

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

**Statement of Consultation**

**Adopted 28 February 2023**



**West  
Northamptonshire  
Council**

## **1. Introduction**

This report sets out the consultation undertaken on the Newnham 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 26<sup>th</sup> April 2022 West Northamptonshire Council's Planning Policy Committee resolved that consultation could take place on the document.

## **2. Consultation**

Consultation commenced on 6<sup>th</sup> June 2022 for eight weeks. Statutory consultees, the parish council, 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 9<sup>th</sup> August 2022. The consultation period was extended past the original deadline of Monday 18<sup>th</sup> July 2022 due to unforeseen circumstances. A public online meeting was arranged for 19<sup>th</sup> July 2022 and the presentation slides and accompanying notes were subsequently made available on West Northamptonshire Council's website.

## **5. Comments received.**

17 responses were received during the consultation period. These are set out at Appendix B.

## **6. Consideration of Responses**

The Council considered the comments received and changes were made to the document as a result of the responses. This is set out in Appendix B.

The representation was reported to the Council's Planning Policy Committee on 28 February 2023 when the document was adopted.

## **Appendix A – Consultation Notice**

### **Newnham 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 Newnham. 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 6<sup>th</sup> June 2022 and closes at midnight on Monday 18<sup>th</sup> July 2022.

Comments in writing should be forwarded to Rhian Morgan, Heritage Policy Officer, 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 18<sup>th</sup> July 2022 at the latest.

Comments cannot be accepted after this time.

**Rhian Morgan**


Heritage Policy Officer

## Appendix B – Consultation Responses

### Written responses

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
Andrew Banks	<p>The following comments are in the order of the draft and include a few very obvious corrections which have probably already been made. The main comments concern the excellent descriptive and historical parts of the draft, not the policies, recommendations, etc, with which I generally agree.</p> <p>1. Historical Development, Page 20, para 1 You refer to the footpath east of the Nuttery as shown in Fig 7. Yet Fig 7. In my download excludes both The Nuttery and the footpath. Also, what is the second 18th century map you mention in the first sentence?</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>This reference should refer to Figure 8, where the southern village boundary follows the footpath south/ west of the Nuttery. This will be amended. The second map referred to is the 1765 “New &amp; Old” enclosure map, which is also attributed to Collis, and is likely a copy of the first.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Page 20, para 1, amend as follows: “Some type of village boundary is also shown <u>as can be seen on the map at Figure 8,</u> and the southern extent of the boundary follows the historic</p>

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
	<p>Para 2 Word "map" omitted after 1764.</p> <p>2. Spatial Character, Page 26 Map The Fig.14 and 15 (on page 28) maps are incorrect in showing the Woodland Trust share of the wood increased to include the whole orchard, excluding our substantial share. Here is the correct Land Registry version: (image inserted)</p>	<p>Comments noted, this will be amended.</p> <p>It appears that the boundaries shown on the GIS mapping within the appraisal (i.e around the plot of The Nuttery, particularly land to the south and west) do not reflect the land registry boundary. The GIS boundaries are taken directly from current Ordnance Survey mapping and as</p>	<p>footpath from Preston Capes Road through to the fields east of The Nuttery (see Figure 7 8)."</p> <p>Page 20, section 6, para 6, add text as follows: "The 1764 <u>map</u> shows a property at this location"</p> <p>Page 27, section 7.3, para 1,</p>

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
		<p>such cannot be amended by officers. It is not the intention of these maps to show the ownership of each parcel of land. References to the orchard in the appraisal will be amended to reflect the shared ownership between the Woodland Trust and The Nuttery.</p>	<p>amend text as follows:          "It is managed <u>in part</u> by the Woodland Trust (<u>this being the portion open to the public</u>), <u>and part by the owners of The Nuttery (residential property)</u> and has a very secluded character..."</p> <p>Page 27, section 7.5, para 1, amend text as follows:          "At The Nuttery on Manor Lane,</p>

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
	<p>Page 27, para 1 (Public open spaces) Should you use the word "private" for the churchyard and The Nuttery in a section headed "Public Open Spaces"? Maybe omit it or substitute "quiet" or "intimate"?</p> <p>It is difficult to describe The Nuttery simply. From pre-enclosure times most of what is now the orchard was part of the same plot as the house on it. In 1764, the owner (and probably builder) also owned a few strips in the big fields and so received a small land award. In the nineteenth century the house and plot (already a nuttery) were acquired by the Marriotts of Newnham House. Shortly before the last Marriott in Newnham sold it to us in 1991, she gave the larger part of the wood (about ¾) to The Woodland Trust, but retained about 200 trees which we continue to manage in the traditional style. The Woodland Trust decided not to change the name for their new site, which sometimes leads to confusion. At some point, pretty much the whole orchard was underplanted with snowdrops and they became a very successful second crop, co-existing happily with the hazels. Many of the snowdrops remain, although no longer in rows. (We open our part of the orchard once a year in snowdrop time in aid of the parish church.) Too much information! But how to correct the references</p>	<p>This is an understandable point, and alternative wording will be used for clarity.</p> <p>The changes suggested above to other points will clarify the mixed ownership and management of the Nuttery orchard.</p>	<p>the walnut <u>cobnut</u> orchard here has survived in similar form and is managed in <u>part</u> as a Woodland Trust site. <u>The other part is owned as part of the residential property The Nuttery."</u></p> <p>Page 27, section 7.3, para 1,</p>

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
	<p>in the draft without a history lesson? Incidentally, the orchard is not at the rear but at the south and west sides of the house (although possibly behind it in earlier centuries when there was once a door into the lane at the end of the cobbled pavement).</p> <p>Could I suggest that the main descriptive sentence is amended to the following or something similar, leaving references to management until the Trees section (see below) where you already talk about it? <i>"The Nuttery is a Victorian cobnut orchard found at the end of Manor Lane beside the house of the same name. It has a very secluded character, with numerous avenues through the trees. Many snowdrops, long since planted in the avenues as a second crop, also remain. In about 1990 the then owners of the house gave around three quarters of the orchard to the Woodland Trust to preserve and keep open for public enjoyment."</i></p> <p>Page 27, para 3 (Trees) Towards the end of this paragraph you mention "orchards to the south of The Nuttery". What is meant? The nut trees to the south of our house, both in our part and the Woodland Trust's, form an integral part of the Nuttery orchard, which is dealt with elsewhere in more detail. So exclude this reference? If you then move the main sentence about The Nuttery to the end of the paragraph, you can get the sentences dealing with bits and pieces of orchard out of the way first.</p>	<p>The suggested changes above should provide sufficient clarity.</p> <p>This refers directly to the property The Nutter. To provide clarity this will be altered to state the property.</p>	<p>amend text as follows: "Two more secluded, <del>private</del> quiet spaces are the churchyard and The Nuttery."</p> <p>No further change.</p>



Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
	<p>The existing sentence about The Nuttery begins after you describe “remnants” of a fruit tree orchard at The Banks, and says:            “At The Nuttery in Manor Lane, the walnut (sic!) orchard has survived in similar form” Do you mean as a remnant? It is intact, the same size as always, save for the tiny strip on the west side recently partly lost to make space for Hazeldean (which you have spelt more normally as Hazeldene). You can see the plot round the house on the 1764 pre-enclosure map. Parts of the orchard where the trees may now appear to have been lost have merely been coppiced, the forestry practice essential to preserve and rejuvenate them. The Woodland Trust only manage their part. We manage the remainder, following the traditional practices of our predecessors. May I suggest the following new wording or something similar for that sentence. Taken together with the above suggestions for para 1, I think it covers the same ground as your draft, but more accurately.</p> <p><i>“At The Nuttery in Manor Lane, the coppiced cobnut orchard has survived intact and is managed in the traditional manner, both by The Woodland Trust and privately. The nuts ceased to be sold commercially in 1985.”</i></p>	<p>This should read more clearly as it has survived relatively intact, as in it has a similar form to its depiction in historic mapping. This will be clarified with new text.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Page 27, para 3 Section 7.5,</p> <p>Add text as follows:</p> <p>“orchards to the south of The Nuttery (the house itself)”</p>

