

Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan



Consultation Statement

Introduction

The Tuxford Neighbourhood plan (NP) has been prepared in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Order Act 2004, the Localism Act 2011, the Neighbourhood Planning (general) regulations 2012 and the Directive 2001/42/EC on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). The NP establishes a vision for the future of the Parish and sets out how this vision will be realised through planning and managing future land use and development change over the lifetime of the NP.

The NP is a planning document prepared by the local community. It is legally bound and once it has been formally 'made' by Bassetlaw District Council (BDC), it must be used by:

- Planning Officers at BDC when assessing planning applications; and
- Applicants who are preparing planning applications.

In order for this NP to carry sufficient 'weight' when assessing planning applications, it must be examined by an independent examiner who will assess the plan for its conformity to a set of 'basic conditions' as set out in the NP regulations. If successful, the Plan, along with any recommended amendments, will be subject to a public referendum.

The Aims of this (Regulation 14) Consultation

The aims of Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan consultation process were:

- To involve as much of the community as possible throughout all consultation stages of the Plan development, so that the Plan was informed by the views of local people and businesses from the start of the process;
- To ensure consultation events took place during the consultation period in order to allow members of the community to 'have their say' during the process;
- To engage with a wide range of people as possible, using a variety of approaches and communication and consultation techniques; and
- To ensure the results and findings of the consultation are fed back to the community for them to view.

Regulation 14 Consultation

The Regulation 14 consultation is a statutory six-week (minimum) consultation period as detailed within the NP regulations 2012. The Regulation 14 consultation is where a draft NP is available for the local community as well as statutory consultees to provide comment and input into the process. Any suggested amendments to the Plan are detailed in this statement and a decision on whether these suggested amendments has been made are also detailed.

The draft NP Plan was sent to all statutory consultees such as BDC, the Environment Agency, Historic England etc. A list of all relevant statutory consultees can be found in **Appendix 1**.

What is a Consultation Statement?

This Consultation Statement relates to the draft Tuxford NP and has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the NP Regulations 2012. Section 15(2) of parts of the Regulations sets out that a Consultation should contain the following:

- Details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed NP;
- Explain how they were consulted;
- Summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
- Describe how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed NP.

This statement provides an overview and description of the consultation period on the proposed Tuxford NP which ran until the 18th September 2015.

The separate document entitled 'Consultation Summary'¹ sets out the list of methods, events and publication that have led to the production of this draft of the Tuxford NP.

¹ Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Summary

Public Consultation

Several methods were undertaken in order to promote this consultation period to the wider community and other relevant stakeholders. These include:

Website

The NP website provided detail of the consultation period, public events and how to respond. Copies of relevant documents and response forms were also provided where people could download at their convenience. The NP website can be found at the following address:

www.tuxfordneighbourhoodplan.org.uk

Local Media and advertising

The following lists the principle engagement and promotion activities undertaken during the consultation period.

Method of Consultation	Detail	Who was Consulted?
Tuxfordian Article		All residents
Poster	A number of posters were erected across the town advertising the consultation period and events.	All residents and businesses
Public Banner	Produced to provide constant advertisement of the NP and the consultation events	All residents and visitors
Public Events	Designed to allow local residents to 'have their say' on the draft Tuxford NP.	All residents and businesses in the town
Website	A dedicated Neighbourhood Planning website has been created to provide residents with up-to-date information and copies of documents	To all who have internet access

The NP steering group produced a small A5 sized leaflet and a poster (below) that advertised the consultation on the NP and the four public consultations events. The posters were put up around the town and within various venues and facilities, including local shops.



Public Events

During the consultation period, the NP steering group organised a number of public events whereby it gave members of the local community to attend and gain further information about the NP process and the current consultation. Four separate public events were organised, including:

Saturday 1st August 2015 – St Nicholas Church (20 attendees)

Main issues raised:

- The majority of people agreed that the NP was a good idea and the majority of policies were appropriate to manage future development;
- Concern over the lack of existing infrastructure to accommodate large scale future development;
- Increase in the level of traffic;
- Concern over the proposed infill policy and the scale of development;
- Concern over the current level of parking in the town centre

Thursday 20th August 2015 – Chilli Petals Café (22 attendees)

Main issues raised:

- The majority of people agreed that the NP was a good idea and the majority of policies were appropriate to manage future development;
- Concerned over the level of parking in the town centre;
- Believed the town needed a greater level of family sized housing;
- Believed the local landscape needed to be preserved.

Wednesday 2nd September 2015 – Working Men's Club (26 attendees)

Main issues raised:

- The majority of people agreed that the NP was a good idea and the majority of policies were appropriate to manage future development;
- Concern over the level and location of proposed development in the town;
- A new community centre is needed;

- Concern over the lack of local businesses in the town

Friday 11th September 2015 – Chilli Petals Café (35 attendees)

Main issues raised:

- The majority of people agreed that the NP was a good idea and the majority of policies were appropriate to manage future development;
- The local businesses and services needed protecting;
- New development should provide family and older persons accommodation;
- Concerned over an increase in traffic into the town.

Consultation Responses

This section contains the responses and comments received on the draft NP throughout the Regulation 14 consultation period from both local residents and other consulted bodies and statutory consultees.

