

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions  
Thorpeness CAAMP

Comment ID/Ref	Name	Type of response	Comment	Council Response	Actions
1	Private Individual	Enquiry	<p>I am in receipt of your letter on the above matter, as sent to the owners of apartments and houses that comprise 1-6 The Headlands, which includes myself.</p> <p>Headlands (Thorpeness) Ltd is a company that owns the freehold to 1-6 The Headlands. The company is wholly owned by the owners of the respective apartments and houses that comprise 1-6 The Headlands, so whilst technically we are the landlord, we operate much the same as a residents association. Just for the record, whilst 7 The Headlands looks to be part of our estate, it is in fact a separate property.</p> <p>Prior to reviewing the matter with my colleagues, it would be appreciated if you could clarify a point relating to sea defences. I understand from communication with one of our residents that the extent of the conservation area has in part been influenced by a perceived complication if the designated area were to extend across existing sea defence installations, i.e. further northwards than Johnnygate. It would be helpful if you could clarify why this has been considered to be a relevant constraint.</p> <p>I ask, as the involvement of Headlands (Thorpeness) Ltd as a founding member of Thorpeness Coastal Futures Group, and our representation in Thorpeness Community Interest Company, means that we are aware that consideration is being given to the installation of rock armour to replace existing sea defences, and that any such rock armour might be extended to include the sea frontage to The Headlands, so as to minimise any risk of out-flanking. Details regarding this can no doubt be obtained from Coastal Partnership East.</p> <p>Your advice will be greatly appreciated. Many thanks.</p>	Acknowledgement sent, advised they contact Coastal Management Team	
2	Private Individual	N/A	Requesting print copy	Printed copy sent	

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions  
Thorpeness CAAMP

3	Private Individual	N/A	Requesting print copy	Printed copy sent	
4	Private Individual	N/A	Requesting print copy	Printed copy sent	
5	Private Individual	Support, Observation	<p>Apologies for the slight lateness of this response. I have just read through the draft revised Thorpeness Conservation Area Appraisal. I am an architect and own the property at 2 The Dunes Thorpeness.</p> <p>My only comment is to encourage the introduction of the Article 4 Directive as mooted in the Management Plan. We have replaced PVC windows in 2 The Dunes, present when we bought the property in 2014, with appropriate timber casements. I believe it is important that if the degradation of the original houses and bungalows is to be prevented and they are to be protected from inappropriate “improvements” planning policy must be allowed to control such alterations.</p>		
6	Parish Council	N/A	Request for in-person meeting.	Attended Parish Meeting in March 2022	
7	Private Individual	Enquiry	<p>Question about the Thorpeness new conservation area proposal</p> <p>I own 4c The Headlands and was wondering what the implication of adding the beach to the conservation area would mean. I am of course very aware that there is erosion happening near us and although this possibly won't reach this area for a while, how would the conservation status impact potential new sea defences?</p> <p>Looking forward hearing.</p>	Acknowledgement sent, advised they contact Coastal Management Team	
8	Historic England	N/A	Requesting virtual copy	Virtual copy emailed	
9	Private Individual	Support, Observation	<p>We respond as co-owners of one of the properties on South Beach within the proposed extension area.</p> <p>We agree with the principle of extending the Conservation Area to include the row of holiday bungalows. They are an</p>	Noted	Minor text amendment

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions  
Thorpeness CAAMP

		<p>important feature of the original village, and development should be controlled to maintain the current style and in particular to avoid the sort of major enlargement of properties that has occurred further down South Beach. We do however wish to comment on some of the points made in the document.</p> <p>1. The commentary makes no mention of the severe weather conditions experienced close to the sea, and especially by the beachfront houses. Historically the beach bungalows were used only in summer, and their lightweight timber-frame construction without foundations mirrored that. Because of this construction the buildings move, making wooden doors and windows impossible to seal adequately against the beachside weather. We found that making the originals adequate for winter use was quite impossible, let alone ensuring they comply with the modern energy saving requirements with which we have an ethical as well as legal obligation to comply.</p> <p>We can vouch that with modern materials, even the best prepared painted wood surfaces seldom last more than two years without needing more work. The sea spray rapidly corrodes anything metallic. Yet throughout the document there are adverse comments about uPVC replacement doors and windows, and a lament for the replacement of the original Crittal metal windows used in some structures (eg pp29 &amp; 31 and especially 74-75). Nowhere, however, is there any proposal for a manageable alternative that would provide tolerable thermal efficiency under the challenging environmental conditions encountered on and near the beach in Thorpeness.</p> <p>Owners are required (as we have experienced) to ensure that any upgrades are compatible with modern Building Regulations, and the conservation officers ought to adjust</p>		
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions  
 Thorpeness CAAMP

