

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Neighbourhood Plan for the Parishes of
Cuckney, Norton, Holbeck & Welbeck

CHNW
Neighbourhood
Development Plan
2016 - 2031



Table of Contents

- 1 Introduction 4
 - What is the Cuckney, Norton, Holbeck & Welbeck Neighbourhood Plan?..... 4
 - What is the Consultation Statement?..... 5
- 2 Methodology..... 6
- 3 Responses 8
 - Local Residents Comments..... 8
 - Key Contacts Responses..... 9
- 4 Amendments to the Neighbourhood Plan 17

1 Introduction

What is the Cuckney, Norton, Holbeck & Welbeck Neighbourhood Plan?

- 1.1 The Cuckney, Norton Holbeck and Welbeck (hereafter CNHW) Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) has been prepared in accordance with the Town & Country Planning Act 1990, the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Localism Act 2011, the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 and Directive 2001/42/EC on Strategic Environmental Assessment. The Plan establishes a vision of the future of the ward and sets out how that vision will be realised through planning and controlling land use and development change.
- 1.2 This NDP is a new type of planning document prepared by CNHW 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; and
 - b) by applicants as they prepare planning application for submission to Bassetlaw District Council.
- 1.3 Planning applications must be decided in accordance with Bassetlaw District Council's adopted planning policies (including this NDP).
- 1.4 To carry this much influence in planning decisions this NDP will be go through an independent examination to check that it has been prepared in accordance with planning law, that it is in conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework, Bassetlaw's 2011 Core Strategy and must be approved by a simple majority of votes (i.e. over 50% of those voting) in a local referendum.
- 1.5 The contents of this Plan have been prepared by the CNHW Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, which has been led by Cuckney Parish Council in partnership with Holbeck and Welbeck Parish Council. It covers all of the 2 Parishes and is intended to cover the period 2016-2031.

What is the Consultation Statement?

- 1.6 This Consultation Statement 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;
 - Describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan.
- 1.7 The Pre Submission Draft CNHW Neighbourhood Plan was made available for consultation in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Plan Regulations from 15th June until the 27th July 2015. This document provides a description of the amendments made to the document based on the comments received.
- 1.8 The document titled ‘Consultation Summary’¹ sets out chronologically the consultation events that have led to the production of the CNHW Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan. This consultation formed the basis of the Neighbourhood Policies contained within the Plan.

¹ The ‘Consultation Summary’ document is available to view on the neighbourhood plan website - <http://CNHWneighbourhoodplan.weebly.com/>

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 opportunities to provide their views and comments.

Website

- 2.2 Prior to the commencement of the consultation period on the 15th June 2015, the CNHW Neighbourhood Development Plan website was updated to provide all the documentation (draft plan and supporting documentation) and a summary of the Neighbourhood Plan process. A downloadable version of the Plan itself was also uploaded to the website along with the significant amount of Supporting Documents for the Plan including the 'Consultation Summary'. 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. The link to the pre submission draft is below

http://cnhwneighbourhoodplan.weebly.com/uploads/2/6/0/6/26062193/final_draft_neighbourhood_development_plan.pdf

- 2.3 All documents were also placed on Bassetlaw District Councils website. The link to the CNHW Neighbourhood Plan on the Councils website is as below.

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

Email to Contacts

- 2.4 On the 15th June 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 Steering Group believed would be effected by the Neighbourhood Plan for CNHW, 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.
- 2.5 The email sent on 15th June 2015 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 below in **Appendix x** of this document.

Documents

- 2.6 In addition to the digital copies of documents found on the Neighbourhood Plan website and Bassetlaw District Councils 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 available at Cuckney Stores or by telephone contact with a named member of the Steering Group in each Parish. Each household received an Executive Summary of the Neighbourhood Plan detailing the Steering Group contacts.

Local Consultation Events

- 2.7 The Parish Council wanted to ensure that local residents were allowed as many opportunities as possible to comment on the Draft Plan and its implications for the Parish. The consultation period was set to run alongside a "Festival of Events". This was a two week period when there was at least one different event held in the Neighbourhood Plan Community each day to celebrate the activities happening in our community. These included Open Gardens, Beekeeping demonstrations, gala dinners, a family party and sailing among others. At many of these events during the two-week period Steering Group members were present with Information Boards, Hard copies of the NP and executive summaries. Several hundred people attended events during the two-week festival period and had access to information about the Plan.

Advertisement

- 2.8 The executive summary of the Neighbourhood Plan was delivered to every house and business in the plan area in the week commencing 15th June 2015.

