

Greater Nottingham - Broxtowe Borough, Gedling Borough and Nottingham City Aligned Core Strategies Publication Version June 2012

Response of **Linby Parish Council & Papplewick Parish Council** to
Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions

MATTER 5: THE ENVIRONMENT (Q. 9)

Background

- .1 The representations made here, which build on earlier representations made to the Broxtowe Borough, Gedling Borough and Nottingham City Aligned Core Strategies on behalf of Linby Parish Council & Papplewick Parish Council ("the Parish Councils") are made specifically in respect of the policies and proposals relating to Gedling Borough, unless otherwise stated.
- .2 The Parish Councils are aware that the **Friends of Moor Pond Woods** are making specific representations in respect of questions 6, 8, 9, 11 and 13, including the submission of an historic area assessment of the Middle Leen Valley, in order to assist the Inspector in respect of her questions on the matter of the environment. In the interests of brevity, it has not therefore been considered necessary to reiterate the points made in respect of the majority of these questions here but the Parish Councils do wish the Inspector to note its support to the points raised therein.

Question 9

Response

- .3 The Parish Councils are of the opinion that the two proposed SUE sites at Top Wighay Farm and land North of Papplewick Lane do not take sufficient account of heritage assets in respect of their impact on the conservation villages of Linby and Papplewick.
- .4 The NPPF provides advice regarding the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment at paragraphs 126 to 141. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset [Para. 129]. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be [Para. 132].
- .5 The above policies are reflected in the spatial vision and objectives of the ACS¹ and in its **Policy 11 (The Historic Environment)** which states that proposals and initiatives will be supported where the historic environment and heritage assets and their settings are

¹ The Greater Nottingham – Broxtowe Borough, Gedling Borough and Nottingham City Aligned Core Strategies Publication Version June 2012

conserved and enhanced in line with their interest and significance. Elements of the historic environment that contribute towards the unique identity of areas and help to create a sense of place will be conserved and, where possible, enhanced. Elements of particular importance include Registered Parks and Gardens and prominent listed buildings with a wider visual and economic benefit, such as Newstead Abbey. The justification to the policy is provided at paragraphs 3.11.1 to 3.11.9 of the ACS. Here we are informed that *significance* derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting [3.11.2] and that the care of our historic environment has to be *carefully balanced* with current economic and social needs [3.11.5].

- .6 Turning to the potential impact of the two SUE sites on the built and historic environment, Linby and Papplewick are two of only six conservation villages within the Borough of Gedling. They also contain a large number of listed buildings and structures. The importance of these conservation areas is reflected in the Linby Conservation Area Character Appraisal (adopted August 2011) and the Papplewick Conservation Area Character Appraisal (consultation draft January 2011). Both conservation areas have been extended in recent years, reflecting their continued value as heritage assets and in an attempt to preserve their setting. There are 188 listed buildings in the Borough, including approximately **35** listed buildings and structures (including two Grade II* buildings) within **Linby** and **49** listed buildings and structures (including two Grade I and two Grade II* buildings) within **Papplewick**. In addition, the Grade I Newstead Abbey lies a short distance to the north of Top Wighay Farm.
- .7 The Sustainability Appraisal that accompanies the ACS is designed to assess the economic, social and environmental impacts of projects, strategies or plans such that the chosen option promotes sustainable development. At paragraph lxxv (on page 15) it states that: -
- 'For Top Wighay Farm there are several local wildlife sites and the River Lean near North of Papplewick Lane. The strategy shows negative effects in terms of resourcing and flooding.'* At paragraph 3.67 it is stated that *'A number of areas in Gedling Borough have a strong sense of heritage especially in the rural areas where six of the villages have Conservation Areas. Newstead Abbey Park, once home to Lord Byron, includes a number of heritage assets such as the Grade I listed Abbey and Boundary Wall and is a major feature in the North of the Borough. There are 188 listed buildings in the Borough.'*
- .8 The two SUE sites of Top Wighay Farm and land North of Papplewick Lane were subject to specific assessment within the Sustainability Appraisal. Significantly, in the case of land North of Papplewick Lane, the study recommended that the majority of the (originally larger) appraised site was unsuitable for development due to the Green Belt criterion avoiding coalescence with Linby and impact on the conservation area of Linby and Papplewick Hall historical park and garden.
- .9 In the opinion of the Parish Councils, with specific regard to the impact of the two SUE sites on the conservation villages of Linby and Papplewick and the heritage assets within this part of the surrounding area, GBC does not appear to have fully or properly assessed their individual or cumulative impact on these heritage assets (or their setting) and this has resulted in a flawed overall appraisal of the suitability of the two SUE sites for the amounts of development proposed.

- .10 On this basis, the ACS does not present a sound basis for the future planning of the area surrounding Linby and Papplewick. The important questions surrounding the impact of the proposed SUE sites on heritage assets remain unanswered and insufficient weight has been attached to potential impacts leading to skewed results in the Sustainability Appraisal.
- .11 For these reasons, GBC has failed to fully assess the impact of the two SUE sites on nearby heritage assets in light of their significance, despite these issues being raised as likely concerns in the Council's appraisal of these sites and notwithstanding the spatial vision and spatial objectives that seek to protect and enhance heritage assets. As such, the ACS fails to accord with the advice in the NPPF [Para's 17, 152 and 158] in relation to the conservation, protection and enhancement of heritage assets and is unsound.

Relevant hearing session: Week 2 – Tuesday 5th November: Day 4 (10am)²

Word count: 1,130

Date: 18th September 2013

² Examination hearing session as per draft programme dated 22 August 2013