

Shireoaks Neighbourhood
Development Plan
2015-2028

Consultation Statement

SHIREOAKS PARISH COUNCIL

Contents

1	Introduction.....	4
	What is the Shireoaks Neighbourhood Plan?.....	4
	What is the Consultation Statement?	5
2	Methodology	6
3	Responses.....	8
	Local Residents Comments	8
	Key Contacts Responses.....	8
4	Amendments to the Neighbourhood Plan	21

1 Introduction

What is the Shireoaks Neighbourhood Plan?

- 1.1 This Neighbourhood Plan is a new type of planning document prepared for the Shireoaks Parish Council on behalf of its residents. It is a legal planning policy document and once it has been ‘made’ by Bassetlaw District Council (BDC) it must be used by:
 - A) Planners at Bassetlaw District Council in assessing planning applications
 - B) Developers as they prepare planning application for submission to Bassetlaw District Council.
- 1.2 Planning applications must be decided in accordance with BDC’s suite of planning policies (including this Neighbourhood Plan) unless material considerations otherwise.¹ These applications should reflect the character of Shireoaks and this neighbourhood Plan.
- 1.3 To carry this much influence in planning decisions this Neighbourhood Plan will be examined by an independent examiner who will check that it has been prepared in accordance with planning law, be in conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework, Bassetlaw’s 2011 Core Strategy and be approved by a simple majority of votes (i.e. over 50% of those voting) in a local referendum.
- 1.4 This Plan has been prepared by Shireoaks Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group on behalf of Shireoaks Parish Council. It covers the whole of the Parish of Shireoaks and sets out planning policies for Shireoaks for the 15 years 2014-2029.

¹ In accordance with NPPF paragraph 64

What is the Consultation Statement?

- 1.5 This Consultation Statement relates to the Draft Shireoaks Neighbourhood Development Plan and has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the Regulations sets out that a Consultation Statement should contain:
- Details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
 - Explain how they were consulted;
 - Summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
 - Describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan.
- 1.6 This statement provides an overview and description of the consultation period on the Shireoaks Draft Neighbourhood Plan that ran from the 26th May 2015 to the 13th July 2015. This 7 week time frame was selected for the consultation period rather than the statutory 6 weeks to allow extra, ensuring everyone had an additional opportunity to comment on the Draft Plan.
- 1.7 The Steering Group have undertaken a number of consultation exercises and activities throughout the Plan process, an overview of these is provided within the Plan itself that sets out chronologically the consultation events that have led to the production of the Shireoaks Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan. This consultation formed the basis of the Development Management Policies contained within the Plan that aim to control and promote the sustainable development and growth of the Parish.

2 Methodology

- 2.1 Several methods were adopted to ensure that all relevant bodies and parties were informed of the consultation period, as well as ensuring that local residents were made aware of the consultation period and provided with the opportunity to provide their views and comments.

Website

- 2.2 Preceding the commencement of the consultation period on the 26th May 2015, the Shireoaks Neighbourhood Development Plan (NP) website was updated explaining the Draft Plan and the consultation period. A downloadable version of the Plan itself was also uploaded to the website along with background evidence for the Plan including the ‘SEA Screening Statement’ and ‘Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report’, as well as information from various consultation events. Important contact details and various methods on how to comment on the Draft Plan were detailed on the website to encourage as many responses as possible. Snapshots of the website at this stage can be found in **Appendix A** of this document. The Neighbourhood Plan website is accessible on the link below.

<http://shireoaksneighbourhoodplan.weebly.com/>

- 2.3 All documents were also placed on Bassetlaw District Councils website, images of this can also be found in **Appendix A**. The link to the Shireoaks Neighbourhood Plan on BDC website is as below.

<http://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/everything-else/planning-building/neighbourhood-plans/shireoaks-neighbourhood-plan.aspx>

Email to Contacts

- 2.4 On the 26th May 2015 an email was sent to contacts from a database informing them of the commencement of the consultation period. These contacts involved numerous bodies and individuals that the Parish Council believe will be affected by the Neighbourhood Plan for Shireoaks, such as: neighbouring parish councils, key bodies such as English Heritage and the Environment Agency, and also local business owners and land owners as well as those people who have expressed an interest in being informed on the progression of the Plan. A list of those contacted can be seen in **Appendix B** of this document, minus interested individuals and landowners/businesses whose details need to remain confidential due to data protection.
- 2.5 The email sent on the 26th May informed recipients of the Neighbourhood Plan website and highlighted several methods available to submit comments on the Draft Plan. The contents of the email sent can be seen in **Appendix C** of this document.

Documents

- 2.6 In addition to the digital copies of documents found on the Neighbourhood Plan website and BDC website, hard copies of the Draft Plan and key supporting documents were also placed at important community facilities in the Parish and available to view throughout the consultation period. Documents were also available to view on request.