Consultation Summary

- 2.9 A summary of all the consultation activities that informed the preparation of this Plan is on the neighbourhood plan web site. <http://cnhwneighbourhoodplan.weebly.com/consultation-events.html>

3 Responses

- 3.1 This section of the Consultation Statement contains the responses and comments received on the Draft CNHW Neighbourhood Development Plan throughout the Consultation period running from the 15 June until the 27 July 2015, from those interested bodies/parties who were contacted.

Local Residents Comments

- 3.1 Comments from local residents on the Plan were recorded by Steering Group members present throughout the number of events held in the 'Festival of Events'. A large number of local residents expressed their support for the Plan in general however some provided more detailed comments that are listed below.

Comment Number	Comment
1	Concern was expressed about the number of dwellings proposed for the Depot and the Land north of Budby Road.
2	Concern about air and noise pollution from proposed car park and village hall.
3	Resident did not consider any growth was needed so disagreed with the vision and objectives of the Plan.

Key Contacts Responses

- 3.6 Responses were received from 5 contacts that were emailed regarding the consultation period on the Draft Plan; their comments can be found below. The comments from Bassetlaw and Historic England were substantive.
- 3.7 The comments below are summarised for the full response see the neighbourhood plan web site. Note the policy numbers referred to below are from the pre submission version; the NP policies were renumbered and ordered as part of the response to these comments. The amendments outlined below were only agreed following several meetings between BDC, HE and the Steering Group.

Bassetlaw District Council

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
4	Policy 1	<p>Part 1: this reads as more of an objective than a policy. Consider moving to the objectives in section 5.</p> <p>Part 2: 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.</p>
5	Policy 2	Encouraging applicants to engage the local community in pre application discussions before submitting an application is a worthy intention supported by NPPF paragraph 189. It is noted that policy (in line with national guidance) encourages engagement by asking that applicant 'should' engage, rather than seeking to require it.
6	Policy 3	<p>How will an applicant be able meet the '<i>demonstrable needs applying at that point</i>'? The SHMA referred to in the supporting text is an overarching strategic document that cannot stipulate a fine grain of local housing need to a parish level. Suggest the NP provides a clear signpost to developers on how this need can be demonstrated. Please note if this was attempted with a supporting document it will be important to consider its legal weight if it has not been subject to full consultation or adoption by the local authority.</p> <p>There was lack of clarity about part 2 which was removed following discussions with Welbeck.</p>
7	Paragraph 8.8 & 8.12	The adopted Affordable housing SPD identifies the areas covered by the different affordable housing targets across Bassetlaw. These areas cover the parishes of this NP. Recommend this paragraph is updated to refer to the Affordable Housing SPD.
8	Section 8 & Policy 4	<p>Occupation restrictions imposed by local connections criteria 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 exactly who would live in a development, therefore as a policy, there is no basis.</p> <p>The Community Housing model referred cannot form part of a planning policy</p>

9	Section 8 Continued	<p>Enabling Development: There appears to be a conscious effort to use enabling development (ED) to restore property that Welbeck Estate own which has fallen into disrepair.</p> <p>Section 8 of the NP would benefit from being re-written so it does not read as a Welbeck Estates solution to their own property problems.</p>
10	Paragraph 8.40	Consideration needs to be given to how much planning weight can be given to the Welbeck Estates Pattern Book in guiding design.
11	Policy 5	<p>It is unclear how this policy promotes or reinforces local distinctiveness. Recommend this policy is reworded to better meet the requirements of the NPPF.</p> <p>Elements of this policy are already covered by Bassetlaw Core Strategy policy DM4 and the adopted Residential Design SPD.</p> <p>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. Recommend 'where appropriate' is added to the start of this policy and the word 'all' is removed.</p>
12	Policy 6	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.
13	Policy 7	<p>Part 1: this reads as more of an objective than a policy. Consider moving to the objectives in section 5.</p> <p>Part 2: There are concerns with the words 'significantly and adversely'</p> <p>Part 3: More clarification is needed in this policy to show that the reference to 'physical infrastructure solutions identified'</p>
14	Policy 8	<p>Part 2: What if the community facility was no longer viable and reasonable evidence was provided to show that there was no other community use interested in occupying the building? Under this policy the building would then sit empty?</p> <p>Recommend this policy is amended to include reasonable caveats to address this.</p>
15	Section 12 Site Allocations	How were these sites selected? Assume there was more involved than the discussion between the steering group, Welbeck Estates and Bassetlaw.
16	Policies 10-17	<p>There were some standard concerns regarding</p> <p>A) reference to the pattern book</p> <p>B) evidence of housing demand and supply</p> <p>C) References to community housing</p>
17	Policy 10	Clarification required re access arrangements
18	Policy 11	Land north of Budby road not supported for development.

