

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

**Statement of Consultation**

**Adopted 28 June 2022**



**West  
Northamptonshire  
Council**

## **1. Introduction**

This report sets out the consultation undertaken on the Cottesbrooke 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> November 2021 West Northamptonshire Council's cabinet resolved that consultation could take place on the document.

## **2. Consultation**

Consultation commenced on 16 November 2021 for eight weeks. Statutory consultees, the parish meeting, West Northamptonshire Ward Councillors and other consultees and local residents who had asked to be so, were notified.

## **3. Publicity**

The draft SPD could be accessed from the Planning Policy, Conservation Areas and Consultation pages of the West Northamptonshire Council Website.

Paper copies were available in the main libraries in Daventry, Brixworth, Long Buckby, Moulton and Woodford Halse. They were also available by post on request.

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

## **4. Consultation Period**

Consultation took place with organisations referenced above and local residents on the document for a period of eight weeks until midnight on Monday 17 January 2022. A public online meeting was arranged for 14 December 2021 and the presentation slides and accompanying notes were subsequently made available on West Northamptonshire Council's website.

## **5. Comments received.**

Eighteen responses were received via email, letter and online survey. These are set out in Appendices B and C.

## **6. Consideration of Responses**

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

The representations were reported to the council's Planning Policy Committee on 28 June 2022 when the document was adopted.

## **Appendix A – Consultation Notice**

### **Cottesbrooke 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**

West Northamptonshire Council is consulting on a Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan for Cottesbrooke. The document will, if adopted, provide advice on the special architectural and historic interest of the conservation area and will supplement the Daventry Settlements and Countryside Local Plan (Part 2) and the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

The Council hereby welcomes comments from any interested party on the document. The document will be available on the Council's website:

[www.westnorthants.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/conservation-areas](http://www.westnorthants.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/conservation-areas)

Paper copies can be requested by emailing [heritage.ddc@westnorthants.gov.uk](mailto:heritage.ddc@westnorthants.gov.uk)

The consultation commences at 10am on Monday 22 November 2021 and closes at midnight on Monday 17 January 2022.

Comments in writing should be forwarded to Anna Wilson, Heritage Policy Assistant, Growth, Climate and Regeneration, West Northamptonshire Council, Lodge Road, Daventry, Northamptonshire, NN11 4FP or e-mail [heritage.ddc@westnorthants.gov.uk](mailto:heritage.ddc@westnorthants.gov.uk) by midnight on 17 January 2022 at the latest.

Comments cannot be accepted after this time.

**Anna Wilson**  
Heritage Policy Assistant

## Appendix B – Consultation Responses

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Response	Suggested Action
John Harris, Chair of Cottesbrooke Parish Meeting	<p>I write to express my opposition to <u>any</u> extension of the Cottesbrooke Conservation area for the following reasons:</p> <p>Cottesbrooke is and always has been a beautiful village. Certainly not because it is in a conservation area, but because over the centuries the owners of the village have fostered and nurtured it carefully in a way that has also enabled the self same owners to survive commercially. Now the wider community also recognize that fact they feel the need to want to micro- control it. A conservation area status is going completely against this principle of self determination, in essence saying ‘we know better than you’ and ‘we know what is good for you’. Since 2000 the council effectively micro control any planning issue.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Areas identified as BA3, BA4 and BA5 in the consultation draft will not be included in the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Though conservation area status confers the requirement for planning permission for particular types of development it does not apply to an extensive list of development types. Those for which planning permission is needed are set out in Section 2.3 (p.6-7) of the Cottesbrooke Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan and the conservation area page of the council’s website <a href="http://www.westnorthants.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/conservation-areas">www.westnorthants.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/conservation-areas</a> The requirement for planning permission is aimed at protecting the special architectural and historic character of Cottesbrooke, which makes it such an attractive and distinctive area of settlement and countryside.</p>	<p>See below for actions relating to specific proposed boundary changes</p> <p>No change.</p>



	<p>This is palpable nonsense given the track record of some of the other developments that seemingly are passed through the same planning office. (Demolition of the Red Lion in Brixworth so that a supermarket can be built on a blind corner, odd shaped houses allowed to built on the corner of Creaton and Hollowell roads and the proliferation of warehouses that employ virtually no one etc, etc,etc). Similarly, the Northampton Development Corporation did more cultural and architectural damage in the 1970's than the Luftwaffe ever managed in the 1940's.</p>	<p>mainly to small-scale development which often occurs on residential properties. On their own, these changes may seem insignificant but cumulatively they can have a detrimental effect on the historic character of the area and gradually erode that character. The requirement for planning permission for particular types of development within a conservation area provides the opportunity to steer development so it is sensitive to the historic and architectural character of the village.</p> <p>All planning applications are considered on a case-by-case basis against local and national planning policy. In the case of the Red Lion in Brixworth, which was within Brixworth conservation area, the planning committee of Daventry District Council refused planning permission but the decision was appealed by the applicant and upheld by the Planning Inspectorate.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	---	---	-------------------

	<p>I also fear that this policy will lead to the attempted preservation of something that has never existed. Cottesbrooke has always changed with the times because it has had to. The Blacksmith finally closed in the 1970's, the tied houses have evolved into rental accommodation as a reflection of changing farming structures. The working farmyard in the centre of the village moved to its edge in the 1980's. Moreover, what are you trying to conserve? Cottesbrooke in the 1780's, the 1880's or the 1980's? Your paper seems to refer to the 1830's and rest assured, the village has certainly changed since that period. For example, before the first world war there was a proliferation of Beech trees which were sawn for gun stocks in 1914-18. That was evolution out of necessity, not choice and probably would contravene the ethos of the conservation status?</p> <p>Moreover, what do you think we the residents are all going to do? Chop down trees? Put in plastic double glazing en masse? If that was going to have happened it</p>	<p>It is recognised that places change and evolve so the purpose of a conservation area is not to preserve everything as it was 50, 100 or 200 years ago. Its purpose is to recognise that a place has a special and distinctive character and to ensure that if changes take place they are managed in a way that conserves and enhances that special character.</p> <p>Inappropriate changes do not necessarily need to be made en masse to have a negative effect on the historic character of a conservation area. As has already been mentioned,</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	---	---	-------------------------------------

	<p>would already have done. Years ago. You are now trying to shut a stable door to stop a horse that has never tried to bolt or even wants to bolt.</p> <p>I am afraid that I believe the owners of the village know better what is good for the village than a remote form of pedantic and costly bureaucratic control system operating out of an office 15 miles away. I objected to this nanny state type of government 20 years ago and I do so again now.</p>	<p>incremental changes can lead to the gradual erosion of character. Whilst residents of the village may currently appreciate the village's history, this may not always be the case if properties change hands and new residents move into the area. The requirement for planning permission for particular types of development in the conservation area ensure that there is a conversation between property owners and planners about the details of development proposals so they are sensitive to the character of the conservation area.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Alistair MacDonald-Buchanan, for and on behalf of the</p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Cottesbrooke Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan hereafter referred to as 'the draft Appraisal'. On the whole there are</p>	<p>Comments noted. It is acknowledged that the Cottesbrooke Estate has been managed to a high standard to date.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<p>Cottesbrooke Estate</p>	<p>a number of guiding principles within the document that are not disputed; indeed, a great number have been employed by the Estate for decades. For example, the restrictions on the placement of satellite dishes, consistency of paint colours, no UPVc windows on the Estate properties, maintenance of hedged boundaries and so on. Arguably, the reason that Cottesbrooke has become such an attractive asset in Northamptonshire is because of the Estate's managing principles. Much of the report seems well balanced and well researched by the officers.</p> <p>The comments below have been prepared by Deborah Evans, DE Landscape and Heritage, CMLI, IHBC, MA, a heritage consultant with a specialism in landscape. In addition there are contributions from Fisher German and the Cottesbrooke Estate.</p> <p><i>Summary</i> The Cottesbrooke Conservation Area was designated in 2000. The</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
----------------------------	---	----------------	-------------------

	<p>conservation area includes the whole village of Cottesbrooke, several areas of pasture to its south and the Registered Historic Park and Garden of Cottesbrooke Hall, including key listed buildings such as the mansion, Cottesbrooke Hall (Figure 1 refers). The designation of the conservation area evidences its rich time depth and the long-term stewardship of the Cottesbrooke Estate in sustaining its distinctive rural character.</p> <p>The initial Conservation Area proposed by the planning officers in 2000 included the majority of the residential built environment, hugging the village curtilage, and largely dovetailed into the boundary of the grade II registered Cottesbrooke park and garden (please see Appendix I). However, the planning committee decided to go against the planning officers' recommendation because they insisted on including Cottesbrooke Hall. This posed a dilemma for the officers and their only option was to include the whole of the area designated as Registered Historic</p>	<p>As the Daventry District Council Planning Committee report from September 2000 demonstrates, the inclusion of the registered park and garden within the conservation area when it was first designated was not solely driven by the wish to include Cottesbrooke Hall, as the respondent suggests. As the report states, although registered park and garden status is a material consideration in determining planning applications, it does not confer additional planning controls. Therefore, its inclusion within the conservation area gives it greater statutory protection as well as</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	---	--	-------------------

	<p>Park and Garden – the only boundary that made any sense if Cottesbrooke Hall was to be included. The resulting conservation area that was finally approved increased from some 54 acres to 520 acres to satisfy the perceived need to incorporate Cottesbrooke Hall. This area includes parkland, woodland, arable land and pasture farmland.</p> <p>It is understood that the local authority has a statutory requirement to undertake periodic review of the conservation area (1990 Planning [Listed Building and Conservation Areas] Act) to review the architectural and historic interest of the designation and to assess whether its boundary is fit for purpose.</p> <p>A draft appraisal has been published for consultation. This proposes to extend the existing designation boundary with the intention of the revised conservation area appraisal and management plan becoming Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) to help ‘manage change in a</p>	<p>strengthening its protection through Policy ENV7 of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	---	--	-------------------------------------