Local Consultation

- 2.7 The Parish Council wanted to ensure that local residents were allowed the opportunity to comment on the Draft Plan and its implications for the Parish. A Local Consultation Period was arranged and carried out running from the 15th October 2014 to the 15th November 2014, this was advertised on the Parish board in the centre of the village commencing from the 6th October 2014. Every household in Shireoaks had a leaflet placed in their letterbox (see **Appendix D**) and advertisements were placed in the Shireoaks newsletter both before and after they had been posted (see **Appendix D**). A public meeting was held also on the 21st October 2014 in the village hall which was attended by approximately 40 local residents, drop off boxes were also provided around the village in shops and cafes. In total 71 answer sheets were collected by the Steering Group.
- 2.8 It is noted that the above Local Consultation Period was held before the Regulation 15 consultation that this document relates to; therefore the results of this consultation are not included in this document.
- 2.9 No further consultation events were arranged as part of the Regulation 15 consultation on the Draft Plan, however the Plan was made available for local residents to view in the locations mentioned above, and was available to view on the NP website.
- 2.10 In addition to this, the availability of these documents and information on the Regulation 15 consultation period were included in the village newsletter and the village noticeboard (see **Appendix D**).

3 Responses

- 3.1 This section of the Consultation Statement contains the responses and comments received on the Draft Shireoaks Neighbourhood Development Plan throughout the Consultation period running from the 26th May 2015 to the 13th July 2015, from those interested bodies/parties who were contacted.

Local Residents Comments

- 3.2 No comments from local residents were received on the Neighbourhood Plan throughout the consultation period. However with regard to the extensive consultation undertaken throughout the Plan process, and most notably the Local Consultation Period undertaken in late 2014, this is not deemed as a cause for concern for the Steering Group.
- 3.3 The Steering Group are confident the Plan was made widely available to local people through the consultation period through the means previously indicated and view the lack of responses received at this stage as sign of general support for the Neighbourhood Plan as a result of the extensive consultation undertaken mentioned previously.

Key Contacts Responses

- 3.4 Responses were received from 6 key contacts that were emailed regarding the consultation period on the Draft Plan; their comments can be found below.

Bassetlaw District Council

Comment Number	Comment
1	Please note that at the 3 December 2014 Cabinet meeting, the Council took the decision to withdraw the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (before it was submitted for examination). The council will now commence with the preparation for a new Local Plan. All references to the Site Allocations DPD in this Neighbourhood Plan (and any sites it was proposing to allocate) need to be updated or deleted to reflect this change.
2	Assume there is a missing word in this paragraph, should it read: unless material considerations indicate otherwise? The Footnote references NPPF paragraph 64. Should this be referring to paragraph 12 instead? This would be a more relevant reference.
3	This refers to the Worksop Sub Region. Would recommend using the term Sub-Regional Centre in line with the terminology of the adopted Core Strategy. This would avoid any misinterpretation, especially as the term 'sub region' is usually used to refer to a much larger area.
4	What is the evidence supporting the statement that previous development to the north of the village has contributed to flooding in Shireoaks? Recommend reference is made to this evidence in the paragraph.
5	For clarity suggest the inclusion of the following: '...draw down significant additional investment from new development in the locality to ameliorate the impact...'

6	For completeness, recommend this paragraph also states that as well as the need for conformity with the NPPF, this NP needs to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan (as set out in NPPF paragraph 184).
7	Clarification is needed here to explain that in general, emerging NPs only gain a degree of material weight after they have been submitted for examination (following the formal submission draft consultation stage).
8	As this section defines what is special about Shireoaks, it is considered that the NP overlooks the significance of Shireoaks' railway station. It is a key 'node' within the district's strategic transport infrastructure. It is the only village in Bassetlaw to have such an asset and it is felt that its omission neglects a key aspect of the village's sustainability.
9	States that the old village is characterful. Expansion on this point would be helpful in understating what features of the villages, built or natural, add to this character.
10	Recommend the concern about community cohesion be better explained in this section, particularly in the context of what the NP can influence, i.e. how will the NP address this problem through its vision/policies? New housing development on its own will not necessarily cause or increase a loss in community cohesion.
11	This paragraph would carry more significance and prominence if it was the start of the vision not its supporting text. Please Note, not all developments can achieve the aim of maximising environmental assets. E.g. large residential extensions that require planning permission cannot contribute to this. Recommend replacing 'all' with 'where possible'.
12	This vision would read better as a statement of what the community wants Shireoaks to become in the future, which can then be interpreted by the list of Community Objectives. This will give greater clarity on how the community's vision for Shireoaks will be reached through the policies of this NP.
13	Please note this area is not a Local Nature Reserve. It is a Local Wildlife Site as identified in the Proposals Map of the Local Plan. Local Nature Reserves are formally designated and have statutory protection. Local Wildlife Sites are habitats identified as being of significance at county level. Recommend reference is changed.
14	States that the projects listed throughout the document are not part of NP. This could cause confusion when interpreting the plan and the planning weight that can be given to these projects (if applicable). Their inclusion in the main text of the NP, even with this caveat, is potentially misleading. Recommend these projects are only identified in the separate appendix referenced in this paragraph. Also recommend that this appendix (J) has an explanatory paragraph to make it clear what their status in this NP is.
15	Planning conditions cannot be used as informative notes regarding existing traffic restrictions. Use of planning conditions must meet the requirements (tests) as set out in NPPF para 206. The condition described in this paragraph does not meet these requirements. Recommend this section of the paragraph is deleted.
16	Part A: It should be noted that planning permissions may also be granted for developments that meet the requirements of the NPPF or Local Plan but are not addressed in this NP. This NP will work as part of the wider policy framework and not in isolation.
17	Part A: Not all development will be of a sufficient scale to be directly support the continued viability of Shireoaks. Recommend the wording of this policy be clarified to cover this.
18	Part A-1: what are the objectively assessed local housing needs of the parish? This NP need to set out where the evidence and justification for this can be found.