Comments from Statutory Consultees

Highways England

Rep Number	Any Amendments suggested	Section of the Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
SC1		General	Highways England welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan for Tuxford Town Council, which has been published for public consultation. It is the role of Highways England to maintain and safeguard the efficient operation of the strategic road network and to act as a delivery partner to national economic growth. In the context of Tuxford's Neighbourhood Plan, the principal focus of Highways England is on ensuring that the operation of the A1, routing through the town council area, is not compromised by growth coming forward in the surrounding area	None
SC1A	No	General	It is recognized within the Neighbourhood Plan that development is required in Tuxford to	None

Rep Number	Any Amendments suggested	Section of the Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
			<p>meet Bassetlaw District Council's (as the overarching planning authority for this area) housing requirements. There was a previous expectation in the Bassetlaw Core Strategy Site Allocations document that Tuxford would accommodate approximately 300 new dwellings. However, this document has since been withdrawn and alternative sites may need to be found to accommodate this growth. The Tuxford Place Analysis (2015) document that was commissioned for the Neighbourhood Plan sets out sites in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2014 that might be considered as suitable for development.</p>	
SC1C	Yes	General	<p>Highways England notes that the Town Council is not in support of all of the sites coming forward, but considers that these sites should be used as a framework for Bassetlaw District Council in considering applications. Highways England considers that the cumulative traffic impacts from around 300 new homes in Tuxford could impact upon the operation of the A1, particularly at the southbound off-slip and southbound on-slip at Tuxford. These cumulative</p>	<p>Text has been added to reflect this comment in the narrative and in the policy.</p>

Rep Number	Any Amendments suggested	Section of the Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
			impacts and any need for mitigation would need to be assessed to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the A1	
4	Yes	Policy 4	In this regard, it is considered that “Policy 4: Possible Residential Development Adjoining Tuxford”, should be amended to reflect this requirement.	Text added in narrative ‘It may be that the cumulative traffic impacts of significant development may impact on the operation of the A1. Such impacts will need to be assessed in detail as part of the planning application process. Policy 4 wording added ‘The scale of development should not detrimentally impact on the operation of the A1..

Lincolnshire County Council

Rep Number	Any Amendments to the Plan?	Section of the Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
SC2	No	-	LCC does not have any specific comments to make on individual policies within the Plan. However, it is considered that the document as a whole incorporates an appropriate vision, objectives and policies on a range of matters including, housing, employment, community facilities and the built and natural environments which will help shape the future of the Parish over the period to 2030	None

West Stockwith Parish Council

Rep Number	Any Amendments Suggested?	Section of the Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
SC3	No	-	-	None

Bassetlaw District Council

Rep Number	Any Amendments Suggested?	Section of Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
SC4	Yes	General	Delete all references to the site allocations DPD.	Deleted reference to site allocations and associated narrative
SC4a	Yes	General	As BDC is working on a new Local Plan references to the Core Strategy will quickly become out dated. As such, it may be more beneficial to refer to it as the District Council's 'strategic planning documents' where a specific reference is not essential.	Reference to core strategy only retained where necessary to explain context.
SC4b	Yes	General	Number all paragraphs for clear reference	Agreed. Amendments made
SC4c	Yes	General	In the list of policies in the contents 'protecting and enhancing the historic core' is a policy, however, this section is largely back ground text – is policy	Amended section name of policy 5 to match heading of section which is in keeping with the format for the rest of the policies.

Rep Number	Any Amendments Suggested?	Section of Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
			5: 'development in the conservation area' actually the 'protecting and enhancing the historic core' a policy? The policy names and numbering needs to be clearer.	
SC4d	Yes	General	Change paragraph numbering to make it clearer	Agreed will be amended as part of reformatting
SC4e	Yes	Objective 8	It is unreasonable to suggest that any investment from new development should benefit the whole town. This should be removed.	Objective 8 related to the additional funding that will accrue to the town council. the investment objective reworded for clarity To ensure that planning gain arising from new development is focused on initiatives that will benefit the town
SC4f	Yes	Policy 1	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.	Amendments to wording in policy boxes made in accordance with revised wording proposed..
SC4g	Yes	Policy 1	All major development over the Plan period will maximise the environmental assets and heritage	Wording amended to 'Development over the Plan period will seek to maximise the environmental assets and heritage attributes in and around

Rep Number	Any Amendments Suggested?	Section of Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
			<p>attributes in and around Tuxford, improving access to the countryside and open spaces for residents and visitors where applicable.'</p> <p>Unreasonable to assume that all major development will maximise the environmental assets and heritage attributes.</p>	<p>Tuxford, improving access to the countryside and open spaces for residents and visitors where applicable.'</p> <p>Making it relate to all development not just major development recognises that there may be a scheme of 9 dwellings located either adjoining the conservation area or on the edge of the countryside. The use of the word seek and where applicable allows flexibility as required by the NPPF.</p>
SC4h	Yes	Policy 1	<p>This policy appears to be a combination of two separate aims: Increasing access to the countryside and ensuring that Tuxford is a viable place for development. Recommend that this policy is revised so that it reads more clearly.</p>	<p>No amendment made: it is contested that this policy is intended as an over arching policy (this is stated in the narrative) and under the heading of sustainable development it sets out the overall requirements of future development.</p>
SC4i	Yes	Policy 1	<p>This policy needs revising; it is unreasonable to suggest that development should be supported when it provides new employment space. This would infer that an application would be 'particularly</p>	<p>The removal of policy 1 (3) was discussed but the Steering Group felt strongly that this list of different types of development would ensure that Tuxford thrived. The word viability was changed to vitality and the criteria about this development</p>