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
	<p>Page 29, view 4            You refer to Marriott’s House, but in the maps earlier in the draft you call it Newnham House, which I think has long been its actual name, even when the Marriotts, who bought our house as a farm cottage in the 19th century and sold it to us in 1991, owned it.</p> <p>Page 31, view 26            Although it was built by us loosely in the style of a traditional farm shed and barn, the tall part of our house to the left of the painted brick wall in the photo is actually a music room. Does it matter? For correctness you could omit “and adjacent barn”.            We are glad it gave you the impression we intended to create!</p> <p>Page 40, Fig 24 Map            At the bottom there is a view line marked V28 but it does not appear in the photos or text. Yet it seems to me that it is significant because it touches on something you have omitted to mention, perhaps intentionally. The Nene Way is the most important footpath to pass</p>	<p>This should read Newnham House. This will be changed.</p> <p>The reference to the barn will be removed.</p>	<p>Page 27, para 3, Section 7.5, alter text as follows:</p> <p>“At the Nuttery on Manor Lane, the <del>walnut</del> <u>cobnut</u> orchard has survived in a <del>similar</del> <u>form largely as depicted on historic mapping, save for a small strip on the western side where Hazeldean now stands.”</u></p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>through Newnham, and we see the many walkers who use it as they pass our kitchen window.</p> <p>The eastward direction of the footpath from The Nuttery shown on your maps is misleading because it is just a kink to get over a stile on the old path to Dodford and Weedon before it turns south west over the stream (the Nene) to Little Everdon. This is a very beautiful section of the Nene Way and the old county council walkers' guide made it its prime example of ridge and furrow scenery. When ascending to Newnhams from the stream the view northwest over the green fields to the village and conservation area is one walkers will treasure, despite the existence of the small sewage works. That view is roughly the line V28 on your map. Do you think it would be worthy of mention and inclusion, as giving extra value to the conservation area and also touching on the importance of the Nene Way for the village's profile?</p>	<p>The image and text for View 28 have been omitted in error. They will be added to the final version to reflect the view on the map.</p>	<p>Page 29, para 6, Section 7.6, alter text as follows:</p> <p>"...clear view of <u>Marriotts Newnham</u> House from Manor Lane..."</p> <p>Page 31, para 4, Section 7.6, Alter text as follows:</p> <p>"a prominent dwelling and adjacent barn which stands"</p>

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
	<p>Page 44 , Fig 25, Map for open space analysis</p> <p>Following on from the above comments on the views of the conservation area from the Nene Way, is there a case for formally recognising their moderate significance and for "colouring purple" the two fields to the south of The Nuttery and the other houses in Manor Lane. It would link the adjoining fields already coloured purple as S6 and S7.</p> <p>If your team have already walked down to the stream and back and considered the matter, maybe there are reasons why you decided to treat these fields as insignificant, compared with significant areas S6 and S7. But if it was not walked, there is certainly a case for doing it.</p> <p>Also, shouldn't the narrow strip of the field S6 between the track and our boundary be coloured purple? It is the same field and the same grass, and includes an ancient hedgerow.</p>	<p>Having revisited this area, the contribution made by the views into the village and the importance of the presence of the Nene Way to how the village (and by extension the conservation area) is experienced does give this area of open space some significance.</p> <p>There are long views to the church (albeit with modern properties in the foreground), and some short views to The Nuttery orchard.</p> <p>The openness of the fields is important to the character of the conservation area, but views are more limited</p>	<p>Page 31, Section 7.6, add new text as follows:</p> <p><u>"V28: There is a long view towards the church from the footpath which runs to in an east-west direction south of the village (part of the Nene Way). From the east it also provides a good view over the conservation area</u></p>

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
		<p>than elsewhere (such as OS6 and OS7 for example). As such, it will be categorised as making a moderate contribution to the setting of the conservation area.</p> <p>OS6 should reach up to the edge of The Nuttery itself, including the strip and hedgerow, and as such the map will be amended.</p>	<p><u>rooftops on the approach to the village along the footpath.</u></p> <p>Also add relevant image of view.</p> <p>Page 42, Section 7.7, Add text as follows:</p> <p><u>“OS11: This area of open pasture makes a moderate contribution to the setting of the</u></p>

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
	<p>3. Management Plan Page 62, 11.1, Threats: The first line needs correcting. Recommendation 1. Para 2: Replace "however" with "but"?</p> <p>Threat 2: "Corrugated concrete tiles" There are many critical references in the draft to corrugated concrete tiles. Is it the concrete or the corrugation which your criticism is aimed at? Or both? Our own roof, which you propose to safeguard with an Article 4 Direction (so it can't displease you too much) is of weathered flat concrete tiles used to replace the thatch many years ago and subsequent reclaimed ones.</p>	<p>It is not felt a change from "however" to "but" is necessary here.</p> <p>Where historic properties make an overall positive contribution to the conservation area but are not listed, Article 4 Directions can be used to help control some development, such as the alteration of roofing</p>	<p><u>conservation area.</u> <u>There is a long view of the church spire from the footpath to the south on the edge of the field, and some short views of the cobnut orchard at The Nuttery. The Nene Way passes through this field allowing the experience of these views passing the conservation area. The openness of</u></p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>Page 64, Para 1, Impact on Trees  You say "Traditional orchards, including a significant nut orchard still exist in the conservation in some forms, however (= but!) these have been depleted and are at risk of complete loss."  That implies ours The Nuttery is at risk of complete loss. It certainly isn't.  The</p>	<p>materials. Where (possibly unsympathetic) modern materials have been introduced already, the direction means that any changes to the roof in the future can be steered towards the use of more appropriate styles and materials. Historically, slate (or corrugated tin/iron) would be an appropriate replacement for thatch, and as such it is the concrete tile which is discouraged (not necessarily the corrugation, as this is seen in the use of pantiles on traditional buildings). The management plan encourages the use of historic materials in new development proposals.</p>	<p><u>these fields contributes to the nucleic, rural nature of the settlement, which is particularly characteristic of the eastern side of the village."</u></p> <p>Page 44, amend map to include OS11 and include small strip on western side of OS6.</p> <p>No change.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>Woodland Trust ought to preserve their bit, and we have sweated hard to preserve ours and if we left it we would try to pass it on to new owners pledging to do the same.</p> <p>If you have evidence, you could say:  <i>"..... but some have been depleted and are at risk of complete loss."</i></p>	<p>This will be altered to note that this does not include The Nuttery.</p>	<p>No change.</p>



Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
			<p>Page 64, para 1, Section 11.1, Alter text as follows:</p> <p>“Traditional orchards, including a significant nut orchard <u>at The Nuttery</u>, still exist in the conservatio</p>

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
			<p>n in some <u>varying</u> forms, however <u>Other than The Nuttery</u>, these <u>orchards</u> have been <u>partially</u> depleted and are at risk of <u>complete further</u> loss."</p>
Anne Rushall	<p>I note in the introduction of the document (2.1) that a Conservation Area may be defined as an "...area of special architectural or historic interest, the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance".</p> <p>Area BA 1 *Therefore I strongly agree that the terraces of cottages on the East side of Mounts Lane should be included within the Conservation area. Their</p>	Comments welcomed.	No change.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>appearance (front elevation) has been enhanced by current owners in the last few years.</p> <p>BUT I see little merit in the inclusion of any of the more modern dwellings on either the east or west side of the Lane. They are a mixture of building materials and styles, including a wooden bungalow and a pebble-dashed house.</p>	<p>In proposing extensions to conservation areas, it is generally considered good practice to avoid creating large gaps in the designation, particularly in areas where properties sit closely adjacent to each other and development which affects one may have an impact on neighbouring buildings. The majority of the eastern side of the Mounts Lane is lined with vernacular historic properties up until Woodview, and the same can be said for the western side up to and including Ivy Cottage. Just north of Ivy Cottage there are direct views across the extensive historic enclosures towards the church and the rears of</p>	<p>Remove following properties from proposed designation, including all relevant mapping (all situated on Mounts Lane): The Elms, Redlands, High House, Little Trelawne, Shirley, Branscombe, Markers End, Trevethan, Touchwood, The Rookery, Montag.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>*Newnham Hall has been excluded! (This is a major building in the village and the building itself is listed.) It has a walled garden - the only one in Newnham? - and has well established grounds and gardens, including old topiary, surrounding it. Together with Dicks Farm, these grounds should be included.</p>	<p>properties on Church Street. There is also a low stone wall built in the vernacular style which lines the fronts of properties on Mounts Lane almost along its entirety. It is proposed that the extension at BA1 be reduced to now include the following properties on Mounts Lane- Woodview, Linnets Cottage, Dolphin Cottage, Lester Cottage and Dunster Cottage. Also to be included are the low stone wall running along the frontages of the plots on the eastern side of the lane.</p> <p>Whilst Newnham Hall is a significant designated heritage asset which has a relationship with the village, the main house and its ancillary</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
	<p>P27 "walnut orchard" - should read hazel/cobnut orchard</p> <p>P29 V4 Marriotts House aka Newnham House</p> <p>P53 9.7 Perkins Farm is not thatched</p>	<p>buildings, along with Dicks Farm and the adjacent barn are all listed structures which are afforded protection under the listed building consent system.</p> <p>P.27- As noted above, this reference will be altered in the final draft.</p> <p>P.29- References to Marriott House will be corrected to Newnham House.</p>	 <p>Page 27, para 3, alter text as follows:</p> <p>"...the <del>walnut</del> <u>cobnut</u> orchard here has..."</p> <p>Page 29, para 6, alter text as follows:</p> <p>"...clear view of <u>Marriotts</u></p>

