

APPENDIX 3 – Detailed Summary of Consultation Responses and GBC Response

Overview

Question 1: Do you agree with, or have any comments on, the proposed amendments to the boundaries of the Bestwood Village Conservation Area (Map 11, Page 46)?

Document Reference	Comment	GBC Response (action in bold)
Boundary Amendment Area E – Land Bounded by Moor Road, School Walk, Church Road and the Village Hall and Bowling Green.	Disagree with the removal of Area E from the Conservation Area for the following reasons:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area is a key feature of the village, well maintained, and provides a green, social and active space for residents. 	It is not proposed to remove the bowling green nor the Village Hall from the Conservation Area. The area to be removed from the Conservation Area comprises four modern dwellings, a modern community centre building, and associated derelict land that is unkempt that detracts from the significance of the overall Conservation Area. Whilst the land will no longer be within the Conservation Area, it will remain important to the setting of the Conservation Area. No changes required.
Boundary Amendment Area D – Bestwood Village Sports Ground	Agree with the proposal to include Area D within the Conservation Area, which is a key feature of the village, well maintained, and provides a green and active space for residents. Another respondent agreed with the inclusion of area D.	Noted. No changes required.
Boundary Amendment Area C – Housing Land south	Disagree with the removal of Area C from the Conservation Area for the following reasons:-	This area, most notably the Sycamores, has been redeveloped in the 21 st century and is therefore no longer of sufficient historic interest. The stone wall extends well beyond the Conservation Area.

Document Reference	Comment	GBC Response (action in bold)
of the Sycamores, Moor Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of protection to the main arterial route to the village including stone walling, trees and bushes all of which provide charm/appeal for drivers and residents. 	<p>This is an area assessment and the area/character off Moor Road (area C) has changed significantly. To retain this just to keep the stone wall boundary to the road is not sufficient reason on its own.</p> <p>No changes required.</p>
Boundary Amendment Area B – Land between Park Road and Broad Valley Drive	<p>Disagree with the removal of Area from the Conservation Area for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to any new building within this area that will spoil the look and feel of the area. Removal of the Broad Valley Road dwellings from the Conservation Area is unacceptable – why can't boundaries stay the same? 	<p>This area comprises a car park and modern 21st century housing development, and therefore has insufficient special architectural or historic interest to warrant inclusion within the Conservation Area. There are no proposals to develop the car park which is currently in functional use. The Broad Valley Road dwellings were developed since the previous appraisal was adopted (2005) which further justifies this proposed boundary amendment. No changes required.</p>
Boundary Amendment Area A – Land north of Mayes Rise and School Walk	<p>Disagree with the removal of Area A from the Conservation Area for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments will allow housing development on this site. Paragraphs 7.12 and 7.13 of the 2005 appraisal sought to protect this green area. 	<p>The Old School building is proposed to remain within the Conservation Area boundary. The associated area proposed to be removed from the area comprises 20th century buildings (including Hawthorne Nursing Home and modern former school buildings) and a field – all of which are considered to lack sufficient architectural/historic merit to meet the legal criteria for being included within a Conservation Area. It is furthermore considered that including less significant areas would weaken the credibility of the overall Conservation Area designation.</p>

Document Reference	Comment	GBC Response (action in bold)
		<p>The Council is not aware of any proposal for this area to be developed. However should this be proposed in the future, planning protections remain to ensure that any development is sensitive to the 'setting' of the Conservation Area. It is also noted that Conservation Area designation is not an embargo on development and that the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 200-201 supports sensitive new development <i>within</i> Conservation Areas. No changes required.</p>
<p>Boundary Amendments A, B, C and E</p>	<p>Overarching concern that the removal of parts of the Conservation Area reduced planning controls and will result in negative changes being permitted. That areas are no longer considered worthy of designation ignores the fact that the Council originally designated these areas.</p> <p>Question that little notice has been taken to Conservation Area status, for example recent development in Area C. Concern that removal of areas from the Conservation Area is a tactic to enable further development.</p>	<p>Conservation Area designation is not an embargo on development and it is important that Conservation Area designations only include areas of historic/architectural merit. Regardless, it will remain a planning consideration where relevant to ensure that any development is sensitive to the 'setting' of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The Conservation Area was last reviewed in 2005. In this time, development and changes have inevitably happened in the village. Additionally changes to government guidance and good practice have occurred in this time. Areas proposed to be removed from the Conservation Area have been assessed on their historic/architectural merit based on an up to date assessment.</p>