19	Policy 12	Land South of Creswell Road: questioned reason for a pedestrian crossing stipulated.
20	Policy 14	Woodhouse Hall Barns: there was concern over the wording of this policy as it related to heritage assets, some additional development and the type of housing to be provided.
21	Policy 16	Edison's Cottage: there was concern over the wording of this policy as it related to heritage assets and some additional development.
22	Policy 18	Concern that this policy was too general and did not specify which farm buildings could be re-used for employment purposes had not provided enough evidence or considered the environmental impact.
23	Policy 20	Policy wording considered unclear.
24	Policy 21	Policy wording considered unclear.
25	Policy 23	<p>In line with guidance set out in NPPF paragraph 77, the designation of sites as a Local Green Space will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. This designation should only be used where it meets the requirements of the criteria as set out in the NPPF paragraph 77. It is unclear from the table in this NP or the accompanying Green Infrastructure Project Proposal, how the sites identified specifically meet the NPPF criteria. Recommend this NP includes a better explanation of how these sites qualify for LGS designation. Consideration should also be given to the cumulative area that the proposed LGS cover. This equates to approximately 46.5 Ha. Viewed together this could be considered a significant tract of land (which would fail the NPPF requirements).</p> <p>Please note: no objection is raised to these sites identification as part of the wider Green Infrastructure of the NP area, but it must be noted that Green Infrastructure and LGS designations serve different purposes.</p>

Coal Authority

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
26	-	<p>As you will be aware the Neighbourhood Plan area lies within the current defined deep coalfield.</p> <p>According to the Coal Authority Development High Risk Area Plans for the area, there are recorded risks from past coal mining activity in the form of 2 recorded mine entries, 5 reported surface hazards and geological fissures. The mine entries are at the former Welbeck Colliery, the fissures are present intermittently across the whole area.</p> <p>If the Neighbourhood Plan allocates sites for future development in these areas then consideration as to the development will need to respond to these risks to surface stability in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Bassetlaw Development Plan.</p> <p>However I note that all the proposed site allocations and local green space designations do not coincide with the recorded mining legacy</p>

		<p>features. Therefore The Coal Authority does not object to any proposals within the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan does not specifically address proposed development at the former Welbeck Colliery site, leaving this to the Bassetlaw Local Plan. That site does have high risk features which need to influence development proposals; however this is not a matter for this plan.</p>
--	--	---

English Heritage

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
27	Housing, amount and location	<p>Expressed concern about the amount of housing and its proposed location in relation to BDCs Core Strategy</p> <p>Concerned there was insufficient evidence to support the growth plans</p>
28	Conservation and heritage protection	The growth levels put forward in the Plan would harm the historic environment.
29	Use of enabling development	Did not support the use of this delivery mechanism.
30	Energy efficiency Policy	Required more specific reference to impact on heritage assets.
31	Policy 10	Additional information required regarding impact on heritage assets.
32	Policy 11	HE does not consider this site suitable for development due to its impact on the setting of St Mary's Church.
33	Policy 12 & Policy 13	Did not consider sufficient justification provided.
34	Policy 14	Scale of development would harm heritage assets; opposed use of enabling development.
35	Policy 16	Scale of development would harm heritage assets; opposed use of enabling development.
36	Policy 17	Need to justify number of units and conservation issues.
37	Policy 19	Concern over WW2 hard standings.
38	Policy 23	Need to acknowledge historic landscape character in policy.

Natural England

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
39	-	Natural England generally welcomes the draft neighbourhood plan that sets out development management policies which will guide the future sustainable development of Cuckney, Holbeck, Norton and Welbeck.
40	Vision & Objectives	We are pleased to note that the community vision described at section 4 acknowledges the value of the rural environment and heritage of the plan area. We also particularly welcome community objectives 1, 2, 3 and 5 which aim to conserve the distinctive landscape character and protect and enhance the open spaces and improve non-vehicular access routes.
41	-	We are pleased the Plan places great importance on the need to secure opportunities to protect and enhance biodiversity.
42	Policy 22	We are pleased that a Green Infrastructure Project Proposal has been developed in conjunction with the Neighbourhood Plan which links to the Bassetlaw District Council GI Plan (May 2010). Walking and cycling routes form an important part of the GI network and therefore we support Policy 22 which promotes improving and extending non-vehicular routes within the Plan area to create an enhanced GI network for the benefit of tourists and residents.
43	Policy 23	Our ambition is to strengthen the connections between people and nature to allow everyone to have fair access to and benefit from a good-quality natural environment. We are pleased the Plan recognises the link between quality of life and access to green space and seeks to protect and enhance existing green assets in Policy 23.