			<p>their comments in that light, making proactive proposals rather than solely negative ones as on p 74-75. Modern uPVC frames are vastly better than they used to be, and provide the rigidity needed for weather proofing and insulation to regulatory standards. If owners are not to be permitted to use either uPVC or aluminium, how else in these flimsy bungalows are they supposed to comply with Building Regulations?</p> <p>The attitude expressed on p74-75 would be of even greater concern if the proposal on p75 to introduce an Article 4(2) Direction were implemented. The proposal to ‘encourage retention and repair of original features’ simply doesn’t work for all materials if (a) buildings are to be made useable all year round rather than in summer only (the latter having been the original intention, as acknowledged on p12) and (b) comply with Building Regulations.</p> <p>2. There are several comments about the preferability of unfenced gardens, eg stating that “they integrate best with their setting” (p78). What is not mentioned are the significant disadvantages of that approach. For instance:</p> <p>There is a far greater rabbit population these days – in the time of fishermen living and working locally these were trapped or snared to control the population. Nowadays the population varies greatly season by season, but one can see up to dozens at a time in the car park. The result is that everything that rabbits like gets eaten. That includes in particular the tree lupins that used to be such a feature of this coastline. I have tried to replicate the efforts of Tim Brown, the last professional fisherman in Thorpe, who lived in the Anchorage and used to plant lupin seeds around the sandlings every autumn so as to promote the next season’s shrubs. Regrettably, rabbits like the seedlings and my efforts have therefore all been in vain – other than within our fenced and</p>		
--	--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions  
 Thorpeness CAAMP

			<p>rabbit-proofed garden. Moreover with altered insect life these days there are more often plagues of greenfly that in spring attack the lupins, and most young lupin plants only survive if sprayed to counter such attacks. Without those interventions that we make each year, there would be even fewer lupins than there are.</p> <p>It's notable that a few years ago Natural England (we think) encouraged homeowners further along South Beach towards Aldeburgh to fence off more of the foreshore to help them protect it better from the progressive erosion. Fences have their advantages! Indeed owners should be encouraged to, not discouraged from, fencing off more of the foreshore so as to preserve the flora and prevent yet more erosion (see next para).</p> <p>3. There is a comment about the Council supporting footpaths, and the proposed extension of the Conservation Area includes the beach. Page 76 states: "The Council will also work to ensure that in terms of the highway, footpaths and open spaces the distinctive character of Thorpeness is maintained and protected." I only wish that were the case! As examples of lack of support to date:</p> <p>Some 25 years ago when the gas main was replaced, the contractors blocked off the line after completing their work so as to permit the ground cover to recover; but the Council didn't like the barriers and had them taken down. The result was that that became the default pathway, with progressive erosion ever since then. I have tried to stabilise the sections around Sans Souci with gravel, but further along (behind The Cabin and The Anchorage are particularly bad) one can see that the 'path' is 20-30 cm lower than it used to be.</p> <p>In 2021 I watched a Norse workman 'repairing' potholes in the car park. Because he'd come with insufficient gravel to do the job, he scalped the surrounding banks to get sand for the job.</p>		
--	--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions  
 Thorpeness CAAMP