	<p><i>Listed buildings:</i>  Cottesbrooke Hall (mansion)  Grade I (NHL: 1356891)  Cottesbrooke Hall, outbuildings  and walls Grade II (NHL: 1055751)  Cottesbrooke Hall, statue of  Socrate Grade II (NHL: 1356892)  Cottesbrooke Hall, gate piers and  gates Grade II (NHL: 1067099)  Cottesbrooke Hall, Statue of  Homerus Grade II (NHL:  13666648)  Cottesbrooke Hall, Statue of  Epaminodas Grade II (NHL:  1067100)  Cottesbrooke Hall, Statue of  Licurgus Grade II (NHL: 1067101)  Cottesbrooke Hall, Bridge Grade II  (NHL: 1055745)  Cottesbrooke Hall, Lodge, Gates  and Gatepiers (west), Grade II  (NHL: 1055735)  Cottesbrooke Hall, Lodge, Gates  and Gatepiers (east), Grade II  (NHL: 1356893)  Church of All Saints, Grade I (NHL:  1067102)  The Old Rectory, Grade II (NHL:  1038538)  The Old School Cottages, Grade II  (NHL: (1039111))</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>1&amp;2, Grade II (NHL: 1356894) 3&amp;4, Grade II (NHL: 1038306)</p> <p><i>Conservation Area</i> The Cottesbrooke Conservation Area is described at 3.1 and it was adopted c. 2000. The purpose of the conservation area is to help conserve 'an area of special architectural or historic interest, the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance' (Section 69 Planning [Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas] Act, 1990). The designation illustrates the time depth, scale and massing of the village and its surrounding landscape.</p> <p>Trees within the conservation area are subject to regulation which are adhered to by the estate. There are presently no individual Tree Preservation Orders or Tree Preservation Order Areas within the Cottesbrooke Conservation Area.</p> <p>Work undertaken within woodland found within the conservation area is addressed by an established Woodland Management Plan</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>(WMP) and an accompanying English Woodland Grant Scheme (EWGS).</p> <p>Following consultation on the original conservation area boundary in 2000, the estate supported a southern boundary to the designation around the village as proposed by the local authority (Cottesbrooke Estate Response to the Proposed Cottesbrooke Conservation Area, 26<sup>th</sup> May 2000, Appendices 1 and 3). The estate wished to support a 'practical and logical conservation area boundary for the village': this remains the intention.</p> <p><i>Registered Historic Park and Garden (NHL: 1001028)</i> Cottesbrooke Hall is included on Historic England's <i>Register of Historic Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest at Grade II</i>, which attributes national interest. The registered area extends to c. 250ha of formal gardens, parkland and woodland: it is broadly contiguous with the existing conservation area</p>	<p>The purpose of the review that commenced in 2021 is to assess the whole boundary of the conservation area. If there are areas within the boundary that have deteriorated or have been negatively affected by development to an extent that they no longer make a positive contribution, the boundary can be altered to exclude these areas. The current review did not find any such impacts within Cottesbrooke Conservation Area and, therefore, does not recommend changes to the boundary to exclude any particular areas.</p> <p>Comments noted. Whilst the Registered Park and Garden designation relates to the designed gardens and landscape park that was largely created in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, there is no presumption that the conservation area boundary must follow that of the registered park and garden, particularly if subsequent features of the landscape make a positive contribution to its present character and appearance.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	--	--	-------------------------------------

	<p>boundary. The site was added to the register in 1984, the designation description was written in 1998 and reviewed in 2000. Research informing the designation was undertaken by Dr. Paul Stamper, a national expert on historic designed landscapes, who also authored the designation description. As part of his work he reviewed the mapped record from 1780 on; this evidences the evolution of the designed landscape. His key sources are recorded on the register description. The understanding of the landscape would have been ground-truthed to establish intactness and character as part of the registration process. This determined the zenith of the designed landscape was as recorded by the First Edition Ordnance Survey c. 1886. This standard approach was adopted by the then English Heritage designation department. The established boundary of the registered park is therefore informed by this research.</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p><i>Undesignated heritage assets</i>  The conservation area includes many examples of ‘undesignated heritage’ assets as understood by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, July 2021) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Within the registered park, such features include a ha ha along the east boundary of the park, ‘Broken Bottle Bridge’ and relic ridge and furrow earthworks. These heritage assets, together with the designated heritage assets, are subject to the concept of ‘setting’ as described by the NPPF/PPG and supporting sector guidance. The draft appraisal notes and discusses setting on p 7 and at 9.8. While setting is not fixed, the individual and collective settings of the heritage assets may extend beyond the established designated boundaries. The potential impact upon the setting of a heritage asset is a consideration in the determination of a planning application and the estate is aware of this.</p>	Comments noted.	No change.
--	--	-----------------	------------

	<p><i>Inheritance Tax Exemption, Agreement and Undertakings</i>  While not a designation in itself, the core of the Cottesbrooke estate is subject to an Inheritance Tax Exemption (ITE) agreement with HMRC to protect the historic and natural interest of the site. The agreement and its associated undertakings concerns 110 acres within the registered park and conservation area. This includes the formal and wild gardens, the lake, the lodges and six cottages. The undertakings are informed by a Heritage Management Plan (HMP), 1989, and the site is regularly inspected and monitored by Natural England and Historic England on behalf of HMRC.</p> <p>The HMP refers to specific features found within the traditional, working landed estate with policies for their conservation and care. These features are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Axial vistas, avenues and individual parkland trees;</li> <li>• Woodland areas;</li> <li>• The lakes;</li> <li>• Permanent pasture;</li> <li>• The Mitchell Bridge;</li> </ul>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the owners are committed to conservation and care of the Cottesbrooke estate. Whilst the HMP is a valuable method of managing and protecting various features of the parkland, gardens and a selection of building, the conservation area designation also affords statutory protection to those features that are not covered by the HMP.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	---	--	-------------------------------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small scale buildings and cottages, and,</li> <li>• Access</li> </ul> <p>This is a clear and powerful indication of the public value attributed to Cottesbrooke and the commitment of its owners since 1937, the MacDonald-Buchanan family, to its long-term and appropriate stewardship.</p> <p><u>Other land-based agreements</u>  <i>Countryside Stewardship</i>  The Cottesbrooke Estate has benefitted from successive Countryside Stewardship Agreements. The present agreement runs until 2026. This agreement is informed by a comprehensive and multi-disciplinary Parkland Management Plan (PMP) which focused on the registered park. It was prepared in 2019 by the specialist consultancy, The Landscape Agency. This plan was signed off by Historic England and Natural England following consultation during the plan process. The plan shares the established understanding of the history and significance of the</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	--	------------------------	-------------------



	<p>that commenced in 2005. The management of the landscape is a key component of the Forestry Commissioner's decision making process and always forms part of any consents granted.</p> <p>Woodland within the registered park, including ornamental planting and boundary plantations and belts, is subject to a WMP administered and monitored by the Forestry Commission. This plan considers the silvicultural, landscape and ecological importance of the woodlands and tree planting. It is supported by detailed and agreed work schedules for each identified woodland compartment for work such as thinning, cyclical felling, natural regeneration and targeted planting. Work associated with this plan is subject to monitoring by the Forestry Commission and is carried out under any required procedures such as Felling Licenses. An EWGS complements the recommendations of the WMP.</p> <p>The PMP refined aspects of the woodland and parkland planting by</p>	<p>Conservation area status usually confers a requirement for the property owner to notify the council of any proposed works to trees over a particular size six weeks prior to those works taking place. However, where a woodland management plan has been agreed with the Forestry Commission, it is the Forestry Commission which notifies the council about the proposed works, rather than the landowner. It is agreed that no additional areas of woodland will be included in the conservation area as a result of the 2021/22 appraisal.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>See actions below in relation to proposed extensions BA3, BA4 and BA5.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>setting out complementary recommendations to the WMP together with future planting strategies. The latter focusses of the succession planting of parkland trees to help conserve and emphasise important design features such as clumps, specimens and the ratio of broadleaves to conifers found within the landscape.</p> <p><b>Other notable observations on the content of the draft appraisal</b>  <i>4. Summary of Special Interest</i>  This summary refers to ‘many fine views’. They are not necessarily consistent with those identified by the PMP (7.6 refers).</p> <p>The assessment of planted features within the landscape, such as avenues (Figure 40 refers), does not differentiate between known historic planting, such as the main northwest/southwest axis centering on the mansion, or the more recent plantings, such as the lime avenue to the east of the mansion, which actually contains</p>	<p>During the appraisal, officers did not have access to the PMP and were therefore unable to compare views within the draft appraisal and those included in the PMP. Please see further comments below relating to views.</p> <p>The features of historic planting are shown on Figure 28, Section 6, in the Historical Development section of the appraisal focusing on features of 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century date. The Lime Avenue was not included as it was a relatively recent feature (1980s) but it can be added to Figure 28 to make that clear. Figure 40 has been included in Section 7.5 to show various features</p>	<p>See suggested changes below in the section that deals with views in more detail.</p> <p>Section 6, Figure 28, p.34:  Add the Lime Avenue to the Figure 28 and amend the key to include the date of this feature.</p> <p>Section 7.5, Figure 40, p.45:  Amend Figure 40 to include those areas of planting to the north of Cottesbrooke Hall in order to highlight their spatial and visual</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>poor quality trees and requires refinement.</p> <p><i>7. Spatial Character</i>  7.1 This notes Cottesbrooke falls within a Special Landscape Area (SLA) confirmed in 2020. This is a non-statutory local landscape designation intended to draw attention to areas of countryside of high visual quality with integral historic and natural environment significance. The SLA would be a consideration in the determination of planning applications and any wider development proposals and the estate is aware of this. The text continues by confirming the character and amenity of the landscape around Cottesbrooke</p>	<p>that are also considered to be of spatial and visual importance and they are not, therefore, differentiated by their date of origin. This figure will be amended to include those features of historic planting, where they still exist, that are included in Figure 28. Refinement of the Lime avenue will not be prevented due to the fact that it is mentioned in the appraisal as a landscape feature, although notification of works to individual trees will be required by the council at least six weeks prior to those works proceeding.</p> <p>Agreed. Details of the Special Landscape Area (SLA) are set out Section 5-Location and Context. Some additional text will be added to Section 7.1 to reinforce that the natural topography and its use by the estate in the designed elements of the landscape have been influential in the quality of the landscape that is seen today.</p>	<p>importance as well as their historical significance, as shown in Figure 28.</p> <p>Section 7.1 – Spatial Character Summary, p. 35, add the following text at the end of the first paragraph:</p> <p><u>“It reflects the local, natural topography and how it has been utilised over time in the design of the landscape, for both agricultural and recreational use”.</u></p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>which reflects its recognized purpose as the principal village within a traditional landed estate. Indeed, the quality of the landscape reflects the local topography, the design response of the estate over time to that topography, its use of land and the influence of fox hunting in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, specifically, upon the landscape's character.</p> <p><i>7.2 Areas of Archaeological Potential</i>  This identifies areas within the proposed conservation area boundary where areas of archaeological potential have been identified (Figure 31 refers). It also includes areas beyond the proposed boundary (AP3, AP5, part of AP6, AP7, AP11, AP12, part of AP13, AP20, AP21 and AP22), which is confusing. The archaeological resource of the registered park was considered in detail as part of the PMP. This included an assessment of LiDAR data and recorded features such</p>	<p>7.2 The known areas of archaeological potential within and on the fringes of the conservation area were determined by consulting the Northamptonshire Historic Environment Record (HER), which incorporates sources such as fieldwork records, LiDAR data, aerial photographs and other documentary records. Several of the areas of archaeological potential straddle the boundary of the conservation area (AP2, AP3, AP6 and AP13) and therefore merit consideration. It is also important to consider those areas that fall outside of the conservation area boundary but in its vicinity. This is</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	---	---	-------------------

