

CONSULTEE COMMENTS

Bulcote Parish Council – Comments Received 15.06.15

Introduction

The Council accepts that the Bulcote Farm redundant buildings will need to be re-developed and it expects that the re-development will be sympathetic and minimal. However, the current proposal has neither of these attributes and appears to be an attempt to maximise profit at the expense of the Bulcote community and with little regard to the latter.

Planning

The extended development into the Green Belt is not in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) or the Local Plan which make a strong presumption against new development.

The development, in what is effectively open countryside, is against Spatial Policy, which only supports new development in sustainable locations. Bulcote is not considered to be a sustainable location as it does not possess its own amenities but relies on those in Burton Joyce and Lowdham.

The NPPF and the Local Plan make no provision for enabling development and there is no apparent reason why the existing Grade II listed buildings should not be developed in their own right. The principle of "enabling development" is not accepted and there are a great number of farm building conversions schemes that have been undertaken with little or no new build. The English Heritage (Historic England) document "Enabling Development and the Conservation of Historic Places" states that Enabling Development should always be seen as a subsidy of last resort, since it is an inefficient means of funding a conservation deficit. In addition the document states that proposals to provide the majority of subsidy through enabling development would be self-defeating if its extent and scale would be out of keeping with the character of the local landscape. We consider that these are relevant arguments against the proposals for new build.

Building outside the village confines will extend the built up area. The 3D view drawings clearly shows the massing of the new build elements which are considered to be disproportionate to the existing single storey buildings on the west side of the quadrangle. Whilst it is noted that the majority of the new build is on the footprint of previous buildings, it is understood that this has not been accepted as a valid argument in recent planning applications.

It is considered that the new build will increase the Bulcote population by some 50% and by almost 100% within the Bulcote Conservation Area and is therefore contrary to the principle of sustainable development. Bulcote Village has a strong social identity and community spirit, despite being attached to Burton Joyce. Allowing such a large development, surrounding its own open public amenity and accommodating a community building that is so remote from the village centre is likely to fragment the community into two factions, viz, those in the village itself to the north of the railway and those to the south of it.

Infrastructure Matters

1. Schools

There is concern at the number of Pre, Primary, and Secondary School places which would be required as a result of the proposed development. Burton Joyce School is already full

2. Health Facilities

Medical Centres and Dental Practices in surrounding villages are already stretched and additional population would exacerbate the situation.

3. Flooding and Drainage

The content of the Flood Risk Assessment is acknowledged, although not all of the proposed Flood Mitigation Measures have been carried to the Conclusions. These include the creation of a flood action plan and safe access and egress routes to areas of higher ground. It is not clear who will prepare and manage the flood action plan or how the safe access and egress routes are to be defined.

Whilst it is accepted that the final drainage schemes will need to be approved by the Environment Agency, N&SDC and Severn Trent Water it is noted that the proposed layout does not include the 39 new build dwellings. There are also some fundamental issues that could have been resolved with further enquiries. One is the ownership and capacity of the foul pumping station which is understood to be private. In addition the ditch into which it is proposed to discharge surface water is believed to be managed by Newark Internal Drainage Board who do not appear to have been consulted and would be required to give Consent to Discharge.

Environmental and Design Matters

- 1.** The new build dwellings are urban in Character and are not sympathetic to the existing Grade II listed buildings. The terraced properties are more of a throwback to the Industrial Age than being in keeping with a rural conservation area.
- 2.** There is no provision for garaging/storage and the 145 parking spaces will be detrimental to the setting within the Conservation Area. There is, also, no provision for the siting of the 128 wheelie bins required for household waste and recycling. A notional concession has been made by the introduction of a couple of bin areas, but it is not clear how these will cater for the 64 waste bins, 64 recycling bins and possibly a number of garden waste bins.
- 3.** The location of the community building is far from ideal and would be better located to the north closer to the village, which would avoid the parking of cars within the development, and where sufficient parking can be provided for disabled and less mobile residents. Bulcote Village has an active social committee which has been promoting regular social events in the village for in excess of forty years. For the past thirty years or more many of these events have been held within the Gate House; which has been provided by Severn Trent Water for the benefit of the community. Many of the social events take place in the evening and include music. Notwithstanding its poor location in relation to the village centre it seems entirely inappropriate for it to be immediately next to a dwelling. Moreover the floor area of the proposed community building is less than that currently available in the Gate House. This seems entirely illogical given that there could be potential 50% increase in village population. Furthermore one document of the planning submission implies that for historical and

conservation reasons the weighing equipment will be retained in the Gate House, although the house plan shows it to be removed and placed in the Community Building. This will obviously further reduce the available floor space.

Highway and Health and Safety Matters

Increased traffic and the safety of pedestrians is a major concern. Bulcote is a tiny hamlet and increased traffic would be detrimental to the village setting.

The Transport Statement appears to have been prepared against the background of pre-application discussions with NCC Highways who, although having made a number of comments, appear to have had no objections to a formal application being submitted. It is significant to note however, that this initial consultation is based on the conversion of the existing buildings to 25 dwellings and does not include the 39 new build dwellings. Furthermore the report lacks objectivity and derives its conclusions on the desired outcome, which is the development of 64 dwellings on the site. We would make the following comments in relation to the report and its conclusions.

In support of sustainable development the report argues the case for the site being served by sustainable modes of transport i.e. accessibility by foot, cycle, bus and rail. We would accept that the site is reasonably well served by cycle and bus routes although the argument for rail is debatable given that the nearest station is a good 25 minute walk away. Reference is made to the IHT document "Guidelines for Providing Journeys on Foot" which quotes a distance of 800m as being the preferred maximum distance to access town centres and 2km as the preferred maximum for commuting. The report then argues that because amenities such as shops, school and medical centre etc are within 2km they would be accessed on foot albeit the guidelines say that 800m is the preferred maximum distance to walk to town centres. As a point of contention the distance to the school from the site has been measured by GPS as 1900m and not 1450m as stated. The conclusion that "the site is located within close proximity to a number of useful local amenities.." is therefore incorrect. A further statement that the existing and proposed pedestrian infrastructure will facilitate safe and direct pedestrian linkages between the site and local destinations is also false, given that there is no footpath on the section of road from the rail crossing to Old Main Road and no means of providing one. Similarly the section of Old Main Road up to the nearest bus stop on the A612 does not possess any footpath.

The section of road between Old Main Road and the rail crossing is shown in the photograph below. This road is entirely rural in character and any attempt to widen it, if this were possible, would destroy its setting within the Conservation Area. Furthermore it can be seen that of necessity residents park on one side of the road immediately approaching the crossing and severely reducing the effective width of the

Increased traffic flow over the rail crossing would be a concern and NCC Highways recommended that Network Rail be consulted. No reference to any consultation with Network Rail is included in the report. On occasion the rail crossing is closed for maintenance. There is no alternative route to access the site by public road and the private roads are normally secured.

The conclusions of the traffic impact study show that at peak periods there would be an additional vehicle every two minutes along Old Main Road. It is concluded that the development will generate a very low level of additional traffic. This however is all relative and in percentage terms we would contest that it is a significant increase above current traffic levels.

Concerns

1. The stretch of road along Old Main Road to the Church and the nearest bus stop has no footpath and there is no width available to accommodate one.
2. Similarly, the farm access road from the junction of Old Main Road to the railway crossing is narrow with no footpath and is restricted in width by parking for residents of the cottages that front the road. The road is little more than single track. The only way to provide any increased road width would be to culvert the drainage ditch giving concern that the culvert could become blocked greatly enhancing the risk of flooding to adjacent housing.
3. During harvest and other times, the volume of farm traffic increases and, as a result, the road is restricted for both vehicles and pedestrians. The land is farmed to produce material for the Digester at Stoke Bardolph and, as this farming becomes more intense, it will lead to even more traffic servicing the farm.
4. The railway crossing is unmanned and there is only a 30 second interval between the barrier alarm sounding and the train arriving. The frequency of the trains, which pass at full power, is shortly to be increased to half hourly each way and freight trains run between times. There is little hope of or, indeed, facility to increase the width of the crossing.
5. The narrowness and congestion on the access road into the development could impede emergency services would give cause for concern.

To summarise the above points, there is little opportunity to improve the vehicle and pedestrian access from Old Main Road. The railway crossing would be a major danger area, especially in peak times, and the increased flow of traffic onto the A612 would be a further potential danger point.

Conclusion

This appears to be an ill thought out proposal; the only evident thought is that of profit. The plan does not cater for many of the problems which would clearly arise if it were to be implemented and leads one to wonder whether the architects ever actually visited the village.

The Council accepts that the re-development of the existing buildings is desirable but sees no need whatsoever for new build. There is strong support in the Village against any new build as can be seen from the public consultation. We would be concerned that if permission were given for the new build then this would set a precedent for future development to be extended into the area currently designated as pasture. The road layout seems to have been designed in anticipation of this.

Comments received 14.02.18

Previous comments are reiterated. The following additional/revised comments have been made:-

We have been given the opportunity to examine the Viability Assessment prepared by the applicant to justify the Enabling Development together with the independent assessment undertaken by Jones Lang Lascelles on behalf of Newark & Sherwood District Council. However, we were only allowed to view these documents at the District Councils offices in the presence of a planning officer and we were not allowed to make notes or copies. This is considered to be a

totally unsatisfactory way of being able to fully study the documents and to be able to challenge their content. In particular, given the importance of the Viability Assessment in supporting the Enabling Development, we believe this should be offered for public scrutiny as with any other supporting document. More so the independent report which was commissioned by the District Council and presumably paid for by public funds. We consider there are a number of details within these documents in relation to costs and the expected profitability of the scheme that could be challenged e.g. the fact that the profit on the development appears to be relative to that expected by a PLC volume housebuilder, whereas it could be undertaken by a smaller developer whose overheads are less and whose expectations on profit might also be more modest. The costs included for professional services could also be challenge, not only in relation to the percentages quoted, but also in regard to different disciplines included e.g. it is unlikely that a Project Manager, would be required for such a scheme and the role of the Mechanical and Electrical Engineer would be absorbed within the specialists Sub-contractors costs. Furthermore with a ratio of 48 new build dwellings to 24 converted dwellings, it clearly does not appear logical that two new dwellings are required to enable the conversion and refurbishment of one dwelling in the existing farm buildings where the main components of the structure, foundations, walls, floors, roof etc. are already present. The fact that this is open to question is also to be found in Jones Lang Lascelles assessment, which considers that less Enabling Development would be required than that proposed in the Viability Assessment.

In favour of Enabling Development the Viability Assessment quotes at length the English Heritage (Historic England) document "Enabling Development and the Conservation of Historic Places". However it fails to make any reference to the fact that this document also states that "...Enabling Development should always be seen as a subsidy of last resort, since it is an inefficient means of funding a conservation deficit." In addition the document states that proposals to provide the majority of subsidy through Enabling Development would be self-defeating if its extent and scale would be out of keeping with the character of the local landscape. We consider that these are relevant arguments against the proposals for new build and Historic England's response as a consultee appears to reinforce this. Furthermore it is not clear what efforts have been made to avoid extensive Enabling Development. It is considered that the new build will increase the Bulcote population by some 80% and by more than 100% within the Bulcote Conservation Area and is therefore contrary to the principle of sustainable development. Bulcote Village has a strong social identity and community spirit, despite being attached to Burton Joyce. Allowing such a large development, with its own open public amenity and accommodating a community building that is so remote from the village centre that it is likely to fragment the community into two factions. Those in the village itself to the north of the railway and those to the south of it. Moreover this proposed development cannot be treated in isolation and should be considered with regard to the proposed development of the Burton Joyce Car Sales site for which planning permission is also currently being sought. These developments if permitted will more than double the size of Bulcote within a very short period of time.

Infrastructure Matters

Flooding & Drainage

The proposal to discharge surface water into this ditch, albeit attenuated, is of concern as additional flows may restrict flows upstream where it passes through the village bordering Old Main Road and where flooding occurred in 2007.

The report also refers to the River Rother passing to the southeast of the site and not the River Trent. This failure to get the primary river correct questions the credibility of the report, much of which is generic.

Environmental and Design Matters

There is no provision for garaging/storage within the confines of the existing farm buildings and the 152 parking spaces will be detrimental to the setting within the Conservation Area. There is, also, no provision for the siting of the 144 wheelie bins required for household waste and recycling. A notional concession has been made by the introduction of a couple of bin areas, but it is not clear how these will cater for the 72 waste bins, 72 recycling bins and possibly a number of garden waste bins.

If the Council are of a mind to approve the application then Bulcote Parish Council would seek a Section 106 contribution by way of land (which could be offered at zero cost) where a suitably sited Community Building might be constructed e.g. in the land to the north west corner beyond the proposed play area.

Highway and Health & Safety Matters

In support of sustainable development the report argues the case for the site being served by sustainable modes of transport i.e. accessibility by foot, cycle, bus and rail. We would accept that the site is reasonably well served by cycle and bus routes although the nearest bus stop is beyond the 400m guidance recommended by the Highway Authority. Furthermore the argument for rail is debatable given that the nearest station is a good 25 minute walk away. Reference is made to the IHT document "Guidelines for Providing Journeys on Foot" which quotes a distance of 800m as being the preferred maximum distance to access town centres and 2km as the preferred maximum for commuting. The report then argues that because amenities such as shops, school and medical centre etc are within 2km they would be accessed on foot albeit the guidelines say that 800m is the preferred maximum distance to walk to town centres. As a point of contention the distance to the school from the site has been measured by GPS as 1900m and not 1450m as stated which throw into question the other distances quoted. In particular the quoted distance to Tall Trees Garden Centre is 600m from the development is contested. Not only does the garden centre no longer exist, but there is no footpath to it on the south side of the A612 and no safe crossing point opposite its entrance. The conclusion that "the site is located within close proximity to a number of useful local amenities...." is therefore incorrect. A further statement that the existing and proposed pedestrian infrastructure will facilitate safe and direct pedestrian linkages between the site and local destinations is also false, given that there is no footpath on the section of road from the rail crossing to Old Main Road and no means of providing one. Similarly the section of Old Main Road up to the nearest bus stop on the A612 does not possess any footpath.

The section of road between Old Main Road and the rail crossing is shown in the photograph. This road is entirely rural in character and any attempt to widen it, if this were possible, would destroy its setting within the Conservation Area. Furthermore it can be seen that residents park on one side of the road immediately approaching the rail crossing and severely reducing the effective width of the highway. This is of necessity as there is no opportunity for off street parking. The suggestion that safety for pedestrians could be improved by using coloured surfacing might be acceptable in a town centre environment, but it would be inappropriate on a road of rural character in a Conservation Area.

Increased traffic flow over the rail crossing would be a concern, but the Transport Statement contains no reference to any consultation with Network Rail.

Under the previous application Network Rail have commented that the crossing is a borderline high risk crossing and that the risk would increase during peak periods with the forecasted increase in car traffic. This risk will no doubt increase further due to the increased number of houses although surprisingly Network Rail has not commented on this in their response to the latest plans. The potential risks at the crossing were recently evident when on the evening of Tuesday 30th January 2018 during the peak period a car hit the barrier and temporarily closed the line. Network Rail previously suggested some mitigation measures that could be incorporated such as yellow box markings on the crossing and additional signage, all of which would again be detrimental to its setting in a Conservation Area. On occasion the rail crossing is closed for maintenance. There is no alternative route to access the development by public road and the private roads are normally secured. This would isolate the development and prevent access for emergency vehicles should they be required. The Transport Statement suggests that the local highway authority will need to consider the implications of this problem, which in essence means the authors have no solution.

The conclusions of the traffic impact analysis show that at peak periods there would be 26 vehicle movements during peak periods which equates to an additional vehicle every two minutes along Old Main Road. It is concluded that the development will generate a very low level of additional traffic. This statement appears flawed given that there will be a six fold increase in the number of dwellings south of the crossing. In relative terms, given that the number of dwellings in Bulcote will double, we would contest that it is a significant increase above current traffic levels. The report also tries to justify the increase in traffic by suggesting that it would be less than for a commercial development, when no such proposals have been put forward.

Additional Concerns

The railway crossing is unmanned and there is only a 30 second interval between the barrier alarm sounding and the train arriving. The frequency of the trains, which pass at full power, is half hourly at peak times in addition to regular freight services. Some of the freight trains carry fuel and one can only speculate on the consequences of an incident involving one of these. There is little hope of or, indeed, facility to increase the width of the crossing.

To summarise the above points, there is little opportunity to improve the vehicle and pedestrian access from Old Main Road. The railway crossing would be a major danger area, especially in peak times, and the increased flow of traffic onto the A612 would be a further potential danger point where currently a wait of several minutes can be experienced at peak times.

Conclusion

This appears to be an ill thought out proposal; the only evident thought is that of profit. The plan does not cater for many of the problems which would clearly arise if it were to be implemented and leads one to wonder whether the design team ever actually visited the village.

The Council accepts that the re-development of the existing buildings is desirable but sees no need whatsoever for new build. There is strong support in the Village against any new build as can be seen from the public consultation and we are sceptical of the need for such extensive enabling development. We would be concerned that if permission were given for the new build then this would set a precedent for future development to be extended into the area currently designated as pasture. The road layout seems to have been designed in anticipation of this.

Comments Received 30.08.18

The following is Bulcote Parish Council's response to the Enabling Development Executive Summary dated July 2018, prepared by the applicant and submitted in support of the planning application at Bulcote Farm. The submitted document seeks to satisfy the following statements that form Historic England's "policy" on enabling development as set down in their guidance document "Enabling Development and the conservation of significant places"

Enabling development that would secure the future of a significant place, but contravene other planning policy objectives, should be unacceptable unless:

- a. It will not materially harm the heritage values of the place or its setting.
The Executive Summary attempts to reduce the architectural merits of the existing farm buildings in favour of its historical interest as a Model Farm. This has been done to try and offset the obvious impact that the new build housing will have on the Bulcote Farm setting. It also fails to acknowledge that the infill housing adjacent Corporation Cottages will result in the loss of a significant view that is identified in the Bulcote Conservation Area Report 2001. In fact the Parish Council feels that not enough consideration has been given to the proposed development being within the Conservation Area setting insofar as its designation should provide for ".....any changes or new development, either within or adjoining the area, to be sympathetic to and respect its character."
Historic England have commented that the development ".....will fundamentally change the agricultural character of the farmstead through domestication and intensity of use." And the terrace housing in particular ".....will harm the appreciation and understanding of the significance of the model farm, which in part is derived from its agricultural setting and direct, uninterrupted relationship with the rural landscape." They also state that "On the basis of the submission, we believe this proposal is harmful to the significance of the designated heritage asset."
- b. It avoids detrimental fragmentation of management of the place.
Given that the converted buildings will have a divided and separate ownership it is not clear how a unified regime of repair and maintenance will be managed to secure the long term future of the buildings. There will also be fragmentation of Bulcote Village with such a large proportion of new housing been provided south of the railway and benefiting from almost all of the village amenities.
- c. It will secure the long-term future of the place and, where applicable, its continued use for a sympathetic purpose
The Parish Council support securing the long term future of the farm buildings, but remain sceptical of the need for enabling development.
- d. It is necessary to resolve problems arising from the inherent needs of the place, rather than the circumstances of the present owner, or the purchase price paid.

The very large extent of the enabling development is caused by the circumstances of the present owner insofar as they are insisting that this is a "for profit" development. In addition whilst they are happy to insist that the community compromise and not get any CIL they are not prepared to similarly compromise on their commercial requirement for profit. It could also be argued that the extensive development is derived from the neglect of the owner in failing to maintain the buildings.

- e. Sufficient subsidy is not available from any other source
The Parish Council acknowledges this might be the case, but we are also aware that offers made by developers to acquire the buildings have been rejected, presumably so that the applicant can maximise the commercial value of the site if sold with planning permission.
- f. It is demonstrated that the amount of enabling development is the minimum necessary to secure the future of the place, and that its form minimises harm to other public interests
Bulcote Parish Council are not convinced of the need for enabling development and consider that it is being used as a device to obtain planning permission for commercial gain under the pretense of the need to secure the future of the listed buildings through repair and conversion to residential use. It is acknowledged that Jones Lang LaSalle have apparently undertaken an independent appraisal of the viability assessment, although we have recently been informed by the applicant that this was paid for by them. This surely brings into question whether the appraisal is entirely objective and independent.

The need for 48 new dwellings in order to subsidise the repair and conversion of 24 converted dwellings seems entirely illogical given that the primary structure and its foundations already exist. The Elemental Defect Appraisal Survey carried out by Sheperd Myers dated October 2012 states in its conclusions that for the majority of the buildings "The cost of repairs and conversion would be similar to that of an equivalent new build". It is therefore difficult to accept that there is an apparent conservation deficit of 2.86 million pounds. Unfortunately this cannot be challenged as the Viability Assessment and subsequent JLL appraisal have not been made available for public scrutiny.

- g. The public benefit of securing the future of the significant place through such enabling development decisively outweighs the disbenefits of breaching other public policies
Bulcote Parish Council would question what is the public benefit that is proved? The public, represented by the residents of Bulcote, are very much against the development as it is currently proposed. To suggest that the public benefit decisively outweighs public policy is not accepted.

The Enabling Development Executive Summary appears to try and make its point by an over use of the words "robust" and "rigorous" whilst at the same time being selective in terms of the references used to support its argument. For example it refers to the Building Condition Survey (referred to above) having identified serious structural damage in some buildings and seeks to support this with two photographs of what is relatively minor damage. The Parish Council have obtained professional structural engineering advice in relation to the structural condition of the buildings as reported and the structural defects are no more than would be expected of buildings of this age and being subject to a minimal level of maintenance. None of the defects identified can be described as serious and if that was the case why have they not been addressed by the owner.

Reference is made to the development being a significant public benefit and bringing other benefits to local community and area. Given that the local community is against the proposals it is difficult to appreciate what these might be.

The document concludes in summarising a number of points as follows.

The enabling development has been sensitively located to have the minimal impact on the setting of the listed buildings and has been located on the previously developed footprint of the farm. This minimises impact on the openness of the Green Belt and in places, such as the modern Dairy Farm, will dramatically improve it.

This does not appear to be the view of Historic England – see above – or Matthew Tubb, Senior Planner (Policy) for N&SDC.

In terms of highways, despite the constraints of the site, the proposals can clearly provide safe and accessible routes for residents that comply with national guidance such as the Manual for Streets. In fact, the highways proposals will significantly enhance the level of accessible and sustainable routes in this location, which do not currently exist, which will benefit existing and future residents alike.

According to the latest response from Notts. CC Highways this statement is entirely flawed and fails to recognise the impact of the safety requirements of the rail crossing and the effect on residents who have no off street parking. The approach to Bulcote Farm is what it is; a rural road within a Conservation Area and to try and create something that is akin to a modern residential development must be rejected.

1. In addition, the further benefits, outlined below, will be brought forward by the proposed development. A new, enhanced and larger community space will be created through the scheme which will create a focal point for the community providing space for events, classes and Parish Council meetings.
 2. The quadrangle will be landscaped to create 1,168m² of usable greenspace for residents within the area and a total of 1934sqm of additional open space is provided for the community.
 3. Road widening improvements and a new dedicated pedestrian footway, leading to the betterment of highways infrastructure for existing as well as new residents.
 4. During the construction phase, the proposals will support the economy through the creation of new jobs and training opportunities.
 5. Once completed, the development will contribute to diversifying the housing mix within Bulcote, and providing a much needed mix of smaller family homes, as identified within the District and will provide additional spending within the local area, supporting local facilities and services
- 1 & 2 have previously been commented upon in the Parish Councils original response. In essence the proposed community space is smaller in area than the current space and does not take account of the potential 50% increase in village population. The green space within the quadrangle is defined by the private residences that will surround it and as such is unlikely to be of benefit to the rest of the village.

