Cuckney, Norton Holbeck and Welbeck NP meeting with Historic England

15.09 15

Present: Claire Searson (HE) Helen Metcalfe James Green David Collins Darren Ridout Caroline Chambers David Wall Richard Bower Sheila Brailsford

Georgina Smith

HM: How can we agree on balance re NPPF133 and 134?

CS: HE is supportive of Neighbourhood Plans. We appreciate housing pressures. We are not about being in a bubble. If there are tensions, there needs to be supportive evidence.

HE has recently produced leaflets explaining the terms “setting and significance” that will help you.

DC: We don’t want to be in aspic

CS: I hope we can come to some agreement. Having a Neighbourhood Plan is an excellent way and very positive

HM: About balance – we have evidence of the housing demand

DC: This is an unusual situation: 75% owned by Welbeck Estates, 25% owned by local council and private owners. The young persons survey and other consultations evidence the need for housing.

DR: you need to look at us in a different way

CS: It has not been clearly articulated- this is an exceptionally rich heritage area and we have to view what the community wants without harming the area. A sustainability appraisal is needed.

DC: do we need more policies?

CS: I came to the NP cold – the passion of it isn’t in the reading of it.

CC: Would it be helpful to highlight the community consultations?

HM: RE agenda 6. What level of detail of proposed housing sites is required for a NP?

CS: I looked at indicative layouts and though “ugh’

HM: Should we remove them?

JG: I suggest we remove them

DR: Site assessments have been looked at by all the other agencies. If we remove them- it will affect the plan.

CS: We prefer outlines.

Site Specifics

Land North of Budby Road –

CS: there is concern about the view points

DR: Here is an image of the view and how it would not be affected by houses. We could re- arrange the layout of houses with in the red line on the map.

CS: We have big issues re the principle of the Setting, and are very concerned.

DC: If we disagree?

CS: “Setting” is recognized in law. It’s down to the significance of the Chcurch which is a Grade 1 building. If you want to continue with the plan for Budby Road site we would object but HE would review it.

Depot site:

CS: HE is ok with this but consideration must be made to retain the historic aspects of it

CC: This is ludicrous. We are not giving up anything in the plan. We have consulted many times, have spent nearly 3 years of work on the plan.

DR: This is not a market situation. We want different types of rented housing and starter homes.

GS: The design of housing will be in keeping with the style of the surrounding houses. In the three villages there is an eclectic range of houses, built at different times.

DR: re: design guide. A Parente style needs to be adopted by HE, BDC and the community

CS: a pattern book would be very positive, a real strength

HM: this is not going to be possible in the NP. Everyone knows what we are signing up for

DR: We have sufficient evidence already and we don’t want to hold up the plan.

CS: What about the core strategy of 5 houses?

JG: Rural services centre was only Cuckney, the level was low due to the definition.

DC: the NP includes Norton, Holbeck and Welbeck

CS: this all helps to build a picture. HE couldn’t see how you could go from 5 houses to 60

DR: the number is skewed due to the Woodhouse Hall barns plan

HM: Should we take out the numbers and rather write a principle?

DR: the number is important for each site. The density is low on each site. Should it be “up to” a certain number or a minimum?

Land opposite Creswell Road

CS: It’s a matter of balancing impact against need

DR: Where better to put 3 bedroom houses for families?

CS: there isn’t any reference to the conservation area as a whole. There is a potential for impact here. You need to identify the need for houses here

Allotments site

DR: I’ve worked hard to illustrate the layout here. After discussion with BDC conservation team this has been agreed upon. It is intended for starter homes.

CS: I am ok with it as long as the heritage aspects are considered

Woodhouse Hall Barns

DR: There was planning permission- but it has lapsed. The enabling aspect has been dropped and it is now just for conversion to residential use.

CS: Put in place a plan for protection and use the building at risk policy

Eddison’s cottage

CS: the principle problem was the “enabling” factor

DR: we don’t want to lose the opportunity to have new build behind the cottage

CS: That is not in our remit

JG: Use the Heritage at risk policy

CS: Boost the policy on protecting the historic aspects

Lady Margaret Crescent

CS: Again, Where is the need?

DR: There is more need for bungalows in Norton.

CS: Be aware of the historic significance of Norton Grange

Hatfield Business plantation

CS: What of the heritage aspect of the slabs?

DR: There are 40 pads. Does HE want one to be restored with a narrative?

CS: WW2 is part of the rich tapestry of the history of Welbeck. It does have historic interest

DC: Clearing the site will enhance the history rather than damage it. At present it is impassable and unrecognizable.

DR: the historic area could be on the left of the plan area

CS: Boost the text for the historic aspects

CS: Apart from the Budby Road site, HE is in agreement with the remainder as long as the historic aspects are maintained. HE is very much in favour of NPs and is working with other NP groups in a positive way.