	<p>as lost drives and relic ridge and furrow. Policies and actions were agreed to help protect this archaeology, such as the requirement for an archaeological watching brief associated with specific conservation projects. Actions such as tree planting also consider the underlying archaeology when identifying future planting locations. Given that the majority of the park is managed as permanent pasture, risk to archaeology is considered to be low. Conservation work to historic features within the park is undertaken by the estate to the required standards associated with the historic environment, such as Listed Building Consent, and any requirement for a specific archaeological assessment would form part of this process.</p> <p><i>7.3 Public Open Spaces</i> This section provides a useful description of recognized open space used by the public within the conservation area which contributes to its special character and interest. It should be noted that the playing field is privately</p>	<p>because they may indicate the presence of as-yet unknown archaeological deposits within the conservation area. This is standard practice in any heritage assessment that includes an archaeological element.</p> <p>7.3 Thank you for providing information about the ownership of the playing field. It will be removed from Figure 40 and the corresponding text removed from Section 7.3 and incorporated into the Open Space Analysis in Section 7.7.</p>	<p>Section 7.3-Public Open Spaces, p.41, first paragraph, remove the following text: <del>"A third important open space is the playing field and space surrounding the village hall on the south side of Station Road. As well as providing an</del></p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>owned by the Estate but let to Cottesbrooke Village Hall Limited. The value of these spaces is not disputed nor is their contribution to the conservation area and to other heritage assets or to the SLA</p>		<p><del>important recreational amenity for residents, this area contributes to the setting of the Grade II listed Old School Cottages on the opposite site of the road. Although there has been some landscaping to create the football pitch, which may have resulted in the loss of some archaeological earthworks, the area retains its open character and form, which dates back to at least the 19<sup>th</sup> century, as demonstrated by the 1839 Tithe Map. It contributes to the dispersed character of the east end of the village."</del></p> <p>Figure 40, p. 45 remove the playing field from the map.</p> <p>Section 7.7-Open Space Analysis, p.60, third paragraph, amend text to read:</p> <p>"OS5: Playing field and playground on south side of Station Road This area makes a significant contribution to the character and setting of the conservation area. Now a playing field and playground, <u>which provides an important recreational amenity for the village</u>, this area contributes to</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p><i>7.4 Footpaths</i>  This section provides a useful summary of the public footpaths within the vicinity of the conservation area. The</p>	<p>7.4 Comments noted. It is agreed that the public footpaths and permissive paths enable the public to enjoy the Cottesbrooke Estate. Details of the</p>	<p>the rural character of the village with views through trees on the southern boundary to the open countryside. By 1628 the open space was divided into five plots, two of which had buildings upon them. Although the internal divisions no longer exist, the external boundary reflects that on the 1628 map <u>and the 1839 Tithe Map</u> and is therefore important in terms of the historic morphology of the settlement. Although the Grade II listed building, the Old School Cottages (1-5) is on the opposite side of the road, <del>this open space</del> the playing field contributes to its setting. <b><u>It also contributes to the dispersed character of the east end of the village.</u></b></p> <p>Section 7.3-Public Open Spaces, p.41, remove Figure 35 and move to Section 7.7-Open Space Analysis, p. 60, under third paragraph.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>Cottesbrooke Estate maintains public rights of way within its ownership as required to enable continued access to the estate and to allow for its greater appreciation. The Estate also provides over 4,500m of permissive paths for public access.</p> <p><i>7.5 Trees</i> This section notes there are presently no Tree Preservation Orders or Tree Preservation Order Areas within the conservation area. This is important, the success of existing agreements and the good stewardship of the estate has not required this. The section continues by listing some 'important individual and groups of</p>	<p>permissive paths are not included in the conservation area appraisal because additional information about their various locations has not been provided.</p> <p>7.5 It is agreed that the trees within the conservation area are managed well under the various agreements and management plans. This successful management of trees suggests that the conservation area status is not prohibitive. The individual and groups of trees highlighted in the appraisal are those which make a particular</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	--	--	-------------------

	<p>trees', although this appears to be based on a general appreciation of the trees rather than on any detailed historical or arboricultural assessment (Figure 40).</p> <p>Of these trees, all which lie within the registered park, were surveyed and assessed as part of the PMP with provision for targeted tree work, replanting or even removal. The future management of, specifically, the avenues to the northwest and southeast of the mansion is assured. Note: the northwest extension of the northwest/southeast axis is to be refined as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To the east of the road: the existing conifer stands are to be refined to allow for an increase in wood pasture. The axial line will be retained as a central ride between clumps and new specimen trees. To the west of the road, new specimen tree will continue to frame the view to the northwest, and,</li> <li>• The young lime avenue to the east of the mansion. This planting is partly failing. The</li> </ul>	<p>contribution to the conservation area's character, for example by being a prominent feature within a view, channelling views towards other features and/or their historic importance in the deliberate design of the landscape. At the same time it is made clear in the appraisal that important trees are not limited to those which are mentioned in the document.</p>	
--	---	--	--

	<p>PMP has recommended the removal of the failing trees but the retention of the view by planting c. 60 new parkland trees individually and in loose groups to create a more informal edge to this recent intervention.</p> <p><i>Other trees</i> Ornamental trees within the formal gardens of Cottesbrooke Hall are subject to the ongoing management and evolution of those gardens. Cottesbrooke Hall is one of the most celebrated gardens in the East Midlands and demonstrates the highest horticultural and arboricultural standards.</p> <p>Yew trees in the church yard. These are both within the existing conservation area and contribute to the setting of the Grade I listed building. They are part of the character of the churchyard and therefore unlikely to be removed unless dangerous and then very likely to be replaced.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	---	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

	<p>The tree in the garden of the Old Post office. This is outside the ownership of the estate but it is already subject to regulation as part of the conservation area.</p> <p><i>7.6 Views</i> This section identifies 'important' views within the conservation area but no standard methodology, such as GLVIA 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, appears to have been employed. Dynamic and designed views, based on historic evidence and found within the registered park, are addressed by the PMP and illustrated by Figure 4.19 in that report.</p> <p>The views identified by the draft appraisal correspond with the PMP as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• V1, V16 = framed view southeast along avenue (axial line recorded c. 1720</li> <li>• V11, V12, V28 = Framed view northwest along avenue (axial line recorded c. 1720);</li> </ul>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>7.6 The GLVIA 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition methodology principally relates to assessing the impact of proposed development on views as part of Environmental Impact Assessment or Strategic Environmental Assessment, rather than identifying, in the first instance, which views are of importance. Views that contribute to the significance of Cottesbrooke Conservation Area were identified in accordance with Historic England's guidance 'Appraisal, Designation and Management of Conservation Areas: Historic England Advice Note 1' (Second Edition), 2019.</p> <p>The respondent's comments concentrate on those views that are included in both the PMP and the conservation area appraisal. Other views that are not mentioned by the respondent are included within the appraisal but fall mainly within the village.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>See suggested changes below.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• V17, V26 = designed views from the house and area of Ladies Pool.</li> <li>• View 15 broadly corresponds with a view identified by the PMP to the east of a woodland, and,</li> <li>• V27, V29, V25 = These are incidental views identified by the draft appraisal which have no historic basis.</li> </ul> <p>Note: No views are recorded from the historic northern driveway by the draft appraisal. The PMP records four dynamic views from this feature looking north, northeast and south towards the mansion.</p> <p>The PMP identified no key designed views in the area to the south of the house. The views identified by the draft appraisal in this area are therefore considered to be incidental.</p>	<p>The views included in the appraisal are those which were recorded from publicly accessible locations. Should additional information about these four views from the historic northern driveway be received it could be incorporated into Section 7.6 of the appraisal.</p> <p>As there are so many incidental views within the parkland and gardens of Cottesbrooke Hall, specific views which are not designed views will be removed from the appraisal. Instead, text will be added at the beginning of Section 7.6 to explain the importance of incidental views.</p>	<p>Section 7.6 – Views p.46, changes to be made to the text and Figures 41 and 42 on receipt of additional information about four views from the historic northern driveway.</p> <p>Section 7.6-View and Vistas, p. 46, add the following text after the second paragraph:</p> <p><u>“Within the gardens and parkland of Cottesbrooke Hall there are a number of designed views which form an important element of its character. They are identified in the appraisal. There are also many incidental views. Although</u></p>
--	---	---	--

	<p><i>7.7 Open Space Analysis</i> This section is informed by a methodology employed by Alan</p>	<p>7.7 Agreed. The methodology is referenced and the criteria on which the open space analysis is based are set out in Section 7.7, p. 58.</p>	<p><u>they are not identified individually within the appraisal they are no less important for the contribution they make to the parkland and rural character of the conservation area and its setting as well as its visual amenity.”</u></p> <p>Section 7.6-Views and Vistas, p. 46-50, remove text relating to views 4, 13, 18, 19, 25, 27 and 29 and re-number remaining views.</p> <p>Section 7.6-Views and Vistas, Figure 41, p. 51, remove images of views 4, 13, 18, 19, 25, 27 and 29 and re-number remaining views..</p> <p>Section 7.6-Views and Vistas, Figure 41, p. 51, remove reference to views 4, 13, 18, 19, 25, 27 and 29 from Figure 42 and re-number remaining views.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>Baxter Ltd for land around Craven in the Yorkshire Dales<sup>1</sup></p> <p>The criteria offers a useful approach to evaluating the land within and around the proposed conservation area boundary (Figure 53 refers). The purpose of the exercise is, however, questioned. Cottesbrooke Estate is a large landowner able to exert a level of control over its holdings to provide a consistent management approach in contrast to the multiple owners found around Craven. The estate is an active agricultural operation, managing land as arable, pasture or woodland with integral open spaces within the village and wider landscape contributing to its recognized character.</p> <p>This character would be a consideration should any form of development arise particularly within the areas identified outside the proposed conservation area</p>	<p>The purpose of the open space analysis is to identify important features or elements of an open space. This enables its level of significance to be assessed in terms of its contribution to the character and setting of the conservation area. It also helps to ascertain whether a particular open space merits inclusion. The analysis found that proposed extensions BA1 and BA2 merit inclusion in the conservation area. Whether the various open spaces are under multiple ownerships or are under single ownership is not one of the criteria against which open spaces are assessed. It is acknowledged, however, that consistent management of open spaces on the periphery of Cottesbrooke Conservation Area is a positive attribute.</p> <p>Contrary to the respondent's comments, the analysis in Section 7.7 of the appraisal does not look at open space as a consideration in its own right. As explained above, it is the various features within an open space,</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Section 7.7, p. 59, first paragraph, second sentence, amend the text to read:</p> <p>"These particular open spaces, identified in Figure 51, lie</p>
--	--	---	---