- 3 Proposals for highway improvements have yet to be approved by Highways and there would appear to be very little likelihood of them doing so. In fact the applicant appears to have totally ignored this issue presumably in the hope that the overriding factor for planning approval will be the restoration of the farm buildings and that highway access will become a *faite accompli*.
- 4 The suggestion that the construction phase will support the economy through the creation of new jobs etc. is a stock phrase that will have no substance in reality. In fact the construction phase will have a very severe impact on the community with dust, noise and increased traffic.
- 5 Again this incorporates stock phrases that have no substance. Bulcote has no facilities and relies on those in Burton Joyce. It will therefore provide no benefit to Bulcote and in fact will place even greater pressure upon local schools and healthcare services in the neighbouring villages of Burton Joyce and Lowdham.

On balance it is considered that the very substantial public benefits from securing a sustainable use for a nationally important Grade II Listed Model Farm far outweigh the limited enabling development located on the previously developed footprint of the farm. The development has minimal impact on the openness of the Green Belt and will deliver highway improvements alongside the range of additional benefits the proposals bring.

The statements made in this concluding comment are not borne out by the evidence presented. Very substantial public benefits have not been proved and to suggest that there will be only limited enabling development is inconceivable. The fact that some of this enabling development will be on the footprint of the previously developed farm is not supported by N&SDC Planning Policy (Matthew Tubb) or Historic England in its proposed form. Similarly the suggestion that there is minimal impact on the openness of the Green Belt is not supported and the suggestion that the proposals will bring highway improvements alongside the range of additional benefits is arrogant and conceited.

This new document was expected to provide some clarity on the financial aspects of the Viability Assessment given that it purports to contain commercially sensitive information and has not been made available for public scrutiny. In essence it provides nothing more than headline figures even though it states that these are derived in part from Building Cost Information Service (BCIS) build costs which are broadly available to any construction professional. Furthermore the Historic England document on enabling development declares the likely profit to be expected. It is therefore difficult to appreciate, what commercially sensitive information it contains.

The "Enabling Development Executive Summary" has failed to change Bulcote Parish Council's view on the proposed development and has if anything reinforced some of our objections. Furthermore we consider that it has failed to fully satisfy any of the seven statements of The Policy set down in Historic England's guidance document that would make Enabling Development acceptable. We remain supportive of refurbishing the existing farm buildings, but are not convinced of the need or motives for enabling development and therefore object to the submission in its current form.

Comments Received 20.09.18

With reference to the Parish Councils recent response on the above application we would like to comment further following our understanding that the McCarthy Stone development on the Burton Joyce Car Sales site has recently been approved. We would reiterate our previous comments that this application and the Bulcote Farm development cannot be treated in isolation. The impact on local services should both developments be approved would be significant and unsustainable.

We would also comment further on the arguments put forward for the Enabling Development. The alleged conservation deficit of £2.86 million pounds equates to an average cost per new build dwelling of just under £60,000. Given the assumption as quoted that the developers profit would be 20% and say half goes towards the conservation deficit. This would mean that the average price of each new build dwelling would need to be approximately £600,000 which is clearly unrealistic. We acknowledge that the costs have supposedly been vetted, but we would question whether Jones Lang Lascelles have been sufficiently objective in their appraisal.

The Parish Council are also mindful that the provision of a Community Hall within the current application is entirely inappropriate in both its size and location. Should Newark & Sherwood DC be of a mind to approve this application, Bulcote PC would ask that consideration be given to dedicating the land at the rear of Corporation Cottages to Bulcote Parish Council for community use under a Section 106 agreement in the absence of any Community Infrastructure Levy.

Comments received 29.11.18

The following is Bulcote Parish Council's response to further information received in relation to highway access with regard to the above planning applications.

It is noted that the proposed highway layout is fundamentally the same as that submitted previously and rejected by Nottinghamshire County Council Highways in May 2018. The drawing has been amended in accordance with a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA), although the carriageway widths and footways are essentially the same and Notts CC Highways comments appear to have been ignored.

The RSA records that a site visit was undertaken during early afternoon when traffic was noted unsurprisingly, as being light and is therefore unlikely to be a fair indicator of traffic movements at peak periods. During the 35minute visit the level crossing was noted to have closed twice. Again this is unlikely to be representative of level crossing closure during peak periods. Reference to anticipated traffic movements are taken from the original Transport Statement and quoted as 37-39 vehicles during the am and pm peak periods. Given that this represents approximately one vehicle for every two of the 86 dwellings that would need to use this route, it is judged as being an underestimate. The fact that there is no public transport or schools within reasonable walking distance of the development, would mean many families are likely to be making school journeys and work journeys separately during the am peak period. The estimated number of vehicle movements could therefore be closer to 60.

The RSA supposedly indicates a proportionate and viable means of eliminating or mitigating the identified problems of highway access, but ignores narrowing of the road by parked cars close to the level crossing or the influence of the level crossing itself. The level crossing has been identified by Network Rail as borderline high risk and the need to provide additional signage and extensive

road marking to ensure its safety in accommodating any additional traffic. This has been ignored in the RSA and no reference is made to its regular closure for maintenance and the temporary isolation of vehicles south of the railway. It also ignores the fact that residents adjacent the railway have no facility for off street parking and therefore create an unavoidable narrowing of the road adjacent the crossing.

Bulcote Parish Council does not believe that the proposals put forward offer a viable solution to the problem of accessing the size of development proposed. The existing highway is a rural road within a Conservation Area and any attempt to upgrade it would be detrimental to its character and setting. In the same way that there is a desire to secure the future of the existing farm buildings, this should equally extend to the preservation of the character of the Bulcote Conservation Area as defined by its existing roads.

Burton Joyce Parish Council – 09.07.15 - It was resolved to register an objection to the proposed new build at Bulcote Farm based on the following criteria:

The proposed new housing development at Bulcote Farm would put an unsustainable pressure on the amenities at Burton Joyce including the primary school and the GP surgeries which are already full to capacity. The Parish Council is also aware that the new development in Bulcote could exacerbate parking issues in Burton Joyce Village centre. It is felt that this application should be considered in conjunction with the proposed new housing development at Teal Close Burton Joyce will be enclosed on either side by significant housing schemes which will increase the volume of heavy traffic through the village.

Nottinghamshire County Council Highway Authority

Comments received 15.06.15 - The application site is located on an unadopted section of Old Main Road, gaining access over Bulcote level crossing. As submitted, the site location plan does not demonstrate a connection to the public highway within the red line of ownership, and therefore, no means of access to the site.

For this size of development, the carriageway leading to the development is required to be 5.5m in width and be adopted by the Highway Authority. The adopted section of Old Main Road carriageway varies in width between 4.8m and 4.9m and the unadopted section, after the level crossing and leading to the application site, varies between 5.1m and 5.3m. There are no footways along this section of Old Main Road, therefore, providing no facilities for pedestrians, and as such is not considered to be a sustainable location. This section is a bridleway, and is not segregated from the farm access, so the Rights of Way section have raised the concern that ramblers, cyclists and equestrian users will be using this route along with the traffic to/from the site for approx. 300m.

As the proposed layout is making use of existing buildings within the site, the routes into the site are shown between two buildings and do not provide any visibility for emerging vehicles. Some dwellings to the east (around the large 'green area') are positioned too far from the main spine route to provide suitable carrying distances for waste collection, i.e. residents should not be required to carry waste more than 30m and waste collection vehicles should be able to reach within 25m of the storage point.

It is unclear which sections of the layout are to be adopted, and so the internal layout has not been thoroughly studied due to the above issues requiring attention. Taking all of the above into account, it is recommended that this application be refused due to insufficient carriageway widths leading to the site, lack of visibility and sustainability issues due to the lack of footways in the

vicinity.

Comments received 29.01.18 - Since the correspondence summarised below (Sept 2017) I have had no further feedback from the Applicant /Agent. So I am surprised that this new application does not address my comments and there has been no change to the highway plan relating to these comments and now submitted again (Drawing No. 0398-02 Rev C).

Furthermore the submission states that "Access to and within the site conforms to national and local standards". This statement is false.

On 1st September 2017 Savills and Croft were told via email that:

Information on their drawing that stated "subject to confirmation of surveyed boundary on site" and "subject to topo survey" offered no confidence in what was being proposed in terms of carriageway and footway widths. In an attempt to be helpful, Notts CC Officers visited the site and took measurements to verify what width was available within the constraints of the public highway boundary.

It was found that the highway, north of the level crossing, is restricted; measuring between 6.2m at its narrowest, and for 40m or so never gets wide enough to offer a minimum requirement of 1.8m footway + 5.5m carriageway + 0.4m margin to boundary fence (7.7m in total).

Whilst on site, other matters came to light which exacerbate the access situation. On street parking occurs and further restricts carriageway widths in the vicinity of the level crossing. Also the bus stop at Nottingham Road is not only further from the site than the Highway Authority guidance of 400m (maximum) and 250m (desirable), but also has no additional linking footway north of the corner by Kings Barn. It was concluded that the site would, therefore, not support the use of sustainable travel. One bus stop is about 600m away with no linking footway and another (that is linked by footway) is about 900m from the site.

On 4th September 2017 the following details were also pointed out to Savills and Croft in an email:

The offer of a footway of 1.2m north of the level crossing "subject to confirmation of surveyed boundary on site" is not possible within the measured parameters of the public highway.

It was pointed out that a road having a 5.5m wide carriageway fed from one that is 4.8m and one that lacks adequate & safe pedestrian facilities was irrational.

Conclusion:

It was, and remains the conclusion that Old Main Road is unsuitable to support a development of the size and nature being applied for. Perhaps the applicant may wish to respond to the above comments prior to a recommendation to refuse or otherwise is offered by this Authority.

Comments received 23.04.18 - I remain unconvinced that adequate and safe access is being offered for the type and size of development being proposed.

I have previously pointed out that an access carriageway width of 5.5m was required and it does not make sense to have a 5.5m c/way south of the level crossing served from a 4.8m c/way north of the level crossing.

In addition the access layout now being put forward offers too many compromises to be acceptable. In each of the following cases the minimum highway design guidance figures are not met.

A general footway of 1.8m is offered when 2.0m is the min. standard.

A 'short' length of 1.2m footway over 14m is offered when a pinch point of 1.2m footway should only extend up to 6m.

A carriageway of 4.8m is offered when 5.5m is the min. standard.

A verge of 0.2m – 0.4m is offered when 1.0m is the min. standard.

Whilst this Authority may accept some level of flexibility in some circumstances; using the guidance alongside engineering judgement, it is considered that the combined effect of the compromises being sought is unacceptable in this case.

Furthermore, given the requirement for a 5.5m c/way, none of the offered footway/verge widths can be achieved.

I conclude that Old Main Road is unsuitable to support a development of the size and natures being applied for.

I will therefore be recommending that the Planning Authority refuse the application on the grounds that:

- The vehicular and pedestrian traffic generated by the proposed development would be likely to result in an unacceptable increase in danger to the users of Old Main Road due to the increased use of the an access which is geometrically substandard for the type and size of development being proposed. The proposal is contrary to Spatial Policy 7 since it fails to provide safe, convenient and attractive accesses for all, including the elderly and disabled, and others with restricted mobility.
- The proposal is contrary to Spatial Policy 7 since it would not support sustainable travel insofar as inadequate provision is made for pedestrian access, and; access to bus service provision is poor.

Comments received 26.11.2018 - The application site is located on an unadopted section of Old Main Road, gaining access over Bulcote level crossing.

For this size of development, the carriageway width leading to the development is required to be 5.5m and be adopted by the Highway Authority. The adopted section of Old Main Road carriageway varies in width between 4.8m and 4.9m and the unadopted section, after the level crossing and leading to the application site, varies between 5.1m and 5.3m. It is unacceptable, nor does it make sense, to have a 5.5m carriageway south of the level crossing served from a 4.8m carriageway north of the level crossing. In addition, the access layout now being put forward offers too many compromises to be acceptable. In each of the following cases the minimum Nottinghamshire County Council highway design guidance figures are not met:

- A general footway of 1.8m is offered when 2m is the minimum standard.
- A 'short' length of 1.2m footway over 14m is offered when a pinch point of 1.2m footway should only extend up to 6m. The Planning Authority's Spatial Policy 7 seeks the provision of not only safe provision, but also convenient and attractive access for all including the elderly and disabled, and others with restricted mobility.
- A carriageway of 4.8m is offered when 5.5m is the minimum standard.
- A verge of 0.2m-0.4m is offered when 1m is the minimum standard. 'Manual for Streets' suggest a minimum clearance of 450mm to street furniture and the same distance is used for traffic

sign clearance in the Dept. for Transport's Traffic Signs Manual. An existing protective post and rail fence runs alongside the carriageway edge north of the level crossing. Given this exists, a 0.4m verge would be accepted but nothing less, given the additional traffic that would be generated by the proposal. If inadequate clearance is given, drivers tend to steer clear of any obstruction and effectively reduce the width of the 'running' carriageway (which in this case is already proposed to be less than required).

Whilst the Highway Authority may accept some level of flexibility in some circumstances by using the guidance alongside engineering judgement, it is considered that the combined effect of the compromises being sought is unacceptable in this case.

Furthermore, given the requirement for a 5.5m carriageway, none of the offered footway/verge widths can be achieved. There is a distance of approx. 40m where the available highway width never gets wide enough to offer a minimum requirement of 1.8m footway + 5.5m carriageway + 0.4m margin to boundary fence (7.7m in total). On street parking further exacerbates the situation.

The bus stop at Nottingham Road is not only further from the site than the Highway Authority guidance of 400m (maximum) and 250m (desirable) but also has no additional linking footway north of the corner by Kings Barn. It is concluded that the site would, therefore, not support the use of sustainable travel. One bus stop is approx. 600m from the site with no linking footway and another (that is linked by footway) is approx. 900m from the site.

With regard to the layout, the visibility splays onto Old Main Road from the main spine road have not been demonstrated. The parking spaces shown at the turning head of the spine road are unlikely to be used. It has been noted in the past with previous development sites that an increase in on street parking in the vicinity occurs as residents prefer to park their vehicle adjacent their property.

It is therefore, recommended that this application be refused for the following reasons:

1. The vehicular and pedestrian traffic generated by the proposed development would be likely to result in an unacceptable increase in danger to the users of Old Main Road due to the increased use of an access which is geometrically substandard for the type and size of development being proposed. The proposal is contrary to Spatial Policy 7 since it fails to provide safe, convenient and attractive access for all, including the elderly and disabled and others with restricted mobility.
2. The proposal is contrary to Spatial Policy 7 since it would not support sustainable travel insofar as inadequate provision is made for pedestrian access, and access to bus service provision is poor.

Comments received 07.12.18 - Further to comments dated 6 November 2018, additional information has been made available in terms of two independent Road Safety Audits based upon the same drawing 0398-02-E.

The first audit was carried out by Go Surveys Ltd at the request of the applicant/agent. The other audit was carried out by Via East Midlands on behalf of the Highway Authority.

Some of the issues raised in each audit can be resolved or are not considered to be critical to a recommendation or decision. However, I draw attention to the following issues contained within these audits which are considered to be seriously significant:

Re: Go Surveys audit

'Problem 5' identifies the need for guardrailing/handrail which the applicant/agent offers to provide. This is on the section of footway that is proposed to be 1.2m. The erection of the guardrail/handrail will take up 0.1m - 0.2m, thus narrowing the footway to 1.0m – 1.1m. A wheelchair user requires 0.9m, so there would be no room for a person to pass in the opposite direction without stepping into the carriageway. Two adults passing one another usually require 1.5m, and the width for a child walking with an adult would also be compromised (1.2m is required according to Manual for Streets).

With 'Problem 7' comes a recommendation to realign the post and rail fencing on the north-east side of the road. This is unlikely to be possible for two reasons:

- a) The extent of the public highway may not allow for it to be set back without encroaching on third party land, and;
- b) There is no room to do this since the fence is located on a very narrow verge between the carriageway and the ditch.

It is noted within '3.1 Observations/Notes' that the existing signs would need resiting so that they do not reduce the effective width of the proposed footways. This point has not been addressed in the 'designer's response'; yet a scheme to relocate the signs would need to be assessed. Without further information there is a fear that a further reduction in the footway width may occur.

Re: Via East Midlands audit

'Problem 3.2' draws attention to some steps leading to adjacent dwellings, along the section of footway that is proposed to be 1.2m wide, just north of the level crossing. Further site investigation has revealed that these steps are at one of the narrowest points of the public highway and the top step that lies at the height of a potential footway is only 0.75m – 0.85m wide. At this point, 3 options to tackle the issue of the steps may be argued, but none of them is acceptable, as follows:

- a) Retain the footway at 1.2m by setting the steps back. This involves third party land and permission, and is therefore outside the control of the applicant.
- b) Have the 1.2m wide footway narrowed further at the steps to, say, 0.8m; and so retain the steps. This is not wide enough for a wheelchair user and further exacerbates concerns over the footway width and the potential need of pedestrians/wheelchair users to move into the carriageway.
- c) Retain the footway at 1.2m and retain the steps by narrowing the carriageway below 4.8m. This would add further compromise to the scheme in terms of the highway standards and cause conflict between opposing traffic movements.

Any further Safety Audit of these options is unlikely to conclude a 'safe' outcome.

'Problem 3.3' again draws attention to the "inadequate footway width" which could force pedestrians into the carriageway; a problem made worse by the presence of parked cars. Whilst there is a recommendation to widen the footway it has already been identified that this is not possible. Furthermore the Applicant Agent' response to this issue, dated 26 November 2018, suggests that 1.9m is required for two wheelchair users to pass one another. This calls into question not only the adequacy of the 1.2m wide footway but also the 1.8m wide footway that is more extensively proposed.

Conclusion

I remain unconvinced that adequate and safe access is being offered for the type and size of development being proposed and my comments of 6 November 2018 remain valid, including the recommendation to refuse the application on the following grounds:

☒ The vehicular and pedestrian traffic generated by the proposed development would be likely to result in an unacceptable increase in danger to the users of Old Main Road due to the increased use of the an access which is geometrically substandard for the type and size of development being proposed. The proposal is contrary to Spatial Policy 7 since it fails to provide safe, convenient and attractive accesses for all, including the elderly and disabled, and others with restricted mobility.

The proposal is contrary to Spatial Policy 7 since it would not support sustainable travel insofar as inadequate provision is made for pedestrian access, and; access to bus service provision is poor.

Comments received 03.01.19 - Further to comments dated 7 December 2018, a telephone conference with the applicant's agents was held on 17 December 2018 and further representation was made by email on 20 December 2018 by the agent, including new suggestions to deal with the highway issues.

In response I would raise the following points (which are not necessarily exhaustive, but offered to aid the time line):

1. I do not accept the agent's comment that the degree of risk was agreed as being "finely balanced, rather than there being a significant safety issue". My understanding was that the agents saw the risk as "acceptable" whereas I took the opposite view. No joint view was agreed over whether or not the risk was low or not.
2. Clarity is required over who "they" refers to under 'Road Safety Audits' section when it states: "they are satisfied all safety concerns they raised have been addressed".
3. Via's Road Safety Auditor, Simon Taylor's suggestion of a give way/ priority arrangement was, I understand, an unpremeditated idea to be investigated. This does not mean that such an arrangement would be automatically endorsed by him, or by the Highway Authority.
4. Drawing 0397-05 of a proposed give way/priority arrangement was submitted. This should be the subject of a further safety audit. Network Rail may also have a view on this scheme, and it is recommended that the Planning Authority re-consult them since any risk here could have major implications on train safety.
5. The proposals to overcome the 'step' issue requires further investigation. However, whilst this may offer a solution to the step problem, it does not take away from the fact that the footway will be down to 1.0m-1.1m wide which is insufficient for an adult and child to walk along this stretch, let alone two adults to pass one another.
6. The email representation refers to "improvements providing a significant enhancement and benefit to the arrangement that currently exist". This must be measured against existing and proposed flows of vehicles and pedestrians. The same is true when the possibility of pedestrians stepping into the carriageway is mentioned. Whilst the submissions refer to traffic and pedestrian flows generated by the development, no counts of current use have been taken, as far as I am aware. In such a rural setting the pedestrian flows can heavily fluctuate depending on weather and seasons, bearing in mind also that the access south of the level crossing is a public bridleway. In conclusion then, insufficient information has been submitted to assess the degree of benefit the proposed improvements would bring over existing conditions (if indeed one exists that is not detrimental to highway safety). I should

also point out that at the time of writing the submitted pedestrian flow generation figure has not been checked.

In conclusion, I currently remain unmoved from my stance of recommending refusal of the applications as stated in earlier comments.

Comments received 24.01.19 -

Further to comments dated 3 January 2019, a road safety audit has been carried out on the proposal to offer a 'priority traffic' system, and additional representation was received on 22 January 2019 including an updated safety audit and a technical note.

I have had limited time to assess this new information before issuing these comments in time for the Committee report to be prepared, so I wish to reserve the right to comment further prior to the meeting if necessary.

Drawing 0398-05 has been submitted as a possible solution to the 'narrow footway' issue discussed at length in earlier correspondence. This proposal would provide a 'give way/priority traffic' system with a narrowed carriageway and a wider footway. Despite suggesting that this be subjected to road safety audit in earlier comments, the applicant has not done this. However Via East Midlands have, at my request, carried out an audit and this is to be submitted to the Planning Authority. A response to the Audit is normally requested from the scheme designer. The audit raises some issues but, most notably, concerns are raised about the potential for vehicles to become trapped on the railway level crossing and in collision with a train. In order to address this concern the auditors recommend that on-street parking be removed from the immediate approaches and exits of the level crossing, whilst also pointing out that any yellow box and/or parking restrictions are unlikely to be enforced. Consequently this raises a whole range of new questions:

To what extent should parking be restricted?

- b) How many residents will be affected? What alternative parking arrangements do they have?
- c) Where might displaced parking occur? Would that generate other issues to be addressed?
- d) Would a Traffic Regulation Order be approved by this Authority given that it is open to a consultation and democratic process? Such restrictions could not be guaranteed at this stage.
- e) What if such restrictions, if introduced, were ignored and predictably un-enforced?

Should this option be pursued it is recommended that Network Rail be re-consulted since any risk here could have major implications on train safety. However, as it stands, this proposal is neither sufficiently advanced to remove safety concerns nor can a satisfactory solution be assured, particularly since any required Traffic Regulation Order is outside the control of the applicant and Planning Authority; it is open to a separate consultation, democratic and legal process.

Drawing 0398-02-G remains the applicant's preferred road scheme option and provides further information on how it is proposed to overcome the issue of further narrowing of the proposed footway by the steps to the adjacent dwelling. The suggestion is that the last step two steps can be remodelled into one step. I consider that this is an unworkable solution, since it would provide a last step that would have a riser greater than the maximum set out in various Regulations and Guidance Notes, and a flight of steps with inconsistent height risers which is considered unsafe. See footnote for further information. If the step issue cannot be addressed satisfactorily, then the footway at this point would be as narrow as 0.75m – 0.85m. This is not wide enough for a wheelchair user and further exacerbates concerns over the footway width and the potential need

of pedestrians/wheelchair users to move into the carriageway. Furthermore, it still fails to address the issue that, even if a 1.0m -1.1m footway could be achieved by addressing the step matter, this is not considered acceptable or safe.

The updated safety audit submitted by the applicant's agent, Go Surveys (January 2019), now provides a 'risk assessment' section and the conclusion reached by them is that all matters can be safely addressed. This fails to consider that at least one of the recommended mitigation measures cannot be implemented, as discussed in my comments dated 7th December 2018, and fails to assess any of the separate risks identified in the Via East Midlands safety audit dated November 2018.

The newly submitted Technical Note 1 compares the proposed road scheme (Drawing 0398-02-G) with 3 other sites in the Country which also have a narrow footway. None of these offer a like-for-like comparison.

- The 'Chew Valley Road' example has a 5.8m (approx.) carriageway.
- The 'Pepper Street' example is a one-way street with a 4.4m (approx.) carriageway and 3.4m (approx.) approach and exit; thus restraining speeds and avoiding vehicle conflicts.
- The 'Oughtrington Lane' example is signalised and so operates as 'one-way', with no vehicle conflicts. This also appears to have a 5.3 metre (approx.) carriageway where traffic is two-way. The humped back bridge scenario is historical and clearly not one that should be held up as an example to follow.

