APPENDIX A – Detailed Summary of Consultation Responses and GBC Response

Overview

Representations were received from the following six parties (questions responded to in brackets).

- Resident 1 (Question 2)
- Sport England (Question 2)
- Papplewick Parish Council (Question 2)
- Resident 2 (Question 2 and Question 3)
- Natural England (No comments)
- The Office of Rail and Road (No comments)

Question 1a

Do you agree with the proposals to extend the Papplewick Conservation Area boundaries to include West of Hall Lane (Area B)?

No comments received related to Question 1a.

Question 1b

Do you agree with the proposals to extend the Papplewick Conservation Area boundaries to include Papplewick Hall Park and Garden (Area C)?

No comments received related to Question 1b.

Question 2

Do you have any comments on the wording of the Papplewick Conservation Area Appraisal (Part 1 of the document)?

Doc Ref.	Comment	GBC Response
Para 2.2	Papplewick Parish Council – Papplewick does not lie on a belt of magnesium limestone (Cadeby Formation). The ML outcrop only extends eastwards to the river Leen. Most of the parish is underlain by marls of the Edlington Formation and Bunter (Sherwood) Sandstone. Main Street lies on a ridge of quaternary sediment which falls away to the west, east and south.	Agree – text amended accordingly.
	There are two different cottages that have been used as post offices, now converted to residential use, not one.	Agree – text amended accordingly.
Para 3.1	Papplewick Parish Council – " The larger settlements of Linby and Hucknall" - Linby should not be included in the sentence as it is not a large settlement.	Noted. Linby is described as larger in the context of being compared to Papplewick. No change required.
	Advise that GBC should define the location of Blidworth Waye. The Blidworth Waye sign is at Top Farm, and therefore Blidworth Waye starts here. The sign for Main Street is on the south side of Hall Lane, and anything south of Top Farm should be referred to as Main Street.	Agree – text amended accordingly.
Para 3.2	Papplewick Parish Council – The Nottingham to Mansfield Turnpike road (now A60) opened in 1787.	Agree – text amended accordingly.

	Papplewick lay on the main Nottingham to Mansfield post road	Agree – text amended accordingly.
Photo 11	Papplewick Parish Council – Refers to unlisted Ward Cottage off Blidworth Waye. This is Main Street.	Agree – text amended accordingly.
Para 4.3	Resident 2 – Support the importance of rural landscape.	Noted.
Para 5.3	Papplewick Parish Council – Linby quarries are not northeast of the village, they are northwest	Agree – text amended accordingly.
	Evidence suggests that most of the houses were rebuilt after the mills closed (in 1850s) with stone recovered from the mills (and not from stone taken from the quarries).	Agree – text amended accordingly.
Para 5.4	Papplewick Parish Council – " not until 1760" This should read 1787	Agree – text amended accordingly.
	Not "Oakham – Richmond turnpike", it should read "Nottingham – Mansfield turnpike".	Agree – text amended accordingly.
Para. 6.3	Resident 2 – Support archaeological assessment/investigation undertaken prior to development.	Noted.
Para 12.3	Resident 2 – Do not agree that the developer of this site preserved the character by virtue of the unsuccessful elements and lack of planning conditional control 'during' development. We would point out that the garage block (which was formerly	Noted. Planning permission was granted for this development in 2003. Gedling Borough Council is required to consult adjoining neighbours and the Parish Council on applications within the parish and will continue to do so. Paragraph 12.3 notes that

	the village Smithy) was always rendered. The development could have been better designed if there had been more consultation between the developer, Parish and Borough Councils and residents, particularly as this was one of the most prominent sites within the village.	rendering is not a common finishing material within the Conservation Area. No change required.
	The fencing used as a garden boundary now restricts pedestrian view of oncoming traffic approaching the crossroad. Vehicles approach a left hand turn faster than prior to the development. From day one of this development it was obvious that in the future this boundary would be a problem, which is the case and such boundary treatment should be avoided especially in the centre of a conservation village.	Noted. Paragraph 12.3 identifies the timber garden fencing as an untypical boundary treatment and states development layouts with rear gardens to the main road should be avoided in the future. No change required.
Para 12.3	Papplewick Parish Council – The garage block on the Linby Lane frontage of Blacksmiths Court has been finished in render, because it is the original forge, and the developers were obliged to renovate it in this way - see the Heritage Appraisal on the Papplewick website for photograph and further details	Noted. Paragraph 12.3 notes that rendering is not a common finishing material within the Conservation Area. No change required.
Para 13.15 & 13.16	Resident 2 – Support	Noted.
Appendix 2	Papplewick Parish Council – Heritage buildings – have omitted the barn and farm buildings at West View Court which are buildings of local interest. West View Court Barn has rare example of a reducing	Appendix 2 identifies buildings listed in the emerging Local Planning Document (LPD) or in the Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Register (HER) and is not intended to be a complete list. Appendix 2

