From John Robinson, Trustee Southwell Heritage Trust.



Policy So/PV "Southwell Protected Views" versus So/MU/1 mixed use site

- 1 The NSDC Allocations and Development Management Plan is UNSOUND due to an inbuilt contradiction.
- 2 Map 6 Southwell Proposals (attached, together with a blow-up of the area next to Southwell Minster) shows the site So/MU/1 very close to the Minster. The site is fully within the Protected View arc from South East to South West of the Minster, the focal point of this inwards and outwards view arc.
- Page 46 of Newark & Sherwood Submission Allocations & Development Management DPD states:

"The Core Strategy requires that the setting of Southwell, including views of Southwell Minster and Workhouse are protected and enhanced. The allocation of sites and the detailed requirements for development of those sites has had regard to this requirement and has been informed by the detailed 'Southwell Landscape Setting' document prepared by the Council and Notts County Council."

This (underlined by me) claim is NOT CREDIBLE.

It can only have been written by someone not familiar with that busy stretch of Church Street, the well used footpaths and playing fields near there, and the footpaths crossing the rising land to the South East.

The wonderful views inwards towards the Minster and outwards into the countryside, seen by thousands of people daily, would be destroyed by any building more than 9 feet / 3 metres high.

- Southwell Conservation Area Appraisal July 2005 states on P14: "The area around the Minster Churchyard and extending south to cover the school grounds and recreation grounds is identified as a 'Green Wedge' in the Local Plan. The policy of the Southwell Green Wedge states that 'planning permission will not be granted for development that damages, intrudes into, or detracts from, the open character of this area".
- This unsoundness / contradiction is easy to correct, as So/MU/1 is for only 13 houses out of 298 proposed for all sites in Southwell.

 There is space for these elsewhere, especially as NSDC have proposed 30 house per hectare, when a higher density is desirable on central sites to make houses more affordable.

John Rolemson