None of these reflect the road scheme dimensions or scenario being proposed. Notwithstanding this, no details are provided of any accident records or speed readings, nor any information about whether or not these sites have been considered in association with significant planning applications. There may be lots of examples of poor standard footways historically inherited by the Highway Authority, but this does not mean that such poor standards should be concluded as acceptable or safe for future residential development.

The submitted Technical Note 1 provides further information on the existing and predicted vehicle and pedestrian flows on Old Main Road. The table below offers a summary:-

	Existing	Existing and Development
Vehicles	94	410
Pedestrian	19	135

Notwithstanding the question over whether a pedestrian count in January offers a typical value (as recorded in the Technical Note), it can be seen that the proposal would add significantly to the flows on Old Main Road. Using the above figures, vehicle flows would more than quadruple, and pedestrian flow rise seven-fold.

In conclusion, the details and proposed mitigation measures that have been submitted fail to overcome safety concerns. I currently remain unmoved from my stance of recommending refusal of the applications as stated in earlier comments.

- The vehicular and pedestrian traffic generated by the proposed development would be likely to result in an unacceptable increase in danger to the users of Old Main Road due to the increased use of the an access which is geometrically substandard for the type and size

of development being proposed. The proposal is contrary to Spatial Policy 7 since it fails to provide safe, convenient and attractive accesses for all, including the elderly and disabled, and others with restricted mobility.

- The proposal is contrary to Spatial Policy 7 since it would not support sustainable travel insofar as inadequate provision is made for pedestrian access, and; access to bus service provision is poor.

Footnote:

It is suggested to raise one of the top steps by 20mm. This would take a riser height to 180mm (Note: the submitted survey information which suggests the new riser height would be 170mm is disputed).

Building Regulations 2010 part M (2015 edition) states that steps should be uniform with a rise of between 150mm and 170mm.

Department of Transport's document 'Inclusive Mobility' states: "A riser height of 150mm can be managed by most people; a little more than this is possible if there are well designed handrails but 170mm should be regarded as the maximum in normal circumstances".

Highways England's DMRB BD29/17 document states that risers and treads of each step in a flight of stairs shall be uniform, and the riser shall be not more than 150mm.

It is considered that a rise of 180mm and the lack of uniformity in the riser heights is not compliant with the above and potentially a safety risk particularly since there is no handrail either.

Nottinghamshire County Council Rights of Way – comments received 25.1.18

I have checked the Definitive Map for the Bulcote area and can confirm that Bulcote Bridleway No 1 runs through the development site. I attach a plan showing the definitive route of the bridleway. This route forms one entrance to a large bridleway network including definitive and permissive routes between Burton Joyce, Bulcote, Gunthorpe and Hoveringham

Bulcote Bridleway No 1 is also the vehicular route for the existing farm and the proposed new development. While this is currently used predominately by farm traffic, a development of this size and the extra traffic that it will generate (shown in Technical Note 1 as a 4 fold increase in cars) will compromise the safety of the users of the public bridleway (public on foot, cycle and horseback). The additional traffic will cause significant damage to the surface of the bridleway.

There has been no acknowledgement of the bridleway and the implications for the safe use by equestrians if the development is granted permission.

Therefore we object to the development on the basis of the reduced public safety due to vastly increased vehicular traffic in the same space with no offer of a suitable solution, and increased damage to the surface of the bridleway which would be the responsibility of the vehicle users/developer/landowner.

While the damage issue could be resolved by constructing the road to adoptable standards, it would need to be taken on by the Highways Authority and maintained as part of the adopted road network. The issue of ensuring the safety for the public on horseback has not been addressed.

These comments have been provided by Via East Midlands Limited on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council, in its capacity as Highway Authority, through Via's continuing role of providing operational services on behalf of the County Council

Nottinghamshire County Council Policy – comments received 17.06.15

Introduction

Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) has been asked for strategic planning observations on the above planning application and this letter compiles responses from Departments involved in providing comments and observations on such matters. The following comments were agreed with the Chairman of Environment and Sustainability Committee.

The planning application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement, Design and Access Statement and a range of other supporting documents. This response is based on the information submitted with the application in the context of national, regional and local policy.

Description of Development

The development will create 64 dwellings, which will comprise the following mix, in terms of conversion, new build and unit sizes. The development will also contain:

- o A 95sqm new community building, located in the Old Dairy;
- o 1,168sqm of accessible shared amenity space within the Courtyard.
- o 145 parking spaces; and
- o 25 cycle parking spaces throughout the development.

National Planning Context

One of the core principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is to support and deliver economic growth to ensure that the housing, business and other development needs of an area are met. The NPPF looks to boost significantly the supply of housing. The principles and policies contained in the NPPF also recognise the value of and the need to protect and enhance the natural, built and historic environment, biodiversity and also include the need to adapt to climate change.

A key aspect of the NPPF is that it includes a presumption in favour of sustainable development which means that, for decision-taking, local planning authorities should approve development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay or where a development plan is absent, silent or out of date, grant permission unless any adverse impacts of the proposal outweigh the benefits, or specific policies in the NPPF indicate that development should be restricted.

The NPPF also discusses the weight that can be given in planning determinations to policies emerging as the local authority's development plan is being brought forward. The weight given to these policies will be very dependent on; their stage of preparation, the extent to which there are unresolved objections and the degree of consistency with the NPPF.

The Government is committed to securing economic growth, with the planning system encouraging sustainable growth, as set out in paragraphs 18 and 19 of the NPPF.

Paragraphs 29-41 of the NPPF address the issue of sustainable transport. The NPPF requires all major planning applications to be supported by an appropriate Transport Assessment (TA) and concludes that new development proposals should only be refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts would be severe.

County Planning Context

In relation to the Minerals Local Plan, the proposed site is not in close proximity to any existing or proposed mineral extraction allocation sites (although a potential allocation, Shelford West, is south of the site, on the opposite side of the River Trent). However, the site lies within a Mineral Safeguarding and Consultation Zone for sand and gravel. In line with the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 143) the Minerals Local Plan Preferred Approach (2013) sets out a policy (DM13) concerning these zones. As the re-use of an existing building and farm site the provisions of this policy are not relevant in this instance and so there is no mineral safeguarding objection to raise.

In terms of the Waste Core Strategy, there are no existing waste management sites within close proximity of the site and so the proposal does not raise any issues in terms of safeguarding our existing waste management facilities (as per Policy WCS10 of the Waste Core Strategy). As a new housing and community use development we would be keen to see the best practice of waste management for the development. As set out in Policy WCS2 of the Waste Core Strategy, the development should be 'designed, constructed and implemented to minimise the creation of waste, maximise the use of recycled materials and assist the collection, separation, sorting, recycling and recovery of waste arising from the development.'

Public Health

The Nottinghamshire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) provides a picture of the current and future health needs of the local population.

The Nottinghamshire Health and Wellbeing Strategy sets out the ambitions and priorities for the Health and Wellbeing Board with the overall vision to improve the health and wellbeing of people in Nottinghamshire.

Strategic Planning Issues

Strategic Highways

The County Council does not have any strategic highways objections to the proposed development.

Ecology

The application is supported by an Ecological Appraisal (dated April 2015) and Bat Mitigation Strategy (dated April 2015). The proposals will not affect any designated sites or areas of notable habitats, and with the exception of bats (see below), no significant impacts on protected or otherwise notable species appear likely, subject to the follow mitigation/enhancement measures being secured through a condition (s):

1. A pre-commencement inspection of working areas for badgers (as per paragraph 6.5 of the Ecological Appraisal)
2. Standard controls relating to nesting birds during the period March to August inclusive, relating to both vegetation and buildings (as per para. 6.8 of the Ecological Appraisal)
3. The submission of a detailed Landscaping Scheme (as per para. 6.11 of the Ecological Appraisal)
4. The installation of bird boxes (targeting house sparrow, starling and swift) within the fabric of the new/renovated buildings (as per para. 6.13 of the Ecological Appraisal)

With regards to bats, surveys have confirmed the presence of three transient summer roosts (used by common and soprano pipistrelles) in the buildings identified as B6a, B10 and B12 in the Ecological Appraisal/Bat Mitigation Strategy. A number of mitigation measures are outlined in section 4 of the Bat Mitigation Strategy, which appear to be appropriate.

All species of bats are European Protected Species, by virtue of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (the 'Habitats Regulations'), which implement Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (the 'Habitats Directive'). Under regulation 53 of the Habitats Regulations, activities which would otherwise contravene the strict protection regime offered to European Protected Species under regulation 41 (which includes the destruction of roost sites) can only be permitted where it has been shown that certain tests have been met. Within the context of a planning application, these are that;

- the activity is for the purpose of preserving public health or safety or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest ("IROPI");
- there is no satisfactory alternative
- the favourable conservation status of the species in question is to be maintained

Furthermore, under regulation 9(5) of the Habitats Regulations, local planning authorities, in the exercise of their functions, have a statutory duty to have regard to the requirements of the Habitats Directive so far as they may be affected by the exercise of those functions. What this means is that consideration must be given (during the determination process) to whether or not the three tests outlined above have been met. In this case, the tests outlined above are addressed in sections 6.76.9 of the Bat Mitigation Strategy, and it is concluded that the favourable conservation status of the species concerned will be maintained.

In any event, a licence will be required by the applicant to carry out works affecting roosting bats, as per the regulations outlined above. It is indicated that further bat survey work will be carried out in 2015. As the results of these surveys are obviously not yet available, but may potentially result in the need to amend the mitigation measures proposed, it is requested that a condition is used to require compliance with the Bat Mitigation Strategy, unless otherwise amended or superseded by the requirements of a Natural England Protected Species Licence.

Landscape and Visual Impact

The applicant has not provided a landscape appraisal; the site lies within TW06 Bulcote Village Farmlands, and alongside the western edge of TW51 Stoke Lock River Meadowlands, both of

which have 'Conserve and Create' as overall policy.

However, the development will remove modern agricultural buildings and although more building is proposed, the new buildings are of vernacular design, and the development reinforces the traditional character of the retained buildings. The development is also contained within existing field boundaries and will form a tighter cluster of structures than the current farm buildings.

TW51 Landscape Features

- . **Conserve** the traditional pastoral character and undeveloped flood plain adjacent to the River Trent.
- . **Enhance** the ecological diversity of the river meadowlands and seek opportunities to recreate wet grassland.
- . **Reinforce** and strengthen the continuity and ecological diversity of stream and water courses.
- . **Conserve** and enhance the pattern and special features of meadowland hedges.
- . Seek opportunities to convert arable land to permanent pasture.
- . Enhance visual unity through appropriate small-scale tree and woodland planting.

Built Features

- . **Conserve** the existing field pattern by locating new small scale development within the existing field boundaries.
- . Promote sensitive design and siting of new agricultural buildings.
- . Promote measures for reinforcing the traditional character of farm buildings using vernacular styles.

TW6 Landscape Features

- . **Conserve** existing meadowland hedgerows and seek opportunities to restore the historic field pattern with new hedgerow planting.
- . Seek opportunities to restore arable land to permanent pasture.
- . Strengthen the continuity and ecological diversity of stream corridors.

Built Features

- . **Conserve** the historic character and setting of village settlement of Bulcote – new development should respect the scale, design and materials used traditionally.
- . **Conserve** historic field pattern by containing new development within historic boundaries.
- . **Create** small scale woodlands and carry out appropriate tree planting to reduce the visual impact of large scale agricultural sheds and commercial development along the A612.
- . Promote sensitive design and siting of new agricultural buildings.
- . Promote measures for reinforcing the traditional character of farm buildings using vernacular styles.

Development Contributions

Libraries

There is currently a proposal for a new development on Bulcote Farm. This would comprise 64 new dwellings. At an average of 2.4 persons per dwelling this would add 154 to the existing libraries' catchment area population. The nearest existing library to the proposed development is Burton Joyce Library.

The Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA) publication "Public Libraries, Archives and

New Development: a standard approach” recommends a standard stock figure of 1,532 items per 1,000 population.

The County Council would not seek any costs towards increasing the size of the library to accommodate this population but for this development a contribution will be sought just for library stock. An increase in population of 154 would put pressure on the stock at this library and a developer contribution of £2949 would be expected to help address this situation.

The County Council would seek a developer contribution for the additional library stock that would be required to meet the needs of the 154 population that would be occupying the new dwellings. This is costed at 230 (population) x 1,532 (items) x £12.50 (cost per item) = £2949.

Education

With regard to the above application the County Council can confirm that the proposed development of 64 units would yield an additional 13 primary and 10 secondary places.

Based on current projections, the primary and secondary schools are at capacity and cannot accommodate the addition 10 primary places and 8 secondary places arising from the proposed development on land at Bulcote Farm, Old Main Road, Bulcote.

The County Council would therefore wish to seek an Education contribution of **£321,515** (£148,915 (13 x £11,455) to provide primary provision and £172,600 (10 x £17,260) to provide secondary provision) to accommodate the additional pupils projected to arise from the proposed development.

Conclusions

The County Council do not have any strategic highways objections to the proposed development. The County Council do not have any objections to the proposed development from a Minerals and Waste perspective.

In terms of Ecology, the County Council suggest a number of mitigation measures and conditions, as set out in detail above.

In relation to Landscape and Visual Impact the applicant has not provided a landscape appraisal, this should be provided. However, the development will remove modern agricultural buildings and although more building is proposed, the new buildings are of vernacular design, and the development reinforces the traditional character of the retained buildings. The development is also contained within existing field boundaries and will form a tighter cluster of structures than the current farm buildings.

The County Council would seek a developer contribution for the additional library stock that would be required to meet the needs of the 154 population that would be occupying the new dwellings. This is costed at 230 (population) x 1,532 (items) x £12.50 (cost per item) = £2949.

The County Council would therefore wish to seek an Education contribution of £321,515 (£148,915 (13 x £11,455) to provide primary provision and £172,600 (10 x £17,260) to provide secondary provision) to accommodate the additional pupils projected to arise from the proposed development.

Comments Received 27.09.18

Ref: 17/02325/FULM, Development comprising 16 residential units (Use Class C3) associated with Planning Application 15/00784/FULM and Listed Building Consent 15/00785/LBC for the Conversion of Grade II Listed Farm Complex "Bulcote Steading" and associated enabling residential development, with associated infrastructure, parking and landscaping.

Ref: 15/00784/FULM, Full Planning Application and Listed Building Consent for a development comprising 64 residential units (Use Class C3) and community building (Use Class D1) through the conversion of a Grade II Listed Farm Complex "Bulcote Steading" and associated enabling residential development, with associated parking and landscaping. To be read in conjunction with application ref: 17/02325/FULM.

Location: Bulcote Farm, Old Main Road, Bulcote

Thank you for your letters received by the County Council on 9th August 2018 requesting strategic planning observations on the above applications. The County Council would draw attention to previous comments made in reference to application 15/00784/FUL in a letter dated 17th June 2015 to Newark and Sherwood District Council. I have consulted with councilors and colleagues across relevant divisions of the County Council and have the following comments to make.

National Planning Context

In terms of the County Council's responsibilities the following elements of national planning policy and guidance are of particular relevance.

Waste

The National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW) sets out the Government's ambition to work towards more sustainable and efficient resource management in line with the waste hierarchy. Positive planning is seen as key to delivering these waste ambitions through supporting sustainable development. This includes ensuring that waste management is considered alongside other spatial planning concerns and helping to secure the re-use and recovery of waste wherever possible.

Paragraph 8 of the NPPW states that:

'When determining planning applications, all planning authorities should ensure that:

- the likely impact of proposed non-waste related development on existing waste management facilities, and on sites and areas allocated for waste management, is acceptable and does not prejudice the implementation of the waste hierarchy and/or the efficient operation of such facilities;
- new, non-waste development makes sufficient provision for waste management and promotes good design to secure the integration of waste management facilities with the rest of the development, and, in less developed areas, with the local landscape. This includes providing adequate waste storage facilities at residential premises, for example by ensuring that there is sufficient and discrete provision for bins, to facilitate a high quality, comprehensive and frequent household collection service;
- the handling of waste arising from the construction and operation of development maximises reuse/recovery opportunities and minimises off-site disposal.'

In Nottinghamshire, relevant policies are set out in the Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Replacement Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Waste Core Strategy (December 2013).

Minerals

Section 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) covers the sustainable use of minerals. Paragraph 203 points out that ‘It is essential that there is a sufficient supply of minerals to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs.’

Paragraph 204 states that planning policies should:

- ‘safeguard mineral resources by defining Mineral Safeguarding Areas; and adopt appropriate policies so that known locations of specific minerals resources of local and national importance are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this should be avoided (whilst not creating a presumption that the resources defined will be worked);
- set out policies to encourage the prior extraction of minerals, where practical and environmentally feasible, if it is necessary for non-mineral development to take place’.

In Nottinghamshire, minerals safeguarding and consultation areas are defined in the emerging Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan (Draft Plan Consultation 2018) and supported by Policy SP8, which also covers prior extraction.

In terms of the role of local planning authorities in planning for minerals, paragraph 206 of the NPPF states that: ‘Local planning authorities should not normally permit other development proposals in Mineral Safeguarding Areas where if it might constrain potential future use for mineral working’.

The national Planning Practice Guidance provides further information on the role of district councils in this regard, stating that ‘they have an important role in safeguarding minerals in 3 ways:

- having regard to the local minerals plan when identifying suitable areas for non-mineral development in their local plans. District Councils should show Mineral Safeguarding Areas on their policy maps;
- in those areas where a mineral planning authority has defined a Minerals Consultation Area, consulting the mineral planning authority and taking account of the local minerals plan before determining a planning application on any proposal for non-minerals development within it; and
- when determining planning applications, doing so in accordance with development policy on minerals safeguarding, and taking account of the views of the mineral planning authority on the risk of preventing minerals extraction.’

Transport

Section 9 of the NPPF addresses the issue of sustainable transport. The NPPF, in paragraph 111, requires all developments which will generate significant amounts of movement to provide a travel plan and the application for such a development to be ‘supported by a transport statement or transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed’. It also states, in paragraph 108, that it should be ensured that ‘appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of location and its

location' and 'any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree'.

Education Provision

Paragraph 94 of the NPPF states that:

'It is important that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education. They should:

- a) give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools through the preparation of plans and decisions on applications; and
- b) work with schools promoters, delivery partners and statutory bodies to identify and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted.'

Healthy Communities

Paragraph 91 of the NPPF points out that 'Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs...'

With regard to public rights of way, paragraph 98 states that they should be protected and enhanced, 'including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks..'

County Planning Context

Transport and Flood Risk Management

The County Council as Highway Authority and Local Lead Flood Authority is a statutory consultee to Local Planning Authorities and therefore makes separate responses on the relevant highway and flood risk technical aspects for planning applications. In dealing with planning applications the Highway Authority and Local Lead Flood Authority will evaluate the applicants proposals specifically related to highway and flood risk matters only. As a consequence developers may in cases where their initial proposal raise concern or are unacceptable amend their initial plans to incorporate revisions to the highway and flood risk measures that they propose. The process behind this can be lengthy and therefore any initial comments on these matters may eventually be different to those finally made to the Local Planning Authority. In view of this and to avoid misleading information comments on planning applications made by the Highway Authority and Local Lead Flood Authority will not be incorporated into this letter. However should further information on the highway and flood risk elements be required contact should be made directly with the Highway Development Control Team and the Flood Risk Management Team to discuss this matter further with the relevant officers dealing with the application.

Strategic Highways

Although a development of this size is not likely to have a significant impact on traffic volumes on the strategic highway network in isolation, when considered in combination with other proposed development in both Newark and Sherwood and Gedling district the impacts are likely to be severe, especially on the A612 / A6097 and A6211. In which case NSDC operate a CIL policy which

requires financial contributions from qualifying development towards highway infrastructure improvement schemes. It is assumed that this development, if approved by the LPA, would be subject to a CIL contribution towards strategic highway infrastructure improvements which include the upgrade of the A612 /A6097 Lowdham roundabout.

Minerals and Waste

The adopted Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Replacement Waste Local Plan, Part 1: Waste Core Strategy (adopted 10 December 2013) and the saved, non-replaced policies of the Waste Local Plan (adopted 2002), along with the saved policies of the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan (adopted 2005), form part of the development plan for the area. As such, relevant policies in these plans need to be considered. In addition, Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Areas have been identified in Nottinghamshire and in accordance with Policy SP8 of the emerging draft Minerals Local Plan (July 2018) these should be taken into account where proposals for non-minerals development fall within them.

Minerals

In relation to the Minerals Local Plan, the site is within a sand and gravel Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Area. Regarding Minerals Safeguarding areas, Policy SP8 in the emerging draft Minerals Local Plan states the following:

‘Development within minerals safeguarding areas will have to demonstrate that mineral resources of economic importance will not be needlessly sterilised as a result of the development and that the development would not pose a serious hindrance to future extraction in the vicinity.’

To the south and east this application site is in close proximity to areas allocated under Policy M6.6 (Gunthorpe) of the adopted Minerals Local Plan (2005). However in the period since this area has been allocated no permission has been granted for this area to be worked and the site has not been put forward as a potential site allocation as part of the Draft Minerals Local Plan.

Under these circumstances and in light of previous County Council comments stating that this site is of no concern regarding minerals sterilisation, it is deemed unlikely that this proposed development would pose a sterilisation risk, as there has been no indication that the site is due to come forward as an area of extraction in the foreseeable future. Therefore the County Council does not wish to raise any objections to the proposal from a minerals perspective.

Waste

In terms of the Waste Core Strategy, there are no existing waste sites within the vicinity of the site whereby the proposed development could cause an issue in terms of safeguarding existing waste management facilities (as per Policy WCS10). As set out in Policy WCS2 ‘Waste awareness, prevention and re-use’ of the Waste Core Strategy, any development on the site should be ‘designed, constructed and implemented to minimise the creation of waste, maximise the use of recycled materials and assist the collection, separation, sorting, recycling and recovery of waste arising from the development.’ In accordance with this, proposals likely to generate significant volumes of waste would benefit from being supported by a waste audit. Specific guidance on what should be covered within a waste audit is provided within paragraph 049 of the Planning Practice Guidance.

Ecology

The County Council does not have any further comments in respect of ecology.

Developer Contributions

Should the application proceed, the County Council will seek developer contributions in relation to its responsibilities in line with the Council's adopted Planning Obligations Strategy and the Developer Contributions Team will work with the applicant and the Local Planning Authority to ensure all requirements are met. Please contact Andrew Norton, Developer Contributions Practitioner in the first instance (andrew.norton@nottscc.gov.uk or 0115 9939309) with any queries regarding developer contributions.

Education

The proposed developments of 80 dwellings would yield an additional 17 primary and 13 secondary places.

We would therefore wish to seek an education contribution of £232,152 (17 x £13,656) to provide primary and £230,789 (13 x £17,753) to provide secondary provision to accommodate the additional pupils projected to arise from the proposed development.

Please note the cost per place may change if a number of developments come forward in an area which will require master planning and will result in an extension to an existing school or a complete new school build with land. This will be based on build cost, which would be subject to final confirmation.

Further information can be found in an education statement attached to this response in Appendix 1.

It is anticipated that details of any developer contributions sought by the County Council will be provided as soon as possible. Any developer contributions sought will be necessary in order for the proposed development to be considered acceptable and as such the County Council will wish to raise objections to this application unless these contributions will be secured.

Should any developer contributions be sought in relation to the County Council's responsibilities it is considered essential that the County Council is a signatory to any legal agreement arising as a result of the determination of this application.

Conclusion

It should be noted that all comments contained above could be subject to change, as a result of ongoing negotiations between the County Council, the Local Planning Authority and the applicants. These comments are based on the information supplied and are without prejudice to any comments the County Council may make on any future planning applications submitted for this site.

Nottinghamshire County Council Education – comments received 04.06.15 - Based on current projections, the primary and secondary schools are at capacity and cannot accommodate the addition 10 primary places and 8 secondary places arising from the proposed development on land at Bulcote Farm, Old Main Road, Bulcote.

We would therefore wish to seek an Education contribution of £321,515 (£148,915 (13 x £11,455) to provide primary provision and £172,600 (10 x £17,260) to provide secondary provision) to

accommodate the additional pupils projected to arise from the proposed development.