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
	<p>P61 BA 1 line 8 should read Manor Lane not Mounts Lane</p>	<p>P.53 This should read the barn at Church Farm, and will be corrected.</p> <p>P.61 This will be corrected to say Manor Lane.</p>	<p><u>Newnham House...</u>"</p> <p>Page 53, para 8, alter text as follows:</p> <p>"...including Church Farm, Perkins <u>the adjacent barn at Church Farm...</u>"</p> <p>Page 61, para 2, alter as follows:</p> <p>"...similar to that of <u>Mounts Manor Lane...</u>"</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
Darron Maddock	<p>I have read the proposals for the Newnham conservation area several times and am unclear of its purpose. It is stated that a conservation area can be defined as 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.</p> <p>Yet the aim of the document seems to be to include modern buildings into the area of the conservation area, such as the two modern houses and two modern bungalows on the western side of Mounts Lane. This seems illogical.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>In proposing extensions to conservation areas, it is generally considered good practice to avoid creating large gaps in the designation, particularly in areas where properties sit closely adjacent to each other and development which affects one may have an impact on neighbouring buildings. The majority of the eastern side of the Mounts Lane is lined with vernacular historic properties up until Woodview, and the same can be said for the western side up to and including Ivy</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Remove following properties from proposed designation, including all relevant mapping (all situated on Mounts Lane): The Elms, Redlands, High House, Little Trelawne, Shirley, Branscombe, Markers End, Trevethan,</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
		<p>Cottage. Just north of Ivy Cottage there are direct views across the extensive historic enclosures towards the church and the rears of properties on Church Street. There is also a low stone wall built in the vernacular style which lines the fronts of properties on Mounts Lane almost along its entirety. It is proposed that the extension at BA1 be reduced to now include the following properties on Mounts Lane- Woodview, Linnets Cottage, Dolphin Cottage, Lester Cottage and Dunster Cottage. Also to be included are the low stone wall running along the frontages of the plots on the eastern side of the lane.</p>	<p>Touchwood, The Rookery, Montag.</p>



<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>As you read further there seem to be more inconsistencies. I fail to understand the logic of applying Article 4 Direction to April Cottage, The Old Smithy and Tanyard House on Church Street, withdrawing their permitted development rights. By my understanding and local knowledge Tanyard house was a house built around 1970-75 on behalf of Mr &amp; Mrs James Punch. Why does this modern building qualify as historic in any way. The lack of patina of the stone construction and plastic frame windows surely give this away. We can also say with 100% certainty that The Old Smithy did not exist prior to the turn of this century (2000) as it currently does. Previously it was a single story shop which was developed in approx 2000/2001, meaning the majority of the property is new with modern materials. I have photos which show the extent of modern materials used and so am again wondering about the decision making which is going on. Finally April Cottage, which has been Subject to a planning approval works over the past three year and has already undergone significant modernisation. What specifically sets this property aside for special attention, when other properties of similar age which have not been modernised on the same street have been ignored. Again I have historic photos which show the street scene in times gone by to support this view.</p> <p>It's important when making these decisions that only really impact the owners that you properly understand the age and significance historically of all the buildings or at the very least explain the rationale leading to such impactful outcomes.</p>	<p>As noted above by the respondent, conservation areas are "areas of special architectural or historic interest" where the overall character must be taken into consideration when determining planning decisions. The character of Church Street is highly consistent due to the use of vernacular ironstone for all of the properties, their scale, their form in relation to the highway (i.e sat close to the road, creating enclosure) and their orientation to the road. What also creates consistency is the style and ratio of fenestration, the majority of which is</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
	<p>Finally and to further demonstrate the lack of knowledge when putting this document together. The photos on page 47 are not of terraced properties as described but semi detached. The lower picture is of a single home which is attached to one other property, making it semi</p>	<p>small-pane casement. Whilst there may be properties on the street which have been modernised (it is incredibly rare that a property has not undergone some form of alteration over its lifetime) or properties built in relatively recent years, this does not mean that they fail to make a contribution to the character of the conservation area, or continue to preserve the consistency in form, materials and style. As such, the control of permitted development rights ensure that the contribution these properties make continues to be considered appropriately in order to preserve or enhance</p>	<p>Page 47, Figure 28</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>detached, NOT terraced as the text states. How can you possibly have such little knowledge of your subject matter when you are formulating such impactful plans.</p>	<p>the overall character of the conservation area.</p> <p>The figure reference should split these pictures, as the terrace reference refers to the bottom image only, which historically is shown on maps as a terrace of three small cottages. The image above is of semi-detached properties on Daventry Road. This will be corrected in the final draft.</p>	<p>title, alter as follows:</p> <p>“Examples <u>above</u> of <u>semi-detached</u> <u>properties (top)</u> and <u>historically terraced</u> properties in Newnham conservatio n area.”</p>
Edgar Mobbs	<p>I HAVE BEEN THROUGH THE 65 PAGES OF THE CONSERVATION AREA PROPOSALS AND AM NOW VERY PUZZLED INDEED AT THE CONCLUSIONS.</p> <p>IT SEEMS THAT DIFFERENT CRITEREA HAVE BEEN USED FOR THE WESTERN AND SOUTHERN AREAS OF THE VILLAGE COMPARED WITH THE EASTERN AND NORTHERN AREAS.THE WESTERN AND SOUTHERN AREA PROPOSALS VERY CAREFULLY IGNORE ALL MODERN HOUSING</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>All proposals are formulated applying the same best practice methodology, however each area is different, therefore there may be different outcomes in applying best practice.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The areas of modern housing at Coronation Road, West Road and Bradbury Road are</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	FROM BEING BROUGHT INTO THE CONSERVATION AREA - BUT THE EXACT OPPOSITE SEEMS TO BE THE CASE IN THE EAST AND NORTH!	<p>For example, where there are clear areas of discrete modern development, such as a complete new road/estate as at Coronation Road, West Road or Bradbury Road, these areas can be simply excluded if there is no architectural or historic interest which merits inclusion within the designation.</p> <p>However, almost all of the other lanes within the settlement have an organic mixture of historic and modern properties, as is quite normal within most villages. As such, the application of the methodology may produce different outcomes as the characters of those areas are different.</p>	<p>planned extensions to the village where there are no historic properties, as opposed to the infill development which has occurred on roads such as Mounts Lane and School Hill, where modern and historic properties sit adjacent to one another, having developed over time. As such, the treatment of</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>FOR EXAMPLE, IT IS NOW PROPOSED THAT THE WESTERN SIDE OF MOUNTS LANE WITH ITS 2 MODERN HOUSES AND 2 MODERN BUNGALOWS SHOULD JOIN THE CONSERVATION AREA AS PART OF YOUR EXTENSION "BA1". THE PROBLEM IS THEN FURTHER COMPOUNDED BY THE OMISSION FROM THE CONSERVATION AREA OF THE LEADING HOUSE OF THE VILLAGE, NEWNHAM HALL, WITH ITS FARM HOUSE AND WALLED GARDEN, PART OF WHICH IS ACTUALLY LISTED, BUT THEN TOTALLY IGNORED FOR THE CONSERVATION AREA!</p> <p>I WOULD SUGGEST THAT A REVERSAL NEEDS TO BE MADE. THE WHOLE NEWNHAM HALL AREA SHOULD BE INCLUDED, WHILE THE 2 MODERN HOUSES AND 2 BUNGALOWS (ONE OF WHICH IS ONLY CONSTRUCTED OF CEDARWOOD) ON THE WEST SIDE OF MOUNTS LANE SHOULD BE EXCLUDED, AS THEY CORRECTLY ARE AT PRESENT.</p> <p>THE PROPOSAL FOR THE EXTENSIONS AS THEY STAND IS COMPLETELY UNACCEPTABLE. CONSERVATION SHOULD BE CHIEFLY ABOUT OLDER HOUSES, PROBABLY STONE BUILT OR WITH SOME ARCHITECTURAL MERIT, BUT CERTAINLY NOT MID 20<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY MODERN HOUSING, WHICH SHOULD BE TREATED LIKE THE WESTERN END OF THE VILLAGE. CORRECTIONS ARE THUS BADLY NEEDED.</p>	<p>In proposing extensions to conservation areas, it is generally considered good practice to avoid creating large gaps in the designation, particularly in areas where properties sit closely adjacent to each other and development which affects one may have an impact on neighbouring buildings. The majority of the eastern side of the Mounts Lane is lined with vernacular historic properties up until Woodview, and the same can be said for the western side up to and including Ivy Cottage. Just north of Ivy Cottage there are direct views across the extensive historic enclosures towards the church and the rears of</p>	<p>these areas will differ.</p> <p>Remove following properties from proposed designation, including all relevant mapping (all situated on Mounts Lane): The Elms, Redlands, High House, Little Trelawne, Shirley, Branscombe, Markers End, Trevethan, Touchwood, The</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
		<p>properties on Church Street. There is also a low stone wall built in the vernacular style which lines the fronts of properties on Mounts Lane almost along its entirety. It is proposed that the extension at BA1 be reduced to now include the following properties on Mounts Lane- Woodview, Linnets Cottage, Dolphin Cottage, Lester Cottage and Dunster Cottage. Also to be included are the low stone wall running along the frontages of the plots on the eastern side of the lane.</p>	<p>Rookery, Montag.</p>
<p>Glen McDonald</p>	<p>I live at the property known as Bartons, The Green, Newnham. My property is shown as the only residential property to fall under your proposed new category called 'Local List'.</p> <p>I don't understand why there has to be this additional new category? Your reason for this on page 55 seems quite vague. Surely there is</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Local heritage lists are used across the UK in</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>already enough planning controls and regulations we already have to abide by without adding this new category? Why is such a new category required and what exactly does it mean and what are the implications for me? For example;</p> <p>Why am I the only residential property on this new list? What additional controls does it place on me? If, as you say on page 55, it does not confer any further planning controls then why the need to have this additional level of red tape and bureaucracy?</p> <p>I would have thought there is enough regulations to protect public assets, such as the war memorial and phone box, but if not, then could possibly understand why a new 'Local List' could be introduced for those but surely not for a residential home which has enough regulations and is one of many other residential homes just like it in this and so many other villages around the country?</p> <p>Does the Local List just mean the look of the front of my property as shown in your photograph on page 56 or the back as well? With our country facing increasing climate and energy challenges we all might need to think differently and put solar panels on our roofing though I would have thought should that happen for me then it would at least be on the opposite side (i.e. the south side) of your photograph. Is this allowed under your Local List? If not, then how am I compensated for that?</p> <p>Does the outbuildings at my property (not shown in your photograph) fall under the Local List? If so, what are the implications for those too?</p>	<p>order to recognise heritage assets which make a special contribution to their local area, be they buildings, monuments, landscapes, or archaeological features. Therefore, a list can contain both public features like the war memorial and public telephone box, and domestic buildings. Assets added to a local list are often identified because they have particular significance, relating to factors such as age, architectural special interest, good condition, group value, or associations with local noted persons, for example. Assets that are proposed to be added to the local list are also generally those which are not likely to</p>	