19	Part B: There are concerns with the words ‘significantly and adversely’ – normal Development Management definition would be ‘does not cause material harm to’. To contemplate refusal of an application, material harm must be caused. Without that definition, it makes application of the policy quite difficult – and potentially open to challenge.
20	Part C: This condition cannot be applied to all developments (as many will not result in an increase in HGV traffic. Conditions can only be used if they meet the requirements (the six tests) set out in NPPF paragraph 206. Policies cannot specify the use of generic conditions. Recommend this is deleted.
21	Part D: Reference needs to be made to the NPPF - not just to local and Neighbourhood Policy Plans. If not this effectively summarises and repeats the aims of NPPF paragraph 12 and 14. Suggest this is amended or deleted.
22	It should be noted that as these are heritage assets existing legislation, NPPF and LP policies protect them from developments that would undermine their significance.
23	Footnote has the wrong date for the Green infrastructure Study. It should say 2010.
24	Please note the correct title for this study is the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment (2009). For accuracy and completeness, this paragraph should reference the Magnesian Limestone Ridge Policy Zones and not just the policy zone numbers.
25	Title of the study is: ‘Landscape Character Assessment 2009’.
26	Part A: Small scale developments will not be able to meet all of the criteria in this policy. Suggest this is reworded to only apply to developments when applicable.
27	Part 1: Which local habitats is this policy referring to? The key to protecting habitats is identifying them. The policy should therefore refer to the protection of significant identified habitats. It should also be noted that NPPF paragraph 113 advises that ‘Local planning authorities should set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development on or affecting protected wildlife or geodiversity sites or landscape areas will be judged. Distinctions should be made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites, so that protection is commensurate with their status and gives appropriate weight to their importance and the contribution that they make to wider ecological networks.’
28	Part 2: What soils is this policy seeking to protect? Is this referring to best and most versatile agricultural land? If so this is already covered by the NPPF (paragraph 112) and guidance the development management handbook. Is this section aimed at a specific area i.e. Coachwood Green? If so recommend it is referenced in this policy for clarity.
29	Part B: Recommend changing the wording to ‘Development on sites in appropriate locations...’ as not all green field locations will be appropriate for development regardless of their biodiversity impact. Requiring a developer to deliver biodiversity gains beyond existing mitigation requirements to result in a net enhancement may be considered unreasonable as costs can render a development unviable. It should be noted that National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) advises that in plan making terms: ‘Plan makers should consider the range of costs on development. This can include costs imposed through national and local standards,

	<p>local policies and the Community Infrastructure Levy, as well as a realistic understanding of the likely cost of Section 106 planning obligations and Section 278 agreements for highways works. Their cumulative cost should not cause development types or strategic sites to be unviable. Emerging policy requirements may need to be adjusted to ensure that the plan is able to deliver sustainable development’.</p> <p>Recommend this policy is reworded to require ‘no net loss of biodiversity of the site’.</p>
30	<p>This policy needs to strike a balance between seeking the protection of undesignated features and becoming too onerous for developers. Too many restrictions or unnecessary requirements may be deemed unreasonable at an examination. In particular: Part A: landscape strategies are not required for outline applications – perhaps rephrase to ‘for detailed major application submissions’.</p>
31	<p>Part A 2: It would be considered unreasonable and impractical to expect this on small scale sites that do not contain any trees or hedgerows or a site that has a large copse of trees. Also note existing legislation does not protect all hedgerows.</p> <p>Recommend adding ‘where appropriate’ at the start.</p>
32	<p>Part A 3: This policy assumes all trees should be protected; this will not be possible if a condition survey shows existing trees to be dead, dying or dangerous or it is agreed through permission that the trees should be removed. For trees that do remain on a site to be developed, the council usually uses a standard condition to achieve the same level of protection. This part of the policy is unnecessary, recommend it is deleted.</p>
33	<p>Part A 4: This cannot be applied if the development is to the south of the village. This is a site specific issue that should not be in a general issue based policy recommend it is deleted.</p>
34	<p>Part A 5: This is already covered by Core Strategy Policy DM9 therefore does not need repeating in the NP recommend it is deleted.</p>
35	<p>Part B: This is already covered by Core Strategy Policy DM9 therefore does not need repeating in the NP recommend it is deleted.</p>
36	<p>Please note that the Site Allocations DPD has been withdrawn and will not be allocating the site referred to in this paragraph. It should also be noted that Bassetlaw District Council has given a resolution to grant planning permission on this site (subject to a legal agreement). Requiring a ‘sense of openness’ between the edge of the existing settlement and this site, has the potential to conflict with aims of this planning permission as it is intended to allow the expansion to the existing primary school. This will result in some development directly adjacent to the existing edge of the settlement. Maintaining ‘openness’ here could stop this expansion of the primary school. Please note that the community will have the opportunity to comment on the final layout of this site at the reserved matters application in the future.</p>
37	<p>It must be noted that a local green space is not the same as a green belt. Guidance in the NPPG Paragraph: 015 Reference ID: 37-015-20140306 states that Local Green space designations should not be used ‘to achieve what would amount to a new area of Green Belt by another name’. Recommend reference to green belt land is deleted.</p>
38	<p>Agree with seeking good linkages between new developments and the existing village but what does the NP mean by the ‘established village’?</p>

