

APPENDIX 2 –Summary of Consultation Comments and GBC Response

Question 1: Do you have any comments on the wording of the Conservation Area Character Appraisal (pages 4 - 62)?

Document Reference	Comment	GBC Response
Page 59 parag 13.1	Our suggestion would be could the edge of the borough boundary and the conservation boundary near the Linby Kennels on Church Lane be one of the same. Would certainly bring cohesion. Also the quarries on the northern end of Quarry Lane, which are SSSI, would it be worth considering extending the boundary to include those.	Disagree. The borough boundary and conservation area boundaries have different purposes. The conservation area boundary should only include those areas that are of special architectural and/or historic interest. Extending the conservation area boundary to align with the borough boundary at Church Lane or include the SSSI would not include additional areas of special architectural or historic interest. Although the biological importance of the SSSI is fully acknowledged this is separately protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).
General comments	Beautifully kept stone crosses Linby Docks cleared and maintained very nicely and is a nice feature of the village Beautifully kept front gardens throughout village make a big difference to those passing through Brooke Farm and the Pub are fantastic assets in the village and show what the heart of the village is about	The listed qualities of the Conservation Area are noted.

	<p>Lampposts and signposts to be black Building materials to be consistent, eg concrete fences, plastic guttering, pvc windows. Speed restrictions upheld Safe passage of crossing, by Brooke Farm/pub/bus stops, and also by the school Ensuring the appropriate speed of heavy vehicles including lorries and farm vehicles Due to the volume of traffic and the speeds that are not monitored or limits upheld, the air and noise pollution could be damaging to the buildings and area and should be looked into to ensure longevity of the village Isn't there a limit to the weight on the road? This is not checked up upon. A better entrance to the village from Papplewick Road name signs to be consistent. Eg Church Lane, on one side is on the wall (preferred, in keeping), the other side is free standing.</p>	<p>The importance of materials of street furniture and buildings within the conservation area are noted within the appraisal.</p> <p>Speed and weight restrictions are a matter for Nottinghamshire County Council as highways authority to control and enforce. The appraisal notes the impact of traffic on the village and paragraph 2.15 identifies a number of increasing pressures on Linby including increases in vehicular traffic and the associated highway works.</p> <p>It is unclear how the entrance to the village from Papplewick could be improved.</p>
	<p>There seems to be clear desire and commercial reasoning to improve transport access from the A60 to the M1 via an access road to the North of Linby and Papplewick joining the top of the new Top Wighay development. This seems to have a clear route and will provide access for the logistics transport needed and the increased commuter traffic as well as future-proofing the Gedling</p>	<p>The construction of a new road to the north of Linby and Papplewick to link the A60 to the M1 would need to be delivered and funded as part of a development scheme. Such a route has not been identified as a requirement of the Top Wighay Farm development.</p> <p>It is noted that the land to the north of Linby and Papplewick includes a number of sensitive</p>

	development plans and infrastructure. In-fill development of Top Wighay land will then be possible for retail and industry, and for residential housing to flourish appropriately. This feels like the appropriate strategy for building back better holistically as we go forward.	designations including Local Wildlife Sites, Protected Open Space and the Linby Quarries SSSI. Account would also need to be taken of the need to cross the Robin Hood line.
--	---	--

Question 2: Do you have any comments on the wording of the Conservation Area Management Plan (pages 63 - 78)?

Document Reference	Comment	GBC Response
Page 67 parag 3.9	I see lots of examples of bad pointing. How can we work together to reinforce the message	<p>The bibliography accompanying the Management Plan includes reference to 'A Guide to Repointing Stone and Brickwork' published by Nottinghamshire County Council. A link will be included to this document and also to the Historic England document 'Repointing Brick and Stone Walls'.</p> <p>The adoption of the revised Appraisal and Management Plan is an opportunity to raise the profile of this guide and the Parish Council could help to draw attention to the guide through the Parish website and other communications.</p>
Page 71 parag 5.1	I worry that non listed properties in CA do not require planning permission for solar	The installation of solar panels on non-listed buildings is permitted development. Permitted

	<p>panels on roof. Can that not be reinforced? They would ruin the feel of the CA if that occurred.</p>	<p>development rights within Conservation Areas are more restrictive and householders are advised to contact GBC prior to starting any works to the exterior of the building. Paragraph 5.4 of the Management Plan refers to the installation of solar panels and suggests installing apparatus to side/rear elevations in order to align with the objectives of the Management Plan.</p>
<p>Page 74 parag 8/1</p>	<p>We are starting to see houses that have stone wall frontages having fencing placed on top of stone walls - which completely impacts the street scene. Examples include 3 Church Lane and 30, Main Street (photo 26 in this document) Can that be highlighted in this point as impacting negatively on the openness of the CA.</p>	<p>The erection of fencing adjoining stone walls is permitted development. Permitted development rights within Conservation Areas are more restrictive and householders are advised to contact GBC prior to starting any works to the exterior of the building. Paragraph 12.13 of the Appraisal acknowledges the impact of fencing and suggests the planting of native species to screen fences from view.</p>
<p>General</p>	<p>Could we not have a working group to include NCC, GBC and LPC to discuss funding avenues that could be explored. The infrastructure in the CA, mainly the footpaths are in a bad state of repair and we find Via or utility companies just patch them up with tarmac or grey cement. This would add some teeth to the management plan instead of a document that says a lot but offers no action plan how to achieve this. Also, looking at point 12.14, 12.15 and 12.17 on pg. 57 - these are items that can be discussed and hopefully look at options how we can mitigate some of these negative issues on the impact</p>	<p>GBC will inform LPC of any funding avenues that become available to support the conservation area. Linby PC are encouraged to liaise with Notts County Council/Via to discuss concerns regarding the condition of footpaths. Under the Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) (England) (No. 2) Regulations 2019, 15% of CIL receipts are passed to the parish councils for the area where development takes place (the neighbourhood portion) and this portion is increased to 25% where a neighbourhood plan is in place, as in Linby. This is a source of funding could be used to support the conservation area.</p>

	of the CA.	
--	------------	--

Question 3: Do you have any other comments?

Document Reference	Comment	GBC Response (action in bold)

Question 4: 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)