			<p>Apart from the fact that sand doesn't work for potholes (it gets pushed out and blown away), he was cutting off the marram grass roots that are the only stabilising influence on those banks. When I expostulated he reckoned to be offended as he was going above and beyond to fill the potholes. That is not the sort of protection that we need the Council to be overseeing.</p> <p>When one of us was a lad in the 1950s the area was thick with marram grass and lupins. 90 % of that cover has now gone, eroded by an admixture of too many rabbits, a lack of care (as above) and far more people trekking past on foot or (more disruptively) on horses, bicycles or with buggies. This will only get ever worse unless remedial action is taken.</p> <p>The most worrying area is the beach. People used to walk along a relatively narrow path along the top of the beach that was covered in a delicate flora of grasses and small wild flowers that provided a firm and wind-resistant surface. But with more traffic the grass got eroded. The exposed sand gets blown away. Because the sand below is uncomfortably soft to walk on, and even harder to cycle on, people walk/cycle to the side, eroding that too. Now the 'path' is perhaps 10 m wide, and there's very little of the firm grassy surface left.</p> <p>When the England Coast Path people were reviewing in 2020 I suggested to them that a 1.5 m wide path of hoggin would provide a firm base that would encourage walkers and wheeled vehicles to stick to a narrower track. But I was told that this would not look appropriate. Apparently it was preferable to have a bare wind-blasted sandy surface that is progressively eroding. It would be really helpful to preservation of the foreshore for a resistant and comfortable-to-walk-on surface to be laid throughout the length of South Beach – and it couldn't cost much to lay a strip of hoggin or equivalent. Particularly if the foreshore is to become part of</p>		
--	--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions  
 Thorpeness CAAMP

			<p>the Conservation Area then that really ought to be implemented.</p> <p>4. As a point of information, The Cabin was moved from Sizewell to its present location in the 1870s, originally as a one room hut. At the time it was the only building on that part of the shore.</p> <p>5. Page 26 refers to the footpath between Killarney and Sans Souci, but not the more substantial boardwalk between The Shanty and The Cabin.</p> <p>6. Page 31 points out that there are no telephone boxes – but there used to be one opposite the Meare, next to the old Estate Office.</p> <p>We hope that these comments will be taken as being constructive and helpful, and that they will be incorporated into the final version. One of us has family connections going back to Thorpeness in the 1870s, and has himself spent time in either The Cabin or Sans Souci virtually every year since 1950. We are therefore very keen that the best is done to preserve both the character of the houses and the environment they sit on.</p>		
10	Private Individual	Support, Observation	<p>The extension to the existing Conservation Area to include the beach bungalows, most of which were former fishermen's houses (shown on the 1882 map) before the creation of the seaside resort was created by G S Ogilvie, is to be welcomed. Most of the bungalows have been substantially altered to fulfil their new role as holiday homes but they still retain elements of their original character and contribute to the special character of Thorpeness. The former Mission Hall behind the dune ridge, immediately south of The Anchorage and to the W of Seacote, is within the extension to the Conservation Area but is not mentioned or photographed. It</p>	Noted	<p>Minor text amendment – The Mission Hall, while possessing some significance, has not been identified as a positive unlisted structure due to the</p>

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions  
 Thorpeness CAAMP

		<p>has a date stone 1899 on the W gable and a stone tablet 'Mission Hall' set in the porch gable below. It has been sensitively converted into a holiday home and is an important part of the history of Thorpeness, replacing the original fishermen's Bethel which was situated nearby on the area of the existing ESC car park. I've attached an article from the Thorpeness &amp; Adringham Heritage Group's Newsletter giving details of how the fishing families participated in Non-conformist worship in the 19th century. The inclusion of the group of remaining black boarded fisherman's huts (S of the Heritage Centre) is important since these are one of the few remaining unaltered structures relating to the fishing hamlet of Thorpe. Consideration should be given to extending the existing Conservation Area boundary to include 'Shore Cote', a one-and-a-half storey white boarded beach bungalow which dates from 1889 (I think, the date is on the W elevation) which is north of Beach Farm and named 'Cote' on the Appraisal map. This is an original bungalow and was rescued from half-way down the cliff after an early 20th century storm. 'Stella Maris' a quirky flat roofed black and white beach bungalow (immediately north of the late 20th century block of houses North End) merits inclusion. I support the buildings to be put forward for listing. The reed-thatched barn has stables attached, forming a courtyard behind the barn. The stables on the E side of the yard have been converted into garages but the N block retains the stable doors. A riding school was located here as a recreational activity for visitors and gymkhanas were held on the field behind the Margaret Ogilvie Almshouses. All the buildings to</p>		<p>modern alterations which have altered its character and appearance, Shore Cote and Stella Maris not included in the Conservation Area following advice from the Coastal Management Team</p>
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions  
 Thorpeness CAAMP