39	<p>Consideration must be given to the advice in Paragraph 60 of the NPPF which states ‘Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.’ It is unclear how this policy promotes or reinforces local distinctiveness. Recommend this policy is reworded to better meet the requirements of the NPPF. Elements of this policy are already covered by Bassetlaw Core Strategy policy DM4 and the adopted Residential Design SPD. This policy needs to recognise that not all development will be able to meet all of the criteria, i.e. small scale developments of single dwellings.</p> <p>Recommend ‘where appropriate’ is added to the start of this policy.</p>
40	<p>Part A 4: A policy requiring developers to use an adopted SPD is not necessary – it already exists and should be used where appropriate.</p>
41	<p>Part B: Using Building for Life as a test for design quality places additional burden upon developers. Building for Life is an aspirational/non-mandatory document setting out a framework for the achievement of quality development. The council doesn’t regard this section as necessary, as there is already an adopted residential design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the district that encompasses the principles of Building for Life. Suggest deletion of this section.</p>
42	<p>This section only quotes selective parts of the URS Shireoaks study. The study notes that ‘The Bassetlaw SFRA does not highlight Shireoaks as one of the villages worst affected by lack of capacity in the public sewer network’. Advice from this study also states that ‘neighbourhood groups have some latitude to build upon NPPF and Local Plan policies for flooding, provided the policies are justified, deliverable, based upon evidence and do not needlessly repeat existing policy’. URS therefore recommended that ‘the Neighbourhood Group holds a workshop with Bassetlaw Council to understand how emerging local plan policy will be applied in the future and therefore whether it is ‘good enough’ for addressing the Neighbourhood Group’s ambitions’. BDC regards existing flooding policies in the NPPF and the Local Plan as sufficient to meet the flooding issues in Shireoaks.</p> <p>The additional Flooding Report (Appendix F) contains anecdotal assumptions that are not evidence – i.e. speculative statement that the compensatory flood plain for the Bovis Homes estate failed due to underground water courses. What is the evidence to justify this statement?</p>
43	<p>The additional flooding report (Appendix F) states that the development of the Shireoaks Common site would result in the loss of almost 8 hectares of flood plain. The SFRA does not identify this site as part of the flood plain. If this assumption is based on BDC’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment ‘non fluvial flood risk maps’, this is a misinterpretation of the map. This map does not identify flood plain. These are merely maps of historic surface water run-off flooding in extreme events. The caveat written on these maps states ‘the identification of areas with a history of sewer flooding or areas vulnerable to surface water run-off in extreme events does not preclude future development, but highlights the need for further consideration of the flood risk to and from any additional development’.</p> <p>It should be noted here that risk of surface water flooding does not preclude further development. Reference to this area as flood plain need to be amended</p>