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
44	-	<p>Nottinghamshire County Council Transport and Travel Services (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 County Council when upgrading and improving bus stop locations to assist with the smooth operation and potential improvement of public transport within the village(s). 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.</p> <p>TTS notes that the plan supports residential development for at least 60 homes across the plan area, and believes that this document could be an important means of ensuring a holistic approach to any future development.</p> <p>However a key omission from the document is reference to the role of Public Transport. Although Public Transport contributions are sought using policies drawn up by the District and County Councils it is important to state the local need for improved services and infrastructure in Neighbourhood Development Plans. Section 8.3 of the document states that “A key driver for the production of this Plan was the provision of housing for older people and the statistics show that this demand will increase.” Therefore the provision of public transport facilities will be an important consideration.</p>
45	Table 1: Sustainability Issues	TTS support this statement and suggest a specific mention for public transport and its role in reducing the impact of traffic congestion and improving opportunities for residents who do not have access to a private car.
46	Para 1.38 Attracting external funding	<p>TTS request that the below is added to this section of the plan.</p> <p>“Developers will also be asked to provide funding through Section 106 agreements to provide improved public transport services and infrastructure which in turn leads to sustainable development.”</p>
47	Policy 1: Sustainable Development	TTS request that paragraph 2 (c) is amended to state “infrastructure associated with leisure, recreational pursuits, public transport and social and community activities within the parish or”
48	Policy 5: Design Principles for Residential Development	TTS supports this policy and would request a specific mention for public transport in sentence (c).
49	Policy 8: Enhancing the provision of community	TTS supports this policy and requests that public transport is mentioned at (3) as a key way to connect residents to community facilities.

	facilities	
50	Site Allocations - Suggested Development Sites	TTS request that a contribution towards improved public transport services and infrastructure from the developer is given as a criteria to be met for a site to be supported by the Neighbourhood Development Plan set out at 12.1 and in Policies 11-17. It is suggested that sites/schemes that afford access to public transport facilities should be given priority for development.
51	Paragraph 14.22	TTS support the request that the scheme must provide details of the public transport provision to adjoining communities.
52	Community Transport	<p>Appendix D makes reference to the important role of Community Transport in delivering transport provision across the plan area. 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 as part of the project.</p> <p>Further references in the document to accessibility to key services could be significantly enhanced through reference to the role Community Transport and the opportunity to support it's future development including specifically within Policy 5 and 8.</p>
53	Project 3	<p>There is no reference in the document to the role of taxis, which are licensed by Bassetlaw District Council and play an import role in the local economy. It is suggested that the role of taxis is included as part of the scope of project 3.</p> <p>TTS have reviewed the Consultation Questions accompanying the Draft Plan, which are addressed through the comments set out in this response.</p>
54	-	The plan area contains a high number of designated listed buildings and conservation areas; this is acknowledged in the text of the plan as a strong positive component of the area. In fact this area has one of the most significantly dominant heritage legacies in the county and is undoubtedly the most extensive of the historic 'Dukeries' estates that this area of Sherwood Forest is of national significance for. The County Council consider this could be expanded upon.
55	Policy 1	<p>The high proportion of designated heritage is acknowledged, but the condition of the listed building stock has not been noted. According to the county council 'Buildings At Risk' register there are a number of designated heritage assets that are in poor condition. The majority of these are within the Welbeck Abbey site, but a considerable number are beyond the country house in the villages and are also in Welbeck Estate ownership. This should be acknowledged, it is the ongoing issue that will remain throughout the plan period and thereafter and it is related to the issue of 'enabling development' that is discussed under section 8.28 of the plan. However, a more appropriate response in the plan to this issue might be to ensure that there is a strong link between the condition of the existing heritage and any development proposals</p> <p>Policy 1: Sustainable Development should be amended to include this. The opportunity to ensure that development can demonstrate a direct benefit to the heritage that is critical to the character and</p>

