

**NUNEATON & BEDWORTH BOROUGH PLAN: EXAMINATION**

**STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND BETWEEN NUNEATON & BEDWORTH BOROUGH COUNCIL AND HISTORIC ENGLAND.**

**Introduction**

This statement sets out the common ground between Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council and Historic England in respect of matters HSG 2 Arbury. The Council agree with the recommended changes as set out by Historic England in the tables below and believe these should be the subject of a main modification.

Local Plan reference and relevant extract	Historic England comment on the relevant issue of Soundness	Recommendation/ suggestion / advice to support the soundness of the Plan
<p><b>Policy HSG2 – Arbury</b></p> <p><b>Historic Environment, paragraph 6.46</b></p> <p><i>The development will also take the opportunity to secure an asset management plan for The Arbury Estate which includes measures to be taken and commitments to the repair and maintenance of Park Farmhouse and the Tea House.</i></p>	<p>Historic England notes the measures proposed to minimise harm from this allocation to the significance of Arbury Hall, its park and garden and associated designated heritage assets, and their settings.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.46 is a welcome commitment and forms an important component of the Borough Plan’s positive strategy for the conservation of its historic environment, including those heritage assets at risk (NPPF paragraph 126). However we would encourage its inclusion within the policy as a ‘Key Development Principle’ as it is an equally important matter to those other principles proposed to be included.</p>	<p>Add an additional Key Development Principle:</p> <p><i>Asset management plan for The Arbury Estate which includes measures to be taken and commitments to the repair and maintenance of Park Farmhouse and the Tea House.</i></p>

**Policy HSG2 – Arbury**

**Paragraph 6.66**

*Any development should take the opportunity to secure an asset management plan for The Arbury Estate which includes measures to be taken and commitments to the repair and maintenance of Park Farmhouse and the Tea House, both Grade II\* Listed Buildings included on the Heritage at Risk Register. Alternatively a Listed Building Heritage Partnership Agreement could be agreed in relation to the building. This would help to offset impacts to the RPG derived from the perception of the possible reduction in the quantity of surrounding rural landscape around the parkland and the reduced degree of separation between the parkland and development and the potential cumulative effect of development in other areas (for instance HSG2 and or EMP8) encroaching upon the rural setting of the park.*

This paragraph appears to be misplaced as should be included at 6.46 following the existing text.

It should be noted that the source of this text is from the Heritage Assessment (ECUS 2016).

The local authority is requested to clarify that any potential HPA would not preclude the need for an asset management plan for the Arbury Estate with measures to be taken and commitments to the repair and maintenance of Park Farmhouse and the Tea House, unless the HPA would do the same.

Reposition paragraph 6.66 to 6.46 and clarify that a HPA would not replace a requirement to prepare an asset management plan for The Arbury Estate with measures to be taken and commitments to the repair and maintenance of Park Farmhouse and the Tea House, unless the HPA would do the same.

Consider whether to include “*This would help to offset impacts ...*” as this appears to be superfluous commentary from the Heritage Assessment (ECUS 2016) and doesn’t provide the justification for a HPA and/or Assessment Management Plan. The heritage assets at risk are the reason.

Katherine Moreton

Head of Planning and Economic Development

Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council

Date: 26.2.2018

Rohan Torkildsen

Historic Environment Planning Adviser South West/West Midlands

Historic England

Date: 26.2.2018