			<p>be put forward are representative examples of Thorpeness's unique architecture and contribute to the overall character of the village. The Uplands, although humble in scale and appearance, provided seaside accommodation for people of all social classes. They are former officers' quarters, built to standard Air Ministry designs, which originally stood on the 1915 World War I air station at Hazlewood, near Aldeburgh. G S Ogilvie had them transported in sections to Thorpeness c.1920 by horse and cart and steam lorry. There is a plan of the air station in Geoff Dewing's booklet <i>Air Station Aldeburgh 1915-1919</i> (ISBN 0 9256416 2 3). I would like to see The Dune House put forward for listing. This was designed by Norwegian Architects Jamund/Vigsnaes (JVA) as part of the 'Living Architecture' initiative and it is situated on the dunes to the south of the Conservation Area. In my view the site presented difficulties in view of its prominence and the unusual character of the seaside resort which the architect has successfully embraced with a building which is distinctively modern yet harmonises with Thorpeness in design and materials. As the draft Management Plan acknowledges, parking is an issue during the peak holiday seasons. Visitors seem to have increased throughout the year, possibly because of foreign travel restrictions, and it would be useful if the existing car park could be extended with enough spaces to compensate for removing parking from beside the Meare which reduces the main thoroughfare to single lane. Cars parked beside the Meare are unsightly as well as causing congestion. Discrete notices prohibiting parking here would be preferable to bollards or yellow lines.</p>		
--	--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions  
 Thorpeness CAAMP

			<p>Thorpeness is a dark sky area and does not need street lights. With regard to new development, the most recent development off Old Homes Road successfully integrates with the 'Thorpeness idiom' but if there are any future developments ownership should be restricted to local workers and appropriately priced for sale or rental rather than them being sold to second home owners. These schemes operate successfully in other popular seaside destinations such as Blakeney in North Norfolk. Overall, the draft Appraisal and Management Plan is a comprehensive, well-researched document and a useful update for the existing one.</p>		
11	Private Individual	Observation	<p>I would just like to add a general point to the discussion about the comments in pages 74 and 75 concerning the preservation of old materials, windows etc. There is already, all over the country, in policy terms, a tension between the needs of conservation control and energy saving and efficiency. There is a huge responsibility on all to make our properties more energy efficient, and this must mean the use of building materials that will make this possible. Too great an insistence on the use of traditional materials, and, to pick a rather egregious example, the preservation (or even reinstatement) of Crittal windows, would make the achievement of energy conservation targets nigh on impossible. An objective measure of this point could almost certainly be obtained by using the software for the issue of Energy Performance Certificates (EPCs) and comparing the rating of the same building with modern and older materials. I believe that even a document with a specific conservation focus, such as the Appraisal, should acknowledge this tension and give greater weight to these energy reduction issues which will be an</p>	Noted	

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions  
 Thorpeness CAAMP

			essential part of national carbon neutrality goals in the next 30 years.		
12	Private Individual	Support, Observation	<p>I wish firstly to correct some factual errors in the Draft, in connection with 3 houses on the south side of Lakeside Avenue.</p> <p>With regard to the Hermitage, no 5 Lakeside Avenue:          The Draft states that the house was built “slightly later in date than Heronsmead, particularly the applied timbering.....”</p> <p>In fact this property was originally a small, flat roofed structure, built of wood and an asbestos material. This was demolished at the millennium and the current house was then built on the site, and is brick built. Therefore it is not “one of the earlier buildings to have been constructed.....”</p> <p>There is also, what I take to be a typing error where the word “gabled” is meant to say “gable”.</p> <p>With regard to no 7 Lakeside Avenue:          The Draft states this property is “probably dating from the c. 1930.....”</p> <p>The Draft states “The house shares much of its detailing and its twin gabled form and recessed centre with that of its neighbour to the east no 5 The Hermitage.....”</p> <p>In fact this property was demolished and rebuilt shortly before The Hermitage i.e. prior to the millennium.</p> <p>With regard to Heronsmead no 3 Lakeside:          Although the property when originally built around 1911, was in fact thatched, the house burned down at a later date, possibly c.1930 and was then rebuilt on the same footprint as the original. It is brick built on a timber frame, but with a clay tile roof. The Draft states “to the rear is a black weather boarded two storey addition of a later date.....”</p>	Noted – Acknowledgement sent	Minor text amendment – corrections, nos. 5 and 7 Lakeside Avenue no longer identified as positively contributing structures as both were constructed in the last twenty years and hence are of little heritage value