Rep Number	Any Amendments Suggested?	Section of Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
			encouraged' if employment space was to be provided; regardless of the specifics of the scheme. Since the policy refers to 'all' development, this would also mean that small developments such as residential extensions or small-scale builds would fall under this	needing to meet other planning requirements (e.g. conservation and landscape matters) was added in the policy box for added clarity.
SC4j	Yes	Policy 1	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. Also, it is not within the scope of a NP to <i>advise</i> developers – suggest this is deleted.	Amendments made
SC4k	Yes	Page 24/ Background Text	The Tuxford place Analysis carries little planning weight. These statements are also contrary to Paragraph 60 of the NPPF: <i>'Planning policies and decisions should not</i>	The TPA is a document to support the design policy in the neighbourhood plan. It was commissioned by the SG and they have had editorial control over the content. The brief was to

Rep Number	Any Amendments Suggested?	Section of Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
			<i>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.</i> These sections should be changed to better comply with the NPPF. Also, 'Tuxford style' is not a defined term. This currently does not conform to Paragraph 60 as above, as it seeks to impose a certain architectural style on developers. Also an issue here with informal language – what 'isn't' and 'doesn't' is ambiguous, subjective and uncertain.	analyse the different design characters in Tuxford and to consider using urban design analysis why some parts of Tuxford were nicer places to live than others. The identification of these places was based on previous community consultation. These findings have been threaded into the neighbourhood plan which has been consulted on extensively. The sentence that referenced the Tuxford style has been removed and replaced with 'The community expects developers to show in their proposals that they have taken into account the findings in the Tuxford Place Analysis taking the best aspects from previous housing design and layout whilst learning from the local evidence to ensure a high quality design and a good standard of amenity is achieved.' High quality design and a good standard of amenity are phrases supported in the NPPF. An extra sentence has been added to show flexibility for innovative designs.
SC4I	Yes	Policy 3	These statements are unreasonable and place additional burden upon developers – Building for Life is an	Policy 3 has been reworded to include key principles of BFL12 explicitly to ensure that if BFL12 is superseded this policy will be valid. More information

Rep Number	Any Amendments Suggested?	Section of Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
			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.	on BFL12 has been provided in the narrative to provide clarity on what a good score would be. This was a recommendation from the examiner on the Elkesley NP
SC4m	Yes	Page 28 Paragraph 3	Quotes should not be included; a general 'feel' for community issues was raised previously in the plan. This is also the view of one or two people, not a collective community position. Also, potentially affecting someone's view across the countryside is not a justifiable reason to refuse development. It is unreasonable to suggest development cannot take place if it affects a resident's view across open countryside. E.g. 'protect all open spaces along with distant views' is unreasonable – what views in	Views referenced were community views not public views but to provide more clarity 'community' views has been put in. Two community quotes have been removed agree that they are rather subjective.

Rep Number	Any Amendments Suggested?	Section of Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
			particular does this refer to? The Tuxford Conservation Area Appraisal would also already cover this.	
SC4n	Yes	Section 3	Managing Growth: Although the NP states that the inclusion of so many sites does not mean it supports them all it is feared that by including them in a document that is adopted as part of the NP it will be regarded as an acceptance of the suitability of them. Should the purpose of the NP be to identify sites that the NP would be supportive of development. From the Council's own assessment of these sites previously we are aware that there will be conservation considerations with some of them. It may be impossible for the planning authority to support the development of all of these sites either on conservation grounds or other matters.	This Plan is criteria based and the community were clear that they did not want to do a site allocation plan. The effect of the conservation area on some of the areas around the town is discussed in the narrative. Section 3 in the TPA has been amended to remove the focus on SHLAA sites but to indicate design principles depending on whether growth was to the north, south of the town. The word sites has been changed to areas.
SC4o	Yes	Page 28 Paragraph 1	'Quantum of development' – This is vague, unclear and not accessible to local people. This paragraph also	Amended

Rep Number	Any Amendments Suggested?	Section of Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
			mentions the Core Strategy – this should instead refer to the Local Plan.	
SC4p	Yes	Policy 4	The word 'possible' should be removed from the title.	Amended
SC4q	Yes	Policy 4 paragraph 1	Wording of the sentence, e.g. 'Some development...' –is ambiguous. ' <i>Where appropriate</i> '... would be more suitable. Also 'edge of development' is vague.	Amended
SC4r	Yes	Policy 4 Paragraph 2	What is considered to be 'detrimental' is subjective. The 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. Recommend that this is revised.	Amended
SC4s	Yes	Map 3	The Key is unclear. Description also states that the map identifies the conservation area, listed buildings and	Map removed and reference made to Tuxford CA Appraisal

Rep Number	Any Amendments Suggested?	Section of Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
			<p>positive buildings in the plan area, however it appears to only show the boundary of the conservation area?</p> <p>The Conservation Area Boundary should also not be shown in the NP as this is covered in the Tuxford Conservation Area Appraisal and may in the future be altered/revised.</p> <p>Instead, this should reference the Tuxford Conservation Area Appraisal so that the policies within the NP remain up to date.</p>	
SC4t	Yes	Policy 4/ page 31	Protecting and enhancing the historic core: p.g. 31 – last sentence – What table is being referred to, where is it?	Table is in the TPA, reference considered unnecessary so has been deleted.
SC4w	Yes	Map 4	<p>How is this map different to the Tuxford Conservation Area Appraisal?</p> <p>This map appears to be a straight lift from the Tuxford CAA, it should be removed and reference the CAA instead.</p>	Map 4 now renumbered map 3 shows character areas that have been identified as part of the work on the Tuxford Place Analysis
SC4x	Yes	Policy 5	Is this actually needed? The preservation and enhancement of the conservation area is currently a	Policy 5 has been amended to include the positive comments of the conservation officer