<sup>1</sup> The text refers to an Historic England methodology. The methodologies endorsed by the Craven study are Conservation Area Appraisal, Designation and Management, Historic England Advice Note 1, 2016 (second edition, 2019) and The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3, 2015 (second edition, 2017)

	<p>boundary. Such areas are also likely to be considered as part of the setting of the existing conservation area, the registered park and of the individual and collective heritage assets therein, which all convey an understanding and appreciation of the open space. The presentation of 'open space' as a consideration in its own right therefore risks confusion and duplication.</p>	<p>including views of and through the space to the wider countryside, which give it significance and determine the extent to which it is important to the setting of the conservation area and/or other heritage designations. It is agreed that the broad character of the landscape surrounding Cottesbrooke as described in the respondent's comments should be considered if any development proposals arise in the future, but it is also important that the specific features within a space, which give it its special character, are clearly defined in the conservation area appraisal. Open space analysis fulfils this requirement and it is in line with the methodology that has been used when appraising other conservation areas in the Daventry area. Further work will be undertaken to provide photographic evidence relating to the significance of individual open spaces around the edges of the conservation area, especially in terms of the extent to which they enable views out to the wider countryside.</p>	<p>immediately adjacent to the conservation area boundary but their attributes generally extend further into other areas of the open countryside. <u>Views of the landscape beyond these areas are not always visible due to tree cover or the natural topography. Open spaces 25-32 are illustrated by photographs below.</u>"</p> <p>Section 7.7, p. 61, subheading 'OS7: Area of pasture south of All Saints Church, amend the text to read:</p> <p>"There are views from the churchyard south to this area of open land and also towards OS9 which contribute to the rural, peaceful atmosphere of the churchyard. <u>The gently rising slope and the line of trees terminate the views at The Green Lane, which runs east to west along the top of the slope...</u>"</p> <p>Figure 51, p.68, extend the area of OS9 south up to the boundary with The Green Lane.</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>Section 7.7, p.62, subheading 'OS12: An area of pasture that is immediately north of Court End, Main Street', amend text to read:</p> <p>"The trees and open space behind them contribute to the peaceful, rural character of the conservation area. There are views of the tree avenue, monument and the ridge and furrow from Main Street <u>as well as glimpses of the rural landscape beyond through breaks in the trees</u> (Section 7.6, V32).</p> <p>Section 7.7, p. 62, subheading 'OS13: Several irregularly-shaped enclosures between the gated road and the Welford Road, west of Cottesbrooke', amend the text to read:</p> <p>"There are several spinneys which are remnants of those depicted on the 1839 Tithe Map, as are many of the hedged field boundaries, indicating that features within this tract of landscape date back to at least the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, and probably earlier. <u>The rising topography and tree cover prevent longer views of the surrounding</u></p>
--	--	--	--

		<p><u>rural landscape beyond the Welford Road.”</u></p> <p>Section 7.7, p. 63, subheading ‘OS14: Two areas of pasture on the northeast side of Welford Road’, add the following text at the end of the paragraph:</p> <p><u>“Similarly to OS13, The rising topography and tree cover prevent longer views of the surrounding countryside beyond Welford Road.”</u></p> <p>Section 7.7, p. 63, subheading ‘OS15: Two areas of pasture south of the gated road’, add the following text to the penultimate sentence:</p> <p><u>“This area contributes to the peaceful and rural character of the landscape surrounding the conservation area and enables views to the wider countryside...”</u></p> <p>Section 7.7, p.63, subheading ‘OS16: An area of pasture north of the gated road and east of Calendar Farm’, add the following text at the end of the paragraph:</p>
--	--	--

			<p><u>“The open character of this land enables long views to the north and northeast.”</u></p> <p>Section 7.7, p.66, subheading ‘OS22: Small arable enclosure on west side of byway’, amend the text to read:</p> <p>“...The openness of this parcel of land enables views back towards the conservation area and in particular across parkland to an avenue of trees (see Section 7.6, V27) <u>as well as northwest towards Homeground Spinney.</u></p> <p>Insert photograph with the following caption:  <u>“Figure 50 of views across OS22 towards the parkland”</u></p> <p>Section 7.7, p.66, subheading ‘OS23: An area of pasture at the southeast corner of the conservation area’, add the following text at the end of the paragraph:</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p><u>“The land slopes gently upwards towards a belt of trees where views terminate.”</u></p> <p>Section 7.7, p. 67, subheading ‘OS24: Mitley Spinney and Homeground Spinney’, amend the text to the following:</p> <p><del>An</del> <u>Three</u> areas of woodland that makes a significant contribution to the character and setting of the conservation area. <del>Formerly three separate spinneys, one unnamed, and Mitley Spinney and Homeground Spinney,</del> <u>tree cover has subsequently increased, forming a single wooded area...</u> The spinneys <del>itself is form</del> <u>are</u> a prominent feature in the landscape. Situated on elevated ground at a height of 155m OD <del>it is</del> <u>they are</u> visible in views looking north from Cottesbrooke Hall (Section 7.6, V15). <u>The rising topography and tree cover close off views to the wider countryside in this direction. The three spinneys are also prominent in views as well as on the approach to the conservation area along the</u></p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>lane from Haselbech (Section 7.6, V29). <u>It is a feature of the 19<sup>th</sup> century park.</u></p> <p>Insert photograph with the following caption:</p> <p><u>“Figure 51: OS24, the spinneys as viewed from the lane to Haselbech”</u></p> <p>Section 7.7, p. 67, insert photograph with the caption: <u>“Figure 52: OS25, views across OS4 towards OS25. The rising topography prevents longer views to the rural landscape beyond.”</u></p> <p>Section 7.7, p. 68, insert photograph with the caption: <u>“Figure 53: OS 26, an area of pasture to the rear of Home Farm which enhances the peaceful, rural character of the conservation area. The rising topography prevents longer views of the landscape to the southwest”.</u></p> <p>Section 7.7, p. 68, insert photograph with the caption: <u>“Figure 54: OS27, an area of pasture that contributes to the</u></p>
--	--	--	--

			<p><u>rural character and setting of the conservation area as it is approached along the gated road. The land rises gently to the south, thus obscuring views to the distant countryside.”</u></p> <p>Section 7.7, p. 68, insert photograph with the caption: <u>“Figure 55: OS28, an agricultural field that contributes to the rural character of the conservation area and its surrounding landscape.”</u></p> <p>Section 7.7, p. 68, insert photograph with the caption: <u>“Figure 56: OS29, agricultural land that enables long views out of the conservation area from the gated road to Guilsborough to the open countryside”.</u></p> <p>Section 7.7, p. 69, insert photograph with the caption: <u>“Figure 57: OS30, an area of pasture that contributes to the rural character of the conservation area. The flatter topography of this enclosure and the countryside beyond, coupled with tree cover</u></p>
--	--	--	--

			<p><u>around its edges, prevent long views of the wider rural landscape.</u></p> <p>Section 7.7, p. 69, insert photograph with the caption: <u>“Figure 58: OS31, An area of both arable and pasture that wraps around the north end of the conservation area, enabling views Mitlely Spinney and Homeground Spinney. The rising topography and the tree cover prevent views of the countryside to the north of the conservation area.</u></p> <p>Section 7.7, p. 69, insert photograph with the caption: <u>“Figure 59: OS32, an area of arable land that enables views from the byway towards Homeground Spinney”.</u></p> <p>Section 7.7, p. 69, insert photograph with the caption: <u>“Figure 60: OS32, an area of agricultural land that rises gently to the east and northeast towards a tree-covered ridge, which obscures longer views of the surrounding countryside.”</u></p>
--	--	--	---

	<p><i>7.8 Public Realm and Other Features of Value</i> The value of the features identified within this section is not disputed. Indeed, the Estate fought to keep the painted timber way marker posts when the local authority previously sought to replace them with aluminium signposts.</p> <p><i>8.1 Building Types and Materials</i> The architecture of Cottesbrooke has a strong vernacular character. Again, many of the features identified in the appraisal have been cherished and managed by the Estate for decades. Indeed, the ‘timber, shallow pitched, canopy porches’ highlighted on page 72 of the report were added by the Estate in the 1970s and 1980s. However, there is a balance to strike between maintaining the architectural characteristics of individual buildings and enabling the buildings to have a sustainable future. For example, the Government requires let properties to meet minimum energy efficiency standards. Such standards are difficult to achieve for more</p>	<p>7.8 Comments noted.</p> <p>8.1 Comments noted. Proposals will be assessed on a case-by-case basis. The additional protections that exist within the conservation area will assist in making those decisions. Information about improving energy efficiency in historic buildings been produced by Historic England in two guidance notes; <u>Energy Efficiency and Traditional Homes   Historic England (2020)</u> and <u>Energy Efficiency and Historic Buildings: How to Improve Energy Efficiency   Historic England (2018)</u>.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	--	--	-------------------------------------

	<p>traditionally constructed properties with features such as single glazed windows. The Estate is legally required to meet these standards and as such there needs to be flexibility and an appreciation that not all architectural features will be able to be maintained in perpetuity.</p> <p><i>8.3 Boundary Treatments</i> Hedges make an important contribution to the conservation area demarking property boundaries and recording enclosure. The estate is aware of its duties under the 1997 Hedgerow Regulations and actively manages such boundaries through replanting, gapping up and cyclical trimming. The Estate will manage over 83km of hedges in accordance with the new Countryside Stewardship agreement which it entered into with the RPA with effect from 1 January 2021. In addition, the Estate will lay over 2,000m of hedge and coppice a further 865m under this agreement.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	--	------------------------	-------------------



	<p>Section 10.4 sets out the rational for these boundary amendments.</p> <p>Taking each in turn, we offer the following observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BA1: This land lies to the south of Station Road and south west of the un-named river which flows through the park to discharge into the River Nene.</li> </ul> <p>The rational for including this land is to better preserve archaeology. This is considered a reasonable intention from the landscape perspective and corresponds with the estate’s wish to retain this area under permanent pasture which also contributes to the setting of the village;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BA2 – land to the south of Station Road and east of 1 and 2 cottages which are part of the ITE agreement. The rational for including this area of paddock is to better preserve archaeology.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments welcomed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	--	---------------------------	-------------------

