</p> <p>6.i. As a homeowner on Cedar Hythe I was disappointed not to have been contacted and/or formally made aware of this draft consultation affecting my property. I found out about it purely by chance. I am concerned that many of the residents of Cedar Hythe will be unaware of this consultation and that an attempt is being made by the authoring body to agree this document without due diligence. I am formally responding but as far as I am concerned I consider that the lack of proper engagement with the community and property owners affected constitutes a breach of trust and legally renders this consultation null and void.</p> <p>6.ii. Furthermore, I have been made aware of the details of a personal dispute on a recent planning application on Cedar Hythe between the authoring body of this Design Guide and the property owner. I am sorry to say that I do not believe this text to have been brought forward in 'good faith' and it to be biased as a result of this dispute.</p>	<p>Area.</p> <p>6.i. The consultation was publicised through the usual channels used for all conservation area-related consultation; the Parish Council placed posters on village notice boards, and notices on the village Facebook page and in the newsletter. It was also publicised through Daventry District Council's website. This is in accordance with Daventry District Council's Statement of Community Involvement (2017), which was agreed with parish councils when it was first formulated.</p> <p>6.ii. It is the statutory duty of Daventry District Council to undertake appraisals for conservation areas periodically. The Council is currently reviewing all of the District's conservation areas. The Design Guidance for Cedar Hythe has been drafted as part of the review of the wider Chapel Brampton Conservation Area, for which the work began in January 2019,</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	---	--	-------------------------------------

	<p>As already raised, this Guide lacks evidence and fact and uses a handful of homes on the estate to try and impose a subjective and personal view. It is not reflective of what has been the reality on the estate for 70 years and not in the tax payer's interest to pursue. Why is this Design Guide being brought forward now only a matter of weeks after this dispute?</p> <p>In summary, my main objections are</p> <p>1. The report establishes a false picture of Cedar Hythe based on examples from a very small proportion of the homes.</p>	<p>having been planned as part of the wider project which began in Autumn 2016.</p> <p>Although there is no available documentary evidence relating specifically to Cedar Hythe, design principles and features typical of 1960s domestic architecture are well-documented. As part of the wider review of Chapel Brampton Conservation Area, Cedar Hythe has been identified as retaining elements pertaining to 1960s design in terms of its architectural style, detailing and the layout of the estate. The draft Design Guidance has been produced to assist property owners/occupiers who may be considering developing their property in the future to ensure any works maintain or enhance the distinctive character of Cedar Hythe.</p> <p>1. Cedar Hythe was visited a number of times as part of the Chapel Brampton Conservation Area appraisal during which time many of the properties were</p>	<p>Add the following references to the Sources Section of the Chapel Brampton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan:</p> <p><u>Listing Selection Guide, Domestic 4: Modern Houses and Housing, Historic England (2017)</u></p> <p><u>https://fet.uwe.ac.uk/conweb/house_ages/flypast/print.htm</u></p> <p><u>http://www.nhbc.co.uk/cms/publish/consumer/NewsandComment/HomesThroughTheDecades.pdf</u></p> <p>No change.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>2. Insufficient/no evidence is provided to support the concept of 'original design principles'.</p> <p>3. Any such design principles once used have long since eroded as the vast majority of the properties on the estate are now developed beyond recognition of the original design.</p> <p>4. Many of the principles highlighted are the subjective opinions of the authoring body. It is wrong to try and impose these opinions onto the property owners of Cedar Hythe. An example of this would be section 10.8 – there is no justification or evidence to support this view whatsoever but other sections are</p>	<p>observed. The purpose of the draft Design Guidance is not to produce a detailed survey for each property in Cedar Hythe but to identify examples and use them to illustrate those elements of the estate that it is important to maintain in order that it retains its distinctive character.</p> <p>2. Please refer to the response to 2.i and 6.ii.</p> <p>3. As previously stated, although there have been changes to properties over time, many still retain features that pertain to the decade in which they were built, giving them their distinctive character. These features include their mono-pitch roofs, use of buff-coloured brick, use of timber cladding, large glass windows and glass-fronted porches, oriel windows with copper roofing, the spacious layout of the estate, wide grass verges and unenclosed front gardens fronting the pavement.</p> <p>4. Please see previous response to 5.i and 6.ii. In addition, prior to the public consultation the draft Design Guidance was reviewed internally by a number of DDC officers. It is not, therefore, the personal opinion of one individual as suggested in 6.ii but brings together the</p>	<p>No further change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No further change.</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>equally lacking in evidence and fact.</p> <p>5. Any new document that places onerous financial responsibility on residents given the amount of exiting development that is contrary to the Design Guide.</p> <p>6. I believe the authoring body is acting in bad faith and this is guide has been brought forward following a personal dispute rather than being the public's interest.</p>	<p>expertise of officers in various departments.</p> <p>5. Cedar Hythe has been within the Chapel Brampton Conservation Area since 2000 and has since then been subject to the additional planning controls that conservation area status brings. The draft Design Guidance, as previously stated, is aimed at providing property owners who wish to undertake development of their property with guidance so they can do so in a way that maintains and enhances the distinctive character of the area. There is no reason to believe that this would lead to onerous financial responsibilities for property owners.</p> <p>6. Please see response to 6.ii above which explains the reason and timing of the draft Design Guidance.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	--	---	-------------------------------------