Rep Number	Any Amendments Suggested?	Section of Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
			statutory duty of the local planning authority under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; section 12 of the NPPF and policy DM8 of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD along with the Tuxford Conservation Areas Appraisal being a material consideration that has been adopted by the local planning authority. This is robust legislation and policy. Policy 5 of the NP makes reference to the TPA only which itself states it is a summary of the conservation area appraisal.	
SC4y	Yes	Policy 5	<p>Makes reference to the conservation area setting but the policy title is development within the conservation area.</p> <p>This policy could focus more specifically on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The setting of the Conservation area. 	Emphasis of policy 5 now includes these points.

Rep Number	Any Amendments Suggested?	Section of Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The restoration of buildings at risk in the area – allowing flexibility in uses compatible with the buildings designation – these could be listed to include .e. Read’s Grammar School/11 Eldon Street. · Specific use policy on Read’s Grammar School – should be worded to include....‘<i>where not harmful to the building’s special interest</i>’ 	
SC4z	Yes	Page 33 paragraph 2	‘Over the next few years.’ Is not appropriate policy language, this needs to be revised?	Deleted text
SC4ai	Yes	Map 5	This map is difficult to read and draw conclusions from. The key is unclear and the intended outcome of this analysis is uncertain. Mapping each and every bungalow is useful to ascertain where certain housing types are located, but the map does very little to suggest what the intended outcomes of this analysis are: is it just a basic analysis to inform current locations, or are residents suggesting future bungalows should be located in	Map has been amended to provide clarification

Rep Number	Any Amendments Suggested?	Section of Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
			these areas and/or reflect these styles? This needs to be made clearer. It also states that the map 'shows the proportion of dwellings that are market housing bungalows and social housing bungalows', however the key suggests that the map represents those that are detached and semi-detached? This map needs to be explained or omitted.	
SC4bi	Yes	Policy 6	It is unreasonable to force developers to build 2 bedroom houses. How has a 2 bedroom dwelling been determined as suitable for a starter home or the elderly? Not everybody would want this. Also, Restrictions of this nature cannot form a Planning Policy. Whilst it may be a laudable aim, and it may be that a developer would be willing to look at such an aim, it cannot be a policy requirement. Planning cannot control who would live in a development, therefore as a policy, there is no basis. Suggest deletion of the Policy.	Deleted specific reference to 2 dwellings in policy 6 but left in need for smaller dwellings suitable for older people and starter homes as this is in accordance with findings in SHMA 2014, consultation feedback and reflects demographic evidence of expected housing need over the plan period. Also added in the narrative Consultation feedback and the findings of the SHMA indicate that some 2 bedroom dwellings would be required to meet this local need. This would be agreed as part of the planning application process.

Rep Number	Any Amendments Suggested?	Section of Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
SC4ci	Yes	Policy 7	<p>Policy 7 (a): 'decent standard' is a subjective statement and not appropriate policy language. Needs omitting. The council will also consider residential amenity at application stage. Policy</p> <p>Policy 7 (b) – This will be considered by the council and so it is a redundant policy.</p> <p>Policy 7. 2: Unreasonable to suggest that if one house is built with 4+ bedrooms you must build another 2 bed property (where there is enough land). This places unrealistic and unreasonable expectations on developers and has the potential to skew property market mixes. If accepted, it is considered that this would be highly likely to be overturned at appeal – possibly with the Local Planning Authority facing a costs claim due to the unreasonable demands upon the market as cited in</p>	<p>This policy wording has been amended and the policy reads as follows</p> <p>Applications for residential development on infill and redevelopment sites will only be supported where the proposals are of a high design quality and where such development meets the following criteria:</p> <p>a) it is in keeping with the character of the area particularly in relation to historic development patterns and building plot sizes</p> <p>b) the design is in accordance with the positive attributes in the Tuxford Place Analysis.</p> <p>2. Proposals that include smaller dwellings to meet local need on infill sites that are within safe walking distance of local amenities will be encouraged.</p>

Rep Number	Any Amendments Suggested?	Section of Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
			the Policy. Suggest this should be deleted.	
SC4di	Yes	Policy 8	<p>Policy 8 (Part 1 and 2): Why have only A3 and D2 uses been identified as suitable? Also, A3 uses can change to A1 or A2 uses, and D2 can change <i>temporarily</i> to flexible A1, A2, A3 or B1 uses under permitted development rights following the 2015 Use Classes Amendment Order. The policy does not account for this flexibility of uses and will need to be revised. Points a) and b) are also not needed - the planning process would consider this at time of application. 'Significantly and adversely' – The 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. Recommend that this is revised.</p>	<p>A3 and D2 uses are highlighted because these reflect the feedback in the consultation for additional cafes (a3). Encouraging D2 reflects the needs for more internal community meeting space as the town still has now hall.</p> <p>Policy 8 3 has been revised based on the comments</p> <p>Within the Local Centre Boundary, the design of new shop frontages should ensure that active frontages are created to enhance the vitality of the retail centre.</p>