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions  
 Thorpeness CAAMP

			<p>In addition to the statement (paragraph above) re the roof, in fact the weatherboarded part of the house is to the side of the house, not to the rear..... Although it was partially rebuilt a few years ago, this section of the house was in situ when my family moved into Heronsmead in 1977, and it is believed was built many decades prior to that date. While the windows, and doors along the south side of the house are “replacement uPVC units.....”. the wooden front door was in situ in 1997, and is believed to be from the rebuild, after the fire.</p> <p>My views on the Draft Proposal:          I am pleased the this review is taking place, as I think Thorpeness is indeed a very special place, and the Conservation Area status enables it to receive an element of protection that would not otherwise be available.          I am totally in agreement that the designated conservation area warrants the extension plan suggested, at this time.          At a time when so much of our heritage is being lost, due to development the ability to protect special areas such as the village of Thorpeness is I believe vital.</p>		
13	Private Individual	Support, Observation	<p>I think this document is exceptionally well researched and presented. I have owned a property on The Uplands, Thorpeness for almost 30 years, this document has shed new light on the history and design of the village for me and I am very grateful for it. I am impressed.</p> <p>I have a few specific comments which I give below:          Page 66. Mill House ‘built after WW2’ but the photo on page 11 shows Mill House circa 1930’s I think.          Page 64: Boundary is OFTEN enclosed by lattice fencing, not always. (end of last paragraph on this page).          Page 66: I agree that future developments and alterations to the Uplands wooden buildings should be carefully managed and I would include in this front boundaries, gates and usage</p>	Noted	Minor text amendment - corrections

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions  
 Thorpeness CAAMP

			<p>of front areas. For instance one property has now been totally rebuilt, fills much more of the plot and has a shingle drive at the front for car parking, with a large wooden gate on the boundary.</p> <p>Page 64. Numbers 1 to 16 of the Uplands were indeed built in 1919 but I always believed they had been ex-Army huts or barracks that had been transported for somewhere locally and reconfigured to make the properties that now exist here. They were intended for modestly scaled and people staying there would go to the golf club for their meals.</p>		
14	Private Individual	Support, Observation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I agree with the plan and its vision to maintain the enduring qualities of the village, especially extra vigilance on homes development as well as updating. I believe in some cases this has gone too far, some homes on Lakeside have been remodelled to a point where all the original Thorpeness vernacular has been removed not only in architectural detail but also with colours, esp. grey, that do not fit.</li> <li>2. The gravel roads and informal paths need to be left as such, as any 'tidying up' removes the informal nature of the village.</li> <li>3. Regarding the Property Alnmouth which you mention in your report. It has been in my family for over 35 years now, and was originally built on or just after 1880 by William Harling; one of the original buildings in the village of Thorpe before its development in the 30's. It still retains all the original tongue and groove interior boarding on walls and ceiling in every room.</li> <li>4. I'm not sure if parking issues are part of your remit, but outside Alnmouth there are double yellow lines on the bend before the straight parking section. Unfortunately people abuse this and often park on the bend during busy periods and I have witnessed several near misses with cars and pedestrians. I think something needs to be done here.</li> </ol>	Noted	