	accordingly.
44	Part A: The map in Figure 2 is not a defined water catchment area – this is a misleading description. It identifies a series of open dykes not a defined area. To describe this as a catchment area implies a designation of this area as such. This reference should be changed.
45	<p>Part D: We appreciate that this is a positive aspiration and assume it is derived from standards in the Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH).</p> <p>However, this policy does not account for the viability impact of setting a lower discharge rate on new development. What is the justification for this and can it be considered reasonable in viability terms? BDC considered CSH standards in the Core Strategy, but evidence suggested that delivery would be cost prohibitive in addition to the costs of delivering affordable housing, open space etc. National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) advises that in plan making terms (including Neighbourhood Plans): ‘Plan makers should consider the range of costs on development. This can include costs imposed through national and local standards, local policies and the Community Infrastructure Levy, as well as a realistic understanding of the likely cost of Section 106 planning obligations and Section 278 agreements for highways works.</p> <p>Their cumulative cost should not cause development types or strategic sites to be unviable. Emerging policy requirements may need to be adjusted to ensure that the plan is able to deliver sustainable development’ In addition, for relevant applications, the views of appropriate technical consultees would be sought on this matter. Recommend this part of the policy is deleted.</p>
46	Part E: recommend the identification of specific sustainable drainage techniques be removed from this policy and only identify that ‘...development should incorporate sustainable drainage techniques wherever possible...’This will allow for flexibility in the identification of the best drainage solution for a particular site and allow any new drainage solutions developed after this policy is adopted to be used as well.
47	Please note that the Site Allocations DPD has been withdrawn and will not be allocating the site referred to in this paragraph. It should also be noted that Bassetlaw District Council has given a resolution to grant planning permission on this site (subject to a legal agreement). This paragraph should be updated to reflect this.
48	<p>Encouraging applicants to engage the local community in pre application discussions before submitting an application is a worthy intention supported by NPPF paragraph 189. However, developers can only be required to undertake pre-application engagement with the community if the application is for a wind turbine development involving more than 2 turbines or where the hub height of any turbine exceeds 15 metres. For all other developments it can only be encouraged in line with the guidance in paragraph 009 of the NPPG. Recommend this policy be reworded to encourage engagement not require it.</p> <p>For reference: NPPF Paragraph 189 states ‘Local planning authorities have a key role to play in encouraging other parties to take maximum advantage of the pre-application stage. They cannot require that a developer engages with them before submitting a planning application, but they should encourage take-up of any pre-application services they do offer. They should also, where they think this would be beneficial, encourage any applicants who are not already required to do so by law to engage with the local community before submitting their applications.’</p>

	For reference: NPPG Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 20-009-20140306 states ‘Pre-application engagement with the community is encouraged where it will add value to the process and the outcome. It is mandatory to carry out pre-application consultation with the local community for planning applications for wind turbine development involving more than 2 turbines or where the hub height of any turbine exceeds 15 metres.’
49	As well as requiring this development complies with the policies of the NP it will also need to comply with policies of the adopted Core Strategy and NPPF. Recommend references to these are added to this paragraph.
50	Agreed. The inclusion of a policy to deliver these community facilities is a good aim of the NP and builds on the Core Strategy in a positive manner. However as stated for Policy 6 above the NP cannot require engagement at a pre-application stage. Reference to this should be amended in line with changes to Policy 6.
51	Support the aims of this policy. Except: Part A2: reference to policy 6 is not necessary as pre-app cannot be required only encouraged (see policy 6 comment above) Part C: reference to policy 6 is not necessary as pre-app cannot be required only encouraged (see policy 6 comment above)
52	Parking standards are already addressed in Bassetlaw’s adopted Residential Parking Standards SPD. The SPD sets a minimum standard of 1 space for 1 bedroom dwellings and 2 spaces for dwellings with 2 or more bedrooms. This policy sets a different parking requirement for new development. Recommend more evidence is needed to justify the NP’s requirement. It should also be noted that over time government guidance differs on parking provisions, the wording of this policy should include the statement ‘consistent with current national guidance at the time of determination’ to ensure flexibility with any national changes.
53	The NP recognises that speed restriction measures are not land use planning matters. If they cannot be delivered through the NP, recommend they are not included to avoid confusion (See also comments on projects above).
54	Policy 10 Part A: Reference to ‘in and around the plan area’ in the policy is potentially confusing. Is this policy only seeking onsite improvements to enhance the overall offer of such facilities to the NP area or is it seeking off-site improvements? If it is the latter, please note that the planning system cannot require developers to provide additional off-site improvements if they do not reasonably relate to the development itself. Recommend the wording is revised for clarity.
55	Parts A and B: The financial burden of providing what is asked for in this policy should be carefully considered and flexibility in the policy wording provided. Paragraph 173 of the NPPF states that: ‘Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be

	<p>deliverable.’.</p> <p>Adding flexibility in this policy could still require developers to explore the inclusion of such features but if it is shown to render the development unviable, the development will not be stopped by this policy. Recommend the word ‘must’ is removed from both parts and replaced with ‘where viable, should’.</p>
56	No objection to the designation of this area as Local Green Space. However, the area shown on the map in figure 4 may conflict with the aim of policy 12 to develop a visitor’s centre on the site. It should also be noted that a planning application for the development of this visitors centre has already been submitted.
57	<p>No objection to the designation of the area as a Local Green Space, however please note the potential conflict with the aim of policy 12 to develop a visitors centre on the site. Also:</p> <p>Part a): Justification for the designation of this Local Green Space (LGS) to act as a landscape buffer could be interpreted as similar to a green belt (to stop the expansion of a settlement). In line with the guidance in the NPPG Paragraph: 015 (Reference ID: 37-015-20140306) LGS should not be used to act like a green belt. The designation of a LGS needs to meet the requirements as set out in paragraph 77 of the NPPF. Recommend this justification is deleted. Instead recommend the inclusion of an additional justification to explain that this policy is intended to protect a valuable area of recreational space. This will better align this policy with the aims of NPPF paragraph 77.</p>
58	<p>Part A 1: What is meant by materials appropriate to the semi-rural setting?</p> <p>This will be difficult to enforce in a planning application. More information is needed to explain what this policy is seeking. Would the use of glass, wood, brick, natural materials such as green roofs or metal cladding be supported?</p>
59	Part A 2: Please note this site is a Local Wildlife Site not a Local Nature Reserve. Local Nature Reserves are formally designated and have statutory protection. Local Wildlife Sites are habitats identified as being of significance at county level. Please correct this reference.
60	Reference to policy 6 should be amended in line with comments on policy 6 set out above.