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>If in the event of a future sale of my property the value is impeded by being on this new Local List what mechanism is in place in order that I can be duly compensated for that?</p> <p>To date I have painted the window frames and rendered walls as part of my normal maintenance work. Can this proceed as normal or will you be instructing specific rules about that e.g. colour, type of paint etc? If so, what are those proposed rules and how will I be compensated for that additional cost?</p> <p>I would prefer my house not to be on the proposed Local List and request this be taken off. I don't think it is necessary for a residential property to be on this proposed new list as there are sufficient planning rules and regulations in place already.</p>	<p>be granted listed building or scheduled monument status, as their significance is generally considered local rather than national. As such, the way local list assets are managed is proportionate to this "non-designated" type of asset. These assets should be given protection in order to preserve them for the local community to enjoy. This does not mean that they should not be altered at all or not be allowed to evolve, but that if proposals are made which require planning permission, the significance of the asset can appropriately be taken into account. In line with the management of "non-</p>	



<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
		<p>designated" heritage assets, there is no automatic removal of permitted development rights for assets on the local list. They are instead protected through local and national policy, which considers that they should be preserved in a manner proportionate to their significance. Sometimes, it is stated that a particular aspect of an asset should be locally listed, but more often than not it is the whole asset. In the case of "Bartons" the whole property would be included on the list. Furthermore, it is only the external appearance which is covered by the policy, not internal. If alterations to outbuildings were being</p>	

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
		<p>proposed, then there may be cause to consider the impact this may have on the main property or the character and appearance of the wider conservation area, but this would be entirely dependent on the proposals being made.</p> <p>Maintenance work is not regulated by the planning system, and so repainting windows or maintaining a rendered wall can be done without the need to apply for permission.</p> <p>There is no evidence that living in a locally listed building has any effect on housing prices. As such, there is no national mechanism for compensation for</p>	

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
		<p>being placed on a local list. As stated above, there are no reduced permitted development rights, and so matters such as the installation of solar panels or other alternative energy sources would be dealt with under the existing conservation area regulations. The following Planning Portal webpage provides details of the conditions for installing solar panels:  <a href="#">Planning Permission: Solar equipment mounted on a house or a block of flats or on a building within the curtilage - Solar panels - Planning Portal</a></p> <p>The following link is for Historic England's advice relating to Energy Efficiency and</p>	

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
		<p>Historic Buildings which you may find useful should you be considering making alterations to your property. <a href="#">Energy Efficiency and Historic Buildings   Historic England</a></p> <p>If you would like to speak to a planning officer about this or any proposals, please contact the Development Management team at the Council.</p>	
Jim Simpson	<p>1. Newnham Parish Council consider that, subject to the comments that follow, the appraisal is a well-researched document that brings together the history and importance of the village, thank you.</p> <p>2. An informal meeting of villagers was called to discuss the appraisal, it's implications and ramifications prior to the delayed online presentation. That resulted in a series of questions being raised which Rhian Morgan has kindly responded to. On the basis that the appraisal document will become a supplementary planning document, those questions and answers (modified by our comments below) must be included (as an annex) as part of the</p>	<p>Comments welcomed.</p> <p>It is not normally practice to include Q&amp;As as appendices to our appraisals. Therefore they have been included in this report below as a</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>appraisal document (as opposed to extracts from the Q &amp; A's being inserted and taken out of context). If the Q &amp; A's are not included, then this response must be treated as setting out in full both the questions and the answers</p> <p>3. In respect of the answers to the various questions that have been given, we have the following comments:- Q1 – it needs to be made clear in the answer that there are currently no local requirements and the designation of a property within the Conservation area will not alter the national requirements</p> <p>Q2 – whilst the question related to EV charging points, there needs to be guidance in the appraisal to the installation of CCTV camera's please</p>	<p>further set of consultation responses, complete with the answers provided at the online meeting.</p> <p>If this is referring to local and national validation requirements, then it is correct that there is no change to the local requirements. At the national level, applications for the construction of one or more dwellings; or a building or buildings with a floor space of 100 square metres or more require a design and access statement.</p> <p>The installation of CCTV cameras is not controlled under the planning permission regime, but it would</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>Q5, Q6 &amp; Q7 – despite the answers given, we still see no justification for the proposed inclusion of the additional part of Mounts Lane – marked “BA 1”.</p> <p>At the last conservation review in 1998, they were deemed not worthy of inclusion in the conservation area at that time. Nothing in the appraisal document or the answers sets out what has changed and why.</p>	<p>likely require listed building consent if a camera were proposed to be affixed to a listed building. In considering the addition of CCTV systems to properties within conservation areas, the overarching principles of development within a conservation area should be considered. Does the proposed development preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area? Are there ways in which the siting or design of CCTV cameras can be mitigated so as to impact a little as possible on appearance? Further information will be added to the Design Guidance principles at</p>	<p>Remove following properties from proposed designation, including all</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>The 4 properties on the west side of Mounts Lane proposed for inclusion are all relatively modern properties. Likewise, Montag, Calvine and Touchwood on the east side are 3 properties that have been built since 1967 and are modern.</p> <p>Some of the remaining properties along the east side that are proposed also fall into the more modern category. None of these properties are considered heritage assets and nor are they within the definition of "historical".</p> <p>We consider that the inclusion of the properties within "BA 1" is simply an "infill" of the plan which will have cost implications for the owners which are both wholly unnecessary and wholly disproportionate. The existing planning and building regulations are considered sufficient.</p> <p>Without any proper justification, we consider that "BA 1" should be excluded from the appraisal. If in due course it was considered there was some justification for inclusion, then a further consultation can take place.</p>	<p>Section 9 to provide help.</p> <p>In proposing extensions to conservation areas, it is generally considered good practice to avoid creating large gaps in the designation, particularly in areas where properties sit closely adjacent to each other and development which affects one may have an impact on neighbouring buildings. The majority of the eastern side of the Mounts Lane is lined with vernacular historic properties up until Woodview, and the same can be said for the western side up to and including Ivy Cottage. Just north of Ivy Cottage there are direct views across the</p>	<p>relevant mapping (all situated on Mounts Lane): The Elms, Redlands, High House, Little Trelawne, Shirley, Branscombe, Markers End, Trevethan, Touchwood, The Rookery, Montag.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
	<p>Q11 – we have yet to see the scoring to justify the inclusion of “Bartons” on the Local List and therefore reserve our position to comment further</p> <p>Q17 – please ensure that we are notified of and copied into the consultation process</p> <p>Q19 - please ensure that we are notified of and copied into the consultation process</p>	<p>extensive historic enclosures towards the church and the rears of properties on Church Street. There is also a low stone wall built in the vernacular style which lines the fronts of properties on Mounts Lane almost along its entirety. It is proposed that the extension at BA1 be reduced to now include the following properties on Mounts Lane- Woodview, Linnets Cottage, Dolphin Cottage, Lester Cottage and Dunster Cottage. Also to be included are the low stone wall running along the frontages of the plots on the eastern side of the lane.</p> <p>This has subsequently been provided via email.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>