Rep Number	Any Amendments Suggested?	Section of Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
			<p>Policy 8 (3) – shopfronts generally are active frontages and in some cases where a retailer occupies a building that is not an existing shop it may not be possible due to conservation constraints to install an active shopfront. Is this policy section necessary? What is it trying to achieve?</p> <p>Policy 8, point c): It is difficult to ascertain at what point something would have the support of the ‘community’ – not everyone would agree on particular aspects of a scheme.</p>	
SC4ei	Yes	Map 7	The map key is illegible/too small. Also, why does the NP refer to an SSSI which is outside of the Tuxford NP boundary? This would be covered by the local plan.	Agreed map removed
SC4fi	Yes	Policy 9 (1)	This refers to the wrong map	Map references amended. Also 9 (2) put in narrative as this is an action for the town council
SC4gi	Yes	Policy 10	Remove reference to ‘retail’	Not sure why this should be removed, the retail element will be limited

Rep Number	Any Amendments Suggested?	Section of Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
				under the policy and may financially be necessary to secure the development
SC4hi	Yes	Policy 10	<p>Policy 10, Part c: 'Local shop' is not a defined planning term.</p> <p>Policy 10; 1e: Policy not needed, this would be considered by DC at the application stage. Appropriate definition is material harm.</p> <p>Policy 10. F: If the site has been 'masterplanned' then the design, site boundary and map must be clearly shown in the plan.</p>	10 1c and 1e removed. No masterplan is available at time of writing
SC4ii	Yes	Map 10	No reference to the map? Is this showing existing parking provision or proposed? This needs to be made clearer.	Map title amended to clarify this is existing car parking
SC4ji	Yes	Policy 11	Need a map of Clarke Lane to communicate this better. Also, how does access to Clarke lane improve parking?	Additional text added in narrative and map added to show site. Policy wording amended
SC4ki	Yes	Policy 13	This conflicts with strategic policy and the strategic aims of the council.	The policy has been amended to leave to BDC policy development for

Rep Number	Any Amendments Suggested?	Section of Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
			Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy states that 'Economic development proposals which deliver employment opportunities in Tuxford, will be supported within the Development Boundary, in line with other material considerations and planning policy requirements. Extensions to existing employment sites at Ollerton Road and Lodge Lane, of a scale and type appropriate to the settlement and surrounding land uses, will be supported'. By trying to place a limit on development in this area, the NP is in conflict with strategic policy CS6 of the Core Strategy and it should therefore be removed. This policy also conflicts with the NPs previously identified issue of there being 'no employment opportunities' in Tuxford	employment purposes within the development boundary. However the policy has been adjusted to support limited development adjoining the development boundary for employment use only. It is contested that this is in general conformity with policy CS6 in that it enhances the employment offer but limits development outside (but adjoining) the development boundary by size and use only supporting small schemes for employment use. The reference to extending the industrial estates has been amended to remove Ashvale industrial estate but keeping in Ollerton Road and Lodge Lane as this is in conformity with CS6.
SC4li	Yes	Policy 13	The entire policy is unnecessary as this would be covered by planning processes. Recommend that it is removed from the plan. Also, why	The policy has been altered to promote B1 and B2 adjoining the development boundary whilst leaving to district policies employment policy within the development boundary.

Rep Number	Any Amendments Suggested?	Section of Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
			does the plan seek to prevent takeaways?	
SC4mi	Yes	Implementation and Review	‘On the back of development’ is not appropriate policy language, please revise. Also, it is noted that the plan will be monitored by the Town Council to assess the effectiveness of the policies outlined in the NP – has a clear monitoring framework been established? How will policies be measured for effectiveness? What indicators will be used?	Phrasing amended; monitoring mechanisms will be agreed in due course
SC4ni	Yes	Appendix 7	Read Building – ‘ <i>It is proposed that this building be refurbished</i> ’ this is understandable but would suggest that it states ‘ <i>brought into a sustainable use consistent with its conservation</i> ’ as refurbished can mean many things included harmful works. ‘ <i>an all weather tennis court.....etc.</i> ’ Why these uses specifically?– this is precluding the use of the site. Why not make funding available to assist	Amendments made as per advice given here re Read Building. Additions to project list to be discussed by steering group.

Rep Number	Any Amendments Suggested?	Section of Plan	Proposed Amendments	Amendments Made
			<p>with any use that will lead to the space being in a community use or offer funding to assist cover any identified conservation deficit to bring the site back into a good condition. Any use and development here must consider section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 – the proposed uses listed in this appendix could in fact be harmful to the building and setting / significance of the site without a detailed assessment. Bringing the building and rear garden into a long term sustainable use consistent with the building’s conservation is the most important thing and financial assistance and policies must be written to this end.</p> <p>As part of the list of projects can a grant scheme be proposed that will assist in the restoration or reinstatement of historic features in the conservation area?</p>	

Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting – 16th September 2015

Tuxford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group held a meeting on the 16th September 2015 to discuss the initial consultation feedback. Through the consultation concerns had been given with regards to point 2 of Policy 7: Infill Development. In response to this, the steering group have agreed to remove this point from the policy. See **Appendix 2** for a copy of the meeting minutes.