	<p>This is considered a reasonable intention from a landscape perspective and corresponds with the estate's wish to retain this area under permanent pasture which also contributes to the setting of the village, specifically 1 and 2;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BA3 concerns the west side of a spinney on the west edge of the registered park. This historic spinney has been expanded since 1900 and the rationale for its inclusion within the conservation area is 'for completeness' (10.4.3 refers).</li> </ul> <p>The western area is not, however, an historic woodland. It lies beyond an internal ditch which marks the boundary of the park. It does not appear on the tithe map. For this reason, it is excluded from the registered park and existing conservation area. Its inclusion risks confusing the understanding of the relative significance of the east and west areas of this woodland and an understanding and appreciation of the established</p>	<p>Comments welcomed.</p> <p>Paragraph 10.4.3 also mentions that the spinney contributes to the verdant character of the parkland but it is agreed not to include this area within the conservation area.</p> <p>See response above.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Section 6, p.34, Figure 28, amend the map so that the west half of the spinney is not shown as an historic area of woodland and that it falls outside the conservation area. Also alter the boundary on Figures 31, 42, 51 and 65 to exclude the area identified as BA3 in the consultation draft from the conservation area.</p> <p>No further change.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>boundary of the registered park. This woodland is already subject to a live EWGS as part of the WMP and subject to agreed thinning/felling cycles. The PMP has also assessed this spinney and recommended a refinement to the WMP: targeted felling of Scots pine along the inner east boundary. The clear segregation of the west and east spinney is therefore important. The further layer of designation risks eroding the understanding of, specifically, the registered park. It is also unnecessary from a management perspective given the existing management requirements associated with the various agreements and undertakings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BA4 includes parts of Mitley and Homeground spinneys. These woodlands are not included in the registered park for the same reasons as the west area of spinney above. Although partly historic plantings, these woodlands had evidently lost sufficient character and intactness by 1998 not to be included within</li> </ul>	<p>It is agreed the conservation area boundary will not be extended to include BA4, Mitley Spinney and Homeground Spinney.</p>	<p>Alter the boundary on Figures 28, 31, 42, 51 and 65 to exclude the area identified as BA4 in the consultation draft from the conservation area.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>the designation boundary. C. 1900, the Ordnance Survey recorded parkland between them had already been planted up and in their coalescence the woodlands extended northeast outside the park to include Homeground.</p> <p>As with BA3, the inclusion of the area within the conservation area risks confusion in an understanding of the registered landscape and of the relative significance between different areas within it. These woodlands are also subject to a live EWGS as part of the WMP, with consented thinning and felling operations. The introduction of a further layer of designation is therefore unnecessary and potentially confusing.</p> <p>Note: it is not unusual to have woodland outliers (coverts, plantations or clumps) beyond a park boundary but within an estate landscape. This is particularly common in hunting landscapes as</p>	<p>See response above.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	<p>No further change</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>found across Northamptonshire and Leicestershire. It is worth mentioning that the officers' statement in the draft appraisal on page 100 that this wooded area "was formed by three spinneys but since then tree cover has increased, forming a single wooded area" is incorrect. There remain three spinneys. Other evidence offered by the officers also seems somewhat uncertain. Indeed the restoration and reinstatement to parkland of the two fields running up to these woods from the Hall were a key consideration for Natural England, and The Landscape Agency when developing and informing the Parkland Management Plan. At no point did the spinneys ever form part of the discussions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BA5 concerns a pair of small boundary woodlands bisected by a stream ditch in the southeast of the registered park. Only the western part of these woodlands is within the registered park, the eastern part lies within farmland.</li> </ul>	<p>Thank you for drawing attention to this inaccuracy. Should the appraisal be adopted by the council as a supplementary planning document, changes will be made to it to recognise that it is in its final form. This will include omitting Section 10.4 – Proposed Boundary Amendments from the document.</p> <p>It is agreed that proposed extension BA5 will not be included in the conservation area.</p>	<p>Delete Section 10.4 – Proposed Boundary Amendments p.100-102 from the final version of the document, if adopted.</p> <p>Alter the boundary on Figures 28, 31, 42, 51, 65 and 67 to exclude the area identified as BA5 in the consultation draft from the conservation area.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>This is clearly recorded by the Ordnance Survey c. 1886 and c. 1900 and is why they were not included within the designation boundary. It is incorrect to describe them 'as a feature of the historic parkland'. The extension of the conservation area to include the eastern parts of the woodland will, again, risk a misunderstanding of their relationship to the historic woodlands within the park. These woodlands are also subject to live EWGS as part of the WMP and subject to consented planting and thinning. The PMP recommends the removal of Leyland cypress with the east woodlands. The introduction of a further layer of designation is therefore unnecessary and potentially confusing.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b> Cottesbrooke is a highly designated historic environment composed of a conservation area, listed buildings, a registered park and garden and undesignated heritage assets which lies within an SLA.</p>	<p>See response above.</p> <p>Please refer to previous comments above which address these issues.</p>	<p>No further change.</p> <p>No further change.</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>These designations inform complementary agreements and undertakings which allow the estate to continue to operate as a viable working business. The commitment of the Macdonald-Buchanan's to Cottesbrooke is evidenced by the number of these agreements – ITE, Countryside Stewardship, WMP – they have entered into and each is governed by its own requirements and monitoring arrangements. Cottesbrooke is in safe hands, the estate 'manage change in a manner sensitive to the character and appearance of the conservation area' (3.1). The wish to extend the conservation area boundary as described risks duplicating management responsibilities and thereby actually introducing potential risk to the very assets the designations are intended to conserve, notably the understanding of the registered park within the wider estate landscape. The benefit of extending the conservation area boundary is therefore considered to be low. No benefit will be</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>brought to the registered park itself. Land beyond the park boundary can be considered part of the setting of the designated and undesignated heritage assets. This measure of protection already extends beyond the existing boundaries and, again, the merit of extending the conservation area is therefore questioned. The existing boundary is 'fit for purpose'.</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>Mike Roberts, for and on behalf of Trustees of the Hospital of John Langham</p>	<p>I write to you as trustee of the Hospital of John Langham regarding the appraisal of the Cottesbrooke Conservation Area. This has been reviewed by the Planning Officers of West Northants, and appears balanced and well researched.</p> <p>However, my comments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Conservation Area is already very large. The arguments against such a large area are by and large identical to those put forward in 2000, when the Planning Officers recommended a much smaller, “tighter” conservation area, but were over-ruled by the Planning Committee who insisted that Cottesbrooke Hall should be included.</li> <li>• An extension of the Conservation Area and tightening of controls will make it harder for the buildings and</li> </ul>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The character of Cottesbrooke village is that of an estate village, whose development has been heavily influenced over the years by Cottesbrooke Hall. As such, the inclusion of the hall is paramount to the understanding of the village’s history. The designation in 2000 of the hall, its park and gardens and the village as a single conservation area is commensurate with the approach taken to other estate villages elsewhere in West Northamptonshire.</p> <p>This current review will not change or add to the types of controls that have been in place since 2000, when the conservation area was first designated.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

	<p>landscape to continue to be used in a sustainable way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Article 4 Directions will put additional complexities and cost into straight forward activities such as repainting houses and replacing old windows.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed boundary, includes areas which are outside of the Registered Park and Garden and therefore blurs the line between what is historic</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed Article 4(1) Direction would remove some permitted development rights for particular properties. These are set out on p. 98 of the appraisal. Whilst particular types of development would require planning permission, which would incur the cost of a householder application, the types of development for which permitted development rights would be removed are those which are carried out on an occasional basis. In some circumstances planning permission may not be required if the development involved is like-for-like replacement but this would need to be checked with the council's planning team. If the conservation area appraisal was adopted this would not bring the Article 4(1) Direction into force. It would be subject to a separate consultation at which time property owners would be contacted directly.</p> <p>It has been agreed that the conservation area will not be extended to include proposed extensions BA3, BA4 and BA5. This means the conservation area boundary will</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No further change.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>and what is recent (last 50 years).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Cottesbrooke Estate, at its own cost, maintains much of the amenity of the village. Who is going to maintain the items on the Local List which belong to the community i.e. the Telephone Kiosk and what are the implications if the care of these assets is not sustainable.</li> </ul>	<p>continue to be aligned with that of the Registered Park and Garden designation on all but its south side where it incorporates the village, as designated in 2000.</p> <p>Local list status does not confer any additional planning controls but it does recognise buildings or structures as locally important and they are given protection through policy if any proposed development is going to affect them. In terms of maintenance, local list status does not put any extra obligation on the custodian or owner to maintain the structure. If the estate was no longer able to fund that, it would be down to the community to fund it in its role as the custodian. If it was to fall into disrepair it would not be in the council's powers to take any enforcement action. The council would rather work with the community to try and find a solution. The council does offer community funding grants so that is a potential source of funding, especially if the kiosk is providing some sort of community facility, for example, a book exchange, if it is no longer a functioning telephone kiosk.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	--	--	-------------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On the whole the village's character has been established over years of careful management by the custodians at the time and without the extra layers of control enforced by the Local Authority. By adding more bureaucracy, it may start to tip the balance of retaining historic features and securing the long term sustainability of the village assets.</li> </ul>	<p>Whilst conservation area status introduces the need for planning permission for particular types of development, its designation was not a response to a perceived threat but rather recognition that it is a place of special historic and architectural character that merits conservation area status. It is acknowledged that the Cottesbrooke Estate is managed well by the owners. The proposed extensions to the conservation area are areas of pasture. The planning controls throughout the remainder of the conservation area would be the same as those which have been in operation since 2000 under which it has been successfully managed by the Estate working with the local planning authority.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Eric and Joyce Wright</p>	<p>I am writing to ask why it is necessary to extend the conservation area as you propose. Is there not adequate area (520 acres) to protect the village and its environs?</p> <p>Much of what is proposed I support – such as removing electricity poles, burying cables, minimizing street clutter and no street lights.</p>	<p>Thank you for your response. Please see comments from the Cottesbrooke Estate and the officer response to the same question above, under the heading 'Proposed boundary changes to the conservation area'.</p>	<p>No further change.</p>

	However, I feel the positives are weakened by this unnecessary step to extend the boundary of the conservation area wider.		
Peter Messenger	<p>I have felt the need to write to you about the Conservation Area Review. I was born in Cottesbrooke and I worked at Cottesbrooke for over 50 years and have been retired for some 10 years. Cottesbrooke's unique character is that it has no street clutter and has been managed as a traditional estate village. This gives it its unique feel. As a result, I welcome the review's conclusion that its rural character must be preserved.</p> <p>I cannot understand however that extending the conservation area adds to what already is in place – it may not. Views from the village are long and the areas in question cannot be seen from the village.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>It is agreed that the conservation area will not be extended to include the proposed extensions BA3, BA4 and BA5. The extensions BA1 and BA2 will be included for the contribution they make to the archaeological and historic interest and rural character of the conservation area. BA1 and 2 are to the south of Station Road and can be seen from the road.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
Carol Bozier	I have lived and worked in Cottesbrooke for over 40 years. The Estate is very largely	Thank you for your comments. Please see the response to comments made on behalf of the Trustees of the	No change.