Document Reference	Comment	GBC Response (action in bold)
		<p>The Council has a legal duty to consider Conservation Areas a part of planning decisions and did so in relation to the development referred to in Area C.</p> <p>The assessment made has been in accordance with Historic England best practice with the best interest of the Conservation Area as a planning tool in mind. Future development has not formed a consideration in any boundary alteration discussions. No changes required.</p>
	<p>Church Road where the welfare club is, is poorly maintained and needs development. I believe it is important that these areas remain in the conservation area to ensure they are developed sensitive to the historic character of the area.</p>	<p>The area to be removed from the Conservation Area comprises four modern dwellings, a modern community centre building, and associated derelict land that is unkempt that detracts from the significance of the overall Conservation Area. The land remains important to the setting of the Conservation Area. Regardless, it will remain a planning consideration where relevant to ensure that any development is sensitive to the 'setting' of the Conservation Area. No changes required.</p>
<p>Boundary Amendment Area A – Land north of Mayes Rise and School Walk????</p>	<p>Concerned that the conservation plan brings the area down to The Square at its top end. There is a small piece of land which rises up here. If this small piece of land (presently maintained by council) is taken out of the conservation area there is a risk that it will be developed without due regard for the historic importance of the rest of the houses on The Square.</p>	<p>The associated area proposed to be removed from the area comprises 20th century buildings (including Hawthorne Nursing Home and modern former school buildings) and a field – all of which are considered to lack sufficient architectural/historic merit to meet the legal criteria for being included within a Conservation Area. The area of land off Keepers Close has planning</p>

Document Reference	Comment	GBC Response (action in bold)
		<p>permission for residential development (under construction at the time of writing) and is not open space maintained by the Council.</p> <p>Conservation Area designation is not an embargo on development and it is important that Conservation Area designations only include areas of historic/architectural merit. Regardless, it will remain a planning consideration where relevant to ensure that any development is sensitive to the 'setting' of the Conservation Area. No changes required.</p>
	<p>The car park for the Country Park has been removed from the Conservation Area. Again, the risk is that it could be developed and reduce the size of BWCP.</p>	<p>This area comprises a car park and modern 21st century housing development, and therefore has insufficient special architectural or historic interest to warrant inclusion within the Conservation Area. There are no proposals to develop the car park which is currently in functional use. The Broad Valley Road dwellings were developed since the previous appraisal was adopted (2005) which further justifies this proposed boundary amendment. No changes required.</p>
	<p>The south end of Moor Road, which you propose to remove, is actually a wooded area full of mature trees. Maintaining such areas has to be of benefit for the community and the environment.</p>	<p>The trees at the southern end of Moor Road Area C are protected by a Group Tree Preservation Order. No changes required.</p>
	<p>Agree the welfare and community centre block offers 'opportunities for enhancement' (p42). Should the block not remain included, and support</p>	<p>Note comments on the welfare and community centres offers opportunities for enhancement. A brief has been included at Appendix 1 to promote</p>

Document Reference	Comment	GBC Response (action in bold)
	<p>be given to landowner and Parish Council to develop appropriately for community need within the constraints of the conservation area?</p>	<p>the site for appropriate development. The Council will seek discussions with the landowner and other key stakeholders when resources permit.</p> <p>The area to be removed from the Conservation Area comprises four modern dwellings, a modern community centre building, and associated derelict land that is unkempt that detracts from the significance of the overall Conservation Area. The land remains important to the setting of the Conservation Area. No changes required.</p>
	<p>Note the trees and wall along Moor Rd. is there a reason protection is being removed from part of this area? I'd suggest it should continue to be extended to the footpath as shown on the attached map.</p>	<p>This area, most notably the Sycamores, has been redeveloped in the 21st century and is therefore no longer of sufficient historic interest. The stone wall extends well beyond the Conservation Area. This is an area assessment and the area/character off Moor Road (area C) has changed significantly. To retain this just to keep the stone wall boundary to the road is not sufficient reason on its own.</p> <p>The trees are protected by a group Tree Preservation Order. No changes required.</p>
<p>General</p>	<p>There has been a number of developments in the area since the 2005 appraisal, which at paragraph 7.25 highlighted the impact of traffic along Moor Road. Concern that the village has had a significant increase in traffic due to housebuilding.</p>	<p>Noted. No changes required</p>

Document Reference	Comment	GBC Response (action in bold)
General	Concern that the village only has a corner shop/post office as a local amenity.	The principle of new amenities within the Conservation Area would generally be supported by the Council, subject to site specific considerations (such as highway safety, amenity, design, etc.). However, the Council has no direct role in providing new shops. No changes required
General	Concern that cars park on the road across from Bestwood Country Park. Propose this area is double lined.	This is not a matter that can be resolved through this consultation. It is suggested that the respondent raises this with Nottinghamshire County Council as the responsible highways authority. The Council has a legal duty to consider Conservation Areas a part of planning decisions.

Question 2: Do you have any comments on the wording of the Conservation Area Character Appraisal (pages 3-48)?