	slate roof in Swithland slate.	notes that (i) any buildings not included on this list, but which meet the criteria set out in Historic England guidance on Local Heritage Listing Advice Note 7 may also be considered to be of local significance; and (ii) the emerging Papplewick Neighbourhood Plan also intends to include a policy that identifies buildings of local interest. Policy 31 of the emerging LPD relates to Locally Important Heritage Assets and refers to the preparation of a list of assets to be undertaken following adoption of the LPD. No change required.
Мар	Resident 1 – The southern boundary of St James' churchyard shown on the maps of the proposed conservation area is incorrect. The churchyard was extended southwards, with planning permission and the extension was consecrated in 2015. Alterations to the conservation area should probably reflect this boundary change.	Planning permission was granted to extend the St James' churchyard in 2011. The southern extension is not included within the amended Conservation Area boundary. It is not considered to be necessary to amend the Conservation Area boundary to reflect the extended churchyard as the purpose of the boundary is to preserve and enhance areas identified as being of heritage value rather than demarcate land use. No change required.
Мар	Sport England – It is noted that the proposal is to extend the conservation area boundary to include the cricket pitch of Papplewick and Linby Cricket club. It is noted that a key view is from the cricket ground to St. James' Church is already recognised. Sport England would not wish to raise an objection to the extension of the conservation area, but the inclusion of the cricket ground within the proposed conservation area should not prevent appropriate	Given that the cricket ground is an established land use it is unlikely that appropriate proposals to enable the use as a cricket ground would be viewed unfavourably. The cricket ground currently falls within a Registered Park and Garden as such heritage credentials are already a planning consideration. Conservation Area designation means there would be a duty to 'preserve and enhance' (which is not a requirement for a Registered Park and Garden); that all trees would be protected (even those without a Tree Preservation Order); and any demolition may need

	development within the cricket ground (recognising the important views) which supports the sustainability of cricket at the site and which benefits the development and growth of cricket at the site.	planning permission. In addition, national Green Belt policy specifically considers appropriate provisions for outdoor sport to be appropriate for the Green Belt, which would be another consideration against which future proposals would be determined. No change required.
Мар	Papplewick Parish Council — Some areas surrounding the village have been excluded from the Conservation Area because they are within the Green Belt, but other areas around the Hall for example which are also in the Green Belt have been included. The Hall grounds are listed Park and Garden, even though this extends into Linby Parish.	Conservation areas are defined by their special architectural and or historic interest. It is not the purpose of conservation areas to include land solely for protection and where other policies come in to play they should be sufficient to control development. A park and garden is a specific designed landscape that relates to the hall and has special interest because of this. Open Fields do not have this special interest in this case. No change required.
Мар	Papplewick Parish Council – Castle Mill has been excluded owing to the distance from the village centre. Although Castle Mill is within Linby Parish, it is not within Linby's conservation area and we feel that it should be brought into Papplewick's Conservation Area by association. Logically, the built heritage of Moor Pond Woods should also be included in the conservation area. These are not afforded any other protection and they provide context and the setting to the village centre.	Castle Mill is a Grade II Listed building and has sufficient protection under existing planning policies from harmful development. The building is located at distance from the conservation area and the areas in between do not warrant inclusion. Also existing Green Belt policies will provide sufficient protection for this area. No change required .
Мар	Papplewick Parish Council – Linby Lane has views of St James' Church. We feel that the area bordered	The land does not have special architectural or historic interest in its own right and therefore should not be included. Views of St James Church are across open