Environment Agency

Comment Number	Comment
61	We have reviewed the pre-submission version of the plan which sets out many good policies which promote sustainable development within the plan area and we are supportive of the Vision, Objectives and policy aspirations of the plan, with particular reference to flood risk and wildlife.
Policy 5: Reducing the Risk of Flooding	
62	No development should be permitted within 8m of any watercourse classified as a ‘main river’ (examples include the rivers Ryton, Idle and Trent). We would advise consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority for the appropriate buffer

	distance for ‘ordinary watercourses’
63	We recommend that point C of the policy be amended to read as follows ‘New development should protect existing watercourses and land drainage wherever possible or re-align and improve to the satisfaction of the LPA, in consultation with the Environment Agency or Lead Local Flood Authority’.
64	Where practical, new developments should aim to de-culvert any culverted watercourses within the development boundary.
65	We recommend that Point D should be split into 2 separate points within the policy i.e. the water efficiency part of the policy forming a standalone policy point (part F) and the SUDS, paving references incorporated into point E.

Natural England

Comment Number	Comment
66	Natural England generally welcomes the draft neighbourhood plan which sets out development management policies which will guide the future sustainable development of Shireoaks.
67	We are pleased that the Community vision includes aspirations to maximise the environmental assets, improve access to the countryside and open spaces for residents and visitors. The vision recognises the role of green infrastructure in providing flood mitigation and a valuable recreational resource in addition the green assets also have an important biodiversity function providing ecological corridors.
68	We welcome the acknowledgement of the importance of the three major wildlife corridors running through the plan area and the role they play in providing a green lung to the communities and wider population, providing opportunities for access, recreation and sustainable travel.
69	We support Policies 2, 3, 11 and 12 which seek to protect and enhance the quality and quantity of natural assets and open spaces and encourage opportunities to increase biodiversity and access to nature.
70	<p>We have checked our records and based on the information provided, we can confirm that in our view the proposals contained within the plan will not have significant effects on sensitive sites that Natural England has a statutory duty to protect.</p> <p>We are not aware of significant populations of protected species which are likely to be affected by the policies /proposals within the plan. It remains the case, however, that the responsible authority should provide information supporting this screening decision, sufficient to assess whether protected species are likely to be affected.</p>

Nottinghamshire County Council

Comment Number	Comment
71	The document makes no reference to minerals, but a large proportion of the plan area, to the south of the village, (See Appendix 1) lies within a Mineral Safeguarding and Consultation Area for limestone. The County Council can see no reference to site specific allocations in the Neighbourhood Plan and so there are no site specific comments to make in relation to this. The County Council would suggest that the Neighbourhood Plan make some reference to the safeguarding and consultation area.
72	Policy 1C - The County Council is not sure why this would need to be in the Shireoaks Draft Neighbourhood Plan as this section of Shireoaks Road is already subject to a 7.5 tonne weight restriction and a low bridge height limit. There is not much else NCC can do other than limiting development served directly from Shireoaks Road, but each development will be viewed on its own merit.
73	TTS welcome the draft Plan and the emphasis on sustainable development (Policy 1). In particular TTS hope that the Plan, when adopted, will give support to the Council when upgrading and improving bus stop locations to assist with the smooth operation of public transport within the village. The comments in this response are intended to support TTS with making public transport and infrastructure improvements by mitigating the concerns from residents about proposed improvements.
74	TTS support this statement and suggest a specific mention for public transport and its role in reducing the impact of traffic congestion.
75	TTS ask that an additional principle is added to Policy 1 stating “5. funding to enhance the local bus network and bus stop infrastructure to ensure that the needs of the growing population are met.”
76	TTS support Policy 4 and request that public transport is referenced as follows ‘including the provision of improved public transport services and infrastructure for easy movement beyond the town centre’
77	Paragraph 13.3 states as one of the community concerns “Ensuring that infrastructure is provided to support the proposed development e.g. footpath and cycle ways, roads and traffic management”
78	Policy 10: Promote sustainable movement and connections TTS request that the following is added: "C Where appropriate to its scale and location, development must include proposals which enhance the local transport network and associated infrastructure to promote modal shift from the use of the private car."
79	The document doesn't make reference the important role of Community Transport in delivering transport provision, especially in rural areas. A number of important community transport providers are based in Bassetlaw, and it is suggested that reference to their work, and the potential for Community Transport and related services i.e. taxi buses to complement the local bus network is explored.
80	· Three wildlife corridors are identified in paragraph 3.6, and mentioned elsewhere in the Plan. Whilst the County Council would agree that these three areas do indeed function as wildlife corridors, it is suggested that a fourth, major corridor also exists, running from Dumb Hall Lane on the county boundary, north-east through Scratta Wood, Shireoaks Park Wood and Shiroaks Hall to the River Ryton;