Non statutory Comments

Representation Number	Comment Source	Any Amendments Required?	Section of the Plan	Suggested Amendments to the NP	Amendments made
1	M Carter	No	None	None	None
2	-	Yes	Policy 7	I do not agree with the policy of putting extra dwellings on a site. 2 beds with 4 or 5 bed houses, in fill with all the same type of houses, flats together will be better	Point 2 within Policy 7 has been agreed to be removed. Amendments to wording of policy 7 have removed this issue
2a	-	Yes	Policy 10	Present community facilities are not used to capacity as it is i.e. the Beeches centre, chapel rooms, and scout hut, so why add extra. Sports facilities are needed	This does not represent the feedback from the wider community
3	A Merchant	No	-	-	None
4	R & P Hancock	No	-	-	None
5	-	Yes	Policy 9	-	None
5a	-	Yes	Policy 11	Car parking was lost when parking bays were built.	None – No direct impact on policy and no alternative wording suggested

Representation Number	Comment Source	Any Amendments Required?	Section of the Plan	Suggested Amendments to the NP	Amendments made
6	P Martin	No	-	-	None
7	-	Yes	Policy 7	-	None
8	M Willatt	No	-	-	None
9	C Green	No	-	-	None
10	G Newton	No	-	-	None
11	F Derush	No	-	-	None
12	-	No	-	-	None
13	-	No	-	-	None
14	C Burn	No	-	-	None
15	C Cook	No	-	-	None
16	M Cyril	No	-	-	None
17	J Sewell	No	-	-	None
18	A Marlow	No	-	-	None
19	-	No	-	-	None
20	-	No	-	-	None
21	D Mountford	Yes	Policy 7	Not Point 2	Policy 7 has been revised this issue has been removed.
22	-	Yes	Policy 7	Point 2 not acceptable – refer to policy 6 – should this read ‘ten dwellings’ one small home per 10 large dwellings’ to link with policy 6.	Policy 7 has been revised this issue has been removed
23	J Robinson	No	-	-	None
24	G Robinson	Yes	Policy 2	The Town Council are elected to speak on behalf of the community	-
24a	G Robinson	Yes	Policy 7	Whilst agreeing that there should be a mix of dwelling types, rigid rules regarding ratio	. Policy 7 has been revised this issue has been removed

Representation Number	Comment Source	Any Amendments Required?	Section of the Plan	Suggested Amendments to the NP	Amendments made
				of small to large properties could result in an imbalance.	
25	-	No	-	-	None
26	G Price	No	-	-	None
27	E Lockwood	No	-	-	None
28	-	Yes	Policy 5	The local Council should be able to make owners maintain their properties i.e. in the Market Place, the convenience shop is an eyesore as is the derelict building adjoin the working men's club.	This is outside the remit of this land use planning document and relates to the management of property.
29	-	Yes	Policy 1	Most infrastructure levy and S106 are negotiated out by developers. Why aspire to something you will never get.	The law requires that where CIL is in operation 25% of it goes to the community affected if that community has a neighbourhood plan in place.
29a	-	Yes	Policy 3	There needs to be a distinctive choice of material to show how things move on	In policy 3 the need to use materials in keeping with the local character has been added. The NPPF does not allow for too much prescription in specifying materials , style etc
29b	-	Yes	Policy 7	No. this is overusing in terms of density of the land. People bought their homes due to the existing space.	Policy 7 has been revised this issue has been removed
30	A Houghton	No	-	-	None
31	P Pendleton	No	-	-	None
32	N Connoles	No	-	-	None
33	-	No	-	-	None
34	-	No	-	-	None
35	A Nayler	No	-	-	None

Representation Number	Comment Source	Any Amendments Required?	Section of the Plan	Suggested Amendments to the NP	Amendments made
36	S Nayler	No	-	-	None
37	-	Yes	Policy 11	Parking only on one side of the road Eldon Street and Newark Road.	Suggestion added in narrative that TC will continue to work with BDC and NCC to seek improvements to the flow of traffic.
38	-	No	-	-	None
39	-	Yes	Policy 11	Cannot get into the bays on the Butchers side should have left it as it was. A big waste of money.	Point noted by the TC and will be fed back to BDC; outside remit of this NP but no such parking arrangements are promoted in the Plan.
40	G B Willatt	No	-	-	None
41	N Spencer	Yes	Policy 3	'Major development' says to me new developments when there are buildings empty or for sale already in the town	BDC has its own policies to encourage the occupation of empty properties this is not within the remit of the NP
41a	N Spencer	Yes	Policy 4	Wouldn't want Tuxford expanding to the size of somewhere like Retford	The amount of growth will be decided by BDC and not the NP.
41b	N Spencer	Yes	Policy 6	I don't agree that there should be more dwellings for the older generation. I believe housing already in the town should be utilised before anymore is built	This comment does not accord with the wider consultation, the SHMA or the demographic analysis
41c	N Spencer	Yes	Policy 7	As stated previously. Dwellings already built should be utilised first. Green spaces should be kept as 'green'.	BDC has its own policies to encourage the occupation of empty properties this is not within the remit of the NP. The suitability of small infill sites will be assessed at the planning application stage.
41d	N Spencer	Yes	Policy 11	I don't think the school outdoor area should be compromised by parking as they are already	This was not an issue brought to the attention of the TC during wider consultation.