	by Moor Pond Woods, Linby Lane and Main street should also be included in the Conservation Area in order to preserve the view of St James' Church	fields where other policies exist to prevent development. No change required.
Мар	Papplewick Parish Council – St James' Church – The boundary for the churchyard used in the Proposed Conservation Area is incorrect: It does not include the extension to the churchyard which was granted planning permission in 2011.	Planning permission was granted to extend the St James' churchyard in 2011. The southern extension is not included within the amended Conservation Area boundary. It is not considered to be necessary to amend the Conservation Area boundary to reflect the extended churchyard as the purpose of the boundary is to preserve and enhance areas identified as being of heritage value rather than demarcate land use. No change required.
Мар	Papplewick Parish Council – Papplewick Hall Grounds have been included but there is no mention of the 'Model Dairy' which is also a site of interest dating from the 1920s.	Noted.
Мар	Papplewick Parish Council – There are a number of unreferenced historical and environmental observations in the report (several of which are inaccurate). We feel that there should be a bibliography to support the text.	It is not considered that a bibliography is necessary. This appraisal refreshes a previously drafted version prepared by another party, so references are not available in each instance. Much of the information included in the appraisal is a statement of fact arising from visual observations made within the Conservation Area. The approach taken reflects that for other Conservation Area Appraisals adopted in Gedling Borough. No change required.

Question 3

Do you have any comments on the wording of the Papplewick Management Plan (Part 2 of the document)?

Doc Ref.	Comment	GBC Response
Paras. 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.9, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.9, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 9.1, 13.1 & 13.2.	Resident 2 — Support	Noted.
Para 3.3	Resident 2 – Support the protection of the linear frontage development.	Noted.
Para 3.7	Resident 2 – Support the use of appropriate doors and windows within the conservation area. However, as residents of a Listed Cottage we feel that in today's society when homes are expected to be more energy efficient consideration should be given to residents being allowed to replace inefficient Yorkshire sliding windows. With today's modern techniques it is possible to have these windows made in wood with double glazing (including thin glazing bars) which would not detract from the cottages as much as having secondary plastic double glazing which is noticeable.	In such cases replacement windows would need Listed Building Consent where they are different to the existing or original windows are being replaced. Double glazing is not supported in Listed Buildings as other methods of thermal insulation including secondary glazing are more appropriate as they do not impact upon the original window. Double glazing is a modern invention which if utilised would undermine the historic integrity of a Listed Building and would cause harm to architectural and historic character. All proposals will be considered on their merits. Proprietors are advised to contact the Council's Development Management team prior to carrying out works. No change required.

Para 3.8	Resident 2 – Support the avoidance of dormer windows within the conservation area but a precedent has already been set with installation of a large dormer window on the side roof at 60 Main Street within the last 12 months.	Generally, the purpose of avoiding dormer windows would be to preserve the traditional character and appearance of the Conservation Area where such additions are rarely seen. Proposals to install dormer windows will be considered on their merits. Proprietors are advised to contact the Council's Development Management team prior to carrying out works. No change required.
Para 5.1	Resident 2 — Lack of planning control and consistency already experienced with regard to alarm boxes.	Where the installation of solar panels, satellite dishes and alarm boxes (on a Listed Building or within a Conservation Area) requires planning permission, proposals will be considered on their merits. Proprietors are advised to contact the Council's Development Management team prior to carrying out works. No change required.
Para 8.1	Resident 2 – Stone walling has been removed to allow off road parking to some of the properties on Main Street. It is essential for off road parking to be available due to the narrowness of Main Street in certain sections.	In cases where it is proposed to remove boundary walls to provide for off-road parking, a balanced judgement will be required that takes in to consideration the preservation and enhancement of the Conservation Area, the level of harm that may be caused to character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the possible wider public benefits of proposals. Proposals will be considered on their merits. Proprietors are advised to contact the Council's Development Management team prior to carrying out works. No change required.
Para 8.2	Resident 2 – If there is insufficient space for gate piers a return on the wall should be allowed, which is something that has already been incorporated in	Relevant planning applications will be considered on their merits. No change required.

	creating vehicular access.	
Para 10.1	Resident 2 – Support. However, when new residents move into the village they are very often unaware of such regulations and they should be made aware of planning regulations affecting a property within the conservation area. In the past a booklet was produced detailing listed buildings and planning regulations. This would be useful to residents of all property owners within the conservation area.	
Para 12.1	Resident 2 – Support the importance of key unlisted buildings and any impact on them should be assessed with any development.	Noted.