	there are opportunities to strengthen this corridor in places.
81	In the Vision in section 5, it is suggested that point 4 should be expanded to read “... as well as their role in reducing flood risk and supporting wildlife”.
82	In the Objectives in section 6, Community Objectives 2 and 4 are particularly supported; however, it should be noted that the Woodland and Coachwood Green area is not a ‘local nature reserve’ within the specific meaning of that phrase – Local Nature Reserve is a formal designation, which the County Council do not believe that the area has obtained (although it may be desirable to seek this status in the future). Reference to the ‘Local Nature Reserve’ is also repeated in paragraph 16.3.
83	Also in section 9, paragraph 9.4, a number of species are listed. It would be desirable to specify that the crayfish present are (native) white-clawed crayfish. Mink should not be listed here, as they are an invasive non-native species (and which have a major detrimental impact on the next listed species, water vole).
84	Policy 2 in section 9 is supported; A2 could also refer to ‘species-rich grassland’ in the list of habitats.
85	Policy 3 in section 9 is supported; section A would, ideally, refer to the use of native species appropriate to the local area within landscaping plans.
86	In Policy 4, an additional point A6 could be added, to require development to demonstrate biodiversity enhancement through the installation of integrated bat and bird (house sparrow, starling and swift) boxes within the fabric of new buildings.
87	In Policy 5 it is suggested that section E is expanded to indicate that surface water management features, as listed, should be designed to deliver wildlife benefits where possible.
88	The plan refers to the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment but then fails to refer to it as a tool to use when considering development proposals. The County Council would suggest the following additions: Policy 2B: development on sites in the open countryside must assess the impact of the proposals on landscape character and visual amenity through deployment of a Landscape Character and Visual Impact Appraisal or Visual Impact Assessment.
89	Policy 3A: for any major applications a landscape strategy shall be submitted which will include A Landscape Character and Visual Impact assessment
90	Community Objective 4: NCC Country Parks and Green Estates Team supports Community Objective 4 to develop the Woodlands and Coach Wood Green provided that proposals are made in consultation with the Authority.
91	Note: The Authority could not support the formal designation of the site as a Country Park under the Countryside Act 1968 as the site doesn't meet the criteria as original set out by the then Countryside Commission for country parks. We do however support its continuing designation as Local Green Space, and welcome continued and increased community involvement and management of the site.

Thorpe Salvin Parish Council

Comment Number	Comment
92	I had a look at the map included in this plan and I believe you may need to re-examine the western boundary. You appear to be annexing part of our parish and therefore part of RMBC and Yorkshire. The county boundary/Parish boundary is not immediately adjacent to Netherthorpe for instance but some way down the road to Shireoaks.

RPS Planning & Development Ltd

Comment Number	Comment
93	<p>As detailed within the narrative to the Neighbourhood Plan, the now withdrawn BDC Allocations Document, which detailed how the Council proposed to deliver the relevant housing requirements within the Worksop area, proposed two large scale mixed use developments to the north and east of Shireoaks (MU1 and MU2).</p> <p>In the case of Allocation MU1, this mixed use development would significantly increase the size of Shireoaks, which is obviously contrary to the aspirations of the Neighbourhood Plan. The proposed 175 dwellings and 15.4 ha of employment land would be notably out of scale with the size of the current settlement and directly contradict Objectives 1 and 7 of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Allocation MU2 would be visually intrusive to the village itself and when considered alongside MU1, the resultant effect would be to create a virtually continuous built up area linking Worksop and Shireoaks, extending along the A57.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan should look to safeguard against the future inclusion of these allocations in the emerging Bassetlaw District Council Local Plan in order to ensure that the main vision for the Village and the core Community Objectives are not undermined. I appreciate that the Local Plan is at a very early stage of preparation and that the previous Allocations Document has now been withdrawn. However, through the Preferred Options outlined in the Allocations Document, BDC have made a clear statement of their development site preferences going forward, whereby they will be looking to deliver their development requirements for the future.</p> <p>It has been suggested that the two sites at Woodends Farm could be used as a buffer between Shireoaks and Worksop in the context of proposed allocations MU1 and MU2. The reality is, however, that the two land parcels are not large enough to provide a meaningful buffer between the two settlements. Conversely, it would appear far more appropriate for sites MU1 and MU2 to remain as providing the relevant buffers, with the land off Shireoaks Common offering a more suitable minor infill extension to the existing Shireoaks development boundary. The two parcels at Woodends Farm could contribute approximately 100 dwellings (including</p>