<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>4. Both we and those within the Conservation area are pleased to see some documented guidance which has hitherto been lacking.</p>	<p>All those who respond to the consultation will be informed of the report/consultation progression.</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>Comments welcomed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>John Taylor</p>	<p>I live at Montag Mounts Lane Newnham a 1968 built house.</p> <p>I do not think it reasonable to change my 1968 built house into a conservation zone, and thereby remove permitted development rights and involve me in expense and greater difficulties to make minor property changes, which were allowed when I recently bought the property.</p> <p>Accordingly please exclude my property as other have been in previous zonings</p>	<p>In proposing extensions to conservation areas, it is generally considered good practice to avoid creating large gaps in the designation, particularly in areas where properties sit closely adjacent to each other and development which affects one may have an impact on neighbouring buildings. The majority of the eastern side of the Mounts Lane is lined with vernacular historic</p>	<p>Remove following properties from proposed designation, including all relevant mapping (all situated on Mounts Lane): The Elms, Redlands, High House, Little Trelawne,</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
		<p>properties up until Woodview, and the same can be said for the western side up to and including Ivy Cottage. Just north of Ivy Cottage there are direct views across the extensive historic enclosures towards the church and the rears of properties on Church Street. There is also a low stone wall built in the vernacular style which lines the fronts of properties on Mounts Lane almost along its entirety. It is proposed that the extension at BA1 be reduced to now include the following properties on Mounts Lane- Woodview, Linnets Cottage, Dolphin Cottage, Lester Cottage and Dunster Cottage. Also to be included are the low</p>	<p>Shirley, Branscombe, Markers End, Trevethan, Touchwood, The Rookery, Montag.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
		stone wall running along the frontages of the plots on the eastern side of the lane.	
Marc Rieder	<p>I would like to provide my comments on the draft appraisal document as I have some concerns on the proposal as it stands.</p> <p>On the whole, I enjoyed reading about the history of Newnham and the historically important fields, sites and views in and around the village, which I agree is a lovely village and should be protected from encroaching development estates closer to Daventry.</p> <p>1. My first comment is that the open spaces (OS1, OS2 etc), are important, but these should be extended up and around the Newnham Hall (Poets Way) as there are some stunning views up to the ridge way at the top of the hill between Newnham and Daventry. These should be preserved up to and including the windmill (unless this is contained in other appraisals).</p>	<p>Comments welcomed.</p> <p>Whilst wider views and landscape features do make a contribution to the character of the settlement's surroundings, the methodology limits the assessment of open areas to those within the conservation area or immediately contiguous with it. This is partly so an assessment can be made of those areas to</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>2. I agree with the listing of the war memorial and the red telephone box as they add character to the village. I don't particularly see the importance of listing homes within the village. Listing can devalue a property and motivate people (who have looked after it well) to sell it on.</p>	<p>see whether the boundary should be extended, and also to make an assessment of the contribution of open spaces to the setting of the conservation area so that any future proposals on these areas of land can be informed by the assessment. It also allows there to be a logical limit for the assessment, rather than it stretching out into the wider landscape, the significance of which is assessed as part of the views section. The views noted in this response are not visible from the conservation area boundary itself, due to the local topography and tree cover.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>3. In section 10.2 re the properties which are proposed to have some development rights removed. Whereas I'm unsure of the legal basis of withdrawing homeowners development rights, the logic behind the selection of these homes is unclear. Why some houses and not all? Why the more modern / renovated houses and not the others. A number of the older properties on Church street for example have UPVC windows (Village Hall included) whereas the appraisal is proposing to impose restrictions on newer properties such as Tanyard House (circ 1960s) and The Old Smithy (2000's).</p>	<p>To clarify, these proposals are for the local heritage list, not statutory listing. Local Heritage Listing is undertaken to recognise heritage assets which make a contribution to local character due to their heritage significance. As such, domestic properties have as much potential to hold heritage significance as other structures within the public realm. There is also no evidence that designation of any kind devalues properties.</p> <p>Article 4 Directions are made under the provisions of the General Permitted Development (Order) (England) 2015, which</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
	<p>The recommendation of wooden windows "to increase natural ventilation" for older buildings is also flawed. Wooden windows swell, stick shut and are unable to open, preventing good ventilation. Furthermore the cost for Wooden windows (both initial outlay and maintenance/painting cost) is higher than UPVC. Would there be a plan for compensation for the cost in this regard? I believe metal windows as mentioned in the appraisal document have poorer efficiencies still. Note that high efficiency window systems are critical to the Government's drive on becoming carbon neutral (heat pumps and under-floor heating systems heat homes at reduced temperatures and rely on improved insulation). <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/news/plan-to-drive-down-the-cost-of-clean-heat">https://www.gov.uk/government/news/plan-to-drive-down-the-cost-of-clean-heat</a>. There is also a safety aspect of maintenance of wooden windows - which imply working at height every 5 or so years to re-paint and service the windows. Unfortunately everyone knows someone who has fallen off a ladder or had an accident with scaffolding, and the bumpy pathways around Newnham dont help. It has been raised as to whether there is any proposed compensation for removal of development rights? Hence, my recommendation would be to</p>	<p>gives them their legal basis. The directions are used to aid consistent decision making, and to protect or help reinstate features of architectural value, such as fenestration. This can apply to any building in the conservation area which makes a contribution to vernacular character, including more modern properties or older properties which have been altered.</p> <p>Unlike uPVC alternatives, timber windows allow the movement of air and moisture through the fenestration when the windows are closed, rather than trapping</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>allow the use of certain types of UPVC (eg Residence 9 type windows with wooden effect) with colour selected from a range sympathetic to the local surroundings.</p> <p>4. Since the trenching of the pathways around Newnham by Gigaclear, it could be argued that repaving the village to eradicate the resulting scars, would add more aesthetic value than specifying window material.</p>	<p>moisture inside. Timber windows, if maintained also have a far greater lifespan than uPVC alternatives, and have a lower carbon cost over their lifetime. Furthermore, there are numerous methods of increasing the carbon efficiency of a domestic property without the wholesale replacement of windows. Placing an article 4 direction on a property which has existing uPVC windows does not mean that they are immediately required to replace these windows with timber. If a proposal was made to replace the windows (or whichever feature is covered by the direction) in the future, then the impact of the design and materials on</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
	<p>5. Similarly, on roofing materials, whereas I agree with the retention of slate and thatch appearance in the main, the appraisal document should consider that more houses may install solar panels in future and hence recommendation to use solar slates (eg link below) could be considered for conservation areas. <a href="https://www.gb-sol.co.uk/products/pvslates/default.htm?gclid=EAIaIQobChMIIsdnfi93B-AIVT-3tCh3nngpuEAAYASAAEgLRN_D_BwE">https://www.gb-sol.co.uk/products/pvslates/default.htm?gclid=EAIaIQobChMIIsdnfi93B-AIVT-3tCh3nngpuEAAYASAAEgLRN_D_BwE</a></p>	<p>the character of the conservation area would be taken into account. In terms of safety, this is a consideration for the homeowner. There is no compensation right in this case.</p> <p>The value of the uncovering or reinstating of historic surfacing is discussed in the management plan section of the appraisal. The significance of one aspect of the conservation area should not be overstated at the expense of another. Rather, all features should be evaluated proportionate to their significance.</p>	<p>No change.</p>



Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
		<p>The only control over solar panels in conservation areas over and above national design requirements is that they should not be installed on a wall fronting a highway, footway, waterway or public open space. In all cases, the effect of the placement and design of solar panels on the overall character and appearance of the conservation area should be considered. For example, can the panels be placed on a less intrusive elevation?</p>	
Michelle Maddock	<p>I have read the proposals for the Newnham conservation area several times and am unclear of its purpose. It is stated that a conservation area can be defined as 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.</p>	Comments noted.	No change.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>Yet the aim of the document seems to be to include modern buildings into the area of the conservation area, such as the two modern houses and two modern bungalows on the western side of Mounts Lane. This seems illogical.</p>	<p>In proposing extensions to conservation areas, it is generally considered good practice to avoid creating large gaps in the designation, particularly in areas where properties sit closely adjacent to each other and development which affects one may have an impact on neighbouring buildings. The majority of the eastern side of the Mounts Lane is lined with vernacular historic properties up until Woodview, and the same can be said for the western side up to and including Ivy Cottage. Just north of Ivy Cottage there are direct views across the extensive historic enclosures towards the church and the rears of properties on Church</p>	<p>Remove following properties from proposed designation, including all relevant mapping (all situated on Mounts Lane): The Elms, Redlands, High House, Little Trelawne, Shirley, Branscombe, Markers End, Trevethan, Touchwood, The Rookery, Montag.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
	<p>As you read further there seem to be more inconsistencies. I fail to understand the logic of applying Article 4 Direction to April Cottage, The Old Smithy and Tanyard House on Church Street, withdrawing their permitted development rights. By my understanding and local knowledge Tanyard house was a house built around 1970-75 on behalf of Mr &amp; Mrs James Punch. Why does this modern building qualify as historic in any way. The lack of patina of the stone construction and plastic frame windows surely give this away. We can also say with 100% certainty that</p>	<p>Street. There is also a low stone wall built in the vernacular style which lines the fronts of properties on Mounts Lane almost along its entirety. It is proposed that the extension at BA1 be reduced to now include the following properties on Mounts Lane- Woodview, Linnets Cottage, Dolphin Cottage, Lester Cottage and Dunster Cottage. Also to be included are the low stone wall running along the frontages of the plots on the eastern side of the lane.</p> <p>As noted above by the respondent, conservation areas are "areas of special architectural or historic</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>The Old Smithy did not exist prior to the turn of this century (2000) as it currently does. Previously it was a single story shop which was developed in approx 2000/2001, meaning the majority of the property is new with modern materials. I have photos which show the extent of modern materials used and so am again wondering about the decision making which is going on. Finally April Cottage, which has been Subject to a planning approval works over the past three year and has already undergone significant modernisation. What specifically sets this property aside for special attention, when other properties of similar age which have not been modernised on the same street have been ignored. Again I have historic photos which show the street scene in times gone by to support this view.</p> <p>It's important when making these decisions that only really impact the owners that you properly understand the age and significance historically of all the buildings or at the very least explain the rationale leading to such impactful outcomes.</p>	<p>interest" where the overall character must be taken into consideration when determining planning decisions. The character of Church Street is highly consistent due to the use of vernacular ironstone for all of the properties, their scale, their form in relation to the highway (i.e sat close to the road, creating enclosure) and their orientation to the road. What also creates consistency is the style and ratio of fenestration, the majority of which is small-pane casement. Whilst there may be properties on the street which have been modernised (it is incredibly rare that a property has not</p>	

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
	<p>Finally and to further demonstrate the lack of knowledge when putting this document together. The photos on page 47 are not of terraced properties as described but semi detached. The lower picture is of a single home which is attached to one other property, making it semi detached, NOT terraced as the text states. How can you possibly have such little knowledge of your subject matter when you are formulating such impactful plans.</p>	<p>undergone some form of alteration over its lifetime) or properties built in relatively recent years, this does not mean that they fail to make a contribution to the character of the conservation area, or continue to preserve the consistency in form, materials and style. As such, the control of permitted development rights ensure that the contribution these properties make continues to be considered appropriately in order to preserve or enhance the overall character of the conservation area.</p> <p>The figure reference should split these pictures, as the terrace reference refers to the</p>	<p>Page 47, Figure 28 title, alter as follows:</p> <p>“Examples <u>above</u> of <u>semi-detached</u></p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
		bottom image only, which historically is shown on maps as a terrace of three small cottages. The image above is of semi-detached properties on Daventry Road. This will be corrected in the final draft.	<u>properties (top) and historically terraced properties in Newnham conservation area."</u>
Peter Harper	<p>I note with interest the proposed Newnham 2022 consultation document regarding the conservation area proposals. There appears to be mysterious inclusions, omissions, together with inaccuracies in the content.</p> <p>The additions of the modern properties on the western side of Mounts Lane (Area BA1) are mysterious inclusions. They have little to add to the architectural ambience of the village.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>In proposing extensions to conservation areas, it is generally considered good practice to avoid creating large gaps in the designation, particularly in areas where properties sit closely adjacent to each other and development which affects one may have an impact on neighbouring buildings. The majority of the</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Remove following properties from proposed designation, including all relevant mapping (all situated on Mounts Lane): The Elms, Redlands,</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
		<p>eastern side of the Mounts Lane is lined with vernacular historic properties up until Woodview, and the same can be said for the western side up to and including Ivy Cottage. Just north of Ivy Cottage there are direct views across the extensive historic enclosures towards the church and the rears of properties on Church Street. There is also a low stone wall built in the vernacular style which lines the fronts of properties on Mounts Lane almost along its entirety. It is proposed that the extension at BA1 be reduced to now include the following properties on Mounts Lane- Woodview, Linnets Cottage, Dolphin Cottage, Lester</p>	<p>High House, Little Trelawne, Shirley, Branscombe , Markers End, Trevethan, Touchwood, The Rookery, Montag.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>The non-inclusion of the villages leading house, namely Newnham Hall, together with its secluded walled garden is a mysterious oversight. Particularly the surrounding parkland and adjacent Farm House, are areas which ought to have conservation status. Also the omission of any reference to the Windmill on the crown of Newnham Hill ought to be reviewed and included in a conservation area if that status is to have credibility.</p>	<p>Cottage and Dunster Cottage. Also to be included are the low stone wall running along the frontages of the plots on the eastern side of the lane.</p> <p>Both of these assets and their settings are protected by their statutory listing, and have a secluded and discrete character away from the main body of the conservation area.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Poppy Maddock</p>	<p>I have read the proposals for the Newnham conservation area several times and am unclear of its purpose. It is stated that a conservation area can be defined as 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. Yet the aim of the document seems to be to include modern buildings into the area of the conservation area, such as the two modern houses and two modern bungalows on the western side of Mounts Lane. This seems illogical.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>In proposing extensions to conservation areas, it is generally considered good practice to avoid creating large gaps in</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Remove following properties from proposed</p>



<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
		<p>the designation, particularly in areas where properties sit closely adjacent to each other and development which affects one may have an impact on neighbouring buildings. The majority of the eastern side of the Mounts Lane is lined with vernacular historic properties up until Woodview, and the same can be said for the western side up to and including Ivy Cottage. Just north of Ivy Cottage there are direct views across the extensive historic enclosures towards the church and the rears of properties on Church Street. There is also a low stone wall built in the vernacular style which lines the fronts of properties on Mounts</p>	<p>designation, including all relevant mapping (all situated on Mounts Lane): The Elms, Redlands, High House, Little Trelawne, Shirley, Branscombe, Markers End, Trevethan, Touchwood, The Rookery, Montag.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
	<p>As you read further there seem to be more inconsistencies. I fail to understand the logic of applying Article 4 Direction to April Cottage, The Old Smithy and Tanyard House on Church Street, withdrawing their permitted development rights. By my understanding and local knowledge Tanyard house was a house built around 1970-75 on behalf of Mr &amp; Mrs James Punch. Why does this modern building qualify as historic in any way. The lack of patina of the stone construction and plastic frame windows surely give this away. We can also say with 100% certainty that The Old Smithy did not exist prior to the turn of this century (2000) as it currently does. Previously it was a single story shop which was developed in approx 2000/2001, meaning the majority of the property is new with modern materials. I have photos which show the extent of modern</p>	<p>Lane almost along its entirety. It is proposed that the extension at BA1 be reduced to now include the following properties on Mounts Lane- Woodview, Linnets Cottage, Dolphin Cottage, Lester Cottage and Dunster Cottage. Also to be included are the low stone wall running along the frontages of the plots on the eastern side of the lane.</p> <p>As noted above by the respondent, conservation areas are "areas of special architectural or historic interest" where the overall character must be taken into consideration when</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>materials used and so am again wondering about the decision making which is going on.</p> <p>Finally, April Cottage, which has been Subject to a planning approval works over the past three year and has already undergone significant modernisation. What specifically sets this property aside for special attention, when other properties of similar age which have not been modernised on the same street have been ignored. Again I have historic photos which show the street scene in times gone by to support this view. It's important when making these decisions that only really impact the owners that you properly understand the age and significance historically of all the buildings or at the very least explain the rationale leading to such impactful outcomes.</p>	<p>determining planning decisions. The character of Church Street is highly consistent due to the use of vernacular ironstone for all of the properties, their scale, their form in relation to the highway (i.e sat close to the road, creating enclosure) and their orientation to the road. What also creates consistency is the style and ratio of fenestration, the majority of which is small-pane casement. Whilst there may be properties on the street which have been modernised (it is incredibly rare that a property has not undergone some form of alteration over its lifetime) or properties built in relatively recent</p>	

