



ENGLISH HERITAGE

**NEWARK & SHERWOOD LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

**ALLOCATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT DPD**

**EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC**

**HEARING STATEMENT BY ENGLISH HERITAGE**

**Matter 5: Site Specific Issues (Southwell Area)**

**Q19: Would the scale, density and greenfield location of allocated sites be appropriate and contribute to the sustainable development of the District?**

**Q20: Do the policies include adequate and appropriate safeguards with regard to the potential effects of development on the historic environment, flooding and biodiversity? Has satisfactory provision been made in respect of transport and other infrastructure requirements?**

**Q21: Is there uncertainty over funding and delivery of the bypass and, if so, is the Plan sufficiently flexible to cope with this?**

**1. Introduction**

1.1 English Heritage's responsibilities, as the Government's adviser on the historic environment, include the protection and management of England's historic assets. In planning terms, this role includes providing advice to ensure that statute and national policy, particularly in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), are reflected in local planning policy and practice. English Heritage is consulted on local development documents under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

1.2 This statement addresses the above questions on Southwell as they relates to the impact on heritage assets and their settings and the soundness of the Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD). Our original representations on the Publication version of the DPD regarding Southwell (reps 75/7 to 75/19) remain valid.

- 1.3 A Statement of Common Ground is being prepared between the Council, English Heritage and the National Trust, which relates to our original representations on Policies So/PV and So/Wh and the Southwell Landscape Setting Study (reps 75/16, 75/17 and 75/18). Once available, this should be read alongside this hearing statement.

## **2. Response to Question 19**

- 2.1 Due to the richness of Southwell's historic environment, a key challenge for any new housing or employment development is to avoid harming the town's many heritage assets. This applies to both greenfield sites on the edge of Southwell and brownfield sites within the town. All of the proposed allocated sites will need careful planning at the development management stage to try and avoid harming the historic environment. This includes design issues such as scale, density and layout and the consideration of setting impacts on key heritage assets including effects on views.

## **3. Response to Question 20**

- 3.1 Our views on specific sites for Southwell are set out in our original representations (reps 75/7 to 75/14). We welcome the requirements within many of the site specific policies to consider historic environment issues and the overall setting of Southwell. The requirements demonstrate the level of importance and consideration that should be given to potential historic environment impacts and should help to ensure that only appropriately designed schemes are delivered.
- 3.2 In our original representation for Policy So/Ho/6 (Housing Site 6), we requested a minor alteration to the policy in order to make the DPD sound (rep 75/11). We note that the Council have put this alteration forward as a minor modification (in ADM1), which we welcome.
- 3.3 With regards to Policies So/PV and So/Wh, we greatly welcome the inclusion of both policies in order to protect key views and surroundings of some of Southwell's key heritage assets. Our original representations (reps 75/16 and 75/17) expressed concern regarding the wording of each policy and the soundness of the DPD. However, along with the National Trust, we have been in negotiation with the Council on proposed amendments to these policies (as well as Policy So/E/1). It is hoped that the Statement of Common Ground will address this matter and resolve our concerns with the wording of these policies.
- 3.4 It is also hoped that the Statement of Common Ground will address and resolve many of our concerns regarding the Southwell Landscape Setting Study, with an amended version of the study added to the examination library. This study forms an important part of the evidence base for Southwell and underpins individual policies within the DPD, particularly Policies So/PV and So/Wh.

#### **4. Response to Question 21**

- 4.1 Our original representation (rep 75/19) sets out our concerns regarding the safeguarding of a bypass route to the south of Southwell and why we consider the safeguarding to be unsound. We consider that there is uncertainty over funding and delivery of the bypass (the Local Transport Plan, including the Implementation Plan, makes little reference to the bypass) and it is not clear how the DPD would be able to cope with this.
- 4.2 We are aware that Section 10 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 states that Local Plans need to have regard to policies developed by a Local Transport Authority including Local Transport Plans (LTP). However, having “regard to” does not automatically mean safeguarding land for potential future schemes. Furthermore, although Policy SP7 of the Core Strategy commits the District Council to safeguarding locations of highway schemes identified in the LTP, both this policy and the LTP predate the Southwell Landscape Setting Study and the National Planning Policy Framework (including the penultimate bullet point of Paragraph 157 regarding identifying land where development would be inappropriate due to its environmental or historic significance).
- 4.3 Safeguarding the route effectively amounts to an allocation and a presumption that a bypass is possible and deliverable. It also undermines the Study and policies in the DPD, including Policy So/PV and So/Wh, and could lead to more pressure for development to the south of Southwell. The LTP has not had the same scrutiny or consultation as this DPD and it seems inappropriate that a scheme in the LTP should become part of the development plan without further justification. The LTP does not show the route of the bypass and there seems to be no guarantee that the scheme will come forward before the end of the plan period (unlike the allocation sites, which are assumed to come forward before the end of the plan period).
- 4.4 It is not apparent that the DPD would be found unsound without the bypass route safeguarded, given the uncertainties regarding funding and delivery. It is also not clear whether other Nottinghamshire authorities are following the same approach in terms of safeguarding land mentioned in the LTP. Even in the case of Newark & Sherwood, other schemes mentioned in Appendix 2 of the LTP Implementation Plan do not appear to be safeguarded in this or other DPDs (including the A617 Kelham Bypass and the Dukeries Line Improvement).
- 4.5 We consider that the DPD could refer to the potential need for a bypass in the supporting text (along with the issues associated with such a scheme), but it should not be shown as a safeguarded route on Map 6 or mentioned in Policy So/E/1. The current approach to safeguarding

the route makes the DPD unsound in terms of not being justified, effective or consistent with national policy.

Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge MRTPI  
English Heritage

29 November 2012

Word Count = 1,035