	<p>responsible for ensuring the village has retained its rural charm. It has not been managed by public servants. As a result, I believe the Conservation Area should not be changed. A review is a review and nothing need change as a result.</p> <p>I do not drive and would like West Northants to consider some public transport, rather than worry about things the Estate is already managing well.</p>	<p>Hospital of John Langham above (final bullet point) which raise the same point.</p> <p>Where there are currently no bus services some areas have a community transport scheme operating. More information about these schemes can be found on the council's website  <a href="http://www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/councils/erivices/northamptonshire-highways/buses/Pages/community-transport.aspx">www.northamptonshire.gov.uk/councils/erivices/northamptonshire-highways/buses/Pages/community-transport.aspx</a></p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Susan Cazenove</p>	<p>My husband, as chairman of the Parish Meeting, was very involved in the original designation of Cottesbrooke Conservation Area in 2000. I can recall he was adamant that the conservation area should be drawn tight against the village curtilage and argued very vociferously against the extension of the area to the Register of Parks and Gardens boundary. Therefore, I cannot support any extension of this boundary, which seems very heavy handed and unnecessary</p>	<p>Thank you for your response. Please see comments above from the Cottesbrooke Estate under the heading 'Proposed boundary changes to the conservation area' and the officer response, which address each extension and the actions to be taken.</p>	<p>No further change.</p>

	<p>when Cottesbrooke Estate has managed the wider landscape very well.</p> <p>It would benefit the village greatly if the telegraph poles were removed and the power buried. Part of its charm is the lack of street clutter with no street lights and this would be the cherry on the top. I am glad that the Officials recognise the rural nature of the village and wish to minimise street clutter including street lights.</p>	<p>Comments noted. These positive features and public realm enhancements are set out in Sections 7.8 and 10.3 of the appraisal respectively.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Mike Roberts</p>	<p>I live in the Old Post Office and am not a tenant of the Estate. Cottesbrooke is a very unusual village and I am very proud to live in it. However, its special characteristics have not come about accidentally but because of the careful stewarding of the Estate through three owners. Over complicating this by expanding the area of the conservation, adding Article 4 Directions, adding constraints to the management of the Estate, could be counterproductive.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the Cottesbrooke Estate has been well managed and looked after over the years. This includes working with the local planning authority to ensure the requirements of local and national policies and legislation are met. As mentioned previously, the proposed extensions to the conservation area are pasture. The planning controls throughout the remainder of the conservation area would be the same as those which have been in operation since 2000 under which it has been successfully managed by the estate working with the local planning authority. The exception to this would be those permitted development rights</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	<p>Features such as the telephone kiosk, the post box, the lack of street lights together with street clutter, grass verges and hedgerow boundaries, all add to the character and charm of the village. The Officers have correctly identified them as worth preserving. I do however remain concerned that villages such as Cottesbrooke must not become “museum exhibits” and must be allowed to change and develop in a sustainable way.</p>	<p>that would be removed by an Article 4(1) Direction, as detailed in Section 10.2 of the appraisal but this would be subject to a separate consultation.</p> <p>Agreed. Rather than halting development, the purpose of the conservation area is to ensure that changes are managed in such a way that the special historic and architectural interest of the area is maintained and enhanced.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Brian Davies</p>	<p>I have lived in Cottesbrooke for over 40 years and have worked at the Estate as a Forester all that time. During that time, I have worked every inch of the woods at Cottesbrooke and planted many thousands of trees. They are in safe hands. I believe the proposed extension to the boundary of the Conservation area is unnecessary and adds further complications and cost to the management. All woodland is managed under a</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. It has been agreed that the conservation area boundary will not be amended to include the three wooded areas BA3, BA4 and BA5.</p>	<p>No further change.</p>

	Woodland Management Plan and overseen by the Forestry Commission. The Estate employs professional woodland advice in Lockhart Garrett.		No change.
Mark and Debbie Harris	<p>My family have lived and farmed in Cottesbrooke for well over 100 years. We have read the Conservation Area Appraisal.</p> <p>We do not agree with the extension to the boundary of what is already a very extensive area. We believe that as landowners and farmers the constraints that the conservation area imposes – in this case on the Cottesbrooke Estate – are unjustified, when the estate has nothing but the good of the landscape and village at its heart.</p> <p>We do however support the officers decision to preserve the rural character by minimizing street clutter. We also support the proposal to add the post box and phone box to the local list.</p> <p>As property owners we are concerned by the constraints imposed by Article 4 Directions, in</p>	<p>Thank you for your response. Comments noted.</p> <p>Please see comments from the Cottesbrooke Estate under the heading 'Proposed boundary changes to the conservation area', which address each extension and the actions to be taken.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The withdrawal of particular permitted development rights conferred through conservation area status or an Article</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No further change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

	<p>particular the alteration or replacement of windows and doors, and the painting of exterior walls. We do not believe these are necessary in a village that is already a conservation area.</p> <p>Whilst the officers requirements primarily affect Cottesbrooke Estate, we would wish to remind officers that the village of Cottesbrooke is a working, rural village and must be allowed to continue to be so.</p>	<p>4(1) Direction is aimed at steering development so that it preserves and enhances the historic character and distinctiveness of the village. Requiring planning permission for these particular changes will ensure that property owners receive advice about appropriate design, use of materials etc. In consultation with the planning team, if like-for-like replacement is proposed, planning permission may not be required. Conservation area status does not impose a requirement for planning permission for changes to windows. However, should an Article 4(1) Direction be made and confirmed by the council this would bring in some additional controls and these are set out in Section 10.2 of the Appraisal and Management Plan. A separate consultation would be carried out directly with the owners of those properties included in the Article 4(1) Direction.</p> <p>It is recognized that Cottesbrooke is working, rural village and estate and that this is integral to its character. As mentioned previously, the purpose of the conservation area is not to prevent development from taking place but to ensure that development is undertaken</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	---	--	-------------------

		in such a way that it preserves and enhances the village and estate's historic character and distinctiveness.	
Sheran Macdonald-Buchanan	<p>I acknowledge that the Local Planning Authority are legally required to review the Conservation Area.</p> <p>I cannot really comment on the proposed extension to the Conservation area on landscape grounds, however, I remain concerned that the extra layers of constraint, recommended by the Planning Officers, overlaid on many existing layers of specialist designations, would appear heavy handed, unnecessary and potentially costly.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>In addition to the conservation area, other designations that exist within the Cottesbrooke Estate are listed buildings, for which listed building consent is required for most types of works, and the registered park and garden. In the case of the latter, other than being a material consideration when planning applications are determined, it confers no additional planning controls. Conservation area status for extensions BA1 and BA2 would acknowledge the positive contribution they make to its historic and rural character and setting. It is agreed that the conservation area boundary will not be extended to include extensions BA3, BA4 and BA5.</p> <p>It is not the purpose of conservation area status to prevent development. Instead, it helps to ensure that if changes are proposed they are</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No further change.</p>

	<p>For Cottesbrooke to survive in the future, it should be able to grow and thrive with a regulatory environment that encourages sustainable development. I am concerned that too much control from the Local Government will suppress the growth of the village in a sustainable way. Cottesbrooke will become a curious relic with no hope for the future. Perhaps it already is.</p> <p>I believe this is a real danger. For instance, Article 4 Directions could put the wish to meet Government net zero targets in direct conflict with West Northants Planning Officers.</p>	<p>managed in such a way that the special character of the conservation area is conserved and enhanced.</p> <p>Planning applications are considered on a case-by-case basis taking into account the local and national policies on sustainable development and energy efficiency. It should be remembered that embodied carbon needs to be considered in development proposals, including those which are incorporated in the proposed Article 4(1) Direction. For example, the replacement of timber window frames with uPVC window frames is not necessarily going to help to achieve net zero targets if the embodied carbon of the uPVC frames (carbon emitted through the extraction and transport of raw materials and the manufacturing process) is greater than</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	---	---	-------------------------------------

	<p>The inclusions of assets in the local list is in principle a worthy aim but do these really warrant the enhanced status the local list provides?</p>	<p>the energy efficiency of the windows. In addition, rather than focusing on the replacement of windows to improve energy efficiency, a ‘whole building’ approach should be followed. This considers the way in which a building performs as an integrated environmental system and determines what is appropriate in terms of energy efficiency measures. This is particularly important for historic buildings where some energy efficiency measures may lead to unintended consequences such as the build-up of moisture. Historic England has produced several guidance documents on energy efficiency and heritage assets <a href="#">Energy Efficiency and Historic Buildings   Historic England</a></p> <p>The heritage assets proposed to be added to the Local List are assessed against a set of criteria adopted by the council that look at age; condition and quality; rarity; group value; and historic associations. The</p> <p>Local List candidates in Cottesbrooke were assessed against the criteria were found to meet the threshold for inclusion on the list.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	---	--	-------------------

	<p>The Estate plants many trees (1000s of trees in fact) each and every year. It has a biomass boiler to help heat the Hall and several other village properties. This not only helps manage the woodland resource, it also helps with the Estate's carbon footprint. The trees grow locally, are harvested locally, are chipped locally and provide heat locally. This virtuous circle could well suffer if further woodland is included in the Conservation area. I cannot therefore support the proposed extension to the Conservation area, which proposes to include 3 more areas of woodland that are already included in the Woodland Management Plan under the watchful eye of the Forestry Commission.</p>	<p>As mentioned above, it is agreed that the conservation area boundary will not be extended to include the woodlands identified as BA3, BA4, and BA5.</p>	<p>No further change.</p>
<p>Mrs J.R. Macdonald-Buchanan</p>	<p>I have read the appraisal from West Northants and would like to say I thought it was excellent.</p> <p>I was involved in the original consultation in 2000 and I recall the issues regarding extending the conservation area to mirror the Registered Parks and Gardens boundary. I see the plan is to</p>	<p>Comment welcomed.</p> <p>Please see comments from the Cottesbrooke Estate under the heading 'Proposed boundary changes to the conservation area', which address each extension and the actions to be taken.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No further change.</p>