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
	<p>To further demonstrate the lack of knowledge when putting this document together. The photos on page 47 are not of terraced properties as described but semi detached. The lower picture is of a single home which is attached to one other property, making it semi detached, NOT terraced as the text states. How can you possibly have such little knowledge of your subject matter when you are formulating such impactful plans.</p>	<p>years, this does not meant that they fail to make a contribution to the character of the conservation area, or continue to preserve the consistency in form, materials and style. As such, the control of permitted development rights ensure that the contribution these properties make continues to be considered appropriately in order to preserve or enhance the overall character of the conservation area.</p> <p>The figure reference should split these pictures, as the terrace reference refers to the bottom image only, which historically is shown on maps as a terrace of three small</p>	<p>Page 47, Figure 28 title, alter as follows:</p> <p>“Examples <u>above</u> of <u>semi-detached</u> properties <u>(top)</u> and <u>historically</u> terraced</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
		cottages. The image above is of semi-detached properties on Daventry Road. This will be corrected in the final draft.	properties in Newnham conservation area."
Richard Harcock	<p>I received yesterday your letter and have read the plan in detail.</p> <p>I support the plan and have no issues in general with the concept. The report on the village is a good commentary on the state of the dwellings and the environment created which I feel is favourable, I do wonder what your remit in total is, because there is no mention of the traffic situation around the village and the impact the school traffic has on the environment. Your comments if appropriate would be appreciated.</p> <p>The report has a error in the description of my property ,as on the land registry, I reside in Newnham Chapel and not The Old Chapel.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Section 11, the management plan, provides guidance on how highways matters, including traffic can have an impact on the character of the conservation area.</p> <p>Thank you for this information, it will be amended in the final draft.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>Page 60, Section 10.2, table 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> column, alter as follows:</p> <p>"...Pippin Cottage, The Old</p>

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
	<p>I would also welcome it being include in the list of locally special buildings as many 'walkers 'comment on its position and structure.</p>	<p>Newnham Chapel has been assessed against the local list criteria and has met the scoring threshold, and will therefore be added to the local list.</p>	<p><u>Newnam Chapel...</u>"</p> <p>Page 57, Section 10.1, new text as follows:</p> <p><b><u>"Newnham Chapel</u></b></p> <p><u>Newnham Chapel is situated on School Hill, its gable facing the road. The gable end contains a large round-headed arch with art nouveau style, leaded, stained-</u></p>

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
	<p>I do think the report is excellent and I welcome your your reply if appropriate.</p>	<p>Comments welcomed.</p>	<p><u>glass window with Y-tracery (appears to be metal framed)</u>  <u>Above is a simple stone moulded arch, fleur-de-lys detail and date stone of 1909.</u>  <u>The chapel is now in residential use, but the exterior features of the building have been retained intact."</u></p> <p>Page 58, Figure 36,</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
			add Newnham Chapel to map.  No change.
Robert Vale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A large and detailed piece of work, must have been costly, no doubt we will see this in our rates, and why now when the government is pushing for better insulation in buildings, you want to restrict the use of Double Glazing, Plastic window frames and Solar Panels, all of which would help in the fight to hold down climate change and the Cost of living, is this not against everything the Government is trying to achieve?</li> </ul>	Conservation area planning requirements do not necessarily prohibit the installation of double glazing, UPVC or solar panels. Rather, the guidance in the appraisal encourages proposals to consider the potential impact of design and material choices on the character and appearance of the conservation area. Furthermore, research shows that non-invasive and reversible modifications can be made to historic timber windows (such as	No change.



Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
		<p>secondary glazing, shutters, thick curtains or draft strips) which can greatly aid thermal performance without the resulting embodied carbon which is inherent within a new UPVC double or triple-glazed unit. Historic England have several advice notes and research papers are regularly forthcoming on the subject (<a href="#">Traditional Windows - Their Care, Repair and Upgrading</a> (<a href="http://historicengland.org.uk">historicengland.org.uk</a>)). As such, the thermal upgrading of an historic property (or a property constructed with vernacular materials such as stone, lime, slate etc) is more complex than replacing historic features with modern alternatives,</p>	

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I have lived on the west side of Mounts Lane for about 40yrs in one of the four modern houses highlighted in area BA1, why have they been included in the proposed conservation area, none of these properties have anything special going for them. Our house (High House) is the oldest being completed around 1947.If we had had to go with your conservation proposals now, the house would still have the second hand Crittal industrial windows and an asbestos roof.</li> </ul>	<p>and, in looking at making upgrades, a whole house approach should be taken in order to meet government targets.</p> <p>In proposing extensions to conservation areas, it is generally considered good practice to avoid creating large gaps in the designation, particularly in areas where properties sit closely adjacent to each other and development which affects one may have an impact on neighbouring buildings. The majority of the eastern side of the Mounts Lane is lined with vernacular historic properties up until Woodview, and the same can be said for the western side up to</p>	<p>Remove following properties from proposed designation, including all relevant mapping (all situated on Mounts Lane): The Elms, Redlands, High House, Little Trelawne, Shirley, Branscombe, Markers End, Trevethan, Touchwood, The Rookery, Montag.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mounts Lane is narrow, now it has become a car park, most houses have 1, 2 or even 3 cars with insufficient parking space, because of this the verges have been eroded to nothing as vehicles have to pass these parked cars on the grass.</li> </ul>	<p>and including Ivy Cottage. Just north of Ivy Cottage there are direct views across the extensive historic enclosures towards the church and the rears of properties on Church Street. There is also a low stone wall built in the vernacular style which lines the fronts of properties on Mounts Lane almost along its entirety. It is proposed that the extension at BA1 be reduced to now include the following properties on Mounts Lane- Woodview, Linnets Cottage, Dolphin Cottage, Lester Cottage and Dunster Cottage. Also to be included are the low stone wall running along the frontages of the plots on the eastern side of the lane.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cars are essential in Newnham as there is no public transport, and no shops; 4 shops, the Post Office, the Chapel and a Pub/Garage have all been turned into residential premises.</li> <li>• Mounts Lane has very recently had installed a renewed overhead electricity distribution scheme with new poles and conductors also Open Reach have just erected their own pole mounted overhead cable system along the frontage of these houses, all this definitely spoils the view.</li> <li>• I do not agree with your comments on the village views. Trees and Views are not compatible, when we moved to Mounts Lane 40yrs ago it was possible from our bedroom windows to see games of cricket at the Badby pitch and also the Little Everdon cricket pitch, that is no longer possible, we can't see the church now and that is only a few hundred yards behind us all due to trees.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments noted. The management plan section of the appraisal addresses the potential issues caused by the increase in vehicles which should be taken into account in determining any future proposals.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Conservation area recommendations usually propose that services (where possible) should be sited so as there is minimal impact on character and appearance, and that ideally they should be taken underground.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="465 858 1451 1104">• School Hill and much of Coronation Road have some of the best views in the village (I have lived there) most houses were built before the properties on the west side of Mounts Lane, and I would have thought are of some historic value, none of this area is included in your proposals. Is it an advantage to be in the conservation area? if so, why is the whole village not included? If it's a disadvantage, why are we (BA1) included?</li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="1487 277 1825 504">However, this is not always possible at this time, but should be considered by statutory undertakers in future works.</p> <p data-bbox="1487 587 1825 1359">The natural landscape changes over time, and views along with that. The appraisal reviews the character of the conservation area at a point in time, and as such the value of existing planting is taken into account. Proposals to prune, top, lop or remove trees over a certain size require notification to the council, and due to this process their importance and impact (within views for example) can be assessed on a case by</p>	<p data-bbox="1852 277 2029 312">No change.</p> <p data-bbox="1852 1091 2029 1126">No change.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
		<p>case basis as and when proposals are made.</p> <p>It is proposed in the appraisal to include the rest of the historic properties on School Hill, excepting the mid-century properties on the northern side facing the green. Whilst views are an important part of the experience of a conservation area, character and appearance created by architectural and historic interest, as well as the effective management of new development are the principal concerns. Development within conservation areas should seek to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area, making positive</p>	

Respondent	Comments	Suggested Officer Response	Suggested Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="465 277 1391 344">• The photo of No5 Badby Rd (BA3) is no longer up to date. (It was 5 cottages when I lived there at No3, 80yrs ago)</li> <li data-bbox="465 464 1447 564">• In the text you seem to have mixed up Mounts Lane and Manor Lane, it is Mounts Lane that meets the Weedon Road at Poets Way not Manor Lane.</li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="1487 277 1825 1086">improvement or helping to maintain existing character. This means that development is given more consideration, and can lead to higher quality construction and design. Overall, conservation areas help to preserve the cohesion of historic areas. The publication Heritage Counts explains the various ways looking after heritage can have benefits on people's lives: <a href="#">50 Years of Conservation Areas   Historic England</a></p> <p data-bbox="1487 1129 1805 1278">The photographs used in the appraisal document were taken at time of appraisal.</p>	<p data-bbox="1852 507 2018 544">No change.</p> <p data-bbox="1852 778 2029 890">Page 61, para 2, alter as follows:</p> <p data-bbox="1852 935 2029 1123">"...similar to that of <u>Mounts Manor Lane</u>..."</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
		These references will be amended in the final draft.	
Steve Ratcliffe	Some obvious omissions are: Newnham Hall not being included. Surely such a large and auspicious building should not be exempt from your investigations. Why has the windmill not been included in your findings? Surely that has architectural and historic significance.	Both Newnham Hall and Newnham Windmill are recognised as of architectural and historic interest through their grade II listings respectively. Whilst both contribute to the story of the historic development of the area Newnham Windmill is too far from the conservation area to be considered to be included within the boundary, and Newnham Hall, its ancillary buildings, gardens and walkways forms a discrete grouping which is adequately protected by the listing and planning process. Furthermore, both	No change.