Document Reference	Comment	GBC Response (action in bold)
General	The wording of the appraisal fails to acknowledge that the council has been at fault for the degradation of character and appearance of the areas proposed to be removed from the Conservation Area – including granting planning permissions in areas B and C	The Council has a legal duty to consider Conservation Areas as part of planning decisions and planning decisions referred to have done so. Planning applications must be determined in accordance with local plan policies, which requires a range of issues to be taken into account. Planning decisions are publicly available on the website.

	The Bestwood Miners Welfare site is mentioned a number of times and it's quite a complex site and organisation. Specifically, on p 4, perhaps the welfare should be referred to as 'the Village Hall within the welfare' as that is the bit identified as needing to be conserved	Noted. Agreed to refer to the "Village Hall" on page 4.
--	---	---

Question 3: Do you have any comments on the wording of the Conservation Area Management Plan (pages 49-67)?

No comments received

Question 4: Do you have any other comments?

Document Reference	Comment	GBC Response (action in bold)
General	Stop meddling. Waste of time and money. This process is to justify officer wages.	Local authorities have a duty under Section 69(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to review conservation area boundaries and to review conservation area appraisals to highlight and protect significant heritage features.
General	A representation raised the following matters:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that recent and potential future new housing development will result in the unique charm of the village being lost. 	These matters raised are not matters that can be resolved through this consultation as they do not relate to the conservation area appraisal. In relation to development, this consultation does not propose future growth. The purpose of the

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that services/facilities are not available currently to accommodate further growth. • Concern that the 14 speed humps on Moor Road have an invasive antisocial impact on the surrounding area (including the negative impact of motorists exceeding speed limits, vibration stress causing structural damage to households, and pollution caused by stop/starting). Propose speed humps are replaced with camera/digital displays. • Propose a vehicle weight restriction is imposed along Moor Road to reduce HGV's cutting through. 	<p>Conservation Area is to highlight and protect significant heritage features. It is suggested that the respondent may wish to provide their own comments on relevant future planning applications.</p> <p>In relation to speed humps, vibration transfer, pollution and weight restrictions, it is recommended that the respondent raises this with Nottinghamshire County Council as the responsible highways authority</p>
General	Plead that the Council listens to local residents on this consultation and development proposals	Noted
General	Bestwood Village struggles with the consequence of over development within the Gedling, Ashfield and Nottingham City boundaries Gedling should take a lead and halt future development.	The Conservation Area appraisal does not propose future development, but is one of the considerations that will be used to help determine future planning applications and, if appropriate, to guide future development. The purpose of the Conservation Area is highlight and protect significant heritage features. It is suggested that the respondent may wish to provide their own comments on relevant future planning applications.
	A number of original red brick walls removed during my time living on The Square – when I rang the Council and asked whether planning permission would be required for this. I was told it would not	Guidance is provided in paragraph 6.1 of the Conservation Area Management Plan which states that demolition of walls requires planning permission but there are exceptions including

	be. The conservation plan suggests that planning permission would be required for such changes.	where a wall is under 1 metre in height where it abuts a highway or less than 2 metres high elsewhere.
	What is the intention regarding enforcement with reference to detailed points such as satellite dishes, walls, windows etc? Is there any plan in place to communicate with residents in the properties concerned, or to encourage compliance. Parish Council is willing to work with GBC for example, in valuing our heritage work.	The Council has an enforcement policy to take action in appropriate circumstances. The suggestion to raise awareness of valuing heritage in the local community has merit and the Council will give further consideration to this proposal.
	Could the yellow and purple areas in the picture below (historic leisure facilities, sports pitches and site of annual village bonfire event) be recognised as local leisure space?	Plan requested on 18/09/2020. This is not a matter for the Conservation Area Appraisal but for the forthcoming Local Plan review and will be kept on file.

Question 5: Feedback – Please share your views about your experience of this consultation in order for us to improve our service.

Document Reference	Comment	GBC Response (action in bold)
General	Would appreciate if somebody could answer my questions.	Noted. This report of responses has been e-mailed to all respondents.
General	The length of the document at 68 pages may put off most people from understanding and replying to the consultation.	Noted. The Council has produced a detailed review to provide useful planning guidance to cover all of the historic elements of the village. It is noted that some may be put off – the Council has

		publicised the main element (the boundary amendments) via site notices throughout the village to enhance local understanding.
General	The process also predominantly implies that everybody has appropriate reading and writing skills and that everyone has the technological means to access Microsoft Word and provide a response via e-mail. I accept that you do offer a paper review at the council offices but again that assumes people can travel to do this. There should be a more universal means for the council to gain public feedback on any type of proposal especially in a concentrated area such as Bestwood Village.	Usually the Council would endeavour to provide a physical copy within the local area. Due to the Coronavirus situation, this consultation has been hosted predominantly online with a physical copy at the Council offices where officers can control appropriate quarantining of documents. Contact details have been made available to ensure the Council can respond to individual accessibility requirements.