

Tibshelf Parish Council
Notes of the meeting of the Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group
held on Thursday 10th June, at 7.00 p.m.

Present: Councillors: A E Beckett (AB)-P Billington (PB)- I Brentnall (IB)
M Coupe (Chair) (MC)- R Vaughan (RV)-D Watson (DW)

Community: E Ball (EB)-B Green (Vice-Chair) (BG)- S Haddock (SH)

In attendance: S Coldwell (Locum Clerk)
A Towleron (Planning Consultant)-(AT)
5 members of the public

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of the Councillors:
Cllr K Salt and S Wood
Apologies for absence were received on behalf of the Community:
H Channon, M Shreeve and P Trevelyan
Apologies received from C McKinney (B.D.C.)

2 Notes from the meeting held 13th April 2021

All in favour of accepting meeting notes.

3 Heritage Assets List

MC requested AT to give further information on the asset list and how being on the list does not affect the owner's property, particularly from a planning point of view. AT referred to listed buildings and conservation areas, which form heritage assets, which are encouraged to be protected and conserved. Other properties, which do not meet the criteria of being a listed building but are of some historical architectural interest also should be protected through the planning system. AT further explained that being on a heritage list does not affect the owner's permitted development rights of the property. If a property which is included on the heritage list is subject to a planning application, then this would be considered as part of the planning application.

A member of the public questioned whether, having their property on the heritage list would provide another potential layer of obstruction to planning application acceptance. Another member of the public explained that legislative frameworks change over time and although the property development rights may not be affected today, this may change in the long term. AT acknowledged that there could be changes in the future.

PB made comment, that if a property owner didn't want to be listed on the heritage asset list, then they shouldn't be forced to be on it. He expressed concern that properties had been added to the heritage list without owners' knowledge. MC explained that all buildings were considered for whether they had any historical relevance. An original list of between 60-70 properties has been reduced by approx. half. Owners of the properties on the reduced list were then contacted by letter to make sure they were happy to be included on the list.

EB expressed concern that the letter sent out was not a consultation letter.

AT explained that if property owners, after receiving the letter, objected to being on the heritage asset list then the property would be removed.

DW asked that everyone should remember the goal of the neighbourhood plan, and that was to guide development; the neighbourhood plan cannot be used to stop development and it may be subject to change based on wider aspects of the district. DW also reiterated that she does not believe a heritage asset list is necessary in the neighbourhood plan.

AB agreed that the letter was inappropriate and contained contradictions. AB believed that the NPSG should have spoken with property owners on the heritage list before issuing the list as a key part of consulting with the community on the neighbourhood plan. AB expressed concern of how the parish council will pick up on the neighbourhood plan once the steering group has disbanded. AB also believes the heritage asset list is unnecessary.

MC explained that listed buildings had been excluded from the heritage asset list.

AT explained that the letter that was sent to property owners on the heritage asset list was a standard letter from Historic England.

A member of the public was concerned that, being included on the heritage asset list would mean another hoop to jump through in the planning application process and asked if the list was necessary.

AB explained that the neighbourhood plan will ultimately sit with Bolsover District Council once it's been adopted. Any planning applications are first received by Bolsover and they are then sent to the parish council.

MC explained that there will be another neighbourhood plan exhibition, another consultation and a referendum.

A member of the public emphasised the importance of the consultative aspect of the neighbourhood plan. He added that the property he owns in the village was purchased with the acknowledgement of the importance and responsibility to preserve it.

BG commented that the heritage asset list has been developed over time and that it is not yet a final list. There has been no definite decision made about whether the list will be included in the neighbourhood plan. A decision will need to be made based on feedback of next steps, i.e. include the list, not to include the list, amend the list to include any properties outside of the conservation area.

MC suggested that owners of any properties remaining on the heritage asset list be consulted with for their opinions.

SH confirmed there were six property owners who requested to be deleted from the list and there were five property owners who were uncertain

AB voiced her concerns that the neighbourhood plan will be a document which will be picked up by future councillors who have not been involved in the consultation and planning. AB believes that, having an asset list could cause future problems for parish councillors in the future and the list should be removed from the neighbourhood plan.

AT responded to a question from EB about the publication of the heritage asset list on the local planning authority website and the historic environment records. AT explained that the government maintains a list of all buildings of historic interest. EB voiced concern that changes by the government could have a detrimental effect to the owners.

A member of the public complained that the meeting had not been publicised sufficiently and questioned why there were details of properties from the list on the Neighbourhood Plan website. MC explained this had been done on an informative basis.

A member of the public asked what would the consequences be if a property owner who had agreed to be on the heritage asset list then changed their mind. AT confirmed that as a planning document, it can be amended. Modifications to a neighbourhood plan can be made by the local planning authority or the qualifying body (Bolsover District Council or Tibshelf Parish Council).

PB commented that he knew some of the property owners on the list and they had expressed concern. MC explained the appeals process for those owners wanting to be removed from the list would only apply in the most extreme circumstances.

IB emphasised the responsibility held to the community of Tibshelf in valuing its heritage. IB recommended that the list should be included in the neighbourhood plan but, if a property owner wishes to be removed from the heritage asset list, then this should happen and without the need for any appeal process.

AB recommended that a clear letter is sent by the parish council to all property owners currently on the list to apologise for the initial letter and ask if they would like to remain on the list with an outline of exactly what this entails.

AT explained that the 'national list' is maintained by the government. This is separate to the heritage asset list for the neighbourhood plan. The national list contains 32 buildings, including three listed buildings, all from this parish.

A member of the public referred to the conservation area being under review and asked why the Crown Public House (18th century building) is not in the conservation area.

BG recommended that under the proposal from I Brentnall, the Crown Public House is not in the conservation area and it can be added to the heritage asset list.

AB recommended another meeting is held to discuss who will be on the list before contact is made with those property owners as well as discuss the contents of the next letter to be sent out.

MC asked DW to get an update from Bolsover District Council on the review of the conservation areas. DW confirmed she had already asked for an update and expects a reply in the next couple of months.

IB proposed that the heritage asset list to include properties outside of the conservation area unless the owners of the properties have objected to being on the list. EB seconded the proposal. All in favour.

4 Update on the Present Situation regarding the Plan/Action moving forward

MC recommended that this be updated after finality of situation with the Heritage asset list.

5 Date of next meeting

MC will liaise with the Locum Clerk to find a suitable time/date for the next NPSG meeting.

The meeting closed at 8.45pm