<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>Your geography of the village and the naming of certain roads seems to be inaccurate enough for me to question the validity of some pages.</p> <p>Why are you including modern buildings on Mounts Lane in these findings? What architectural oddities do you find in a prefab wooden house built in what must have been in the 1970s?</p>	<p>assets are referred to in the appraisal for their importance in the development of the area.</p> <p>There is an instance where reference to Mounts Lane is mistakenly Manor Lane. These will be corrected in the final draft. It is not clear what is meant in terms of the geography of the village.</p> <p>In proposing extensions to conservation areas, it is generally considered good practice to avoid creating large gaps in the designation, particularly in areas where properties sit closely adjacent to each other and development which affects one may</p>	<p>Page 61, para 2, alter as follows:</p> <p>"...similar to that of <u>Mounts Manor Lane</u>..."</p> <p>Remove following properties from proposed designation, including all relevant mapping (all situated on Mounts Lane): The Elms, Redlands, High House,</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
		<p>have an impact on neighbouring buildings. The majority of the eastern side of the Mounts Lane is lined with vernacular historic properties up until Woodview, and the same can be said for the western side up to and including Ivy Cottage. Just north of Ivy Cottage there are direct views across the extensive historic enclosures towards the church and the rears of properties on Church Street. There is also a low stone wall built in the vernacular style which lines the fronts of properties on Mounts Lane almost along its entirety. It is proposed that the extension at BA1 be reduced to now include the following properties on Mounts</p>	<p>Little Trelawne, Shirley, Branscombe, Markers End, Trevethan, Touchwood, The Rookery, Montag.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>On the subject of exterior electrical wiring, antennae and such are we not allowed to be eco conscious and have electric cars, solar panels or other devices to cut our carbon emissions?</p>	<p>Lane- Woodview, Linnets Cottage, Dolphin Cottage, Lester Cottage and Dunster Cottage. Also to be included are the low stone wall running along the frontages of the plots on the eastern side of the lane.</p> <p>These things are not necessarily banned within conservation areas, rather their design and placement (in the case of antennae, dishes and solar panels) is controlled in order to ensure that harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area is mitigated. Unless they effect the fabric of a listed building, the installation of many</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>If the houses in the village are to be forced to make changes in line with these proposals, who is going to fund the additional costs which will be incurred because we are forced to use materials like lime mortar, specific window materials etc. or for whatever reason our current homes do not meet your criteria.</p> <p>Are you going to force the villagers to make changes to the current fabric of the village just to satisfy what you believe the village should like and not what is practical or has been in place for many decades.</p>	<p>energy efficiency measures are either not controlled through the planning system or are controlled on a national level (unaffected by conservation area designation). More information can be found on this on the government planning portal: <a href="#">Introduction - Home energy generation - Planning Portal</a></p> <p>There are no changes which are "forced" or immediately required by the designation of an amended boundary and new appraisal document. Changes proposed by an applicant (requiring planning permission) will be steered towards</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>There are a lot of good points in your findings and agree many features need protecting but the day to day maintenance and development of the village does require some common sense to be applied.</p>	<p>preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area. As is usual, the cost of proposals made will be the responsibility of the homeowner/ applicant.</p> <p>There is no onus to make changes, rather any proposals made to the council through the planning application system should seek to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area. This may include utilising historic materials and designs.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

**Survey responses**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
<b>Q1. Were you previously aware of the conservation area appraisal for Newnham taking place?</b>			
Richard Harcock	Yes I was aware	Comments noted	No change
Bruce Dupe	No I wasn't aware	Comments noted	No change
Glen McDonald	No I wasn't aware	Comments noted	No change
<b>Q2. Do you agree with the proposed boundary for the conservation area? (map available for viewing through the link on Conservation Areas web page)</b>			
Richard Harcock	Agree proposed boundary	Comments welcomed	No change
Bruce Dupe	Disagree proposed boundary	Comments noted	No change
Glen McDonald	Agree proposed boundary	Comments welcomed	No change
<b>Q3. Do you think this Appraisal captures the special interest of Newnham?</b>			
Richard Harcock	It does capture the special interest of Newnham. A very concise document and a complete village conservation area would preserve the whole village. Including the modern properties will provide a full picture of its development and preserve its character.	Comments welcomed	No change
Bruce Dupe	It does capture the special interest of Newnham	Comments welcomed	No change
Glen McDonald	It does capture the special interest of Newnham	Comments welcomed	No change
<b>Q3. Do you agree with the candidates for the Local List? (see pages 55 - 58 of the Appraisal). Are there any more potential candidates which you would like to suggest?</b>			

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
Richard Harcock	Agree candidates- The Bartons, The Green.  Also adding The New Inn as there is a Barn at the rear which has a very interesting roof structure.	Comments welcomed.  At the point of reporting, no further information has been available to assist in the evaluation of this property. The New Inn itself does not meet the criteria for local listing, and at this stage the barn has not been evaluated. As such the process of designation will continue and information will be sought.	No change  No change
Bruce Dupe	Agree candidates	Comments welcomed	No change
Glen McDonald	Don't know/No opinion	Comments noted	No change
<b>Q4. 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?</b>			
Richard Harcock	There is enough clear guidance	Comments welcomed	No change
Bruce Dupe	There is enough clear guidance	Comments welcomed	No change
Glen McDonald	Don't know/No Opinion	Comments noted	No change
<b>Q5. Do you think there are any actions missing from our Management Plan? (see pages 62-64 of the Appraisal).</b>			
Richard Harcock	There are no actions missing. Needs adopting quickly and followed through with	Comments welcomed	No change  No change

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	supportive management that is quick to act.	The plans will be adopted at the earliest opportunity once all of the comments have been considered.	
Bruce Dupe	There are no actions missing	Comments welcomed	No change
Glen McDonald	Don't know/No opinion	Comments noted	No change
<b>Q6. Do you think the proposed Article 4 Directions (see page 59-60 of the Appraisal) would help to preserve special features of the conservation area?</b>			
Richard Harcock	Article 4 Directions would help to preserve special features	Comments welcomed	No change
Bruce Dupe	Article 4 Directions would help to preserve special features	Comments welcomed	No change
Glen McDonald	Don't know/No opinion	Comments noted	No change
<b>Q7. 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>			
Richard Harcock	No comment	Comments noted	
Bruce Dupe	Mounts Lane The inclusion of the three modern properties on the eastern side of Mounts Lane seems to be pointless. None of the buildings are of any architectural	In proposing extensions to conservation areas, it is generally considered good practice to avoid creating large gaps in the designation, particularly in areas where properties sit closely adjacent to each other and	Remove following properties from proposed designation, including all relevant mapping (all situated on Mounts Lane): The Elms, Redlands, High House, Little Trelawne, Shirley, Branscombe, Markers



<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
	<p>significance and are comparatively unattractive compared to the rest of the street.</p> <p>I own the middle property (The Rookery) which together with the other two were built in the early 1970's. All are in need of maintenance and the imposition of added planning constraints makes achieving this unnecessarily more onerous.</p> <p>Other than this, I welcome the appraisal and the proposed conservation area expansion.</p>	<p>development which affects one may have an impact on neighbouring buildings. The majority of the eastern side of the Mounts Lane is lined with vernacular historic properties up until Woodview, and the same can be said for the western side up to and including Ivy Cottage. Just north of Ivy Cottage there are direct views across the extensive historic enclosures towards the church and the rears of properties on Church Street. There is also a low stone wall built in the vernacular style which lines the fronts of properties on Mounts Lane almost along its entirety. It is proposed that the extension at BA1 be reduced to now include the following properties on Mounts Lane- Woodview, Linnets Cottage, Dolphin Cottage, Lester Cottage and Dunster Cottage. Also to be included are the low stone wall</p>	<p>End, Trevethan, Touchwood, The Rookery, Montag.</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Officer Response</b>	<b>Suggested Action</b>
		running along the frontages of the plots on the eastern side of the lane.	
Glen McDonald	No comment	Comments noted.	No change