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions  
Thorpeness CAAMP

15	Private Individual	Observation	<p>A few points to note regarding The Headlands:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the original development comprised seven terraced houses, not apartments.</li> <li>• two of the seven houses remain in the original configuration</li> <li>• the other five houses have been divided into apartments, nominally three flats per house, but two of these flats have subsequently been combined into a duplex apartment.</li> <li>• whilst the 'houses' are presently multi-coloured, they were originally finished in fair-faced cement render.</li> <li>• the adjacent block of garages, mentioned as a positive unlisted building, were originally part of The Headlands, hence seven garages.</li> </ul>	Noted	Minor text amendment – corrections
16	Private Individual	Observation, Objection	<p>Since owning the house in 2007 my wife and I have carried out an extensive refurbishment of Johnnygate and more recently extension to rebuild No 1 Old Homes Road, during which time we have carried out some research of the site's history and gained knowledge of the immediate area. I have no objection to my house now being included in the Conservation Area, however there are a few inaccuracies in your otherwise excellent document which I hope you are able to review and correct.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Page 16 includes an aerial photograph, identified as c.1940. My understanding is the photograph is later, probably mid 1950's, as it shows Johnnygate (then known as the New Home) which was built in 1954.</li> <li>2. Page 16 and page 35 shows photographs labeled as concrete 'anti-tank cubes' from the Second World War, located in my garden at Johnnygate. These are more recent landscape features made by me in 2008, using redundant demolition materials arising from the refurbishment of Johnnygate. They are slightly smaller than the original anti-tank features and have no historic value and should not be</li> </ol>	Noted	Minor text amendment corrections, removal of Johnnygate from the CA and the 'anti-tank cubes' as positive unlisted structures, beach in front of the Headlands and Johnnygate still to be included as no objections raised from the Coastal

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions  
 Thorpeness CAAMP

			<p>identified as NDHAs. The address of Johnnygate is Admirals Walk, not Beach Farm Lane.</p> <p>3. Page 45 and 46 describes the row of cottages on Old Homes Road. I have a copy of the first 1837 OS map, which identifies the original 4 cottages. These were 'double-ended' by Ogilvie, as evidenced by the photograph on page 47 of W.H.Parkes Thorpeness Guide 1912, referenced in your bibliography. So that No 6 Old Homes Road is Edwardian, not c1950 as your text suggests. It is probably worth noting that No 1 Old Homes Road has recently been rebuilt to match this original double ending. The current Conservation Area description identifies the 'higgledy-piggledy' character of the rear of the Old Homes properties providing a positive contribution to the area, which I suggest is worth maintaining.</p> <p>We OBJECT to the beach in front of Johnnygate and the Headlands being included in the Conservation Area as it would appear to disadvantage these properties benefiting from any future shoreline defence. Indeed Johnnygate and the Headlands were subject to coastal erosion in 2013 made worse by embayment beyond the southern termination of inadequate defences which terminated just north of the Old Homes Road footpath. I have copied in Sharon Bleese and Madeline Fallon to comment on this point. I have also copied in Richard Bennett, as representative of the Headlands.</p>		Management Team.
17	Private Individual	Observation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That all these houses, some rather magnificent - - on the seaward side of Northend Avenue that were a part of the original holiday village deserve to be included excepting the new Svensk home (and possibly omitting the Red House)</li> <li>2. The area behind the garages that are included deserves to be extended to include the allotments that are such a special and interesting and attractive</li> </ol>	Noted	Northend Avenue not included specifically on the advice of the Coastal Management Team, the allotments,

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions  
 Thorpeness CAAMP

			<p>feature of the village and that are worked and productive</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. It should also be extended to include the Sports Field and Pavilion that are such an integral part of the village life now that Ogilvie Hall has been converted into housing</li> <li>4. I would add Tinkers End and indeed all the beach frontage extending to the Red House, an area that is such a vital part of contemporary discussion re sea defence management</li> <li>5. Why not include all those beach front cottages towards Aldeburgh up to and including Haven House?</li> <li>6. I would extend the area to included all those open areas green spaces and wildlife reserves surrounding the village – NB up to and including Sluice Cottage, to secure against possible future housing development as these contribute to that unique bubble experience of the village</li> </ol>		<p>sports field and pavilion and surrounding landscape not included natural landscapes, sports fields and agricultural land do not fall under the remit of a CA, area further south along Aldeburgh not included as the majority of older properties have been heavily modified and hence would contribute little to the CA</p>
18	Private Individual	N/A	Requested assistance accessing the Thorpeness CAAMP webpage.	Acknowledgement sent with a different link provided as well as offer to send a printed copy	



Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions  
Thorpeness CAAMP

19	Private Individual	Observation	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to examine the proposed changes to the Thorpeness Conservation Area. The very detailed report consistently - and correctly - makes repeated reference to the importance of 'open spaces' and 'vistas', the 'wider natural landscape', 'commitment to public space', 'recreational facilities' etc. For instance: 'The contribution made to the Conservation Area by open spaces is highly significant....including the golf course...'</p> <p>Which all begs the question as to why the golf course is not included in the Conservation Area?</p> <p>The report confirms it is already within the SSSI.</p> <p>The golf course including its practice ground are essential parts of the 'wider natural landscape'.</p>	Noted	The golf course has not been included as natural landscapes do not fall under the remit of a CA.
20	County Archaeology	Support	<p>Thank you for consulting on the below – apologies to have missed the deadline. We welcome the detail on archaeology and references to the HER.</p>	Noted	
21	Parish Council	Support, Observation	<p>We are pleased to support the Thorpeness draft Conservation area Appraisal and Management Plan update (January 2022) which is a comprehensive and thorough document which clearly expresses many of our own thoughts and concerns and one which we always use when commenting on planning applications in Thorpeness.</p> <p>Management Plan</p> <p>The following are specific paragraphs in the management plan that we wish to make additional comment.</p> <p>We fully support the assertion that Thorpeness has a strong connection with the natural environment within the village and as the appraisal states we would not wish to see this degraded through urbanisation with the addition of elements such as street lighting, concrete kerbs, inappropriate highway signage and road markings.</p> <p>We are pleased to see the plan acknowledges that parking is an issue, to which we are continually seeking to find solutions</p>	Noted	Shorecote and Stella Maris removed from the CAAMP prior to public consultation on the advice of the Coastal Management Team

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions  
 Thorpeness CAAMP

			<p>that are sympathetic to the significance of the original ethos of the holiday village.</p> <p>We also support the concerns raised that inappropriate development and the cumulative effect of incremental change are of significant concern and the statement that the District Council will seek to prevent such inappropriate development from taking place. We will seek to support this through the development of our neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>We welcome the proposal to seek the views of the residents/property owners of the conservation area on the proposal for an Article 4(2) Direction which the Parish Council would support.</p> <p>The Parish Council fully support the statements on the design and location of any new development, the importance of planned vistas, demolition, enhancement opportunities, and building at risk,</p> <p>Landscape and trees - We continue to receive a number of requests to remove or cut back mature trees, which the Parish Council generally support as by their very nature many outgrow the location in which they have been sited. However we would always seek to see them replaced or added to with additional appropriate planting.</p> <p>Again many of these concerns will be addressed as we develop our neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>The identification of listing opportunities is again fully supported as we have long believed that there previous exclusion, often on the grounds that they have had some alteration was not justified and would only lead to further erosion of the contribution they make to the village.</p> <p>Boundary Review</p> <p>We fully support the proposal to extend the existing conservation area to the south to include the beach bungalows, the former Mission Hall and the remaining</p>		
--	--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

Appendix D: Summary of Responses to the Public Consultation/Council Responses/Actions  
 Thorpeness CAAMP

			<p>fisherman's huts. This would make a significant improvement to the current plan as it includes many of the only remaining structures relating to the fishing hamlet of Thorpe.</p> <p>We would also seek to extend the Conservation Area to the north so as to include 'Shore Cote' which currently lies just outside the area, this is a beach bungalow which dates from 1889 and is one of the original bungalows and as a famous photograph testifies, was rescued from halfway down the cliff following a storm in the early 20th century. The extension should then continue eastward to the sea to include 'Stella Maris' another beach bungalow.</p>		
22	Historic England	N/A	<p>Request to submit response after period for public consultation has ended.</p>	<p>Acknowledgement sent with assurance HE's feedback would be welcome</p>	