Representation Number	Comment Source	Any Amendments Required?	Section of the Plan	Suggested Amendments to the NP	Amendments made
				using some of it to add a new classroom. The field is not just used by the primary academy, but also the Sure Start facility and it is a great area to play.	
42	F Carter	No	-	-	None
43	J Kendall	No	-	-	None
44	-	No	-	-	None
45	G Whelan	No	-	-	None
46	-	Yes	Policy 7	Clause 2 – not acceptable	Policy 7 has been revised this issue has been removed.
47	S Francis	No	-	-	None
48	C Campbell	No	-	-	None
49	N V Carlise	No	-	-	None
50	A Wyman	No	-	-	None
51	J Carlise	No	-	-	None
52	M Gagg	Yes	Policy 13	The expansion of Walker's site would be acceptable provided no more wind turbines are erected; the 2 turbines in the village cause noise disturbance during the night for residents of Tuxford and more turbines would be intolerable. No developments in Tuxford must include public toilet in the centre of the village.	Wind turbines are outside of the remit of NPs. There is no proposal for public toilets within the plan
53	M Linwin	Yes	Community Vision	No infrastructure in place to deal with it	The NP is consulted on by a wide range of statutory consultees including highways agency, Notts County Council etc. All

Representation Number	Comment Source	Any Amendments Required?	Section of the Plan	Suggested Amendments to the NP	Amendments made
					development proposals will require a planning application and the impact on infrastructure will be assessed. The payment of a CIL is intended to mitigate the cumulative impact of small development on infrastructure. 25% of the CIL payment will come to TTC.
53a	M Linwin	Yes	Sustainable development	No jobs/ healthcare/ infrastructure	See answer above
53b	M Linwin	Yes	Policy 7	Not before plans of ingress and exit are decided.	Policy 7 has been revised this issue has been removed
54	W Hardy	Yes	Sustainable Development	Any development must be sustainable. I doubt this will be possible	The NP seeks to balance the need to meet the needs of a growing population with the need to protect the environment.
54a	W Hardy	Yes	Policy 3	The infrastructure in Tuxford cannot support further development	The Highways Agency are a statutory consultee for this NP and their comments have already been added to the NP where necessary to reflect their concerns. All development proposals will require a planning application. This process may require a traffic impact assessment to be undertaken (depending on the size and location of the scheme).
54b	W Hardy	Yes	Policy 4	300 additional houses = approx. 600 more vehicles, the village is already gridlocked at times.	This NP does not attempt to allocate land for development. The 300 houses figure was from the district council. This Plan seeks to mitigate the impact of additional development. WRT traffic impact please see answer above.
55	A Georgiou	No	-	-	None
56	J Drake	Yes	Policy 4	Any building would spoil the visual openness and beauty of	The NP seeks to establish clear criteria for the location and scale of development to minimise

Representation Number	Comment Source	Any Amendments Required?	Section of the Plan	Suggested Amendments to the NP	Amendments made
				<p>Tuxford's rolling landscape and conservation areas, wildlife and fauna.</p> <p>How can views of buildings enhance the countryside?</p> <p>Any development within the green would be detrimental to the village. It is a huge area for planners and builders to have access to.</p>	<p>the impact on public views of the open countryside.</p> <p>The Tuxford Place Analysis provides an analysis of the new development should respond in relation to the topography of the area and the location in the town to minimise the negative impact of that development.</p>
56a	J Drake	Yes	Policy 10	How will the current business owners be protected from the proposed retail and office provision?	Competition per se is not a planning matter however the NP seeks to sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre and to support local businesses. Policy 8 and policy 13 support limited retail uses within the local centre boundary and small business development on the areas adjoining Tuxford.
57	-	No	-	-	None
58	E Jackson	Yes	Policy 6	The diversity of housing stock required. Tuxford will only service as a thriving community if it embraces all residents.	Agreed the NP encourages this approach
58a	E Jackson	Yes	Policy 7	Smaller houses must coexist equally with family houses	Agreed a mix of housing types is promoted in the plan
58b	E Jackson	Yes	Policy 8	Retail to support enlarge diversity, particularly to capture passing traffic on the A1	Agreed

Representation Number	Comment Source	Any Amendments Required?	Section of the Plan	Suggested Amendments to the NP	Amendments made
59	-	No	-	-	None
60	-	No	-	-	None
61	-	Yes	Policy 4	These developments will be driven by people who live elsewhere, development should be restricted to a minimum and not just to satisfy targets.	The NPPF does not allow for maximum targets to meet local need only the NP has to be pro-growth and must not obstruct BDC from meeting its district wide housing targets.
62	D Kirkham	No	-	-	None
63	E Sourby	No	-	-	None
64	V Wood	Yes	Policy 7	I do not agree with item 2 whereby I would not want to live in a small property against a large family home	Policy 7 has been revised this issue has been removed
64a	V Wood	Yes	Policy 10	There are sufficient opportunities for leisure in the town i.e. the hire of rooms and the Beeches and Methodist Hall – without a separate building. When we did have a community centre, it was never used to its full potential.	This does not reflect the feedback from the wider consultation
65	J Making	No	-	-	None
66	Fisher German	Yes	Policy 6	Concern over conflicting data regarding housing need. It is suggested that additional evidence is collated to support the communities' ambitions.	The NP group did consider undertaking their own Housing Needs Survey but there was insufficient funding available. The data used is taken from BDCs analysis from the census on household formation 2015 and the figures derived are based on industry recognised methodology.