	<p>extend this further. The conservation area as is seems to me to be big enough to preserve intact the feel and attractiveness of the village. As a result I cannot agree to any boundary changes which will increase this.</p> <p>I would add that I am encouraged by the Officers' wish to maintain the rural nature of the village by encouraging the removal of telegraph poles and overhead wires and discouraging any street clutter and street lamps. The lack of street clutter is one of the village's attractions!</p> <p>I live adjacent to the telephone box and feel it is an important feature which would be good to add to the local list.</p> <p>Any further restrictions imposed on the residents of the village appear unnecessary. Cottesbrooke Estate has done a good job of managing the wider estate for 100 years. They should be encouraged to continue to do so, and any further constraints may be counterproductive.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The planning controls within the conservation area remain the same as those which have been in place since it was first designated in 2000. The removal of some additional permitted development rights through an Article 4(1) Direction as set out in Section 10.2 of the appraisal would be subject to a separate consultation at which</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	---	---	---

		<p>point the relevant property owners would be contacted directly. The permitted development rights to be removed through the Article 4(1) Direction relate to the types of development that are undertaken periodically and are restricted to domestic dwellings. Whilst it is agreed that the Estate manages Cottesbrooke well, this cannot be guaranteed in the future if there are changes of ownership for individual properties.</p>	
<p>Alistair Macdonald-Buchanan</p>	<p>I have responded already on behalf of the Estate. I write now in my personal capacity.</p> <p>In 2000, the Estate argued against the inclusion of Cottesbrooke Hall and approximately 520 acres of surrounding parkland, woodland, arable and pasture farmland into the new Conservation area, but was supportive of a more practical and logical conservation area boundary drawn close to the village curtilage. This “tighter” boundary was rejected by the Planning Committee and the Officers eventually settled on the Register of Parks and Gardens boundary. This was the only logical</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The designation of the conservation area in 2000 to include Cottesbrooke Hall, its gardens and parkland as well as the village is considered to be a logical approach. This is due to the fact that development history and appearance of the village owe much to the fact that it is an estate village that has been greatly influenced by Cottesbrooke Hall over a number of centuries. This approach has been used elsewhere in the Daventry area where there are also Registered Park and Garden designations, for example,</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

	<p>boundary they could agree on. Back then the arguments against this huge conservation area boundary were very similar to those I will use now against any extension from the boundary that mirrors the Register of Parks and Gardens boundary (i.e. the current conservation area).</p> <p>While I still believe the existing Conservation area boundary is too extensive, I must remind you that almost every aspect of what the conservation is hoping to achieve is already well protected through a series of specialist designations and schemes designed to preserve and enhance the special historical and architectural appearance and character of Cottesbrooke. These include listing, ITE and Management Plan, Woodland Management Plan overseen by the Forestry Commission, Countryside Stewardship agreement with RPA and Parkland Management Plan with Natural England (signed off by Historic England and the Environment Agency). All these schemes are agreed on and entered into voluntarily.</p>	<p>Ashby St. Ledgers, Canons Ashby and Brockhall.</p> <p>It is agreed that there is a degree of overlap between the various management schemes and statutory designations. With the exception of the Registered Park and Garden, other designations and management schemes are specific to individual buildings or features. Therefore, the strength of the conservation area is the fact that it is an area designation that not only recognises the significance of those individual buildings/features but also the spaces between them and the landscape in which they are situated.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	---	--	-------------------

	<p>Furthermore, there are planning constraints. Cottesbrooke is classified as a Restraint Village; a Special Landscape Area; there is the Register of Parks and Gardens; an existing Conservation area (these currently mirror each other); and finally open countryside. This comprehensive set of designations and planning policies apply to the wider landscape at Cottesbrooke, Cottesbrooke village and the parkland, woodland and farmland surrounding Cottesbrooke Hall. All are there to protect the historic character and the setting.</p> <p>All the above must be set in context. Cottesbrooke is not a theme park but is a working agricultural enterprise, which includes forestry. Additional restrictions are unhelpful and frustrating. Cottesbrooke must remain viable and sustainable. Extra hoops through which we have to jump will inevitably lead to cost and frustrations on both sides – ours and West Northants – and achieves very little extra protection.</p>	<p>It is agreed that there is a range of designations and policies that help to protect Cottesbrooke Hall, village and their environs, although not all will lend protection specifically to Cottesbrooke’s historic environment. The conservation area designation does, however, focus on the historic environment and the accompanying appraisal and management plan provides detail as to the significance of its various elements, including the proposed extensions, BA1 and BA2.</p> <p>Please refer to the response to similar comments made above in the submission on behalf of the Cottesbrooke Estate. Conservation area status will not confer additional specific planning controls in the proposed extensions. However, it will reinforce their importance. In addition, the appraisal and management plan sets out their significance, which would be a material consideration should particular types of development be proposed in the future.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	---	--	-------------------------------------

	<p>I would ask you to reconsider the enlargement of the Conservation area. I have made a detailed case in the submission on behalf of the Estate.</p>		
<p>Claire Marshall</p>	<p>In relation to the above, whilst I'm not a resident of Cottesbrooke, I very much enjoy walking my dog around this area and using footpaths, Bridleways and byways, it's a lovely area.</p> <p>Referring to the draft consultation I have an observation concerning what has been suggested with regard to adding the new BA areas in particular BA5. It's not actually listed as one of the objectives under section 3.2 although BA1 to 4 are - not sure whether this was an error? However it is included in section 10.4.</p> <p>The reason stated for including it in the new conservation area is that the two spinneys at this location were included on the 1839 tithe map as being within the original Cottesbrooke hall park boundary. However the extract copy of the 1839 tithe map shown in this</p>	<p>Thank you for your response. It is agreed that Cottesbrooke and its surrounding landscape is a very special area.</p> <p>Thank you for pointing out this error. It has been agreed that the conservation area will not be extended to include BA3, BA4 and BA5. Furthermore, Section 3.2 and 10.4 will be removed from the appraisal to recognise that the document is in its final form.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Delete Section 3.2 and 10.4 – Proposed Boundary Amendments p.100-102 from the final version of the document, if adopted.</p>

	<p>document doesn't clearly illustrate this.</p> <p>The area that relates to BA5 is next to the byway at Dairy Beck Farm and this area would appear to actually be situated further to the right of the tithe map illustration. As such the draft documentation doesn't seem to clearly support the reasoning behind the inclusion of BA5 in the new park boundary.</p> <p>As the current brook/stream along the southern side of the current park boundary, near Dairy Beck Farm, would seem to separate the byway from Cottesbrooke Park, I wonder whether this area has actually always been part of the byway and not historically part of the Cottesbrooke park house grounds? Is there another section of the tithe map that would clarify this?</p> <p>A metalled road only depicts where a road covering has been laid not the whole extent of the width of the original highway or byway in this case.</p>		
--	---	--	--

Sandy Bole	I am contacting you in respect of sharing my own personal views regards whether the village should be classified as a Conservation Village?. I have lived very happily in the village for over 3 years now and am still struck at how well managed the village is currently and how it truly stands out as well 'preserved' compared to other local villages. It truly is a gem and has a beautiful aesthetic and any works are carefully undertaken with a mind to how it may affect either villagers or the overall look and functioning of the village.	It is agreed that the village of Cottesbrooke is very attractive and retains much of its historic character. It is acknowledged that this is due in great part to the careful management of the Cottesbrooke Estate.	No change.

	<p>Bearing in mind the unique position of Cottesbrooke, with many properties owned by the Estate, I feel that impossible restrictions as would happen under conservation status is undesirable. This because the Estate has ensured and is continuing to do so, and without these restrictions in place, that this village is as lovely as it is.</p> <p>The cost of running the properties will in variable rise and the current smooth running will be impacted. I am sure your own resources are not infinite either and perhaps your resources maybe better focused on another village that could be significantly improved by this classification?. As a resident I am, therefore, not in favour of getting conservation status.</p>	<p>The conservation area and, therefore, the additional planning controls that this confers, has been in existence since 2000 when it was first designated. Since that time the Estate, as the main property owner, has worked within the conservation area controls to maintain the village, park and gardens to their current standard.</p> <p>As mentioned above, the conservation area status and the additional planning controls have already been in place in Cottesbrooke for the past 21 years. The current review does include proposals for an Article 4 Direction, which would remove permitted development rights for particular types of development, which are detailed in Section 10.2 of the appraisal. These are types of development that are carried out on an occasional basis so the cost of applying for planning permission should not be prohibitive. The proposed Article 4 Direction would be subject to an additional consultation directly with property owners, at a later date.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	---	--	-------------------------------------

<p>Henry Clemons (Cottesbrooke Estate Foreman)</p>	<p>My concern for increasing the boundary of the Conservation area is that it will simply increase the burden and cost on the property and landowners who have created and protected the wonderful areas that the Conservation area reports to protect.</p> <p>It seems that there is little incentive for future landowners and generations to invest and continue to improve and enhance such areas. It is difficult to see a sustainable future for the countryside without imposing further restrictions on the landowners who are prepared to manage and care for areas of importance like Cottesbrooke.</p> <p>It is in danger of disrespecting the people who currently protect these areas and takes no account of the current Government bodies who protect such areas.</p>	<p>Thank you for your response. As mentioned previously, the proposed extensions to the conservation area should not alter the way in which those areas are currently managed or add to the costs of managing those areas. It is agreed that proposed extensions BA3, BA4 and BA5, three areas of woodland, will not be included in the conservation area.</p> <p>As the respondent will be aware, there are a number of schemes in which the Estate is already engaged that provide incentives for managing both the natural and historic environment of the estate. Conservation area status does not impact on these agreements, and they have been working in tandem since the conservation area was first designated 21 years ago.</p> <p>As has been mentioned previously, it is acknowledged that the Estate manages Cottesbrooke well and clearly seeks to maintain its historic interest. Rather than regarding the conservation area status as a hindrance it should be seen as recognition that the estate is well</p>	<p>No further change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>We should all be very aware what happens to non-managed woodland and the idea that these amazing, wooded areas will be of any interest if left to their own devices seems ridiculous. The funding put in by landowners over the years seems to be ignored. Woodlands are protected by the Forestry Commission and further regulation seems unjustified. In the consultation meeting it was stated that there is no cost to the extra regulations, possibly there is no fee but is the cost of time and professional fees to landowners not a cost?</p> <p>Woodland work is difficult enough to carry out in a timely manner with weather, nesting birds and current rules how is it beneficial to anyone to make this harder?</p> <p>As it seems the woodland areas have only been increased for good housekeeping would it not be better to remove these areas completely to allow good</p>	<p>looked after, to the extent that it merits conservation area status.</p> <p>There are numerous areas of woodland within the existing conservation area that are managed effectively through the Woodland Management Plan and EWGS, overseen by the Forestry Commission. As mentioned above, it is agreed that proposed extensions BA3, BA4 and BA5, three areas of woodland, will not be included in the conservation area.</p> <p>See comments above in relation to the conservation area boundary not being extended to include proposed extensions BA3, BA4 and BA5.</p> <p>See comments above in relation to the conservation area boundary not being extended to include proposed extensions BA3, BA4 and BA5.</p>	<p>No further change.</p> <p>No further change.</p> <p>No further change.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>management to continue at the landowners expense?</p> <p>I fully see the value of adding BA1 &amp; BA2 to the boundary if the aim of the conservation area is to protect areas of interest that may be open to future development such as the village of Cottesbrooke. The Hall and Park are Grade 1 listed and in conjunction with other agreements they are never likely to be developed or altered outside the special interests described in the consultation. Again, why not reduce the conservation area to the originally proposed village boundary and concentrate on looking after that.</p> <p>To include items such as the phone box seems nothing but a backwards step as it is only there and of interest to anyone as it has been adopted and maintained by the landowners. How will it be beneficial to future generations if the current situation is altered?</p>	<p>Whilst there are several agreements in place to manage various aspects of the park and gardens, they are not necessarily permanent and could be subject to change at the time of renewal. Although the park is on the list of Registered Parks and Gardens (Grade II) this does not convey any additional protections other than being a material consideration in planning decisions. Usually conservation areas, in whole or part, are de-designated if changes have taken place that mean it is no longer of historic or architectural interest. The current review has not found this to be the case and, therefore, it is not recommended to reduce the size of the conservation area to solely cover Cottesbrooke village.</p> <p>The purpose of local listing is to recognise those buildings and structures that contribute to the historic character of the area. The proposed inclusion of the telephone kiosk on the local list should not be interpreted as a lack of confidence in the custodian's ability to maintain it. In fact, along with</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	---	--	-------------------------------------