This development would also impact on the local library service and at an average of 2.4 persons per dwelling, the 64 new dwellings would add 153 to the existing library's catchment area population. If this development went ahead we would seek a Library contribution of £2,929 for the additional stock that would be required.

Nottinghamshire County Council Education comments received 14.12.18 - I am contacting you in respect of the education contributions which would be sought as a result of the cumulative impact of the above applications. The County Council can confirm that a development of 72 dwellings would generate 15 primary school places and 12 secondary places. Therefore the County Council would be seeking a primary education contribution of £204,840. In terms of secondary education; this will be covered by CIL.

Independent Viability Assessor – (in respect of viability report focusing on developer contributions) – comments received 05.11.18

The Heritage Deficit Appraisal

- 9.1. This section sets out the results of the heritage deficit appraisal that JLL have undertaken.
- 9.2. Critically, this appraisal focuses on the proposals to convert the existing buildings as anticipated by the Applicant. This appraisal does not at this stage incorporate any enabling development into the scheme.
- 9.3. The assumptions for undertaking this appraisal are set out at the end of Section 7 of this report. The appraisal seeks to analyse the viability of the conversion scheme in isolation and thereby assess the extent of the Heritage Deficit.
- 9.4. The following provides an overview of the assumptions that we have adopted and the rationale for our assumptions.
 - Sales values – we have assumed a floor area of 31,807 sq ft (net) and applied an average sales value of £193.20 per sq ft in line with Savills' assessment. The capital values applied in Savills' analysis have been reviewed by JLL Residential team who are broadly content with the sales values that have been applied in the appraisal (albeit that this assumes that demand can be secured for the units, in particular for those which are of a non-standard configuration such as the four bedroom apartment). JLL Residential Surveyors have highlighted that some units could be difficult to sell, due to the site's untested location and that there is very limited comparable evidence to guide an opinion of the sales values achievable for the conversion element. This increases the risk associated with delivering the conversion scheme.
 - Acquisition costs – we have assumed an Existing Use Value in line with Smiths Gore's assessment of £450,000. Please note that this does not include the incentive allowance previously allowed for by Savills. We have applied standard acquisition costs to the Existing Use Value equating to 5.8%, in line with market practice. Please note that this is higher than Savills' original appraisals which assumed approximately 5.5%. JLL's allowance reflects VAT on the Agent's and Legal fees at the prevailing rate of 20%.
 - Conversion costs – we have applied a conversion cost of approximately £122.91 per sq ft applied over the gross area that has been calculated by the Applicant's QS of 3,744 sq m (40,311 sq ft). To this we have applied a 5% contingency to reflect the risk associated with conversion schemes.
 - Professional Fees - We have applied 12% professional fees for the Heritage Deficit Assessment. Please note that this is the highest professional fee allowance that we

would anticipate in our experience, and reflects the fact that the building is Grade II Listed (and hence would require a sensitive conversion scheme).

- This is higher than the Applicant’s assumption which equates to approximately 8% (for both the conversion and the New Build scheme).
- Marketing – we have applied a ‘spot’ figure of £50,000 for marketing, bearing in mind the small scale nature of the conversion scheme. This equates to £2,000 per unit. This is lower than the assumption that Savills have applied of 2% of GDV. We believe that Savills’ allowance is high in this case, given the nature of the scheme.
- Disposal fees – we have assumed 1% agent’s fees and 0.5% legal fees, in line with standard market practice.
- Finance – we have assumed a debit rate of 7%, which is at the higher end of a range of 6%-7% that we would normally anticipate. This reflects both the risks associated with a conversion scheme and the fact that no finance arrangement or exit fees have been allowed for.

- Developer’s return for risk (profit) – we have assumed a 20% profit on GDV. This is line with Savills’ assumptions and reflects the fact that a conversion scheme is likely to be viewed as more risky by potential developers in the market. Developer’s levels of return for risk (profit) are now starting to fall from the 20% GDV which was typical throughout the market downturn. Accordingly, we have reduced this rate for the new build element of the scheme to reflect the lower risks involved.

9.5 Our conclusion as to the level of the Heritage Deficit is as follows:

- Table 9.1 – Results of The Heritage Deficit Appraisal

Scenario	Residual land Value
The Heritage Deficit (Conversion only)	Scenario Residual Land Value (£) The Heritage Deficit (conversion only) - £1,651,094

Source: JLL Analysis (October 2015)

9.6 Table 9.1 shows that, when incorporating JLL’s assumptions into the development appraisal analysis, the heritage deficit is approximately £1.65 million.

9.8 The next section sets out our calculation of the new build residential development, assuming that no affordable housing or other planning contributions (other than CIL which is mandatory) are incorporated into the development appraisal. This needs to be compared with the Heritage Deficit figure above to which it should be broadly equivalent.

10 The New Build Appraisal

10.1 This section sets out an appraisal of the new build development with no affordable housing or Section 106 costs (other than CIL which is mandatory).

10.2 From this analysis, a ‘plot value’ per residential new build dwelling is generated. This can in turn then be used to estimate how many new build units will be required to meet the gap in the development appraisal of the conversion scheme ‘The Heritage Deficit’ and generate the Existing Use Value that has been agreed at approximately £450,000 for the site.

10.3 Drawing on our analysis in Section 7, we have applied the following assumptions in the appraisal of the new build element of the scheme:-

- We have assumed 39 units in line with the Applicant’s original VAR assessment. We

have relied on the floor areas provided in Savills assessment, given that this equates to the schedule of areas provided by Shaw Jagger Architects, which we were given on 4 August 2015.

- Sales revenue – we have applied an average sales value of £230.32 per sq ft to assess this scheme. This is in line with the original Savills' VAR appraisal and has been considered by JLL's Residential Surveyors who are broadly content albeit assuming that demand for units in this location does exist.
- Acquisition costs – we have applied Stamp Duty at 4% and agent's and legal fees at 1% and 0.8% respectively, in line with the Heritage Deficit Appraisal. Please note that this is slightly higher than Savills assumption of 5.5%. JLL's assumptions reflect VAT at 20% on the Agent's and Legal fees.
- New build units construction costs – we have applied the 'Upper Quartile' BCIS Build Costs rebased to 'Nottinghamshire' of £108.23 per sq ft. We have applied this to the area identified in Savills appraisal, given that Shaw Jagger Architects schedule confirms that this relates to the GIA of the buildings. In the new build scheme, there are also no apartments included (and hence there is no allowance for circulation space required).
- Developer's Contingency - We have applied a developer's contingency at 3%. This is lower than Savills' assessment of 5% and reflects the reduced risk for new build development. The allowance of 3% is in line with JLL's experience for new build development schemes.
- Community Infrastructure Levy – we have assumed an allowance of £271,450, applied to the Gross Internal Area (GIA) of the new build at a rate of £65 per sq m, in line with Newark & Sherwood's CIL Charging Schedule. Please note that we have not applied an inflation allowance and have assumed that no reduction for vacant buildings on site can be made.
- Professional fees – we have applied 8% professional fees. This is in line with Savills' assumption. This level of professional fees is more appropriate for the new build element of the scheme. The allowance of professional fees can vary widely in developers' appraisals and some assume lower levels. An 8% allowance is however in line with Newark & Sherwood's Allocations and Development Management DPD Residential Viability Assessment (August 2012).
- Marketing – we have assumed a 'spot' figure allowance of £75,000. Please note that this is lower than Savills' assessment, which applied 2% of GDV for marketing costs. Our reduced allowance reflects the size of the development scheme and the likely allowance that a developer would make to market the new build proposals. Please note that this equates to a total allowance of £125,000 when combined with that of the Heritage Deficit Appraisal (i.e. for the whole scheme).
- Disposal fees – we have assumed Sales Agent's fees of 1% and Sales Legal fees of 0.5%, in line with market practice.
- Finance – we have applied a finance rate of 6.5%, reflecting the lower risk of this scheme when compared to the conversion project of the Heritage Deficit Appraisal. The rate of 6.5% also reflects the fact that no finance arrangement or exit fees are allowed for in the development appraisal. Savills applied 7% in all of their development appraisals.
- Developer's return for risk (profit) – we have applied a developer's return of 18.5% on GDV, to reflect the lower risk associated with the new build development proposals. Developer's profit rates have begun to reduce as the market has improved and we believe this slightly lower rate reflects the reduced risks associated with new

development.

10.4 Table 10.1 sets out the results of our appraisal of the new build element of the scheme, assuming that 39 new build units are provided (as originally envisaged by the Applicant in their VAR submission).

- Table 10.1 – Results of The Appraisal of New Build Development

Scenario	Residual land Value
Appraisal of new build only	£2,084,084

Source: JLL Analysis (October 2015)

Table 10.1 shows that a residual land value of £2,084,084 is generated for the new build development in isolation, based upon JLL's revised assumptions. This equates to a plot value of £53,438 per dwelling.

10.7 The value generated by the New Build Appraisal exceeds the Heritage Deficit calculated in the previous section of -£1,651,094. This suggests that the amount of new build development to enable the development should be lower. If the Heritage Deficit is divided by the Plot Value, this suggests that approximately 31 new dwellings would be required to meet the Heritage Deficit.

10.8 We have therefore 'sense checked' our development appraisal by reducing the number of units in the appraisal to 31 new build units. This produces a residual land value of £1,649,769 which broadly equates to the Heritage Deficit of -£1,651,094. This confirms that approximately 31 new build units would be required in order to meet the Heritage Deficit.

10.9 Please note that the amount of enabling development would increase if planning contributions and affordable housing were also sought.

10.10 The next section provides our summary and conclusions.

11 Summary and Conclusions

11.1 JLL was instructed by Newark & Sherwood District Council in November 2014 to provide development viability advice in relation to the planning application made for development at Bulcote Steading by the Applicant, Northern Trust Developments (NTD).

11.2 A site visit was undertaken on 11 December 2014 alongside an initial meeting at Savills' offices in Nottingham. Following this, the viability submission was submitted by Savills in May 2015 and a meeting was held, following the submission of further information, on 22 July 2015. The Applicant's advisers, Savills, provided further information on 4 August 2015 and 1 September 2015. All of this information has been reviewed to inform our viability analysis.

11.3 The site is located in Bulcote village to the north east of the city of Nottingham. The site is in a semi-rural location, where the majority of land uses are agricultural, with residential dwellings to the north comprising the settlement of Bulcote. The site comprises a complex of Grade II Listed agricultural buildings dating from approximately 1904. They were built as a 'model farm' to accommodate cattle, pigs, horses and food/feed storage. However, the site became redundant in 2013 when the last of dairy herd moved out.

11.4 The Applicant proposes that the existing farm buildings are redeveloped for residential use. The planning application is submitted in full and involves the conversion of the Listed buildings to form approximately 25 dwellings, along with a new community building and

accessible shared amenity space within the courtyard. There is also new build development which the Applicant states will enable the conversion scheme.

- 11.5 We have also commented on the marketing exercise undertaken by the Applicant, the scope of which was agreed with Newark & Sherwood District Council officers in 2014. We have not had sight of the scope of what was agreed, and have been provided with a summary from Smiths Gore of the actions that have been undertaken. Whilst the property appears to have been marketed for the period of time that we understand was agreed with Newark & Sherwood District Council, we have provided a number of comments on the marketing process for officers' consideration and highlighted where we believe that NSDC officers should request additional information from the Applicant to ensure that the marketing initiatives were undertaken.
- 11.6 Having reviewed the Applicant's development appraisal approach and assumptions, we have made a range of comments on the robustness of the approach and assumptions adopted. We have undertaken our own viability analysis of the scheme with revised assumptions, and have assessed the Heritage Deficit at approximately £1,651,094 million. We have then undertaken a development appraisal of the 39 new build dwellings proposed by the Applicant to assess the residual land value that would be produced. This appraisal produced a residual land value of £2,084,084 (which is higher than the Heritage Deficit). This suggests that the amount of new build development to enable the conversion scheme should be lower.
- 11.7 Our analysis suggests that approximately 31 new dwellings would be required to meet the Heritage Deficit and enable the conversion scheme.

Comments received 18.05.18 Following the submission and reassessment of a Revised Heritage Deficit Appraisal the following comments have been received:-

As instructed, I have reviewed the revised Heritage Deficit Appraisal for the conversion of the existing buildings in isolation, and also the appraisal of the proposed Enabling Development. This has involved reconsidering a number of issues that were previously considered in 2015 in light of the revised scheme.

Critically, the red line area boundary has now changed to include the adjacent dairy buildings to the east of the site. These were not included in 2015. I understand that this area has now been included on the basis that the former dairy building and associated hard standing areas can be built on to reduce the density of the enabling development (and hence the impact on the Listed Buildings) across the wider site. I consider this issue later below.

Given the significant negotiations that have been undertaken to arrive at the agreed viability position, I do not provide a chronology of correspondence here. However, set out below is a summary of the position reached regarding the Heritage Deficit Appraisal and the Enabling Development Appraisal and provide a commentary on each assumption.

Heritage Deficit Appraisal

The Heritage Deficit Appraisal was finalised with Savills on 7 February 2017. Savills' email included two Development Appraisals, one sensitivity testing JLL's timescales and the other sensitivity testing Savills' proposed timescales. The agreed model is Savills' timescales (they are slightly different and produce a slightly more viable position) which I have attached.

The brief overview of the agreed Heritage Deficit Appraisal is as follows:

• Sales Revenue - The conversion units have been valued at an average sales revenue of £202.45 per sq ft. This provides an average capital value for each unit of £248,250, over a total area of 29,429 sq ft net sales area. We have reviewed the sales value information provided by Savills in January 2017 and have concluded that the sales values that they have applied are robust. This represents approximately a 5% increase in sales values since our 2015 assessment. Whilst the Land Registry data we have researched and assessed suggests that there has been a higher increase, we cannot find any evidence in the local market for increasing sales values any higher than those applied by Savills. This therefore provides a total Gross Development Value (GDV) for the Heritage Deficit Appraisal of £5,958,000.

- Acquisitions costs – the previous assumption of £450,000 is being assumed, with Stamp Duty being applied in line with the March 2016 budget assumptions. Agent's fees are being applied at 1% and 0.8%, and hence we are content with this assumption. These assumptions have been updated through debate with Savills, given that they were previously applying different assumptions. Please note that this excludes the value of the dairy building which is now included in the red line boundary. I consider this further below.
- Conversion costs – total conversion costs of £183.98 per sq ft (applied over the net saleable area of 29,429 sq ft). This was subject to a detailed review in September 2016 with JLL building surveyors and the total costs were revised and agreed as £5,414,402.
- Contingency – Savills have applied a contingency of 5% on the conversion costs, which we believe to be appropriate for a conversion scheme of this nature.
- Professional fees – Savills have applied 10% professional fees to the conversion cost element. We previously advised that 12% should be applied for the conversion element of the scheme; however have now argued for a reduced level of professional fees as in our experience, professional fees have reduced as a percentage of build costs (given that build costs have increased significantly since our 2015 assessment). Therefore, we are content with the assumption adopted with Savills for the conversion element of the scheme.
- Marketing and letting – an allowance of 1.85% of GDV has been applied. We would usually anticipate an allowance of between 1%-2% for a scheme of this nature, and argued that the lower end of the range this should apply in 2015. Savills's total allowance equates to £110,223 and whilst this is at the higher end of the range that we would anticipate, we believe we are happy to adopt the 1.85% level as a compromise through our detailed negotiations and based upon the evidence Savills provided of a scheme in the local area.
- Disposal fees – Savills have applied standard disposal fees of 1% and 0.5% and hence we are content with this.
- Finance costs – Savills have applied a debt finance rate of 7% which we are comfortable with for a conversion scheme of this nature.

The result of the Heritage Deficit Appraisal generates a negative profit of £1,158,210, and a Heritage Deficit of £2,349,810. Therefore, the Heritage Deficit has increased from -£1,651,094 that we estimated in November 2015 Report.

The Enabling Development Appraisal

The Enabling Development Appraisal was then circulated in mid-February 2017 along with supporting evidence required for assessing for the new build elements of the scheme in relation to sales values (etc.). In addition, the Conservation Deficit Appraisal was also updated to include the value of the Dairy Building, given that the Heritage Deficit Appraisal set out above did not include

the existing use value of this building. This has increased the value of the site from £450,000 to £940,000 (an increase of £490,000), albeit this was subsequently reduced to £900,000 following us querying the area with Savills. This increased the Heritage Deficit from £2,349,810 to £2,862,361.

There were then discussions regarding:

- the appropriateness of the sales values for the Enabling Development;
- the appropriateness of the 20% profit margin on the Enabling Development; and
- the value of the existing buildings for the dairy element of the scheme.

The final Enabling Development Appraisal was circulated by Savills on 16 March 2017. This includes the Conservation Deficit Appraisal with a slightly reduced existing use value of £900,000 based upon our discussions with Savills. All other assumptions remain the same. This provided a revised heritage deficit of £2,861,361. It should be noted that for some reason, Stamp Duty has not been applied in this Heritage Deficit appraisal and hence this would increase the Heritage Deficit slightly if it were applied.

Savills' approach to the Enabling Development appraisal is slightly different to that that JLL adopted in our November 2015 report. In essence, they have undertaken the Enabling Development Appraisal in isolation and have run two scenarios for 47-48 dwellings to demonstrate a residual land value which represents the Heritage Deficit that they have estimated above.

Savills' key assumptions in the Enabling Development appraisal are as follows:

- GDV – they have assumed a total new build area of 49,740 sq ft to which they have applied an average sales rate of £236.33 per sq ft rate of (an average of £250,106 per dwelling).
- Residualised price – Savills have residualised the land value and have applied Stamp Duty and Agents and Legal fees to arrive at this amount. It should be noted that Agent's fees are still 1.5% in this appraisal and they should be 1% to be in line with the Heritage Deficit Appraisal. Savills should be asked to correct this.
- Construction costs – Savills applied a sales rate of £100 per sq ft as an all-in cost for the new build development. As set in our November 2015 report, this appears to be a 'say' figure and does not appear to have been costed by the Applicant's Quantity Surveyors. We believe that this build cost is appropriate (albeit that is at the lower end of the range that we would anticipate for new build development in this location, bearing in mind that any new development will have to be built to a high standard given its proximity and impact on the setting of the listed buildings).
- Developer's contingency – Savills have applied a lower rate of 3% contingency to the enabling development.
- CIL – a CIL rate of £93,450 has been applied by the Applicant, given that the enabling development is new additional development which is CIL chargeable. NSDC Officers should check that the Applicant has calculated CIL correctly and also consider the impact of Regulation 40, as discussed further below.
- Demolition Allowance - The Applicant has assumed an allowance for demolition of £75,000 which relates to the demolition of the dairy building only. Given that we estimate that the dairy building is approximately 38,000 sq ft, we are broadly comfortable with this 'say' allowance for demolition (which equates to £2.00 per sq ft to remove both the substructure and the concrete base of the existing dairy building).

- Professional fees – a lower rate of 8% professional fees has been applied for the new build element. We are comfortable with this allowance.
- Marketing costs – an allowance of 1.85% has been assumed of the GDV. This is in line with the Heritage Deficit Appraisal and our discussions/negotiations with Savills on this issue and the compromise we reached in relation to the Heritage Deficit appraisal.
- Disposal fees – an Agent’s fee of 1% has been applied (which we are content with). A legal fee of £500 per unit has been applied. This is lower than the assumption we would normally apply of 0.5%, although we are broadly content with the assumption adopted.
- Finance rates – an allowance of 7% has been applied of the new build development which we are broadly content with.
- Developer’s return for risk (profit) – a profit of 20% of GDV has been applied for the new build (enabling) development. Although in our November 2015 assessment we adopted a lower level of profit on the new build element (given that it was all for market sale) of 18.5% we have discussed this issue with Savills at length, and Savills have provided a research paper on developer’s profit levels, seeking to justify the 20% assumption on GDV. Although we still have some reservations about whether developers in the market for the site would require a return of 20% on GDV on the new build enabling development, we have reviewed the scheme with our colleagues in our residential agency team who have reiterated to us that there is an element of uncertainty as to how successful the scheme will be (given its relatively untested location) and the bespoke nature of the scheme. In addition, the level of enabling development has increased meaning that the development is more likely to attract a regional/sub-regional, rather than local, house builder. Hence, we have therefore reluctantly accepted the Applicant’s proposal for 20% profit on GDV.

The Applicant’s updated viability analysis suggests that the Heritage Deficit required between 47 and 48 units of Enabling Development on the site, as the residual land values are as follows:

- 47 Enabling Dwellings - £2,788,584 – slightly lower than the Heritage Deficit of £2,861,361.
- 48 Enabling Dwellings - £2,979,661 – higher than the Heritage Deficit.

Summary and Conclusions

The Heritage Deficit has increased significantly since our November 2015 assessment, at which point the Heritage Deficit was £1,651,094 and it required approximately 31 units in order to fund the scheme. The reason for this increase in the Heritage Deficit is threefold:

- The general increase in build costs that has been experienced since our 2015 assessment has increased the cost of the scheme. Accordingly, the ‘on costs’ such as professional fees and contingency (which are related to the build costs) have also increase (albeit that these have been reviewed and adjusted as appropriate to reflect change in market conditions). However, the sales values in the area have not increased enough to offset the rise in build costs.
- The increase in Developer’s Return for Risk (Profit) that we have reluctantly agree of 20% on the Enabling Development rather than 18.5% - Which we estimate increases costs in the appraisal by approximately £176,325 based upon the GDV for the 47 Enabling Unit scheme.
- Although the change in the scheme in February 2017 to incorporate the Dairy Buildings should in theory mean that the Enabling Development can be dissipated across the wider site (to reduce the impact on the setting of the Listed Building), this has also meant that the Development Appraisals have been required to be updated to increase the existing use value for the site to approximately £900,000 (given that if the dairy building is to be used to make way for development, its value also needs to be included in the existing use calculation). In addition, there are other costs associated with this approach, such as the need to demolish

the dairy building (which adds approximately a further £75,000 of cost to the scheme).

Therefore, NWDC Officers may wish to consider whether the dairy building is worth being included.

There are a number of minor issues with the current appraisal (e.g. Stamp Duty etc.) which Savills should correct before confirming the final position. In addition, it should be noted that the scheme for the enabling development is indicative and it would be prudent to refine the viability appraisal when the Enabling Development element of the scheme is refined. For example, the sensitivity test of a 47 and 48 dwellings enabling development scheme shows that the square footage increases significantly by approximately 4,000 sq ft. This is very large for a dwelling house and hence this should be reviewed when the final scale and mix is agreed, to ensure that the impact of viability is properly understood.

It should be noted that we have assumed that the Applicant's assessment of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) for the Enabling Development is correct. This should be clarified by NSDC Officers. In addition, it may be that the CIL can be reduced under Regulation 40 by using the dairy building to offset the CIL on the enabling development.

Finally, it should also be noted that, as we have stated previously, we have not provided advice on the architectural, planning, design and heritage aspects of the project. In particular, NSDC will need to determine whether the Enabling Development proposed by the Applicant is acceptable from a heritage/design perspective (etc.).

NSDC Planning Policy comments received @@@

National Policy

Reflecting a presumption in favour of sustainable development national policy confirms that the National Planning Policy Framework has not changed the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Proposed development which accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved and proposed development which conflicts should be refused, unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.

Defines the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy as being the prevention of urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The construction of new buildings is regarded as inappropriate, save for a limited range of exceptions.

Requires Authorities to maintain a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to deliver a five year housing land supply.

A sequential approach to development and flood risk should be followed, with the objective of steering new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding. If, following application of the Sequential Test, it is not possible, consistent with wider sustainability objectives, for the development to be located in zones with a lower probability of flooding, then the Exception Test can be applied if appropriate.