Representation Number	Comment Source	Any Amendments Required?	Section of the Plan	Suggested Amendments to the NP	Amendments made
67	S Jackson	Yes	Community Objectives	I don't want to see the town grow too much – we moved here for life in a small town large village	Agreed and the NP seeks to ensure that growth is sustainable based on the existing facilities location from larger towns access to employment etc
67a	S Jackson	Yes	Policy 3	I don't want to see more development	The government's national planning guidance is pro-growth and this NP has to be in conformity with that. However this NP does not allocate any sites this will be decided by BDC
67b	S Jackson	Yes	Policy 4	I don't want to live in a big town. Facilities such as the Doctor's and school cannot cope already	See above
67c	S Jackson	Yes	Policy 6	Please do not focus on older people this just creates a ghost town. Younger couples and families need houses too.	The NP seeks to provide smaller dwellings for older people and for starter homes. It is the intention that the provision of suitable dwellings for older people will enable them to downsize freeing up housing suitable for families. .
67d	S Jackson	Yes	Policy 7	I do not want to see owners of large properties sell off green space for their own profit.	Policy 7 has been revised this issue has been removed
67e	S Jackson	Yes	Policy 8	No more development needed.	The government's national planning guidance is pro-growth and this NP has to be in conformity with that. However this NP does not allocate any sites this will be decided by BDC
67f	S Jackson	Yes	Policy 11	I do not think the loss of the school field for staff parking should be supported. I also do	This view was not supported by the wider community consultation

Representation Number	Comment Source	Any Amendments Required?	Section of the Plan	Suggested Amendments to the NP	Amendments made
				not feel there is a need for additional parking given the two sites currently available	
68	J Kewley	Yes	Community Vision	Making the village to large without any extra amenities.	None – no direct impact on the
68a	J Kewley	Yes	Community Objectives	No benefit to the original village	None – no explanation or alternative objectives suggested
68b	J Kewley	Yes	Policy 1	Influx of people into the village with no interest in village life.	None – reason not explained and would not have a direct impact on the intent of the proposed policy
68e	J Kewley	Yes	Policy 2	No consultation would be considered.	None – no clear explanation given
68f	J Kewley	Yes	Policy 3	No benefit to the village	None – No alternative wording suggested
68g	J Kewley	Yes	Policy 4	No benefit to the village	None – No alternative wording suggested
68h	J Kewley	Yes	Policy 6	-	None – no explanation or alternative wording suggested
68i	J Kewley	Yes	Policy 7	-	None – no explanation or alternative wording suggested
68j	J Kewley	Yes	Policy 11	We have enough parking if planned properly	None – no alternative wording suggested
68k	J Kewley	Yes	Policy 13	Would not be any support at all	None – no alternative wording suggested
69	-	Yes	Policy 4	It will affect the setting of the conservation area	None – statement is general and no explanation has been provided as to how development would affect the conservation areas.
70	E Bett	Yes	Policy 9	Map is misleading and does not include all accesses into the surrounding fields.	None – the access map provided provides the most up-to-date public access routes from the town.
71	I Bentley	Yes	Community Vision	At many times of the day, traffic going through Tuxford is	None – statement has no direct impact on the Community Vision

Representation Number	Comment Source	Any Amendments Required?	Section of the Plan	Suggested Amendments to the NP	Amendments made
				dreadful made worse during school runs and by the amount of heavy lorries regularly using the village as a thoroughfare	
71a	J Bentley	Yes	Policy 1	Can Tuxford sustain any future development?	The NP seeks to balance the need to meet the needs of a growing population with the need to protect the environment
72	S Wright	Yes	Policy 1	Expanded commercial premises equals more traffic particularly as you agree to the expansion of the Walker's industrial estate.	None – No clear explanation or alternative wording suggested.
72a	S Wright	Yes	Policy 13	Unless we have a plan to move heavy haulage out of the town centre then we must block any plans to expand the industrial areas. The traffic from Walker's Industrial Estate matched that from ASDA near the Boughton Industrial Estate is dangerous and restricts all opportunities to develop the town. Why would you want to eat in a restaurant where the view outside is only of heavy duty goods vehicles.	The Highways Agency are a statutory consultee for this NP and their comments have already been added to the NP where necessary to reflect their concerns. All development proposals will require a planning application. This process may require a traffic impact assessment to be undertaken (depending on the size and location of the scheme).
73	A Bramley	No	-	-	None

Appendix 1: List of Statutory Consultees

Anglian Water

Bassetlaw District Council

Network Rail

Environment Agency

Natural England

Historic England

Nottinghamshire County Council

Police Authority

Seven Trent Water

Coal Authority

Appendix 2: Steering Group Meeting Minutes

TUXFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING GROUP

Minutes of meeting held 16/09/2015

Present: Sue Robinson (Chair), Dave Mountford, Shirley Peat, Rev Greg Price and Lisa Hill (Town Clerk).

Apologies: None

Declarations of Interest: None

Sue Robinson outlined the purpose of the meeting which was to collate the comments from Consultation Response Forms.

Sue outlined the next steps required which were to produce a Basic Conditions Statement and a Final Consultation Statement. Lisa would clarify whether James Green at BDC or Luke Brown would be able to do this.

Sue presented the consultation response forms which were reviewed by the Steering Group.

Discussion took place with regard to Policy 7: Infill Development and after discussion it was agreed that point 2 could be removed.

It was agreed that traffic should be included within the projects. The Reads Building narrative should be amended to include the application by the Town Council to register it as an Asset of Community value.

Discussion took place about forming a group to carry out the projects in the back of the NP. It was suggested that a Community Interest Group may be the way to do this. Lisa would investigate whether a CIG was suitable.

Sue would write an article for the Tuxfordian.

The date of the next Steering Group meeting would be set shortly.