	<p>affordable homes) towards the housing land requirements for the area or accommodate a mixed use scheme if preferred.</p> <p>Pertinently, the size of development would be of a more suitable size and scale in the context of the Village. Also, notably, none of the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan would be compromised by the development of the Woodends Farm proposal sites. The two development parcels either side of Woodends Farm are far more suitable development site alternatives in this context and so consideration should be made for their reference within the narrative of the Neighbourhood Plan. Critically, they also offer the benefit of immediate deliverability which would help support the basis of the Neighbourhood Plan as it moves forward.</p>
--	---

4 Amendments to the Neighbourhood Plan

- 4.1 The following table outlines how the comments received listed in the preceding section of this document have been used to amend and improve the NP, or if the comment has not resulted in an amendment reasons are given as to why this decision has been reached.

Comment Number	Comment Source	Amendment Required?	Amendments to the NP
1	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
2	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
3	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
4	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Added reference to Fig 2 and the flooding report; added more detail in appendix F plus references as above.
5	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
6	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
7	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
8	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
9	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
10	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Wording amended but kept in 4.3 as social cohesion is a challenge.
11	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Moved para 5.1 to after the Vision, however it cannot be included in the Vision as it was not consulted on.
12	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
13	Bassetlaw District	Yes	Amended as suggested.

	Council		
14	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested, projects moved to own Appendix in the Plan.
15	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Wording amended, not deleted.
16	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
17	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
18	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Information related to survey added.
19	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
20	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Wording amended not deleted.
21	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
22	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
23	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
24	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
25	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
26	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Policy 2 wording amended to reflect BDC comments.
27	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
28	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Reference to soil removed?
29	Bassetlaw District	Yes	Amended as suggested.

	Council		
30	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Policy 3 wording amended to reflect BDC comments.
31	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
32	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Narrative included before policy to provide context and a new section B has been inserted to refer specifically to land to north of village.
33	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Wording amended, not deleted.
34	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
35	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
36	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested
37	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested
38	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended to refer to the "heart of the village".
39	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	More information regarding local character added.
40	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Wording amended, not deleted.
41	Bassetlaw District Council	No - BFL12 is an industry standard and is used and promoted in other made NPs it is not part of the code for sustainable homes that was removed in the deregulation bill.	
42	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	More wording added from URS study that neighbourhood plan groups could have latitude.

43	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Appendix F amended.
44	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
45	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
46	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
47	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
48	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Wording amended but Policy retained.
49	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
50	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
51	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested
52	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Policy and narrative removed.
53	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Wording amended, not deleted.
54	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
55	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
56	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes - Coachwood Green is the Local Green Space Woodlands Country Park is to be developed this confusion arose because map not clear,	Figures 3 and 4 amended to avoid confusion.
57	Bassetlaw District	Yes	Amended as suggested.

	Council		
58	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
59	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
60	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
61	Environment Agency	No – Supports the Plan	
62	Environment Agency	Yes	Amended as suggested.
63	Environment Agency	Yes	Amended as suggested.
64	Environment Agency	Yes	Amended as suggested.
65	Environment Agency	Yes	Amended as suggested.
66	Natural England	No – Supports the Plan	
67	Natural England	No – Supports the Plan	
68	Natural England	No – Supports the Plan	
68	Natural England	No – Supports the Plan	
70	Natural England	No – Supports the Plan	
71	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Reference to minerals added.
72	Nottinghamshire County Council	No - The inclusion of policy 1c reflects the concern residents have with non-enforcement of HGVs ignoring the current restrictions.	
73	Nottinghamshire County Council	No – Support for the Plan	
74	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
75	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
76	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.

77	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
78	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
79	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
80	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Fourth corridor to be added as detailed.
81	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
82	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
83	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
84	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
85	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
86	Nottinghamshire County Council	No - In conjunction with NCC green estates department Friends of Woodlands & Coachwood Green are currently installing bird and bat boxes in strategic locations throughout the village to enhance biodiversity.	
87	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
88	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
89	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
90	Nottinghamshire	Yes	Community Objective 4 amended.

	County Council		
91	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Space not to be referred to as a Country Park.
92	Thorpe Salvin Parish Council	No – BDC have confirmed the map provided and used in the document is correct.	
93	RPS Planning & Development Ltd	<p>No - The NP does not allocate either the MU1 or MU2 site (Site MU2 is not in the NP boundary), and both already have planning permission. Therefore the development of the proposed sites instead of these cannot be delivered through the NP.</p> <p>The proposed sites have also not been presented before throughout the Plan process before this stage.</p>	