



SPECIFICATION

Annex A

SCOPE OF WORKS

FOR THE PREPARATION OF A HERITAGE ASSESSMENT TO SUPPORT THE
PREPARATION OF THE TORPOINT NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT
PLAN

FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION

CLIENT

TORPOINT TOWN COUNCIL

1 - 3 BULLER ROAD

TORPOINT

CORNWALL

PL11 2LD

Dated: 21/07/2021

GENERAL INDEX

SECTION	DESCRIPTION	PAGE No
SECTION 1	Overview	3
SECTION 2	Background and Context	3
SECTION 3	Specification	3
SECTION 4	Timetable	4
SECTION 5	Invoicing Arrangements	4
Appendix 1	Comments on initial draft (August 2018) from Cornwall Council's Historic Environment Service and Historic England	5 - 6

1. Overview

The Town Council is seeking quotations to undertake:

- i) The preparation of a Heritage Assessment of the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan.

2. Background and Context

Torpoint Town Council have instructed a project team including Clifton Emery Design and LRM Planning to prepare a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) for Torpoint.

The attached location plan illustrates the extent of the plan area in red (see **Annex B**).

The Town Council have adopted a 'Vision for Torpoint' (the full document is available at this link http://www.torpointplan.org.uk/vision/A_Vision_for_Torpoint.pdf) and the NDP seeks to formalise the planning related elements of the vision in a statutory planning policy document. An early draft of the NDP (the full document is available at this link <http://www.torpointplan.org.uk/TPNP/TPNP1.pdf>) has been subject of consultation with Cornwall Council and a number of other bodies, including Historic England. The comments of the Council's Historic Environment Service and Historic England are particularly relevant to this brief and are at **Appendix 1 below**.

The Draft NDP proposes a number of sites within the existing urban area for regeneration and the impact of these proposals on the significance of relevant designated heritage assets needs to be considered.

The Draft NDP also proposes the allocation of a site to the north of Torpoint 'The Northern Fringe' for approximately 225 dwellings, 2000 to 2500 sqm of retail floorspace, a community building, sports pitches and green space. The site abuts the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden at Antony Estate. The impact of the proposal on the setting of Antony Estate also needs to be considered.

The Council is now seeking quotations as per the above.

3. Specification

Scope/Requirements

1. The NDP process, and the site allocations in particular, need to consider the impact of the proposals on designated heritage assets. To ensure this, Torpoint Town Council would like to commission a specialist consultant to prepare a Heritage Assessment of the draft NDP.
2. In line with advice received from Cornwall Council, the Assessment will need to complete the following tasks:
 - a) Identify the proposed allocation sites, the heritage assets and their settings;
 - b) Understand the significance of relevant heritage assets, along with the sensitivities and capacity for change irrespective of any known proposals;
 - c) Understand the potential impact of specific proposals on that significance; and
 - d) Use that understanding to inform the design process to:
 - look for opportunities to avoid, minimise or mitigate impact;

- look for opportunities to better reveal or enhance significance, create a more sustainable and interesting place;
- justify any harmful impacts (in terms of sustainable development, the need for change, overriding benefits etc.); and
- Off-set negative impacts through recording, disseminating and archiving archaeological and historical information.

Outputs

The outputs of the project are as follows:

- Review of draft NDP and provision of initial advice on headline issues and main heritage considerations;
- Preparation of a Heritage Assessment in support of the NDP (please allow for one update following feedback on a draft report from the client);
- Liaison with the Local Planning Authority, Heritage England and other key stakeholders as required; and
- Critical review of next iteration of NDP (pre-consultation draft) to provide feedback on how heritage issues have been incorporated.

3. Timetable

The indicative timetable for this work is provided in the table below:

Timetable

Description	Date
Issue Request for Quotation	21/07/2021
Submission of tenders	13/08/2021 midday
Contract award by Torpoint Town Council	20/08/2021

4. Invoicing Arrangements

Invoicing arrangements and payment terms will be agreed prior to contract.

Appendix 1

Comment from Environment Service – Historic Environment Strategy Officer

1. Endorse comments above about the inappropriateness of the policy TOR/8 as it stands, and the better option being character-area based policies.
2. There is no such thing as an interim conservation area –misunderstanding may have arisen because of slightly misunderstanding the process as suggested by Historic England Guidance – yes NDP groups and communities can identify those areas they think worthy of designation –but designation can only be done by the LPA or Sec of State; the NDP can't have a policy which commits outside bodies to future action. Although the Draft NDP seems to acknowledge this by saying that if a CA isn't designated by CC it continues to treat this as an interim CA, this won't mean anything - it either is a CA or it isn't. Possibly consider calling it a 'distinct historic character area' –or something similar.
3. Better approach would be to develop character area based policies, stressing the qualities and distinctiveness of the town, and other areas around it, as identified in exiting studies (CSUS) and their own analyses, and have a policy which stresses the need to recognise, assess, protect and enhance that character.

St Ives majored on character areas...see Page 54 and following of their Plan....they were also based on the CSUS report for St Ives (but then adapted for the rest for the Plan area); they then had character-area specific policies for built environment, which were all basically conservation-area type policies adapted to each character area, so don't have to mention 'interim conservation area' at all. This could be easily adapted for Torpoint – from memory there's much in the CSUS report that could be just re-used as policy wording – this is approach being considered by Lostwithiel.

4. Could also put in something that is less prescriptive or deterministic, by having part of the policy which asks for full and detailed assessment to be done as part of any proposals - can refer to the Historic Environment SPD which will be in place by the time this NDP progresses – the key processes any development in these sensitive areas go through is set out in this text from the draft Historic Environment SPD (set out below) which could easily be adapted for NPs:

“No matter what the scale of the proposals, whether for early discussions, for formal planning applications, or for informal management proposals – and no matter what type of site or how important it is - the basic principles of good practice in the historic environment remain the same; what changes is only the degree and intensity of the work that might be needed:

- 1) Identify the site, the heritage assets and their settings
- 2) Understand its significance, its sensitivities and capacity for change irrespective of any known proposals
- 3) Understand the potential impact of specific proposals on that significance
- 4) Use that understanding to inform the design process to:
 - a. look for opportunities to avoid, minimise or mitigate impact
 - b. look for opportunities to better reveal or enhance significance, create a more sustainable and interesting place

- c. justify any harmful impacts (in terms of sustainable development, the need for change, overriding benefits etc.)
- d. offset negative impacts through recording, disseminating and archiving archaeological and historical information.

The Council expects the process set out in this HESPD to be followed, in appropriate detail proportionate to the scale of the works and the importance of the site, when any intervention in the historic environment is proposed in order to meet the requirements of the Cornwall Local Plan policies, the NPPF and national and local standards and requirements.

Any variation or alternative approach must be fully justified, and must follow an equally consistent, appropriate and transparent method demonstrably compliant with legislation, national and local policies and objectives (for instance as set out in the World Heritage Site Supplementary Planning Document, or the ICOMOS Historic Impact Assessment guidance, or Historic England guidance on specific asset or development types).”