Development Plan

Core Strategy DPD
Spatial Policy 4A 'Extent of the Green Belt'
Spatial Policy 4B 'Green Belt Development'
Core Policy 1 'Affordable Housing Provision'
Core Policy 3 'Housing Mix, Type and Density'
Core Policy 'Sustainable Design'
Core Policy 10 'Climate Change'
Core Policy 13 'Landscape Character'
Core Policy 14 'Historic Environment'

Allocations & Development Management DPD
Policy DM3 'Developer Contributions and Planning Obligations'
Policy DM5 'Design'
Policy DM9 'Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment'
Policy DM12 'Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development'

Assessment

Green Belt

The application site is entirely located within the Green Belt, and I see no reason to disagree with the previous planning policy input provided in June 2015. This advised that the conversion element of the proposal could be consistent with the allowance in national policy for the re-use of buildings in the Green Belt, providing that they are of a permanent and substantial construction. The existing listed buildings would clearly meet this test, and in accordance with the remaining elements of para 90 their conversion would not in itself compromise the openness of the Green Belt nor conflict with the purposes of including land in the designation.

Beyond this the remainder of the scheme, some 48 dwellings, constitutes new build development which is suggested as necessary to support the conversion of the existing buildings. Again I agree with the previous advice, this would clearly represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt. As per national policy such development is by definition harmful to the designation, and should only be approved in very special circumstances. The applicant contends that the conversion is not viable on its own, needs the new build to make it so, and the benefits of this in terms of giving the listed buildings beneficial use constitute very special circumstances. This would nonetheless represent a significant level of development. Setting aside my concerns, over the impact on the openness of the Green Belt and whether the application site represents a suitable location for this scale of development, we will need to be convinced that the numbers proposed have been restricted to purely that necessary. The information provided by the applicant seems to suggest that this is now the case, but I would nevertheless emphasise the importance of this being robustly tested.

It will then be necessary to balance the level of harm to the Greenbelt against the desirability of retaining the listed buildings through conversion. This will clearly partly depend on the view that we come to over their heritage significance, and I would defer to the expertise of colleagues for advice on this. Beyond this the level of harm to the openness of the Green Belt by virtue of the amount and form of development proposed is also a relevant consideration. Given that the application concerns a farm it would be considered greenfield and not brownfield as per para 89 of the NPPF. Notwithstanding this I would recognise that there is clearly existing built

development and areas of hard surfacing within the application site, and so you may wish to consider whether to exercise some pragmatism.

The applicant has indicated that the 48 dwellings will be primarily sited on the footprint of the demolished south western ranges. In this respect I am sympathetic to the argument that due to the removal and non-replacement of existing buildings and areas of hard surfacing there may be no overall increase in the footprint of the developed area. Though again we will need to be content that this is indeed the case. Notwithstanding this whilst the absence of development is integral to how 'openness' should be viewed, this does not mean that landscape and visual considerations are not also relevant. The applicant refers to an overall decrease in the density of development, however this appears to relate back to the profile of the site at the height of its use (a photograph from the 1950's is provided). It is clear that significant demolition has subsequently occurred and that the site is now host to extensive areas of hard surfacing and pasture land. The replacement of these areas with housing would clearly have a greater impact on openness from a landscape visual perspective than the status quo. It is therefore important that we come to a view over what point in time provides an appropriate basis of comparison for the proposed development.

National policy is clear that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt. Given the significant amount of development proposed and the danger from the precedent this could set it is reasonable to expect a comparatively significant justification to be present in support of the proposal.

Sustainable Development

Regard will need to be had to whether the proposed development is consistent with the aim in national and local planning policy of delivering sustainable development. In this respect, bearing in mind the scale of development proposed, I would point to the comparatively isolated location of the application site. Actively managing patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling and focusing significant development (my emphasis) in locations which are or can be made sustainable is a core planning principle of national policy. Furthermore national policy also states that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Elsewhere the need for an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services is referenced.

The spatial distribution of development promoted by Spatial Policy 2 is consistent with this approach, with limited levels of development anticipated below the 'Principal Village' level of the Settlement Hierarchy. Spatial Policy 4B then effectively defines where, and under what circumstances, housing development will be deemed to enhance or maintain the vitality of rural Green Belt communities. It does so through seeking to focus new housing development within the settlement boundaries of Blidworth, Lowdham and the part of Bulcote attached to Burton Joyce. Beyond this it allows for consideration to be given to rural affordable housing exceptions sites within or adjacent to the main built-up area of a number of Green Belt settlements – including Bulcote. The proposal would therefore be at variance with this approach.

Flood Risk

The aim of the Sequential Test is to steer new development to Flood Zone 1 (areas with a low probability of river or sea flooding). Where there are no reasonably available sites in Flood Zone 1, then the flood risk vulnerability of the proposal should be taken into account and reasonably available sites in Flood Zone 2 considered, applying the Exception Test if required. Only where

there are no reasonably available sites in Flood Zones 1 or 2 should the suitability of sites in Flood Zone 3 (areas with a high probability of river or sea flooding) be considered, taking into account the flood risk vulnerability of land uses and applying the Exception Test if required. This approach is reflected in Core Policy 10 and Policy DM5.

Much of the site is located within Flood Zone 2 and whilst part of the scheme constitutes a change of use, where the Sequential and Exception Tests shouldn't be applied, there is still significant new build development proposed, some of which would be located within Zone 2. As per the notes to table 3 'Flood Risk Vulnerability and Flood Zone Compatibility' in the Planning Practice Guidance, some developments may contain different elements of vulnerability and the highest vulnerability category should be used. This is unless the development is considered in its component parts – disregarding the change of use element effectively does this.

The Authority can clearly point to numerous reasonably available sites at lesser flood risk than Flood Zone 2 which are capable of accommodating the new build element through its housing and mixed use allocations. On this basis the only conclusion which can be reasonably reached is that the proposal would be unable to satisfy the sequential test. National policy is very clear that development should not be permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding. To depart from this and support the proposed development we would, in my opinion, need to come to the view that the heritage significance of the listed buildings and the desirability of their retention is such that this outweighs the issue of flood risk, and the failure to satisfy the sequential test.

Housing Mix

The housing mix is overwhelmingly weighted towards 3 and 4 bed units with very little provision of 1 and 2 dwelling types. I would underline that providing for a mix of dwelling types which reflects the nature of local housing need (in line with Core Policy 3) contributes towards the creation of mixed and balanced communities, a key objective of sustainable development. Without justification, in line with the terms of CP3, the proposal would fall short of supporting this.

Developer Contributions

Given its scale the proposed development would potentially trigger a range of developer contributions, including affordable housing provision. Clearly as with housing mix such contributions are integral to the promotion of a sustainable form of development. No provision will therefore require robust justification as a result of viability concerns and/or site specific circumstances. The applicant has pointed to the overall viability picture and need to restrain the levels of development to purely that necessary to sustain the conversion in support of the approach. We will therefore need to be convinced that this has been robustly justified.

Conclusion

National policy is clear that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt. In this case that harm could derive from a loss of openness caused by an increase in the footprint of development and/or from landscape/visual considerations. To be acceptable in Green Belt terms this level of harm would therefore need to be clearly outweighed by other considerations. Such considerations would also need to outweigh the fundamental reservation I have outlined over the appropriateness of the scale of development in this kind of location, and given the inability to pass the sequential test the matter of flood risk. Whether other considerations are sufficient to clearly outweigh these concerns will hinge on the view we come to over the heritage significance of the listed buildings and the desirability of their conversion. Notwithstanding this the issues I have identified are significant and ought to weigh heavily against the development, as proposed.

The change of use element is likely to be acceptable in green belt terms, and exempt from application of the sequential and exceptions tests from a flood risk perspective. Pending the view of Conservation, a scenario can be envisaged where this aspect of the scheme with its lower numbers could be acceptable, my remaining locational concerns having been outweighed by the desirability for conversion to occur. The potential for this to be supported by enabling development in a more suitable location could be explored.

Comments received 04.09.18

These comments follow those provided in February of this year, and seek to respond to the applicant's enabling development report. In addition since my previous comments the updated NPPF has also been published, and the main modifications to the Amended Core Strategy have been placed on deposit for public consultation.

Green Belt

I'm of the view that Spatial Policy 4B within the Amended Core Strategy can now be afforded meaningful weight, according to the tests at paragraph 48 of the revised NPPF. With respect to Bulcote, the policy seeks to focus new housing development within the part of the village attached to Burton Joyce. The part of Bulcote 'washed over' by the Green Belt has not been identified for limited infilling. Aside from rural affordable housing the policy defers to national policy for consideration of other forms of development.

National policy outlines that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. As per my earlier comments the conversion element of the proposal is likely to be consistent with the allowance for the re-use of buildings in the Green Belt- providing that they are of a permanent and substantial construction, that they would preserve the openness of designation and that it would not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.

The framework is clear that the construction of new buildings should be considered inappropriate, save for a range of exceptions. I note that in the 'density' section of the Enabling Development Report the applicant has built a case around the focusing of development on what they consider to be 'previously developed' parts of the site, going on to calculate that the proposed development footprint would be less than that occupied by the current operation. However as an agricultural use the land would not be defined as previously developed land, meaning that the proposal falls beyond the exception allowing for the re-use of such land. I'm also of the view that no part of the scheme would be consistent with the exception supporting 'limited infilling in villages', given that the location is not within the village.

Consequently a significant proportion of the scheme would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and so would by definition be harmful to the designation. Accordingly it should not be approved unless there are very special circumstances. Those very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. National policy requires that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, and so a high threshold should be applied when considering whether 'very special circumstances' exist.

I would accept that it is possible for the desirability of retaining a heritage asset to be a consideration which could outweigh harm to the Green Belt. Though given the high threshold necessary to establish very special circumstances it should be expected that the significance of the asset would be similarly high. I would defer to the expertise of colleagues in Conservation for guidance over the significance of the asset.

In terms of other considerations, the smaller footprint of the proposed development when considered against the historic and existing operation may help restrict the harm to the openness of the designation, but in coming to a view on this you will need to also be content from a landscape/visual perspective. Ultimately the judgement which needs to be made is whether the desirability of facilitating the conversion of the heritage assets outweighs the level of harm to the Green Belt, and so represents the 'very special circumstances' necessary to justify inappropriate development.

Flood Risk

Large parts of the application site fall within Flood Zone 2. Given the range of allocations made through the Development Plan there are numerous reasonably available sites at lesser flood risk, capable of accommodating the new build element of the scheme (the change-of-use element is exempt from the Test). We will therefore need to be convinced that the desirability of the conversion of the Listed Buildings, and so their heritage significance, is such that this justifies a departure from the sequential approach to the location of development and flood risk. As with matters around the Green Belt this ought to, in my opinion, carry a high threshold. Should we be satisfied that this is the case then there would still be the need for the proposal to pass the Exception Test, making the important demonstration that the development itself will be safe from a flood risk perspective and that it will not increase risk elsewhere. I would defer to relevant stakeholders on that aspect.

Sustainable Development

I continue to hold reservations over the location and scale of development and how consistent this is with the desire to promote sustainable patterns of development. In this respect the proposal would not accord with the spatial strategy within either the adopted or emerging Amended Core Strategy. The housing mix is also overwhelmingly weighted towards 3 bed units, with little provision of 1 and 2 bed dwelling types. Core Policy 3 would require a mix which reflects the nature of local housing need, and in the absence of a local Housing Needs Assessment the Sub-Area Report to the Housing Market and Needs Assessment (2014) indicates significant demand for 2 bed units (representing 36.6% of the households who responded to the survey) within the market sector in the Nottingham Fringe Area. I am however receptive to the fact that there is likely to be a viability case in support of the proposed mix, and I am also mindful of the need for any enabling development to be restricted to that purely necessary to support the conversion.

Given its scale the proposed development would potentially trigger a range of developer contributions, including affordable housing provision. Clearly as with housing mix such contributions are integral to the promotion of a sustainable form of development. No provision would therefore require robust justification as a result of viability concerns and/or site specific circumstances. My understanding is that we are now at the point where the enabling case has been accepted, and so again there would be viability justification in support of the approach.

Conclusion

There are a number of issues with the development as proposed – not least the fact that it would represent inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Ultimately it will therefore come down to the exercising of judgement over whether these issues are outweighed by the desirability of retaining the Listed Buildings via their conversion.

Natural England – 02.06.15

Statutory nature conservation sites – no objection

Based upon the information provided, Natural England advises the Council that the proposal is unlikely to affect any statutorily protected sites or landscapes.

Green Infrastructure

The proposed development is within an area that Natural England considers could benefit from enhanced green infrastructure (GI) provision. Multi-functional green infrastructure can perform a range of functions including improved flood risk management, provision of accessible green space, climate change adaptation and biodiversity enhancement. Natural England would encourage the incorporation of GI into this development.

Protected Species

We have not assessed this application and associated documents for impacts on protected species.

Natural England has published Standing Advice on protected species. You should apply our Standing Advice to this application as it is a material consideration in the determination of applications in the same way as any individual response received from Natural England following consultation.

The Standing Advice should not be treated as giving any indication or providing any assurance in respect of European Protected Species (EPS) that the proposed development is unlikely to affect the EPS present on the site; nor should it be interpreted as meaning that Natural England has reached any views as to whether a licence is needed (which is the developer's responsibility) or may be granted.

If you have any specific questions on aspects that are not covered by our Standing Advice for European Protected Species or have difficulty in applying it to this application please contact us with details at consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

Local Sites

If the proposal site is on or adjacent to a local site, e.g. Local Wildlife Site, Regionally Important Geological/Geomorphological Site (RIGS) or Local Nature Reserve (LNR) the authority should ensure it has sufficient information to fully understand the impact of the proposal on the local site before it determines the application.

Biodiversity Enhancements

This application may provide opportunities to incorporate features into the design which are beneficial to wildlife, such as the incorporation of roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nest boxes. The authority should consider securing measures to enhance the biodiversity of the site from the applicant, if it is minded to grant permission for this application. This is in accordance with Paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Additionally, we would draw your attention to Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) which states that 'Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity'. Section 40(3) of the same Act also states that 'conserving biodiversity includes, in

relation to a living organism or type of habitat, restoring or enhancing a population or habitat’.

Landscape Enhancements

This application may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green space provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider new development and ensure that it makes a positive contribution in terms of design, form and location, to the character and functions of the landscape and avoids any unacceptable impacts.

Sites of Special Scientific Interest Impact Risk Zones

The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, which came into force on 15 April 2015, has removed the requirement to consult Natural England on notified consultation zones within 2 km of a Site of Special Scientific Interest (Schedule 5, v (ii) of the 2010 DMPO). The requirement to consult Natural England on “Development in or likely to affect a Site of Special Scientific Interest” remains in place (Schedule 4, w). Natural England’s SSSI Impact Risk Zones are a GIS dataset designed to be used during the planning application validation process to help local planning authorities decide when to consult Natural England on developments likely to affect a SSSI. The dataset and user guidance can be accessed from the gov.uk website.

Comments received 15.08.18 - Natural England has no comments to make on these applications.

Natural England has not assessed this application for impacts on protected species. Natural England has published Standing Advice which you can use to assess impacts on protected species or you may wish to consult your own ecology services for advice.

Natural England and the Forestry Commission have also published standing advice on ancient woodland and veteran trees which you can use to assess any impacts on ancient woodland.

The lack of comment from Natural England does not imply that there are no impacts on the natural environment, but only that the application is not likely to result in significant impacts on statutory designated nature conservation sites or landscapes. It is for the local planning authority to determine whether or not this application is consistent with national and local policies on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may be able to provide information and advice on the environmental value of this site and the impacts of the proposal to assist the decision making process. We advise LPAs to obtain specialist ecological or other environmental advice when determining the environmental impacts of development.

We recommend referring to our SSSI Impact Risk Zones (available on Magic and as a downloadable dataset) prior to consultation with Natural England. Further guidance on when to consult Natural England on planning and development proposals is available on gov.uk at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/local-planning-authorities-get-environmental-advice>

Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust – 08.06.15

Thank you for consulting Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust on the planning applications detailed above. We are pleased to see updated ecological information has been submitted to allow proper consideration of protected species.

The Ecological Assessment Report (TEP, April 2015) states that a number of buildings proposed for development have confirmed bat roosts present and others are considered to have potential for bat roosts to be present but this has not been able to be confirmed. Table 5 of the report is reproduced here for reference:

Table 5: Daytime Bat Assessment of Buildings

BAT ROOST VALUE	BUILDINGS REFERENCE
Negligible	1, 4 and 5
Low	6b
Moderate	2, 3, 7, 8, 9 and 11
Confirmed Roost	6a, 10 and 12

The Bat Mitigation Strategy Report (TEP, April 2015) gives details of required mitigation for buildings 6a, 10 and 12, where evidence in the form of droppings was recorded during the 2014 survey. The general situation has been assessed and roosts (including species and size) have been confirmed – an EPS licence will be required. Part of the proposed mitigation strategy is to carry out updated surveys during 2015 to account for the possibility that location and aspect of roost access points may have altered since previous activity surveys were carried out. We are satisfied that sufficient information has been gathered with respect to Buildings 6a, 10 and 12 at this stage.

We are unclear as to whether the proposed development would impact on any of the features in buildings 6b, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, and 11 where potential was noted during 2014, but not confirmed through further activity survey work. We assume that these features will remain unaffected, as the TEP reports do not suggest that further investigation is required. However, we recommend that the LPA requests confirmation that any potential (unconfirmed) roost features within buildings 6b, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, and 11 will not be damaged, disturbed or obstructed in any way during works. Otherwise, the LPA may wish to request that activity surveys are carried out before the application is determined to confirm whether roosts are in fact present and the EPS license will need to include works to these buildings.

As you will be aware all birds, their nests and eggs (except pest species) are protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (and as amended). Given the previous evidence of breeding birds, any development would be constrained by the bird breeding season. No vegetation clearance, or works to or demolition of buildings or structures that may be used by breeding birds should take place between 1st March and 31st August inclusive, unless a competent ecologist has undertaken a careful, detailed check of vegetation for active birds' nests immediately before the vegetation is cleared and provided written confirmation that no birds will be harmed and/or that there are appropriate measures in place to protect nesting bird interest on site. Any such written confirmation should be submitted to the local planning authority.

Sections 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6 of the TEP Report gives detail of recommendations with respect to run-off, badgers and brown hare. These measures should be secured by way of planning condition.

We would be supportive of ecological enhancements being incorporated into the proposed development as encouraged under paragraph 118 of the NPPF. This may include bird boxes, bat boxes (in addition to those required under EPS license), additional native planting and habitat creation (i.e. native wildflower areas).

Comments received 09.01.18 – No further comments will be made

Nottinghamshire County Council Ecology – comments are included within the Nottinghamshire County Council Policy comments

Nottinghamshire County Council Minerals - comments are included within the Nottinghamshire County Council Policy comments

Nottinghamshire County Council Rights of Way - no comments received

Ramblers – 26.01.18 This development should not impede pedestrian access to the river (although it will make it much less attractive) and we have no objection.

Nottinghamshire County Council Lead Local Flood Authority - 17.07.15 –

- 1 The following comments are based on the source-path-receptor methodology to manage the flood risk from the proposed development to 3rd party properties both adjacent and at distance from the proposed sites. The risk to new properties within the proposed development are also considered.
- 2 The Flood & Water Management Act 2010 recognises the need for engineered management of the flooding risks from surface water and much work has been done by DEFRA, Lead Local Flood Authorities, the Environment Agency and many other organisations to consider the appropriate approaches to reducing the flooding risk to existing properties from existing pluvial & fluvial sources. In addition to this, the mitigation of any increase in flood risk arising from new development or redevelopment has been recognised as a priority for Local Planning Authorities and Lead Local Flood Authorities.
- 3 The site is shown within an area indicated on contemporary records as susceptible to fluvial flooding with an annual probability of occurring between 0.1 & 1% however it is not shown on the Environment Agency 'flood map for planning' as within FZ3 (with an annual probability of flooding occurring greater than 1%).
- 4 The site floor slab levels are proposed as 19.10m or higher to give 250mm freeboard above the 100yr + climate change flood modelled flood level. This is a reasonable approach to take and represents around 500mm above the nearest 100 year flood levels within the most upto date model.
- 5 The site is not shown within an area indicated on contemporary records as susceptible to pluvial (surface water) flooding. We would nevertheless advise that the site levels design enables water to flow away from the proposed dwellings to reduce any residual flooding risk.
- 6 The site investigation trial pit logs note sands and gravels with a water table approximately 2.4m below ground level. In this regard infiltration drainage may be a feasible option and should be investigated further. In this case, care would need to be taken to design soakaways to avoid saturation of ground near foundations and also to ensure that infiltration testing and soakaway design are in accordance with contemporary standards. The use of permeable paving may prove suitable for the site and reduce the amount of surface water attenuation storage required.
- 7 The site drainage strategy proposes disposal to watercourses however this should be regarded as a second choice if infiltration drainage is feasible on the site. Additionally, the local surface water drains may become full at certain times and this may compromise the efficiency of a drainage system designed to discharge into the nearby ditches.
- 8 If infiltration drainage is not feasible, the site would need to attenuate water to the greenfield run-off rate indicated in the Flood Risk Assessment.

- 9 Calculations need to be provided to demonstrate that the system will accommodate all events upto a 100yr + 30% climate change severity with all attenuated water remaining within the site boundary. The drainage design should be submitted to the LLFA and include a fully referenced network plan and also a summary of the drainage simulations for the 100yr +30% climate change event with rainfall event durations ranging from 15 minutes to 24 hours. Where the model shows that flooding may occur at particular nodes, the drainage design should be accompanied by a levels plan to demonstrate how the flood volume would be accommodated.
- 10 A flood routing plan should be provided to show exceedance routes for the surface water drainage system. The flood routing plan should be based upon a detailed levels design for the site and clearly show the levels on the site and finished contours. It is important that all flood routing is directed within the site and towards the attenuation system rather than across the site boundaries at various points.
- 11 The information provided at the present time from the various documents and investigations indicates that the designers are aware of the need to manage the rainfall run-off although further detail would be required to justify the approach taken and demonstrate that the site meets the required standards for flood risk mitigation and surface water management. Nevertheless the strategy is broadly acceptable to Nottinghamshire County Council as a basis for surface water management on the proposed development. This statement is however qualified by the need for detailed design documentation to be provided (possibly at a later date) to justify the assumptions and statements made in the strategy documents submitted as part of this application.
- 12 Information that should be included with a detailed drainage design submission:
- 12.1 Drainage layout plan with model references as appropriate.
- 12.2 All infiltration areas with supporting specification, calculations and construction details.
- 12.3 Attenuation pond/tank details including volumetric calculations, geotechnical & slope-stability calculations as appropriate, specification of materials used to construct any berms.
- 12.4 Full specification & general arrangement drawings for inlet/outlet structures and flow control structures. The details should also include the access arrangements for clearing and maintenance including in times of flood/failure of the infrastructure.
- 12.5 Full documentary evidence for consideration by the LPA/LLFA legal advisors of the rights to discharge to any watercourse.
- 12.6 All calculations should be provided using contemporary drainage software (Windes or similar). If possible electronic files should be provided to support paper and pdf outputs. Information can be provided in common software packages and formats including PDS, Windes, xyz, genio, word/excel/autocad etc. All documents should be referenced with a unique identifier – drawing number, document number/revision etc. Calculations and drawings should be cross-referenced and issue sheets provided to enable tracking of revisions to information.

Comments Received 17.01.18 - No objections to the proposals.

Environment Agency comments received 01.06.15 This site falls in Flood Zone 2 and as such the Sequential Test will apply and only when the LPA confirm the location is acceptable will I consult the teams and this email can be taken as an objection until this matter is resolved. The issue of surface water disposal is now a matter for the Lead Local Flood Authority who should be consulted regarding this proposal.

Comments Received 24.06.15 - We object to this application in the absence of any evidence to demonstrate that the flood risk Sequential Test has been applied. We recommend that until then

the application should not be determined for the following reasons:

Reasons

The application site lies within Flood Zone 2 defined by the Environment Agency Flood Map / Strategic Flood Risk Assessment as having a Medium probability of flooding. Paragraph 101 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires decision-makers to steer new development to areas at the lowest probability of flooding by applying a 'Sequential Test'. In this instance no evidence has been provided to indicate that this test has been carried out.

Overcoming Our Objection

You can overcome our objection by providing evidence that the Sequential Test has been completed and demonstrates that there are no reasonably available alternative sites in areas with a lower probability of flooding that would be appropriate for the type of development proposed.

