

SUTTON POYNTZ NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP

RECORD OF SUB-GROUP MEETING

Topic sub-group	<u>Heritage</u>
Dates of Meeting	<u>10/01/2019</u>
Time of meeting from	<u>4.15 p.m to 5:40 p.m.</u>
Location of Meeting	<u>Bellamy Cottage</u>
Present:	<u>Bill Egerton, Caroline Crisp, Jill Kelsey</u>

Key Discussion Points

This meeting had been called to draft responses to the Heritage-related representations made by villagers and others during the “Regulation 14” consultation in December 2018. A list of these representations, sorted by topic, had been circulated by BE, along with draft responses to some of the representations.

The meeting first noted with thanks the enthusiastic representation from David Stuart of Historic England, which quoted Policies HE1 and HE2, among others, as “*clear and positive examples of how such an exercise can ensure the protection and enhancement of the historic environment and guide future change to that end*”.

The meeting then went through the representations one by one, reaching the following conclusions:

- No 17, Policy HE1 – The Policy as presently drafted applies to all development “on previously undeveloped land”. Nick Cardnell questions why the Policy is only to be applied to brownfield sites and not to greenfield development (although presumably he meant this to read the other way round). The Subgroup concluded that it would really intend the Policy to apply to any application that opens fresh ground. BE will seek advice from Nick Cardnell on wording for the Policy to achieve this. **Action BE.**
- No 17, Policy HE2 – It is not possible for a Policy to action the Local Authority to create a Local List. Advice had been sought from David Stuart, which had confirmed that this is so, and also observed that this is a common problem in Neighbourhood Planning, with some Neighbourhoods creating lists with other names and some lesser degree of protection. The Subgroup concluded that the action currently written as a Policy should be moved to Section 5 (Community Aspirations), along with most of the accompanying text, but that some descriptive text should remain in Section 4 referring forward to the Community Action.

There was discussion on the idea of including a Policy for protecting a temporary “List of Heritage Assets of Local Value” that would include only those buildings whose owners agreed. The idea was rejected on the basis that we had been careful to ensure that potential assets were only excluded on the basis of evidence, not simply because a householder requested its exclusion. This ‘evidence-led’ approach was important and should not be abandoned now. In addition it would raise the question of what to do in the future if a householder decided they wanted to withdraw their agreement.

- No 8, Section 4.4 Heritage – Noted with thanks.
- No 12, HE2 – This representation seeks to strengthen the Policy by publishing the list in the Neighbourhood Plan “for ratification by the Local Authority”. As confirmed by Historic England, it is not possible to action the Local Authority in this way. However the Subgroup agreed to recommend to the Steering Group that the draft list should be published, with the map, as an Annex in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Action BE.

- No 14, HE2 Locally important heritage assets – The first request in this representation was for a change in the wording of Policy HE2. As the Policy is being deleted, the request becomes irrelevant.
- No 14, HE2 Locally important heritage assets – The second part refers to some wording about Silver Street in the text accompanying the Policy. It was agreed that the words were unnecessary and would be deleted in moving this part of the document to Section 5 (Community Aspirations).
- No 14, HE2 Locally important heritage assets – The third comment by these respondents asked that the Neighbourhood Plan should note that there had not been an opportunity for householders to object. The Subgroup concluded that it is not our job to teach the Local Authority to do their job; when and if they create a formal Local List it will be up to them to do it properly, in accordance with law and regulations pertaining at that time. The status of the Report is already abundantly clear.
- No 31, Policy HE2 – This representation observes that the list had “not been well received by many”, and that the draft list was disproportionate in size. The draft responses tabled before the meeting was approved.
- No 5, Section 4.4 – This said that the selection process was ill-advised. The draft response was approved.
- No 6, Page 24 – This queried the selection criteria used by the Heritage Consultant. The draft response was approved.
- No 36 (Springhead Hotel) and No 37 (Punch Taverns) – These representations sought (it is thought) exclusion of the Springhead from the draft Heritage List. It was agreed that careful responses to all of the points in these representations should be drafted, and that the

response should seek also to show the benefits of being on the list. Once the response is agreed, a visit should be arranged to the Springhead to discuss the matter with Jo and Karen. **Action BE.**

- No 8, Section 5.4 – Noted with thanks.
- No 14, Section 1.6 – The content of this will probably already be dealt with in the Consultation Report. The Subgroup did not think changes to the Neighbourhood Plan document were necessary. However it was agreed to discuss this with Peter Dye. **Action BE.**
- No 30 – This provided considerable new information on Puddledock Cottages. However it is not now possible to refer this information back to the Consultant to see whether it would have led to changes in the Report. The draft response was approved.

The response document will now be completed, and re-circulated to the Subgroup members, in time for it to be approved by the Subgroup and submitted to the Steering Group Secretary by Thursday 17th January. **Action BE.**