	<p>Again, it is in danger of disrespecting the work done by such people over the years to protect things that they haven't had to.</p> <p>A real benefit to the area of Cottesbrooke village would be to protect the village streets from signs, speed bumps and streetlights that would completely ruin the character and special feel of the village. Surely being a designated dark area would protect the future of the village far more than an area of woodland?</p> <p>The officers should be aware that only this week the Estate has negotiated with Western Power Distribution to put 250 metres of over head electricity cable under ground in areas of significant importance to the aesthetics of the village and the cost will be beared by the Estate owners. This is along side all the other work under taken by the Estate to insure the future of the village as it is.</p>	<p>its historic interest and the contribution it makes to the street scene, its good condition is also a factor that merits its inclusion on the local list.</p> <p>It is agreed that the low numbers of road signs and a lack of streetlights is a positive feature of the village and this is highlighted in Section 11 – Management Plan of the appraisal under the Highways and the Public Realm sections. Whilst it is agreed that the status of the area as a designated dark sky area may help to maintain the lack of street lighting, it is not within the remit of the council or this conservation area review to make that designation.</p> <p>Thank you for this information. This approach is suggested in Section 10.3- Public Realm Enhancements.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
--	--	---	-------------------------------------

	<p>As a resident of the village and an employee of the Estate, I am not in favour of the majority of the changes to the current conservation area and believe it would be far more constructive to recommend reducing it to the original 2000 proposal of the village boundary.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Please refer to the earlier response as to why reducing the size of the conservation area just to cover the village would not be an appropriate course of action.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>James Macdonald-Buchanan</p>	<p>I have recently been introduced as a partner into the business. I have been "raised and grazed" in Cottesbrooke. I understand that it is proposed that the Conservation area is increased in size. It is already vast and mirrors the Register of Parks and Gardens boundary. This is a "strong boundary", recognised by all heritage bodies, in particular Heritage England. I believe that any change to that boundary could weaken it, because the extensions are arbitrary and not based on historic evidence.</p>	<p>There is no presumption that the boundary of a conservation area should follow that of a registered park and garden. They are different types of designation. Whilst a registered park and garden recognises the deliberately planned and designed gardens and landscape, a conservation area has a wider remit and also recognises other types of architectural and/or historic interest. The current conservation area boundary already diverges from the boundary of the registered park and garden to include Cottesbrooke village. Therefore, there is no reason why it should not diverge in other areas in order to include features that make a positive contribution to its historic interest, appearance and setting. As set out in Section 10.4 of the appraisal, proposed extensions BA1 and BA2 form part of the historic landscape. The</p>	<p>No further change.</p>

	<p>The Estate is already managing many of the things the Officers mention in their review. I agree these make Cottesbrooke special - no satellite dishes, an estate colour, uniformity of porches. The point is the estate is already ahead of the game. That said, I welcome the Officers' recognition of the role the Estate plays, and agree that part of the charm of the village are the grass verges, its lack of street furniture, and no street lights to name a few.</p> <p>As the next generation I want the Estate to be viable and sustainable and so any constraints imposed by third parties feels threatening. Above all, Cottesbrooke must be allowed to adapt, to evolve and to thrive. More constraints could tip the balance. I believe, as custodians, our careful</p>	<p>proposals are based on the study of Lidar survey data and historic maps ranging in date from 1628 to 1950. It has been agreed that proposed extensions BA3, BA4 and BA5 will not be included in the conservation area.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>It is recognised that Cottesbrooke is a working estate. The purpose of the conservation area is not to prevent development from taking place. The additional planning controls with the conservation area (set out in Section 2.3 of the appraisal) aim to manage change so that the historic character of the conservation area is enhanced. If</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No further change.</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>management over many decades has helped make Cottesbrooke something we are all proud of. I ask you not to threaten it with the dead hand of bureaucracy.</p>	<p>the proposed extensions BA1 and BA2 are brought into the conservation area there should be no impact on their management by the estate for reasons already stated above in response to the Cottesbrooke Estate's comments.</p>	
<p>West Northants Council officer comments</p>	<p>Can you please consider making the following changes/additions to the document to ensure that the status and significance of Cottesbrooke as a working agricultural estate is recognised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 8.5 (loss of character) and/or Section 9.1 (alterations and extensions)</li> </ul> <p>Many of the residential and commercial buildings in Cottesbrooke are owned and managed by the Estate. This gives some level of consistency in overseeing and controlling works of maintenance, repair and alteration. Where possible, opportunities should be taken to work with the Estate owners and managers to ensure that ongoing management, use and changes remain sympathetic and compatible with the architectural</p>	<p>Thank you for the suggested text. This will be incorporated into the final version of the appraisal and management plan.</p>	<p>Section 9.1-Alterations and Extensions, p. 86, include the following text after the first paragraph,</p> <p><u>“Many of the residential and commercial buildings in Cottesbrooke are owned and managed by the Estate. This gives some level of consistency in overseeing and controlling works of maintenance, repair and alteration. Where possible, opportunities should be taken to work with the Estate owners and managers to ensure that ongoing management, use and changes remain sympathetic and compatible with the architectural and historic interest of the buildings and their contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.”</u></p>

	<p>and historic interest of the buildings and their contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 9.8 (setting) Cottesbrooke is a working agricultural estate that is managed for arable and livestock farming purposes together with other land-based and sporting uses. There may be conflict between these different and potentially competing uses and interests unless they are effectively managed, with the engagement of all relevant bodies. The role of countryside stewardship and other agri-environment schemes in helping to support rural heritage, including the repair and conservation of historic buildings and structures, and mitigating the impact of agriculture on the environment, is recognised.</li> <li>• Section 9.1. (Trees) Trees and woodlands on the Estate should be managed in accordance with a comprehensive</li> </ul>		<p>Section 9.8-Setting, p.89, add the following text before the first paragraph,  <u>“Cottesbrooke is a working agricultural estate that is managed for arable and livestock farming purposes together with other land-based and sporting uses. There may be conflict between these different and potentially competing uses and interests unless they are effectively managed, with the engagement of all relevant bodies. The role of countryside stewardship and other agri-environment schemes in helping to support rural heritage, including the repair and conservation of historic buildings and structures, and mitigating the impact of agriculture on the environment, is recognised.”</u></p> <p>Section 9.9-Trees, p. 89, add the following text after the first paragraph,</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>and up to date management plan. Sustainable management of trees and woodlands, which may include periodic felling and replanting with appropriate species, can meet the productive needs of the Estate whilst sustaining and, where appropriate enhancing, the historic, landscape and wildlife value of these important features.</p>		<p><u>“Trees and woodlands on the Estate should be managed in accordance with a comprehensive and up to date management plan. Sustainable management of trees and woodlands, which may include periodic felling and replanting with appropriate species, can meet the productive needs of the Estate whilst sustaining and, where appropriate enhancing, the historic, landscape and wildlife value of these important features.”</u></p>
--	---	--	---

## Appendix C – Survey Responses

Respondent	Comments	Suggested response	Suggested action
<b>Do you agree with the proposed boundary for the conservation area? (map available for viewing through link on Conservation Areas webpage)</b>			
Mrs JR Macdonald-Buchanan	Disagree proposed boundary.	No further details were provided in the survey response but the respondent did write separately and those comments have been addressed in Appendix A.	No further change.
<b>Do you think this Appraisal captures the special interest of Cottesbrooke? Please use the text box to highlight any specific features which you think either have or have not been captured.</b>			
Mrs JR Macdonald-Buchanan	It does capture the special interest of Cottesbrooke.	Comments noted.	No change.
<b>Do you agree with the candidates for the Local List? (see pages 75-84 of the Appraisal). Are there any more potential candidates which you would like to suggest? Please use the text box to identify candidates for the Local List, giving an address where possible.</b>			
Mrs JR Macdonald-Buchanan	Disagree candidates.	No further details were provided in the survey response but the respondent did write separately and those comments have been addressed in Appendix A.	No further change.
<b>Do you think there is enough clear guidance regarding conservation areas for residents or those 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>			
Mrs JR Macdonald-Buchanan	There is not enough clear guidance.	Comment noted.	No change.
<b>Do you think there are any actions missing from our Management Plan? (see pages 90-93 of the Appraisal). Please use the text box to identify specific actions, giving justification where possible.</b>			

Mrs JR Macdonald- Buchanan	There are no actions missing.	Comment noted.	No change.
<b>Do you think the proposed Article 4 Directions (see pages 86-87 of the Appraisal) would help to preserve special features of the conservation area? Please use the text box to identify specific locations or features at risk or permitted development rights that you feel should be removed?</b>			
Mrs JR Macdonald- Buchanan	Article 4 Directions would not help to preserve special features.	Comment 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 Appraisal where possible (using paragraph or section numbers) and, if seeking a change be clear what change is sought and provide justification where possible.</b>			
Mrs JR Macdonald- Buchanan	Not answered.		No change.