Comments Received 11.01.18 This site falls in Flood Zone 2 and as such Standing Advice can be applied. You may wish to consult the LLFA regarding surface water disposal.

Severn Trent Water - 08.06.15 – No objections subject to the following condition:-

The development hereby permitted shall not commence until drainage plans for the disposal of surface water and foul sewage have been submitted to and approved by the LPA. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is first brought into use

Reason: To ensure that the development is provided with a satisfactory means of drainage as well as to reduce the risk of creating or exacerbating a flooding problem and to minimize the risk of pollution.

01.02.18 - Pervious comments are reiterated together with a suggested informative:-

Severn Trent Water advise that although our statutory sewer records do not show any public sewers within the area you have specified, there may be sewers that have been recently adopted under The Transfer Of Sewer Regulations 2011. Public sewers have statutory protection and may not be built close to, directly over or be diverted without consent and you are advised to contact Severn Trent Water to discuss your proposals.

Severn Trent will seek to assist you obtaining a solution which protects both the public sewer and the building.

Trent Valley Drainage Board – 24.06.15 The site falls within the Boards District and is served by the Board maintained by Bulcote Farm Feeder an open watercourse which is located to the eastern side of the carriageway.

The Board notes the applicant's proposal to discharge surface water at a rate of 10L per second per hectare. The Boards recommends that the existing run off rate is confirmed and the run off rate designed to be restricted to the greenfield run off rate or a significant reduction on the existing run off rate

The Boards written consent will be required prior to the alteration of flows to any receiving watercourse at the site.

Infilling or culverting of any watercourse at the site must not be undertaken without the Boards prior written consent. If not already done so the Board recommends that the LLFA is consulted on the application in regards to the management of surface water run off.

Comments received 10.10.18 – The site is within the TVIDB district. The Board maintained Bulcote Farm feeder an open water course exists on the eastern site of the carriageway of the site to which BYELAWS and THE LAND DRAIANGE ACT APPLIES.

The Boards consent is required to erect any building or structure (including walls and fences) whether temporary or permanent or plant any tree, shrub, willow or other similar growth within 9m of the top edge of any Board maintained watercourse or the edge of any Board maintained culvert.

The Boards consent is required for any works whether temporary or permanent in over or under any Board maintained watercourse or culvert.

The Board's written consent is required for any works that increase the flow or volume of water to any watercourse or culvert within the Boards district (other than directly to a main river for which the consent of the EA will be required).

Under the Land drainage act the board are permitted to deposit arising from the watercourse on adjoining land. Any occupier of adjacent land wishing to remove the spoil should note that an exemption under the Waste Management regulations may be required from the EA.

No development should be commenced until the LPA in consultation with the LLFA has approved a scheme for the provision, implementation and future maintenance of a surface water drainage system. The Board would wish to be consulted directly if the following cannot be achieved and discharge affects the Boards District:-

- Existing catchment and sub catchments to be maintained
- Surface water run off limited to 1.4l/s/ha for pumped lowland catchments

Surface water run off rates to receiving watercourses must not eb increased as a result of development

The design, operation and future maintenance of the site drainage systems must eb agreed with the LLFA and LPA.

A permanent undeveloped strip of sufficient width should be made available to the bank top of all watercourses on site to allow future maintenance works to be undertaken. For access strips alongside Board maintained watercourses the access width must be at least 9m wide unless otherwise agreed in writing by the board. Where the watercourse is under riparian control suitable access arrangements to the access strip should be agreed between the LPA, the LLFA and the third party that will be responsible for the maintenance.

NSDC Strategic Housing 07.08.15 - Looking at their application we can seek affordable housing on 39 of their units. Policy requires us to seek on-site affordable housing and in this respect we would look to secure 11 affordable homes on the following tenure:-

Affordable Housing Provision = 11 units 7 for rent and 4 for intermediate			
	Rent Soc/Aff	Intermediate S/O	Totals
1 Bed	2	-	2
2 Bed	3	2	5
3 Bed	2	2	4
Total	7	4	11

They should be contacting a Registered Provider to secure an offer on the affordables which would give them an indication of how viable it is to provide them. If a commuted sum was applied I would need to increase the amount of affordables calculated as they are increasing the number of market homes so I would calculate this on 14 units. To calculate a commuted sum I would need to know the proposed sales values of the houses so they should really provide this information therefore mine is only a guesstimate. Are they taking the view they don't want to provide affordables without doing the figures?

I would on the value of properties worth around £150k calculate a figure based on 60% rent and 40% intermediate housing to be £900,000. This is based on a two bed units. Depending on what they are developing i.e. someone beds this figure would be reduced.

Environmental Health Contamination –

Comments received 02.06.15 A Phase I Geo-Environmental Site Assessment has been submitted with the planning application. This report was produced by Resource Environmental Consultants Ltd of behalf of the developer (Ref: 45153p1r0 dated September 2013).

This document describes the history of the site as a mixed use farm which carried out spreading of sewage sludge on land to act as fertilizer. The preliminary risk assessment discusses the potential impacts of these previous uses in relation to the proposed residential development and indicates the probable contaminants of concern. The report then concludes with a series of recommendations including a scope of intrusive investigations/targeted soil sampling to be carried out.

I generally concur with these recommendations and look forward to receiving the Phase 2 Site Investigation report on the findings of the intrusive investigations. I would recommend the use of our full phased contamination condition in order to ensure that this work is carried out to Environmental Health's requirements.

I note that the report states that the site lies in an area where 1%-3% of homes are affected by the presence of radon; however our records show that it is 3%-5%. I would therefore expect the applicant to provide more detailed evidence to provide justification that radon protection is not required at this site.

Furthermore the report describes that the site is potentially within an area affected by historic coal mining. A coal mining report should be submitted with the phase 2 site investigation.

09.01.2018 – Previous comments received 02.06.15 are reiterated

Comments received 15.03.18 details re coal mining and radon survey if the contamination condition is on we can do it through that. The desktop found potential contamination so a phase 2

SI is needed so the condition is required anyway

Gedling Borough Council – Comments received 22.06.15

While the site is located within Newark & Sherwood District the main local services and facilities that are likely to be accessed by residents are in the village of Burton Joyce which lies within Gedling Borough. Consideration should be given to the impact on the services and facilities in Burton Joyce and, where necessary, appropriate contributions made towards mitigating any impact.

Nottingham City is likely to be a destination that will attract a significant number of the vehicle movements generated by the proposal. Consideration should also be given to the impact increased vehicle movements will have on safety and amenity for residents of Burton Joyce.

It is noted that the site is located within the Green Belt and includes a Listed Building. You will need to be satisfied that the proposal accords with Green Belt and Historic Environment policies contained in the NPPF.

Comments received 15.01.18 - These comments relate to the cross-boundary implications of planning application references 15/00784/FULM and 17/02325/FULM that are currently being determined by Newark and Sherwood District Council (NSDC). These proposals comprise the development of 72 dwellings (of which 24 are through the conversion of existing buildings and 48 are new build). The reason for Gedling Borough Council's comments is that the application, being in Bulcote which is effectively an eastern extension to the settlement of Burton Joyce, is located on the Borough boundary and therefore has possible cross-boundary implications. In this respect, the key concern is the potential impact of the proposal upon infrastructure within Burton Joyce given the size of the application being considered.

If minded to grant permission, it is advised that NSDC consult the following:

- County Education for information on the capacity of local schools to accommodate the anticipated number of students arising from the proposal.
- County Highways on the impact on highway safety, in particular in Burton Joyce centre.
- Nottingham North and East CCG on the impact of local health services.

Gedling Borough Council would also support the following development principles if NSDC is minded to approve these applications:

- The provision of open space as part of the development.
- Design that is sympathetic to the rural environment, in particular it takes account where practicable of Policy Zone TW06 of the Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment.
- The provision of an appropriate level of affordable housing if viable
- NSDC securing adequate development contributions towards education, health and open space.

In addition to the above, it is noted that local concern has been raised (see Burton Joyce Parish Council's comments) on the potential impact of the proposal on parking capacity in Burton Joyce centre.

Comments received 29.08.18 - As the additional information relates to the matter of enabling

development, I have confined consultation to our Conservation Officer only. However, previous comments made by Gedling Borough Council on 19th June 2015 and 15th November 2017 remain relevant.

Bulcote Steading at Bulcote farm, Bulcote is located within Newark and Sherwood District and N&S DC Councils jurisdiction. Gedling Borough Council is consulted on the applications described above because it is within proximity of the border between the two Councils, located 1.13km to the east of the Burton Joyce/Bulcote shared village hall, on old Main Road. Burton Joyce and Bulcote are conjoined settlements along the A612 and the river Trent meanders close by to the south surrounded by fields.

The grade II listed farm steading c1902 is a model farm comprising a range of brick built farm buildings set out in quadrangular form and designed by the city engineer Arthur Brown. They are located within a predominantly rural landscape setting. Across from and opposite the steading are modern steel barns. The buildings are located within the Bulcote Conservation area which is characterised by a number of large dwellings set within large mature plots either side of old Main Road and which is bounded by mature hedgerows with open views between. Towards the farmstead to the south of the railway line is a row of C20th semi-detached houses built by the corporation.

The farmstead has been redundant from its use for some time and the information provided explains the details of this and the marketing that has occurred prior to the application being submitted. The scheme is one that seeks residential conversion with enabling development and it is apparent that negotiations over the scheme have been ongoing for some years. Enabling development is the minimum necessary extra development allowed to fund the conservation deficit which occurs when the costs of repairs and conversion to beneficial use outweigh the end value once repaired. Such a calculation requires a quantified repairs schedule to be undertaken by accredited professional, repairs that are to conservation standards. Clearly, the amount of enabling development hinges upon the accuracy of such works and even then they must respect the special architectural and historic interests of the listed buildings. An amount of developers profit is allowed for to ensure a development is worth undertaking. Since no figures are sent with the information I am unable to comment upon the need for the enabling development proposed. I have read through the conservation officers comments which are very detailed, particularly on the history of the site however I cannot agree that there is to be no harm caused when a row of new housing immediately within the setting of the farm stead is proposed that would change the landscape view and the surroundings in which the heritage assets are experienced. I will assume however, that considerable discussions have taken place given the planning history and that have led to the scheme as proposed and inevitably when it comes to the reality a balanced judgement is required that sustains the assets going forward. I understand the importance of saving heritage assets at risk and if nothing is done then they remain as such and a burden to the owners, local community and the local authority alike. Overall the scheme appears to be acceptable and I will assume that the enabling argument is made and that the level of benefits outweighs the level of harm caused. The new housing is sensitively designed in its form and sympathetic to the existing pattern of development nearby (corporation cottages) although detailing could be much improved. In terms of the conversion, new openings are kept to a minimum and existing apertures utilised for glazing, windows and doors and this will help retain the character of the original building in conversion. New boundary fencing should be post and rail with natural native species hedgerows to complement, retaining the rural nature of the site.

I also urge the use of an article 4 direction to withdraw permitted development rights around the

heritage asset and to protect its setting in conversion as residential use will bring demands from multi-ownership/use that may conflict with the historic farmstead and its setting/appearance. It will also be important to ascertain the future management of the site and this can be particularly important where multi ownerships are involved.

I am in agreement with the conservation officers planning policy analysis and I recommend that Gedling Borough Council support the application from a conservation perspective.

Primary Care Trust (Clinical Commissioning Group) – Comments received 01.06.15 NHS England Derbyshire & Nottinghamshire Area Team (AT) has reviewed the planning application for the proposed housing development site on the land at Bulcote Farm in relation to the potential impact on primary and secondary care health services.

From the information provided the AT is aware that the application outlines the development of 64 dwellings. The proposal would trigger the need to provide health related section 106 funding of £551 per dwelling based on 2.3 person occupancy. A development of this nature would result in increased service demand which would not be easily accommodated within existing primary care resources.

It is unlikely that the Area Team would support a single handed GP development as the solution to sustainably meet the needs of the housing development and that the health contribution would ideally be invested in enhancing capacity/infrastructure with existing local practices. We would wish to explore further in conjunction with the CCG and other stakeholders including what options are available and ensure value for money for all parties.

The local practices are in the process of assessing the options available to them due to the significant amount of houses being proposed in the area. As the GP practices are independent contractors we must work to support them to identify a solution that does not destabilise the local health economy. Options available to the practices include increasing capacity at each premise by extending their existing premises a new premise. Until all the options have been explored we are unable to give a definitive answer where the contribution will be spent however we will ensure that the solution provides the best value for money for all parties.

Finally, any such development would need to be considered and approved through the NHS England national process and would no doubt be considered more viable with section 106 contributions.

NSDC Parks and Communities – Comments received 17.06.15 As a development of 64 units this proposal should include provision for public open space in the form of amenity green space (14.4m²/dwelling) and provision for children and young people ((18m² per dwelling). The proposed site layout shows an area of open space in the courtyard totalling 1200m² which fulfils the amenity green space requirement. The layout also shows a large area of pasture; however the supporting documentation does not seem to describe any particular use for this or suggest that it will be publically accessible. The applicants thus need to demonstrate how they will deliver the requirement for 1,206m² of children's playing space.

NSDC Communities – No comments received.

NSDC Waste- Comments received 22.06.15

1. What are the road surfaces on which the refuse freighters are to travel and turn.
2. What are the properties individual refuse arrangements
3. What is anticipated for the two bin stores on the plan. Communal recycling areas are not acceptable
4. What waste management arrangements have been anticipated for the communal building
5. Any other waste management information that is available

Network Rail – Comments received 12.08.15 With reference to the protection of the railway, Network Rail is objecting to the proposals due to the increase in traffic over the railway level crossing on Old Main Road, Bulcote.

The location of the development on Old Main Road in relation to the railway will increase the risk of road traffic 'blocking back' onto Bulcote automatic half-barrier level crossing, and will also create another community that is locked in by the railway which, in turn, will result in major problems when the crossing has to be closed for maintenance purposes.

The risk of 'blocking back, i.e. road traffic becoming stationary on a level crossing for a period of no less than five seconds, is one of two significant factors governing the installation of automatic half-barrier protection at level crossings like Bulcote, the other being that there must not be a significant risk of road traffic 'grounding' on the crossing. Furthermore, Bulcote L.C. is a borderline 'high risk' crossing with a current risk score of D4 and an FWI of 0.00412121 in the All Level Crossings Risk Model following the introduction of additional passenger trains between Nottingham and Lincoln in May 2015, and whilst the risk score would remain unchanged at D4 from input of the additional forecast levels of use by cars in the two peak-hour periods, the FWI (Fatality and Weighted Injuries) score would increase to 0.001173362. This empirically demonstrates that the risk will increase.

Clearly, the scope of the development is insufficient to justify the conversion of the crossing to full-barrier protection or its replacement with a road bridge over or under the railway. However, there is scope for yellow box markings to Diagram 1045 in the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2002 to be applied over the crossing surface to mitigate the risk as stated above of road traffic 'blocking back' onto the railway, using a paint product which has now become available that reduces the amount of times that the markings have to be re-applied. Additionally, extra signage on approach to the crossing nearer to the development would also be required. We would remove our objection on confirmation that the cost of this yellow box marking and signage is met in full by the applicant.

In the event of planning permission being granted for this application, the following are requirements that must also be met,

Drainage

All surface and foul water arising from the proposed works must be collected and diverted away from Network Rail property. In the absence of detailed plans all soakaways must be located so as to discharge away from the railway infrastructure. The following points need to be addressed:

1. There should be no increase to average or peak flows of surface water run off leading towards Network Rail assets, including earthworks, bridges and culverts.
2. All surface water run off and sewage effluent should be handled in accordance with Local Council and Water Company regulations.
3. Attenuation should be included as necessary to protect the existing surface water drainage systems from any increase in average or peak loadings due to normal and extreme rainfall events.
4. Attenuation ponds, next to the railway, should be designed by a competent specialist engineer and should include adequate storm capacity and overflow arrangements such that there is no risk of flooding of the adjacent railway line during either normal or exceptional rainfall events.

It is expected that the preparation and implementation of a surface water drainage strategy addressing the above points will be conditioned as part of any approval.

Abnormal Loads

From the information supplied, it is not clear if any abnormal loads will be used in the construction of the development and therefore be accessing the site via the level crossing. We would have serious reservations if during the construction or operation of the site, abnormal loads will use routes that include Network Rail assets. Network Rail would request that the applicant contact our Asset Protection Project Manager to confirm that any proposed route is viable and to agree a strategy to protect our asset(s) from any potential damage caused by abnormal loads. I would also like to advise that where any damage, injury or delay to the rail network is caused by an abnormal load (related to the application site), the applicant or developer will incur full liability.

Noise/Soundproofing

The Developer should be aware that any development for residential use adjacent to an operational railway may result in neighbour issues arising. Consequently every endeavour should be made by the developer to provide adequate soundproofing for each dwelling. Please note that in a worst case scenario there could be trains running 24 hours a day and the soundproofing should take this into account.

Lighting

Where new lighting is to be erected adjacent to the operational railway the potential for train drivers to be dazzled must be eliminated. In addition the location and colour of lights must not give rise to the potential for confusion with the signalling arrangements on the railway. Detail of any external lighting should be provided as a condition if not already indicated on the application. Network Rail will require steps to be taken and paid for by the Developer to mask any light on the site, or to prevent dazzle to trainmen from road vehicle lights.

Access to Railway

All roads, paths or ways providing access to any part of the railway undertaker's land shall be kept open at all times during and after the development. No part of the development shall cause any existing level crossing road signs or traffic signals or the crossing itself to be obscured. Clear sighting of the crossing must be maintained for the construction/operational period and as a permanent arrangement. The same conditions apply to the rail approaches to the level crossing. This stipulation also includes the parking of vehicles, caravans, equipment, and materials etc., which again must not cause rail and road approach sight lines of the crossing to be obstructed.

Railway Maintenance

Network Rail reserves the right to provide and maintain existing railway signals/signs (whistle boards etc.) and level crossing equipment along any part of its railway. It should be noted that this has been the subject of several complaints recently where householders have said that, by stopping trains outside their houses, we are invading their privacy, and by trains whistling creating a noise nuisance.

Level Crossings

You are also obliged to consult with H.M. Railway Inspectorate at the Office of Rail Regulation on the application (in accordance with the provisions of the Town & Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 2010, SI:2010 No.2184 and Paragraph 13, Appendix B of Department of Environment Circular 9/95).

Network Rail is required to recover all reasonable costs associated with facilitating these works.

I would advise that in particular the drainage and abnormal loads should be the subject of conditions, the reasons for which can include the safety, operational needs and integrity of the railway. For the other matters we would be pleased if an informative could be attached to the decision notice.

Comments received 29.01.18 - With reference to the protection of the railway, Network Rail has no objection in principle to the development, but below are some requirements which must be met, especially with the close proximity to the development of railway level crossing.

Level Crossings

The safety of railway level crossings and crossing users is of paramount importance to us and we would have concerns over any development that may impact on the safety of an operational crossing. In this instance, access to the proposed development is over the Bulcote Level Crossing. We can confirm that we have **no objection** to the development in its revised form providing the developer reaffirms its commitment from 2015 to again meet the cost in full of the provision of yellow box markings to Diagram 1045 in the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 to the crossing surface of Bulcote automatic half-barrier level crossing to mitigate the risk of road traffic blocking back onto the railway, i.e. becoming stationary on the level crossing for at least five seconds, and the cost in full of updating the associated Level Crossing Ground Plan to highlight the yellow box markings therein.

You are also obliged to consult with H.M. Railway Inspectorate at the Office of Rail and Road on the application (in accordance with the provisions of the Town & Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 2010, SI:2010 No.2184 and Paragraph 13, Appendix B of Department of Environment Circular 9/95).

Abnormal Loads

From the information supplied, it is not clear if any abnormal loads will be using routes that include any Network Rail assets (e.g. bridges and in particular the Bulcote Level Crossing). We would have serious reservations if during the construction or operation of the site, abnormal loads will use routes that include Network Rail assets. Network Rail would request that the applicant contact our Asset Protection Project Manager to confirm that any proposed route is viable and to agree a strategy to protect our asset(s) from any potential damage caused by abnormal loads. I would also like to advise that where any damage, injury or delay to the rail network is caused by

an abnormal load (related to the application site), the applicant or developer will incur full liability.

Noise/Soundproofing

The Developer should be aware that any development for residential use adjacent to an operational railway may result in neighbour issues arising. Consequently every endeavour should be made by the developer to provide adequate soundproofing for each dwelling. Please note that in a worst case scenario there could be trains running 24 hours a day and the soundproofing should take this into account.

Access to Railway

All roads, paths or ways providing access to any part of the railway undertaker's land shall be kept open at all times during and after the development. No part of the development shall cause any existing level crossing road signs or traffic signals or the crossing itself to be obscured. Clear sighting of the crossing must be maintained for the construction/operational period and as a permanent arrangement. The same conditions apply to the rail approaches to the level crossing. This stipulation also includes the parking of vehicles, caravans, equipment, and materials etc., which again must not cause rail and road approach sight lines of the crossing to be obstructed.

Network Rail is required to recover all reasonable costs associated with facilitating these works.

I would advise that in particular the level crossings, abnormal loads and soundproofing should be the subject of conditions, the reasons for which can include the safety, operational needs and integrity of the railway. For the other matters we would be pleased if an informative could be attached to the decision notice.

I trust full cognisance will be taken in respect of these comments. If you have any further queries or require clarification of any aspects, please do not hesitate to contact myself I would also be grateful if you could inform me of the outcome of this application, forwarding a copy of the Decision Notice to me in due course.

Comments received 22.08.18 - In relation to the above application I can confirm that Network Rail have no further comments to make on the additional information supplied other than those returned in response to the original application and 17/02325/FULM attached which still apply.

Office of Road and Rail – Comments received 04.04.18 The Office of Rail and Road (ORR) has no comment on the proposals.

NSDC Access Officer – Comments received 11.06.15 It is recommended that the developer be advised to provide inclusive access and facilities for all, with particular reference to disabled people.

In respect of the new build dwellings, Lifetime Homes Standards, BS 9266:2013 'Design of accessible and adaptable general needs housing – Code of Practice' as well as Approved Document M and K of the Building Regulations – Sections 6 to 10, contain useful guidance. The requirements of a dwelling's occupants can change as a result of illness, accident such as sports injury for example, disability or ageing giving rise to reduced mobility or increasing sensory loss. In order to meet these changing requirements, homes need to be accessible to residents and visitors' alike as well as meeting residents' changing needs, both temporary and longer term. Similarly, inclusive access improves general manoeuvrability for all including access for those with push chairs and baby buggies as well as disabled people etc. It is recommended that disabled persons and

wheelchair users' access to, into and around the dwellings be carefully examined. External pathways to and around the site should be carefully considered and designed to accepted standards to ensure that they provide suitable clear unobstructed access to the proposals. Firm wide 'traffic free' non-slip pedestrian pathway routes clear of vehicular traffic are required from the edge of the site and vehicular parking to the dwellings. Consider parking provision for disabled motorists. Any formless or granular material is unsuitable for any pedestrian route to the dwellings. It is recommended that inclusive access be considered to garden areas, amenity spaces and external features. Carefully designed 'step-free' approach, ramps, level flush thresholds, generous doorways, all carefully designed to facilitate easy access and manoeuvre on all floors are important considerations. Switches and sockets should be located at suitable heights and design to assist those whose reach is limited to use the dwelling together with suitable accessible WC and sanitary provision etc.

With regard to the conversions to dwellings, it is recommended that the inclusive access provisions described above are incorporated as far as is reasonably practicable.

With regard to the community building, as well as minimum Building Regulations accessibility standards described in Approved Documents M, K and B, BS8300:2009 'Design of buildings and their approaches to meet the needs of disabled people – Code of practice' contains further useful information in this regard. Access to, into and around the proposal along with the provision of inclusive accessible features and facilities, should be carefully considered together with access from the boundary of the site and from car parking where carefully laid out provision for disabled motorists should be available. BS8300:2009 give further information in this regard including proportion of spaces, layout and design. Access to the development by pedestrians on foot will need to be carefully considered. Safe segregated 'traffic free' pedestrian pathway routes should be considered from the boundary of the site to the proposals and from car parking with dropped kerbs and tactile warnings as appropriate. Access to, into and around the proposal together with provision of suitable accessible facilities and features should be carefully considered. Easy access and manoeuvre for all, including wheelchair users, should be considered throughout together with provision of accessible toilet and sanitary facilities. The internal layout should be carefully designed to be wide enough to allow easy access by wheelchair users, turn and manoeuvre without restriction, barriers to access or obstructions. Available facilities should be accessible to all. Means of escape should be carefully considered and level or ramped egress should be considered from all external doors.