		vitality of the plan area should also be considered as a separate policy and it is not the same issue as enabling development referred to as a 'possible delivery mechanism'.
56	Policy 16	Although the condition of this building has deteriorated due to the neglect of the owners and/or leases, it is also quite demonstrably a fine historic building in a desirable location. The County Council would question the need for additional dwellings to 'cross subsidise' this building, the need for enabling development here has not been tested on the open market, irrespective of the 'special circumstances' that re referred to in section 15.8 the facts remain that neglect of the estate landowner cannot/should not be encouraged in policies within the Neighbourhood Plan.
57	Policy 22	<p>Is a very important proposal that is at the heart of the visitor economy of the area. The wider access to the Welbeck Estate should be a clearly stated ambition. The present levels of access are a critical constraint on the economic viability of the visitor economy in the plan area. Wider access across the plan area, especially for cycling, will enable better links to Clumber and Thoresby beyond and encourage greater access from Worksop.</p> <p>The Green Infrastructure proposals are good in as far as they go, but some additional access routes from the east through the park area really should be considered critical to the realisation of the development of the visitor economy in the area. Also some routes appear to be missing from the Fig 2, such as the existing bridleway that runs due west from Holbeck towards Creswell.</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	Local Resident	No - The NP proposes an approximate number based on consultation and site assessment. The exact number will be agreed as part of the planning application process.	
2	Local Resident	No - Noise and air pollution are material considerations that will be taken into account when any planning application is submitted. Noise pollution can be overcome by regulating opening hours of any community facility as part of the application process. The provision of a car park will provide safer parking and reducing the risk of accidents especially around school starts and finish times.	
3	Local Resident	No - The evidence has shown a need for some modest	

		growth to meet local housing need and this approach was supported consistently across the Plan area and throughout the consultation process	
4	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amendments made to policy format and wording
5	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Policy 2 revised to show that pre application is encouraged
6	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Additional narrative was provided in the justification section to confirm the status of the HNS (and in a later comment on the rural area profile) commissioned for the NP. Evidence for NPs has to be proportionate and it was not considered necessary to consult on all the evidence used to support the Neighbourhood policies given that the scope of the Plan and the content was formed by extensive discussions with the community and that the HNS was on the web site for people to comment on if they wished.
7	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amendments made
8	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Narrative edited to only relate to those living and working or with links within Plan area rather than adjoining parishes but principle remains in. It is well established that planning can establish local connection criteria. Agreed all references to community housing removed from draft plan to be delivered via other mechanisms.
9	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Following further discussions and viability work done by Welbeck all reference to enabling development removed. Section 8 was deleted and replaced by a section on heritage at risk which reflected the comments from BDC and HE.
10	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	The Pattern Book was not produced in time for the submission of the Plan so all references to it have been removed.

11	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	The design policy was rewritten with the heritage elements falling into the new heritage at risk policy and the wording less restrictive as per the NPPF.
12	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Additional evidence to justify this policy provided by the SG and set out in the narrative. The policy is amended to relate specifically to these areas where the evidence supports a more particular parking solution.
13	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amendments made to wording to reflect comments.
14	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amendments made to wording to reflect comments.
15	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Additional narrative provided to show extent of consultation and due process.
16	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	All references removed This point was picked up by adding more narrative earlier in the Plan about the supply of houses in the Plan area (based on a further study done by the SG in September 2015) and the demand for houses that met local need. All references have been removed from the Plan
17	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amended as suggested.
18	Bassetlaw District Council	No - This was the site that had been in BDCs draft site allocation DPD and had received significant community support.	
19	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	This was based on comments from the Highways Agency when the site assessment work was undertaken. It was removed as will be considered as part of planning application
20	Bassetlaw District	Yes	Amendments made: Woodhouse Hall Barns covered in heritage at

	Council		
			risk policy site adjoining separate site allocation policy (new policy 14). Additional work done by Welbeck provided clarity over preferred housing mix also.
21	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amendments made: Edison's Cottage covered in heritage at risk policy. Proposed development kept to this site and buildings within curtilage only.
22	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Policy removed and those listed farm buildings that would be suitable identified in the heritage at risk policy where change of use for economic purpose was supported.
23	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amendments made, policy reworded.
24	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Policy deleted and Cuckney House included in heritage at risk policy.
25	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Amendments made to policy format and wording.
26	Coal Authority	No - Support for the Plan	
27	English Heritage	Yes	<p>There was some confusion about the status of the site assessment work (it was to inform policy not to be part of a planning application). HE placed too great a weight on the detail of the site assessments rather than the principal. Clarification at a meeting in September with the SG, BDC and HE resolved a number of HE's concerns. The NP was intended to establish the principle of development on certain sites the amount would be agreed via planning application.</p> <p>Additional information was provided in the narrative to explain the existing housing stock and the relationship between the 3 settlements (which was why some modest growth is proposed in Holbeck and Welbeck and Norton as well as Cuckney).</p> <p>The SA was not available at the pre-submission draft stage and it was confirmed that this analysis would assist HE in understanding the extent of the consideration already undertaken.</p>