It is recommended that the developer make separate enquiry regarding Building Regulations approval requirements.

Comments received 10.01.18 and 10.08.18 - No observations beyond those previously advised.

HERITAGE COMMENTS

NSDC Conservation Comments Received 07.09.15

Preliminary

The proposal seeks to alter and convert the Grade II listed former farm complex at Bulcote Steading to residential use. The proposal also seeks to erect new residential units and a community building within the wider grounds of the farm site, identified as 'enabling development'. The site is located within Bulcote Conservation Area (CA).

Pre-application advice had been sought before this formal submission (refs PREAPP/00235/12 and

PREAPP/00170/14). Concerns and issues were raised during these pre-application discussions on specific issues, including likely difficulties in conversion and the prematurity of considering new development for enabling purposes without evidence of marketing or figures pertaining to the perceived heritage deficit.

Main issue(s)

Key issues to consider in this case:

- i) Whether the proposal preserves the listed buildings, including their setting and any architectural features they possess;
- ii) What impact the proposal has on the character and appearance of the CA;
- iii) Whether the benefits of the proposed enabling development, which otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.

Legal and Policy Considerations

Sections 16 and 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the 'Act') require the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their setting and any architectural features that they possess. In addition, section 72 of the Act requires the LPA to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the CA. In this context, the objective of preservation is to cause no harm, and is a matter of paramount concern in the planning process.

Policies CP14 and DM9 of the Council's LDF DPDs, amongst other things, seek to protect the historic environment and ensure that heritage assets are managed in a way that best sustains their significance. Key issues to consider in proposals for additions to heritage assets, including new development in conservation areas, are proportion, height, massing, bulk, use of materials, land-use, relationship with adjacent assets, alignment and treatment of setting.

The importance of considering the impact of new development on the significance of designated heritage assets, furthermore, is expressed in section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Paragraph 132 of the NPPF, for example, advises that the significance of designated heritage assets can be harmed or lost through alterations or development within their setting. Such harm or loss to significance requires clear and convincing justification. The NPPF also makes it clear that protecting and enhancing the historic environment is sustainable development (paragraph 7). LPAs should also look for opportunities to better reveal the significance of heritage assets when considering development in conservation areas (paragraph 137).

The setting of heritage assets is defined in the Glossary of the NPPF which advises that setting is the surroundings in which an asset is experienced. Paragraph 13 of the Conservation section within the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that a thorough assessment of the impact on setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset under consideration and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it.

Additional advice on considering development within the historic environment is contained within the Historic England Good Practice Advice Notes (notably GPA2 and GPA3).

In addition, in accordance with paragraph 140 of the NPPF, the LPA should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies. Historic England guidance on enabling development is contained within the 2008 publication 'Enabling Development and the Conservation of Significant Places' which remains a valid and material policy document (this policy applies only to development contrary to established planning policy, not proposals to secure the future of significant places that are in accordance with the LDF and NPPF). The policy itself now sits within the framework provided by Historic England's 'Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment' (2008), which promotes a values-based approach to assessing heritage significance. The detailed practical guidance provided in the enabling development policy document should be applied within the context provided by the Principles.

Enabling development that would secure the future of a significant place, but contravene other planning policy objectives, should be unacceptable unless:

- a) it will not materially harm the heritage values of the place or its setting;
- b) it avoids detrimental fragmentation of management of the place;
- c) it will secure the long-term future of the place and, where applicable, its continued use for a sympathetic purpose; it is necessary to resolve problems arising from the inherent needs of the place, rather than the circumstances of the present owner, or the purchase price paid;
- d) sufficient subsidy is not available from any other source;
- e) it is demonstrated that the amount of enabling development is the minimum necessary to secure the future of the place, and that its form minimises harm to other public interests;
- f) the public benefit of securing the future of the significant place through such enabling development decisively outweighs the disbenefits of breaching other public policies.

If it is decided that a scheme of enabling development meets all of these criteria, Historic England believes that planning permission should only be granted if:

- a) the impact of the development is precisely defined at the outset, normally through the granting of full, rather than outline, planning permission;
- b) the achievement of the heritage objective is securely and enforceably linked to it;
- c) the place concerned is repaired to an agreed standard, or the funds to do so are made available, as early as possible in the course of the enabling development, ideally at the outset and certainly before completion or occupation;
- d) the planning authority closely monitors implementation, if necessary acting promptly to ensure that obligations are fulfilled.

The Conversion of Traditional Farm Buildings: A guide to good practice (English Heritage 2006; <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/conversion-of-traditional-farm-buildings/>) and Traditional Windows: Their Care, Repair and Upgrading (Historic England 2015; <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/traditional-windows-care-repair-upgrading/>) also provide useful guidance relevant to this case.

Significance of the Heritage Asset(s)

The listed building identified as Bulcote Farm comprises a series of farm buildings dated 1902 laid out in a quadrangular plan (the north-west and north-east ranges are two storeys). They were

designed by the Nottingham City Engineer Arthur Brown and can be identified by the red brick structures with blue brick and cill bands with stone ashlar dressings. The roofs are covered in plain tiles with various ridge stacks. The fenestration includes metal framed windows with central opening casements and segmental headed windows. The main buildings include fire-proofed brick arched floor construction with concrete floors.

The north-east stable range has a recessed centre with 20 bays divided by pilaster strips. Every fourth bay has a tall glazing bar window with a smaller window above, and every intermediary bay has a single smaller window above. The projecting block with 3 windows to the left has large glazing bar windows with smaller windows above, and the 5 window projecting block to the right has large glazing bar windows with a central taking-in door (above) with a single smaller window to left and 2 to the right. To the south is a set of ornate iron gates with gabled iron gate piers linking to single storey office building. The office building has two tall brick chimney stacks, a metal roof ventilator and plate-glass sash windows throughout. Street front has a double and 2 single sashes. Gabled south-east facade has two pairs of sashes and a door to left gable and a large triple sash to right gable. Main courtyard front has octagonal corner bay window topped with an iron weather vane. To left a door flanked by single sashes and beyond a pair of sashes. In front of this façade is an interesting 15 ton weigh-bridge made by W & T Avery Ltd, London & Birmingham. The south-east stable range is two storey with a single dairy range to right. Stable range has 12 bays with alternating doors and windows from left, above a taking-in door and three small windows. Dairy to right has deeply overhanging roof supported on circular cast-iron columns. Seven bays, from left a glazing bar sash then a doorway, two further sashes, another double door and another two sashes beyond. Two ten bay pig sty ranges to south-west, single storey with slate roofs. Both main fronts have ten small glazing bar windows and ten roof-lights. Rear facades have ten small segment arched doorways. Gable ends have irregular roofline with single doorways, these doorways lead into corridors which serve the individual styes. These corridors have narrow gauge railway-lines for feeding trucks. Both these ranges have similar facades to the inner courtyard. North-west storage range has 20 bays with 13 large glazing bar windows which alternate irregularly with three cart entrances and a broad entrance to the inner courtyard. Beyond to right is a later 20th extension, not of special interest. To the north-west there are 2 specialist single storey buildings with large glazing bar windows with segmental heads.

Bulcote Farm is an important example of an industrial farmyard. It was constructed specifically by Nottingham City Corporation in order to assist with the dispersal of the solid waste produced by the sewage works at Stoke Bardolph. The Nottingham and Leen Valley Sewerage Board was established following the Nottingham and District Sewerage Act of 1872 in response to resolving pollution of the River Trent and River Leen from the city of Nottingham and surrounding areas. In 1877, the Board's powers passed to the Corporation of Nottingham. The Corporation leased 638 acres of land at Stoke Bardolph from Earl Manvers in 1878, and later purchased the estate. Construction of a sewage farm began under the direction of the Municipal Engineer M. Ogle Tarbotton (surveys of the land at Stoke Bardolph identified it as a suitable area with good drainage, where the sewage could be disposed of by means of spreading it on farm land and letting it seep through into the soil; the first sewage was received on 17 June 1880). The area covered by the farm increased in subsequent years and it soon extended into the neighbouring parish of Bulcote after the Corporation purchased 650 acres of land. Bulcote Farm became fully operational in 1904.

Proposals were put forward in the mid-1960s to expand the piggeries and convert the cow sheds, but this was not taken forward. Shortly after, much of the animal husbandry structures were demolished, including cow sheds, calf pens and piggeries. A new dairy farm was erected on the

other side of the road in 1987. Operations on the site have been scaled back since then, and the site effectively became redundant in 2013.

The former farmstead has group association with the farm manager's house to the south and the 6 semi-detached labourer houses known as Corporation Cottages (these structures are all Grade II listed, and were, according to the listings, also designed by Brown, 1902. Nonetheless, late-19th century maps suggest that Field House predates the model farm). The site and its buildings form an important grouping within the CA.

Demolition

Several modern 20th century buildings are proposed for demolition. These are identified on plan as D, K and H.

Open barn 2 (ref D) is very similar to the barn to the south (ref C) and is formed by a steel frame with timber cladding and fibre cement roof. The frame is probably of some age, noting that cart sheds appear to have been located in this area on the original site plans. However, the cladding materials are modern and the structure is otherwise in poor condition. On balance, the loss of this barn is not harmful to the overall special interest of the listed farmstead in this case.

The grain drying barn (ref G) is a modern portal framed construction attached to the end of the original brick built grain room range (ref K). It is clad with profiled fibre cement sheets above a low level brick plinth. The list entry clearly identifies this structure as having no special interest. Its removal is therefore acceptable.

Machinery barn (ref H) is an open sided, modern portal framed construction. Although the barn is of a similar size to an earlier Dutch barn (constructed in 1913), it is accepted that this barn is of no architectural merit.

Overall, the demolition of these three structures will cause no harm to the setting of the listed farmstead or character and appearance of the CA.

Conversion

The proposal seek to adapt and convert the historic model farm buildings identified as A, B, C, E, F, G, I, J and L. It is recognised that the conversion of the gate house (ref L) appears to involve limited alteration, and that the limited foot print of the piggery structures (refs E and F) ensures that these have limited usage beyond storage (their retention is welcomed however). These elements of the scheme do not appear to be contentious.

We have a number of concerns with the proposed conversion scheme however:

- The internal works include subdivision and alteration. The plan form of a building is frequently one of its most important characteristics and internal partitions, staircases and other features form part of the significance of the farmstead. Proposals to remove or modify internal arrangements, including the insertion of new openings and partitions, will be subject to the same considerations of impact on significance (particularly architectural interest) as for externally visible alterations. The sub-division of the larger barns, for example, which are significant in part for their open interiors, will have a considerable impact on significance. In broad terms, it is felt that the extent of internal sub-division and alteration is harmful in this

case;

- Although it is recognised that thermal efficiency and the installation of new services, both internal and external, are essential to adapt the buildings, the cumulative impact of dry-lining, plumbing, meter boxes, flues and other accretions will all have a considerable effect on the appearance and significance of the listed buildings. Whilst the impact of necessary services could be minimised by avoiding damage to decorative features and by carefully routing and finishing (including the use of materials appropriate to the relevant period, such as cast iron grilles), no details have been submitted to demonstrate how historic fabric will be treated or adapted. In this regard, it should be noted that Building Regulations do not necessarily supersede listed building control and a level of sensitivity is required. It is acknowledged that suitably worded conditions could potentially address some of these aspects. There is, however, currently insufficient detail within the application to demonstrate that the proposals represent the optimum conservation approach. These aspects also form an important element of the enabling argument (see below);
- In addition to the above, no details are provided on what measures might be proposed for flood resilient design within the building fabric (as per the flood risk assessment). Tanking methods, including alterations to floor levels and external windows and doors, could potentially be harmful to the special interest of the listed buildings. Any alterations should be clarified;
- A number of new roof lights are proposed to buildings A, B, I and K. The insertion of new elements such as doors and windows, (including roof lights to bring roof spaces into more intensive use) could adversely affect the building's significance. The use of domestic style roof lights, as is the case with buildings A, B and I, does not reflect the architectural interest of the roof scape in this case. The loss of historic roof lights on building K results in a loss of interest furthermore, and no clear and convincing justification has been made for this element of works;
- Other external alterations include new windows and doors, as well as the blocking-up of existing windows and doors. Whilst some of these alterations are not harmful on their own, there is a degree of harm to architectural interest through cumulative change. Some elements of the scheme could readily be amended to address these concerns by retaining joinery, including for example retaining upper storey loading doors (or perhaps considering half glazing them). In other circumstances, alterations should be removed from the scheme (if the alterations do not have a clear and convincing justification for example). Examples of this include blocking up historic doorways and inserting new windows and doors;
- No details are given on the conservation of architectural features such as loading pulleys or feeding stalls. These should form an essential part of the project and be detailed within a schedule of works. In many instances, it is unclear as to whether these features would be retained.

Enabling Development

In the absence of independent scrutiny of the submitted figures, please treat this advice as interim guidance only. We recognise that this process is in hand, and that further discussion will be undertaken in due course which shall likely impinge upon the advice contained within this consultation response.

I can confirm that the marketing strategy utilised in this instance was discussed with the Council prior to the submission of the applications, and that this strategy conformed with the advice given at that time. I will comment in more detail on this aspect once the independent review has been completed.

Nevertheless, it has not yet been demonstrated what the heritage deficit is (if any) and whether the proposals for new build are the minimum necessary to enable the conservation of the listed buildings at Bulcote Farm. The heritage deficit includes conservation-led renovations to the historic buildings. Since this is not detailed within the scheme, it is difficult to have confidence in the figures. For example, the figures appear to allow for extensive replacement of windows and roof coverings, whereas the optimal conservation approach would be to conserve historic fabric. This is not to say that these elements do not require substantial repair or even replacement, but no details are submitted on the individual condition of these elements which might otherwise indicate what level of conservation is applicable. It is recognised that these elements could significantly affect the figures either way. However, as advised above, I will review this on completion of the independent review of the figures.

Having reviewed the submitted plans, nonetheless, I have significant concerns with the quantum of proposed new development proposed, and the design and appearance of some of the residential blocks. Whilst it is appreciated that the original layout of the farm is referenced in parts of the proposed enabling scheme, many of the new buildings appear to dominate the site (notably the blocks to the southwest, for example).

Summary of Opinion/Recommendations

In its current form, Conservation objects to the proposed development and works to the listed buildings.

It is difficult to comment on the enabling aspect at this time until the independent scrutiny of the figures has been completed. Nevertheless, there are certain aspects of the proposals which could be addressed/clarified:

- Concerns regarding subdivision: in these circumstances, the use of pods or other design devices that allow the entirety of the space to be read might be considered;
- Schedule of works detailing the conversion works. This should ideally detail repairs, renovations and alterations on a room by room basis, with thought given to the conservation of internal architectural features. Any flood mitigation works should be included;
- Historic roof lights should be retained and reused. New roof lights removed as far as is practicable with a justification made for their installation;
- Internal and external alterations reduced as far as is practicable. Retention of historic joinery should be maximised.

Comments Received 09.08.18 – These reiterate the above comments in relation to the main issues, legal and policy considerations and the significance of the heritage assets. Additional comments are noted below:-

Decision-Making

The decision-maker should be mindful of the need to give great weight to the conservation of designated heritage assets (NPPF para. 193). This is consistent with the LPA's duty to consider the desirability of preserving listed buildings (and their setting), as well as conserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area. The Judicial Review concerning The Forge Field Society vs Sevenoaks District Council reminds us of the importance of giving considerable

weight to the requirements of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Mr Justice Lindblom reminds us: “As the Court of Appeal has made absolutely clear in its recent decision in Barnwell [Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd v East Northamptonshire District Council (2014)], the duties in sections 66 and 72 of the Listed Buildings Act do not allow a local planning authority to treat the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings and the character and appearance of conservation areas as mere material considerations to which it can simply attach such weight as it sees fit. If there was any doubt about this before the decision in Barnwell it has now been firmly dispelled. When an authority finds that a proposed development would harm the setting of a listed building or the character or appearance of a conservation area, it must give that harm considerable importance and weight. This does not mean that an authority’s assessment of likely harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area is other than a matter for its own planning judgment. It does not mean that the weight the authority should give to harm which it considers would be limited or less than substantial must be the same as the weight it might give to harm which would be substantial. But it is to recognize, as the Court of Appeal emphasized in Barnwell, that a finding of harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area gives rise to a strong presumption against planning permission being granted. The presumption is a statutory one. It is not irrebuttable. It can be outweighed by material considerations powerful enough to do so. But an authority can only properly strike the balance between harm to a heritage asset on the one hand and planning benefits on the other if it is conscious of the statutory presumption in favour of preservation and if it demonstrably applies that presumption to the proposal it is considering” (paras 48-49).

In heritage conservation, therefore, there are two key legal requirements that apply to decisions concerning listed buildings and conservation areas. Simply put, these legal objectives require special regard to the desirability of preserving these types of designated heritage asset (sections 16, 66 and 72 of the Act). The courts have said that these statutory requirements operate as a paramount consideration, ‘the first consideration for a decision maker’. Planning decisions require balanced judgement, but in that exercise, there must be a sense of the weight society, through parliament, wishes to place on an objective such as heritage asset conservation. The protection of listed buildings and conservation areas is regarded as highly important, and that should not be undervalued out of respect for both the law and democratic will.

Enabling Development

Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies. The key public benefit is usually perceived as securing the long term future of the heritage asset concerned.

The Historic England (HE) (formerly English Heritage) document ‘Enabling Development and the Conservation of Significant Places’, offers specific guidance and criteria to be used in the assessment of enabling development proposals. Paragraph 202 of the NPPF makes it clear that the benefits of an enabling development proposal should simply outweigh the disbenefits of departing from other policies unlike the HE criteria which set out the tests of ‘decisively’ outweighing disbenefits. Given the status and up-to-date nature of the NPPF, and in the absence of any specific development plan policy on this matter, paragraph 202 forms the overarching test in this case, although the HE document remains a useful advice note.

Fundamentally, although the HE guidance predates the NPPF, it still stands as HE’s position on the

concept of enabling development and sits within the framework provided by HE's 'Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment' (2008), which promotes a values-based approach to assessing heritage significance. The detailed practical guidance provided in the enabling development policy document should therefore be applied within the context provided by these principles.

The HE enabling guidance explains that a complex task of assembling the application (by the applicant), and assessing it (by the LPA) is involved. On page 5 it sets out 'The Policy' relating to enabling development. Enabling development that would secure the future of a significant place, but contravene other planning policy objectives, should be unacceptable unless:

- a) it will not materially harm the heritage values of the place or its setting;
- b) it avoids detrimental fragmentation of management of the place;
- c) it will secure the long-term future of the place and, where applicable, its continued use for a sympathetic purpose
- d) it is necessary to resolve problems arising from the inherent needs of the place, rather than the circumstances of the present owner, or the purchase price paid;
- e) sufficient subsidy is not available from any other source;
- f) it is demonstrated that the amount of enabling development is the minimum necessary to secure the future of the place, and that its form minimises harm to other public interests;
- g) the public benefit of securing the future of the significant place through such enabling development decisively outweighs the disbenefits of breaching other public policies.

HE advises that if these criteria are met, planning permission should only be granted if:

- i. the impact of the development is precisely defined at the outset, normally through the granting of full, rather than outline, planning permission;
- ii. the achievement of the heritage objective is securely and enforceably linked to it;
- iii. the place concerned is repaired to an agreed standard, or the funds to do so are made available, as early as possible in the course of the enabling development, ideally at the outset and certainly before completion or occupation;
- iv. the planning authority closely monitors implementation, if necessary acting promptly to ensure that obligations are fulfilled.

The basic proposition in enabling development is that there is a conservation deficit, where the cost of repair and conversion to beneficial use is greater than the market value on completion of those works, so that based on a financial appraisal, some subsidy is required. In short, the enabling development provides a public subsidy in the form of development that would not otherwise be permitted. The HE guidance says market testing is normally the first step in establishing the need for subsidy, and Paragraph 3.6.2 sets out the information needed to cover all financial aspects of the proposal.

Assessment of Proposal

Conservation has no objection to the proposed development.

Bulcote Farm was conceived as a quadrangle with several ranges of buildings providing housing for cows, pigs and horses as well as food storage. The majority of buildings are constructed from red brick with concrete vaulted floors, blue brick detailing, slate roofs and metal framed arched head

windows. Two ranges to the southwest and one within the main quadrangle were demolished in the 1960's (presumably due to underuse/maintenance issues) whilst several portal framed buildings were added over the years in order to adapt to modern agricultural practices. The significance of the current complex, which was designated Grade II in 2005, relates to its architectural interest and social history concerning the model farm movement in the post-medieval era. The farm complex derives significance also from its rural setting and relationship to adjacent listed buildings.

The proposal before us seeks to restore and renovate the listed buildings whilst accommodating a new residential use. The additional provision of enabling development is necessary and justified in this case. The proposal can be summarised as:

- Conversion of the historic farm buildings to form 24 dwellings;
- Enabling development comprising 48 new build dwellings to the northwest of the remaining farm buildings, between the farm and Corporation Cottages, and on the site of the modern dairy farm;
- Over 160 car spaces within the quadrangle, private driveways and parking courts;
- New community use within the former dairy building on the southeast side;
- Public open space within the quadrangle and to the north of the existing historic farm buildings.

The renovation of the historic farm buildings includes removal of modern extensions and portal elements within its setting, resulting in an enhancement to the significance of the listed buildings. The removal of the grain dryer to the end of the granary range for example, and reinstatement of matching period windows will help better reveal the significance of the main range.

There remain elements of agricultural machinery within the granary, including grinding and willowing machines. These are not fixed, and as plant, not protected by the listing in this case.

This machinery is not thought to be located in its original position, although recording will be necessary if a scheme is approved. We recognise that some of these machines might be donated to a museum, but this in itself should not be perceived as a benefit as there is no certainty as to whether such a donation would be accepted, and the removal of the machinery will result in some loss of interest to the model farm. Nevertheless, there are also a number of cast iron hand operated winches fixed to the concrete upper floors, and we are pleased to see that many of these will be retained as part of the scheme (this will need to be conditioned).

The applicant has responded positively to our original concerns regarding alterations to the listed buildings, and the scheme has been significantly revised. Nevertheless, the most significant internal intervention relates to stairways, which are currently limited in number.

The conversion scheme of the main northeast range for example requires individual staircases in each bay. However, this helps reduce internal subdivision and the external reading of the bays remains unaffected. Inevitably, the subdivision of some spaces impacts the legibility of the barns, as do alterations of some of the more specialist areas such as the stables. Overall, we feel that the applicant has struck the right balance between intervention and historic fabric retention/plan-form legibility. New internal walls have been reduced to the minimum necessary, and where intervention is required, it has a clear and convincing justification. Wherever possible, for example, living areas are open plan to maintain a sense of openness, and new walls aligned logically within

the vaulted ceilings or by the line of roof trusses.

We recognise and support the minimisation of new external openings. Exceptions to this include the southwest elevation where the modern grain store will be removed (an enhancement), and some minor alterations to plots 17 and 21. The removal of new roof lights from the scheme is welcomed.

Careful consideration has also been given to Building Regulations and services. Although it is accepted that the industrial character of the buildings generally enables some pragmatic interventions, we welcome the efforts to minimise intervention and visual accretions in prominent positions. The replacement or alteration of existing concrete ground floors for flood resilience is also considered to be acceptable, and the industrial character of the buildings will remain unaffected. Whilst these elements will require appropriately worded conditions, we feel that the indicative strategies for services and insulation are suitable in this case.