28	English Heritage	Yes	<p>The SA will show how the need to protect heritage assets has been assessed against the need for modest growth.</p> <p>The collaborative discussions with HE and BDCs conservation team resulted in a substantial rewrite of the Plan in relation to those sites and buildings that contained heritage assets. Policy 3 the Buildings at Risk Policy encapsulated those sites and buildings that had been identified for renovation, change of use or redevelopment but in the context of protecting the heritage assets. This removed the need for several of the site allocation policies that related to heritage assets.</p>
29	English Heritage	Yes	Further viability work done by Welbeck estates and additional discussion with HE meant the principle of using enabling development was removed from the NP.
30	English Heritage	Yes	Amendment made to policy wording.
31	English Heritage	Yes	<p>Clarification of status of policy i.e. this is not a planning application but establishing the principle meant some of HEs requirements for additional information were accepted as no longer necessary.</p> <p>However, additional wording in narrative and policy to emphasise importance of character and setting was added. Plus confirmation that SA would answer some of the queries.</p>
32	English Heritage	Yes	<p>The SG were keen to keep this site in the NP as it had been the only site in BDC's withdrawn site allocation development plan document that had community support.</p> <p>Wording of policy made more flexible to allow for consideration for some development subject to the setting of the church being protected.</p>
33	English Heritage	Yes	Agreed that SA would cover some of these points relating to the specific site plus additional narrative provides better context for need for some housing growth across the plan area.

34	English Heritage	Yes	Development of the site included in Policy 3 Heritage at Risk so site adjoining barns only remained as a new site allocation with amended wording to reflect more strongly the need to consider the heritage assets. Use of enabling development principle removed.
35	English Heritage	Yes	Development of the site included in Policy 3 Heritage at Risk; site only relates to cottage and outbuildings. Use of enabling development principle removed.
36	English Heritage	Yes	Wording amended to reflect need to protect heritage assets more strongly plus more justification in narrative about nature of housing stock and need for these type and number of units.
37	English Heritage	Yes	Extent of site reduced and 50% of site with hard standings left as heritage area. Pedestrian link from country park (being developed as part of the regeneration of Welbeck colliery site) identified.
38	English Heritage	Yes	Wording amended.
39	Natural England	No - Support for the Plan	
40	Natural England	No - Support for the Plan	
41	Natural England	No - Support for the Plan	
42	Natural England	No - Support for the Plan	
43	Natural England	No - Support for the Plan	
44	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Wording added to Section 3 of the Plan.
45	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Additional text added within Table 1.
46	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Text added under 'Attracting external funding'.
47	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Public transport added to list at Policy 2, 1c.
48	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Other revisions made to the NP means Design Policy is now Policy 6.

			Policy amended to include reference.
49	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Policy amended to include reference.
50	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	<p>The site allocation policies set out the principle they are not planning applications. Contributions towards infrastructure provision will be secured via CIL. The Parish Council will secure 25% of these receipts to fund a range of initiatives including Project 3 which relates to supporting Community Transport.</p> <p>Amendments made to Ste allocation Policies adding in references to proximity to nearest bus stops and routes of available public transport services. Also added reference to contribution to improving services within appropriate Policies.</p>
51	Nottinghamshire County Council	No - This information has been provided in an earlier amendment	
52	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Project 3 amended.
53	Nottinghamshire County Council	No - Reference made in previous amendment	
54	Nottinghamshire County Council	No - Previous amendments cover this comment	
55	Nottinghamshire County Council	<p>No - Response to comments, including amendments proposed on all heritage matters have been set out in this Consultation Statement next to Historic England's comments please refer to these.</p> <p>A Heritage At Risk policy has</p>	

		been added to reflect these comments	
56	Nottinghamshire County Council	No - This policy has been amended with the Listed Barns included in the heritage at risk policy and new development proposed for the adjoining site.	
57	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	<p>The NPSG are working with Welbeck to encourage wider access across the estate by identifying potential non-motorised routes to provide a better footpath / cycling network.</p> <p>Figure 2 has been amended and bridleways no longer shown on the map.</p>