It should also be noted that the repair schedule anticipates appropriate repair and renovation as far as practicable, ensuring that good conservation values are followed. The revised annotations for conversion allow for repair and renovation of existing windows rather than replacement for example. Over 50 per cent of the roof slates are anticipated to be salvageable, furthermore. The scheme expects to retain extensive architectural elements throughout, including winches (associated with taking-in doors), pulleys, belt drive system, trap doors and external light fittings. We also welcome the retention of plank doors to be pinned back (enabling openings to be glazed). The preservation of glazed brick walls in the proposed community space is positive, as is the conservation of the narrow gauge feeding tracks and fabric of the piggery building (to become a useful ancillary element to new residential units). The applicant acknowledges that the manager's office includes extensive interest in terms of joinery, fire places and elements associated with the weighbridge. Suitable conditions will be required governing any repairs, including temporary removal for cleaning/repair.

The car parking within the courtyard will have a significant impact on the setting of the listed farm complex, although it is accepted that the existing extent of hard standing and industrial character ensures that this aspect of the proposal is not fundamentally harmful. The proposal indicates that the central area will be landscaped and used as shared amenity, ensuring that the spaciousness of the yard is sustained, thus preserving the overall stack yard setting of the main listed building range. Landscaping and surfacing will need to be carefully considered nevertheless.

Overall, we consider the conversion scheme to be well-considered and positive.

The new build 'enabling' development can be split into three distinct elements:

- The terraced elements to the southwest and northwest;
- The semi-detached infill adjacent to Corporation Cottages; and
- The detached houses to the northeast replacing the modern dairy farm.

We are convinced that the re-imagining of the demolished historic courtyard rows is acceptable. The intensity of the development in this part of the site is consistent with the historic plan-form of the model farm, furthermore, and the scale and design of the new build reflects aspects of the vernacular farm buildings previously there. The design approach is positive, although careful consideration will need to be given to the subdivision of garden plots (hedges and post and rail fences should be utilised rather than standard panel fences for example).

As for the new semi-detached houses along the roadway, it is felt that these continue the

planform of Corporation Cottages, and although the design is a modern interpretation, the general form and scale is commensurate with the significance of the model farm site and the listed former labourer cottages adjacent. The loss of the views from the road towards rural countryside between Corporation Cottages and the model farm slightly contradicts the aspirations of the adopted CA Appraisal. However, we feel that this is not profoundly harmful, noting that views will still be afforded between buildings. Moreover, there is no planned vista or material receptor in this location, the identified view being more associated with the experience of moving through the site and the sense of space between buildings. The existing hedgerow currently prevents views through this part of the site in any case. The tightknit arrangement of new dwellings proposed along Old Main Road does not preclude the ability to experience the rural setting beyond it. Indeed, early discussions on new build in this area discounted any form of tandem or back-land layouts in order to protect the plan-form and plot arrangement of Corporation Cottages, and in this context, we feel that the infill semidetached dwellings is successful.

The removal of the modern late 20th century dairy farm on the northeast side is welcomed, and will result in a significant improvement to the setting of the model farm and conservation area. The modern farm buildings comprise a significant foot print, and include extensive modern portal elements which are unattractive and obtrusive when compared to the aesthetics of the model farm. Although we accept that the new build component is ostensibly different in character to the existing farm buildings, we feel that the benefit of removing the modern dairy farm complex is a significant consideration. Moreover, the scale, form and design of the new dwellings fits in with the labourer cottage character of Corporation Cottages, and we are therefore satisfied that the development is not harmful to the setting of the listed buildings in this case. Whilst the development sits in proximity to the northeast range of the main listed farm complex, the dwellings will be set well back from the roadway and not unduly prominent.

In conclusion, having scrutinised the plans and details for the conversion and new build, we are satisfied that the proposed redevelopment of the listed buildings at Bulcote Steading and the new development within their setting sustains their overall special interest and causes no harm to the setting of Corporation Cottages or Field House. No harm is perceived to the character and appearance of the Bulcote CA furthermore. The revised plans fully address concerns raised in our previous advice regarding the conversion strategy, and overall I consider the conversion scheme to be acceptable. Change is inevitable in any conversion scheme and in this case, I consider that the revised plans reflect detailed dialogue between the applicant and the Council seeking to minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and various aspects of the proposal. Fundamentally, most of the external historic fabric of the listed buildings is retained, with opportunities taken to improve them wherever practicable.

For clarity, we are satisfied that the overall development is not harmful to the special interest or setting of any listed building, and nor is it harmful to the CA, including its setting. Whilst we accept that the quantum of development is considerable, we are content that a significant portion of the new development is located where previous important historic buildings were situated (the courtyard development), and where it does not, forms a natural continuation of existing buildings (the modest rounding off to Corporation Cottages) or replaces negative brownfield elements (the modern dairy farm).

Given that the enabling figures have been independently scrutinised, we see no reason to dispute the quantum of development. In accordance with Historic England's advice, the enabling should be the minimum necessary to resolve the heritage deficit. If the applicant is required to contribute to local infrastructure via s.106 agreement, the quantum of enabling development will inevitably

rise. I would be concerned by any further development on the site beyond that shown in the revised plans and an increase in the numbers in any part of the site is likely to tip the balance from no harm to harm. Harmful development would clearly contradict the HE guidance on enabling development.

In addition, Severn Trent sites in this District are all operational, ensuring that off-site enabling is not a realistic option either.

The applicant has set out clearly that they would be prepared to enter into a s.106 to secure all of the repairs to the listed buildings as part of a phasing agreement.

Other Matters

In accordance with the Historic England methodology for Heritage at Risk, empty and vacant listed buildings with some level of neglect or deterioration are considered to be at risk. Newark and Sherwood District has 1387 buildings, structures and monuments that are regarded to be of national significance and designated as listed buildings. Whilst the great majority are in good condition, there are a number of buildings that have fallen into disuse and disrepair. These structures are commonly referred to as 'Buildings at Risk' (BaR).

Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) has been carrying out condition surveys of vulnerable buildings since the 1980s. The County Council first published details of buildings at risk in the Historic Buildings at Risk in Nottinghamshire 2004, and have resurveyed the District within the last 5 years. Historic England also publishes a register of nationally significant designated heritage at risk, including all Grade I and II* structures. Consequently, there is no need to replicate this in the local BaR Register. The purpose of the Register is to raise awareness of the deteriorating condition of a number of listed buildings and to generate interest among the local community and potential investors. Listed buildings that are not being maintained in a reasonable condition can be subject to legal action by the Council to enforce proper repairs. In the most extreme cases, neglect may lead to compulsory purchase proceedings by the Council.

The risk level is determined by assessing the condition of a building (usually by external inspection only). Risk level is determined by condition and occupancy, with level 1, 2 and 3 being 'at risk' and 4 being 'vulnerable' or 5 'not at risk'. Extreme risk (level 1) is the worst level and is determined by severe structural failure and redundancy. At the other end of the scale, buildings and structures that are in a fair or good structural condition may still warrant regular inspection due to their vacancy or lack of maintenance, both of which can lead to longer term problems.

In Bulcote, the only listed building formally added to the Register is the gates and piers to Kingswood (based upon a condition assessment). Having discussed the model farm with NCC colleagues, they advise me that it was last surveyed in 2013. The survey results at that time advised that the overall condition was fair (except for the condition of the architectural detail which was classed as poor) but that it was part occupied and therefore classified as risk category 4 (vulnerable). The submitted condition survey of the model farm (forming part of the enabling baseline data and the historic building record/photographic record) reveals that there is masonry cracking in a number of structures, some of which is serious. I believe that this puts the building range into category 3 (at risk). Structural assessment could be used to clarify some of the

observations by Shaw and Jagger in terms of vulnerability/parlous condition of barns. However, having inspected the barns several times over the last 5/6 years, I am satisfied that the buildings are at risk in the context of the HE methodology. It is worth noting that empty and derelict listed buildings can put conservation areas at risk. At present, Newark, Ollerton and Upton are all identified as being at risk on the national Register. In all three cases, empty and decayed listed buildings are a key factor for designation.

Mothballing is only a temporary measure. Given that urgent works procedures can only agree the minimum works to make the buildings wind and watertight, including plastic roof coverings and other temporary measures, the public perception of dereliction is not necessarily addressed and underlying risk factors remain. The 2015 HE guidance on mothballing advises that an active management strategy should be used, ranging from urgent works to security measures, propping, works to reduce the risk of arson, control of vegetation and finding temporary uses. On a site of the size and complexity of Bulcote model farm, many of these issues present cost burdens and practical difficulties. Kelham Island in Sheffield is an example of a conservation area at risk with many historic buildings mothballed for some time before eventually being redeveloped. The former Green Lane Works is a good exemplar of this, and it took support from Historic England in resolve.

In this case, the applicant has indicated the considerable heritage deficit inherent to the site, along with perceived repair costs. It is anticipated, for example, that the cost of essential repairs to the roofs (including rainwater run-off), masonry, windows, floors and asbestos removal is likely to require investment of £1.6 million. The applicant has actively explored other funding sources to address the heritage deficit, and I have no reason in this case to dispute their conclusion that funding from alternate sources is unlikely.

In this context, we feel that the proposal before us represents the optimum viable use of the site with acceptable new development surrounding it which is the minimum necessary to address the heritage deficit.

Summary of Opinion

No objection. In accordance with paragraph 202 of the NPPF, we believe that the case for enabling development has been made and justifies departing from planning policies which would otherwise conflict in this case. The proposal will preserve the special interest of Bulcote Steading and the character and appearance of Bulcote CA. No harm will be caused to the setting of Corporation Cottages or Field Farm, both Grade II listed buildings. The proposed development and works therefore accord with section 16, 66 and 72 of the Act. The proposal also complies with heritage advice contained within the Council's LDF DPDs and section 16 of the NPPF.

Conditions

If the scheme was approved, the following matters will need to be conditioned on the listed building application in conjunction with standard model conditions:

No works of demolition shall begin until a binding contract has been entered into for the carrying out of works for redevelopment of the site in accordance with all the necessary permissions and consents.

Reason: To ensure that the development will proceed in accordance with para.198 of the NPPF.

Before work begins a site meeting shall be held between the local planning authority and the persons responsible for undertaking the works to ensure that the Conditions attached to the Listed Building Consent are understood and can be complied with in full. Notification of the date and time of a meeting shall be made in writing to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: This condition is to ensure that follow-up action can be taken before works begin on site. This is a complex scheme where there will be a number of other conditions, and where planning permission has also been granted.

Before work begins it shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority the appropriately qualified professional specialising in conservation work who will supervise the hereby approved works of alteration or demolition. Any proposed changes to the agreed supervision arrangements shall be subject to the prior written agreement of the LPA.

Reason: To ensure that the works respect the special interest of the listed buildings.

Before the commencement of works, an updated schedule of works, including structural engineering drawings and method statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include:

- a method statement for ensuring the safety and stability of the building fabric identified to be retained throughout the phases of demolition and renovation;
- the arrangements for temporary secure storage of salvage materials and architectural features to be repaired off-site; the person or body specialising in this procedure appointed by the applicant; and a timetable for their reinstatement, re-use or disposal;
- a detailed methodology for the repair and renovation of the building fabric to be retained; and
- an updated methodology for all service and utility interventions, thermal upgrading and flood resilience improvements to concrete floors.

Particular regard should be given to the following items: chimney-pieces; cast guttering and hopper-heads; windows containing historic window glass; historic light fittings; hoist winches; loft hatches; glazed brick faience; architectural elements associated with the weighbridge; metal-work; vaulted ceilings; historic timber beams, joists and rafters.

No such features shall be disturbed or removed temporarily or permanently except as indicated on the approved drawings or without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. Where appropriate, sound materials/features/fixtures forming part of the building shall be carefully taken down, protected and securely stored for later re-use. The agreed measures shall be carried out in full.

Reason: to ensure that the works take the form envisaged by the Local Planning Authority and that they respect the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

During the works, if hidden historic features are revealed they should be retained insitu unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Works shall otherwise be halted in the relevant area of the building and the Local Planning Authority should be notified immediately. Failure to do so may result in unauthorized works being carried out and an offence being committed.

Reason: To ensure that the works respect the special interest of the listed buildings.

A programme of historic building recording and full recording report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before work commences.

Reason: To ensure and safeguard the recording and inspection of matters of archaeological/historical importance associated with the building.

In addition, conditions will need to address all aspects of the new build (joinery schedule, masonry construction, chimneys, eaves/verges and facing materials). All external accretions, including rainwater goods, vents and other elements will need to be agreed. Particular attention will need to be paid to masonry construction (sample panel should be agreed showing bricks, mortar specification, pointing finish and brick bond). Joinery and chimneys should be retained, and thought given to appropriate restriction of permitted development (notably to roofs and potential visual domestic clutter within the setting of the listed buildings).

Informative notes shall include:

This Listed Building Consent is granted in strict accordance with the approved plans. It should however be noted that: a) Any variation from the approved plans following commencement of the development, irrespective of the degree of variation, will constitute unauthorized development and may be liable for enforcement action. b) You or your agent or any other person responsible for implementing this permission should inform the Local Planning Authority immediately of any proposed variation from the approved plans and ask to be advised as to the best method to resolve the matter.

The applicant is advised that the proposed development will require approval under the Building Regulations. Any amendments to the hereby permitted scheme that may be necessary to comply with the Building Regulations must also be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in order that any planning implications arising from those amendments may be properly considered.

All new works unless specified on the approved plans and works of making good, whether internal or external, should be finished to match the adjacent work with regard to the methods used and to material, colour, texture and profile.

Historic England – 15.06.15 - Bulcote Corporation Model Farm is a Grade II listed building of special architectural and historic interest in a national context. Designed by the Nottingham City Engineer Arthur Brown it is considered to be an important example of an industrial farmyard, constructed by Nottingham City Corporation to assist with the dispersal of the solid waste produced by the sewage works at Stoke Bardolph. Historic England (formally English Heritage) previously provided the applicant with pre application advice on the 17th October 2013 – a copy of which was sent to your authority. Though we were (and remain) supportive of finding new sustainable uses for the model farm we did not consider principle of residential use was proven to be the most viable use compatible with the conservation of the heritage asset. At that time we felt it was premature to discuss the details of different options and recommend an adequate period of marketing be required to explore options for future uses. No further pre application advice was requested.

Our advice is given in line with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the NPPF the Planning Practice Guidance and the Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning - notes 1-3. *The Conversion of Traditional Farm Buildings: a Guide to good practice* (English Heritage 2006). This is complimented by our recent guidance on Energy Efficiency and Historic Buildings (English Heritage 2013) both available to download via [helm.org.uk](http://www.helm.org.uk) <<http://www.helm.org.uk> which provides detailed technical advice on improving thermal performance of historic buildings - a subject which will generally be integral to a proposed change of use.

Additional Comments received 25.01.18 - Thank you for your letter of 8 January 2018 regarding the above application for planning permission. On the basis of the information available to date, we offer the following advice to assist your authority in determining the application.

It will be for your authority to determine whether this is an enabling development case to repair and bring back into use the vacant farmstead - with uses that are compatible with its special interest. We are unable to assess the arguments on viability and therefore advise your authority to obtain sufficient information and satisfy yourselves that the scheme is sustainable, safeguarding the significance of the designated heritage assets; and to balance all planning considerations in determining this application.

Significance

Bulcote Farm was listed Grade II in 2005 in recognition of its national significance as an example of a late model farm designed in 1902 by Arthur Brown specifically for Nottingham City Corporation to assist with the dispersal of the solid waste produced by the sewage works at Stoke Bardolph. The buildings are constructed of red brick laid with Flemish bond with blue engineering stretcher bond brick bands and some stone dressings with concrete cills. The farm is located within the Bulcote conservation area and forms part of a wider group of related structures (some independently listed) and including a farm manager's house to the SW and row of cottages to the NW.

Nationally it is a rare and important example of an industrial farmyard based around a quadrangle with ranges of buildings providing housing for livestock as well as food storage. It's historical and communal value lies in the development of sanitary provision in British cities as well as the development and use of model farms. Technically the farm was highly mechanised in its production with feed crops stored and processed on site or consumption by the livestock. The architectural and technical value is clearly expressed through the surviving farm layout, design and fixtures, which followed modern thinking at that time.

Impact of Proposals on Significance

As previously advised, in our national experience, the conversion of traditional farm buildings to residential use does result in a change in character and, if not carefully considered, this change can be harmful. Here the proposals submitted require significant alteration to the Grade II listed buildings through the proposed conversion to accommodate the number of units and residential / change of use requirements. With the benefit of continuing advice from your conservation officer, Oliver Scott, we note that some changes and improvements have been made to the internal layouts working within the historic structural components. We remain surprised that limited information is provided which we do not consider proportionate to fully explain the proposed internal changes and to assess the impact within the heritage statement.

Notwithstanding this, the extent of subdivision will undoubtedly result in the loss of both the historic plan form and fabric - this loss will harm the historic, architectural, aesthetic and communal value of the farm. Externally proposals include glazing door openings and fixing the doors back, new openings and areas of blocking up. If minded to approve we would strongly recommend that robust conditions are imposed to cover all areas of internal and external works to the listed buildings to meet good conservation practice.

Combined with the proposed conversion, the new build which has increased within the setting of Bulcote model farm, within the conservation area, will fundamentally change the agricultural

character of the farmstead through domestication and intensity of use. As previously advised, whilst there may be scope for some sensitive development on the footprint of the demolished south western ranges, the design of the proposed terrace lengths for example, with front, rear gardens, separate curtilages and driveways and the additions which accompany residential use, through domestication, will harm the appreciation and understanding of the significance of the model farm, which in part is derived from its agricultural setting and direct, uninterrupted relationship with the rural landscape. We are supportive however of the removal of the proposed units within the quadrangle and recommend this is sensitively landscaped to retain the open character and unity of the farmstead.

Policy and Historic England Position

As the applications affect a listed building and a conservation area, the statutory requirements to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building, its setting and any features of special interest (s.16, s.66, 1990 Act) and to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area (s.72, 1990 Act) must be taken into account by the authority when determining the application.

The NPPF is clear that great weight should be given to the objective of conserving designated heritage assets. (Paragraph 132) All harm, including that arising from development within the setting of a designated heritage asset, requires 'clear and convincing justification'. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II building should be exceptional.

The applications refer to enabling development in the form of the change of use to residential and the additional new build on the site and within the farm's setting. It is for your authority to determine whether the proposed use is contrary to policy and whether there is a case for enabling development. On the basis of the submission, we believe this proposal is harmful to the significance of the designated heritage asset. We understand your authority commissioned Jones Lang LaSelle to undertake an independent assessment of the financial information submitted. We were not party to this information. From the submission online, we do not know if there is a conservation deficit or that the proposed works will facilitate (or enable) benefits that outweigh harm. There is no evidence submitted to prove the proposed alterations and new build are the minimum necessary. We refer you to further guidance Enabling Development and the Conservation of Significant Places. This Guidance still stands as Historic England's position on Enabling Development. (references to PS56 Policy HE11 is replaced with paragraph 140 of the NPPF). It is for your authority to ensure you have sufficient information and to satisfy yourself on the viability arguments put forward and whether the scheme presented meets the tests within the NPPF.

Historic England has **concerns** regarding the application on heritage grounds.

We consider that the issues and safeguards outlined in our advice need to be addressed in order for the application to meet the requirements of paragraphs 128-134, 137 and 140 of the NPPF.

In determining this application you should bear in mind the statutory duty of sections 16 (2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. We refer to section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

Your authority should take these representations into account and seek amendments, safeguards or further information as set out in our advice. If there are any material changes to the proposals, or you would like further advice, please contact us.

Additional comments received 14.08.18 - The advice given in this letter responds to revised information for listed building application 15/00785/LBC and planning application 15/0784/FULM for the conversion of the Grade II listed farmstead and associated residential development comprising a total of 64 residential units and community building; and the new planning application 17/02325/FULM for 16 residential units. Historic England (formally English Heritage) provided the applicant with pre application advice on 17 October 2013 - a copy of which was sent to your authority. We also provided advice in relation to these applications in our letters of 15 June 2015 and most recently in our letters of 27th January 2018 which still remain relevant. It will be for your authority to determine whether this is an enabling development case to repair and bring back into use the vacant farmstead - with uses that are compatible with its special interest.

We have been consulted in relation to the additional information provided within the Enabling Development Executive Summary Report dated July 2018. The applications refer to enabling development in the form of the change of use to residential and the additional new build on the site and within the farm's setting. As previously advised it is for your authority to determine whether the proposed use is contrary to policy and whether there is a case for enabling development. On the basis of the submission, we remain of the view this proposal is harmful to the significance of the designated heritage asset. We understand your authority commissioned Jones Lang LaSelle to undertake an independent assessment of the financial information submitted. We were not party to this information. Whilst the additional information provided indicates a conservation deficit, no detailed figures have been provided. Your authority would need to be satisfied that the financial information provided is robust and the proposed alterations and new build are the minimum necessary. We refer you to further guidance Enabling Development and the Conservation of Significant Places. This Guidance still stands as Historic England's position on Enabling Development. (references to PS56 Policy HE11 is replaced with paragraph 202 of the NPPF). It is for your authority to ensure you have sufficient information and to satisfy yourself on the viability arguments put forward and whether the scheme presented meets the tests within the NPPF.

Recommendation

Historic England has concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds as outlined in our previous letters of 27th January 2018. We consider that the issues and safeguards outlined in our advice need to be addressed in order for the application to meet the requirements of paragraphs 189-196, 200 and 202 of the NPPF.

In determining this application you should bear in mind the statutory duty of sections 16 (2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. We refer to section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

Your authority should take these representations into account and seek amendments, safeguards or further information as set out in our advice. If there are any material changes to the proposals,

or you would like further advice, please contact us.

Comment received 18.10.18 - Thank you for your letter of 24 September 2018 regarding further information on the above application for planning permission. On the basis of this information, we offer the following advice to assist your authority in determining the application.

Historic England Advice

We have previously provided advice on this application on 14 August 2018 and 27 January 2018 which remains relevant. We have been consulted in relation to the additional information provided within the 'Summary of Conservation Deficit'. As previously advised it is for your authority to determine whether there is a case for enabling development. We remain of the view this proposal is harmful to the significance of the designated heritage asset. It is for your authority to ensure you have sufficient information and to satisfy yourself on the viability arguments put forward and whether the scheme presented meets the tests within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation

Historic England has concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds. Your authority should take these representations into account in determining the application. If there are any material changes to the proposals, or you would like further advice, please contact us. Please advise us of the decision in due course.

Nottinghamshire Building Preservation Trust – 12.06.15 The Nottinghamshire Building Preservation Trust is concerned that the application for the conversion to residential use of the former farm buildings with the extensive 'enabling works' will place unacceptable pressures on the highway and community structure of Bulcote.

Whilst it is desirable to find a sustainable use for the listed buildings the Trust is of the opinion that blocks 17, 18, 19 & 20 are uncharacteristic of the site and could be omitted.

The re-siting of the other blocks would allow reduce the extent of road infrastructure and that this and the retention of only a sample of the pig sty blocks would reduce the amount of obtrusive car parking in the former crew yard.

The Trust therefore requests that the application be refused and a less intensive solution be requested.

Victorian Society – 22.07.15 - This case has been discussed by the Society's Northern Buildings Committee at its recent meeting, and I write not to object to the applications for the adaptation and conversion of the listed farm buildings, as well as the construction of a large expanse of enabling development on the wider historic site.

We have read the comments of Ellis Scott of Historic England, in his letter of 15 June. The Society is fully supportive of the concerns and objections it raises to the proposed scheme. Converting the listed former agricultural buildings to residential use would compromise and harm their impressively well-preserved character and appearance. It would also entail the disposal of a number of interesting pieces of historic machinery, the removal of which would be detrimental to the interest of the complex.

We also echo Historic England's objection to the enabling development proposed to the west of the main group of farm buildings. The scale and number of the new buildings, and the somewhat

suburban idiom adopted, allied to their poor detailing, would be detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings. Moreover, we remain unconvinced that the application provides the information necessary to establish the principle of enabling development. In light of the above we urge you to refuse this ill-justified application consent. I would be grateful if you could inform me of your decision in due course.

AMS – No comments received

CBA – No comments received

SPAB – No comments received

20th Century Society – No comments received