

Mission Neighbourhood Plan
Consultation Statement
September 2016

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Methodology.....	3
3	Responses	4
	Local Residents Comments.....	4
	Key Contacts Responses.....	4
4	Amendments to the Neighbourhood Plan	18

1 Introduction

Misson Neighbourhood Plan

1.1 The Misson Neighbourhood Plan (NP) 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 Parish and sets out how that vision will be realised through planning and controlling land use and development change.

1.2 The NP is a new type of planning document prepared by Misson 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 BDC in assessing planning applications; and
- b) by applicants as they prepare planning application for submission to BDC.

1.3 Planning applications must be decided in accordance with BDC adopted planning policies (including this NP).

1.4 To carry this much influence in planning decisions this NP will be examined by an independent examiner who will check that it has been prepared in accordance with planning law, be in conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework, Bassetlaw's 2011 Core Strategy and be approved by a simple majority of votes (i.e. over 50% of those voting) in a local referendum.

1.5 The contents of the Plan have been prepared by the Misson Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, which has been led by Misson Parish Council. It covers the whole Parish area and is intended to cover the period 2015-2028.

Consultation Statement

1.6 This Consultation Statement relates to the Draft Misson Neighbourhood Plan and has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the Regulations sets out that a Consultation Statement should contain:

- Details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood 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 This statement provides an overview and description of the consultation period on the Misson Draft Neighbourhood Plan that ran from 14 July 2016 until 26 August 2016.

1.8 The document titled ‘Consultation Summary’ sets out chronologically the consultation events that have led to the production of the Misson Draft Neighbourhood Plan. This consultation formed the basis of the Policies contained within the Plan that aims to control and promote the sustainable development and growth of the Parish.

The ‘Consultation Summary’ document is available to view on the websites of Misson Hub <https://themissonhub.wordpress.com> and the Parish Council website <http://www.missonparishcouncil.org.uk/community/misson-parish-council-8129/neighbourhood-plan>

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.

2.2 Preceding the commencement of the consultation period on 14 July 2016, the Misson Neighbourhood Plan (NP) and Design Guide were uploaded onto the Misson Hub website explaining the process and the consultation period. A downloadable version of the Plan and Design Guide was uploaded to the website <https://themissonhub.wordpress.com> and the Parish Council website <http://www.missonparishcouncil.org.uk/community/misson-parish-council-8129/neighbourhood-plan> Contact details and methods on how to comment on the Draft Plan were detailed on the website to encourage as many responses as possible.

2.4 On 14th July 2016 an email was sent by Bassetlaw District Council to consultees informing them of the commencement of the consultation period. These contacts involved numerous bodies and individuals that the Parish Council believe will be affected by the Neighbourhood Plan for Misson, such as: neighbouring parish councils, key bodies such as English Heritage and the Environment Agency, local business owners and land owners. A list of those contacted can be seen in **Appendix A** of this document, minus interested individuals and landowners/businesses whose details need to remain confidential due to data protection.

2.5 Recipients of the invitation to submit comments could respond to Bassetlaw District Council or the Clerk to Misson Parish Council.

2.6 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. Therefore, a drop-in consultation event was arranged on Saturday 16th July 2016 running from 11.00 am - 3:00pm, at the Misson Community Centre. Copies of the Draft Plan and supporting documents were available for local residents to view and Steering Group members were present to engage and listen to local resident's comments and views on the Plans proposals and record these. A flier was produced for this event and posted in key locations within the Plan area; this is available to view in **Appendix B** of this document.

3 Responses

3.1 This section of the Consultation Statement contains the responses and comments received on the Draft Misson Neighbourhood Development Plan throughout the Consultation period, from local residents and those interested bodies/parties who were contacted.

3.2 Local Residents Comments

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
1	NA	No comments received from Local Residents following the public consultation on 16 th July 2016 and the publication of the documents on the Misson Hub and Misson Parish Council Website.

3.3 Statutory Consultees Responses

Auckley Parish Council

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
1	NA	No comments to make

Bassetlaw District Council

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
1	General Comment	It would improve the clarity of the Plan to give tables full titles, in the same way that the maps have been given full titles.
2	Page 5	<p>Paragraph 7: The wording of Parts C, D, E and F doesn't follow from the words 'seek to'. We suggest inserting the word 'ensure' before the word 'that' for each affected Part.</p> <p>Paragraph 8: This should refer to the council having a 'statutory' duty to prepare a Local Plan, rather than a 'legal' duty. Our duty to prepare a Local Plan comes from an Act of Parliament, rather than coming from the rule of law.</p>
3	Page 6	<p>Paragraph 10: As this is the first point in the document where it is referred to, the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD should be given its full title here. It would then be reasonable to simply refer to the 'Core Strategy' from this point forwards. It may be helpful to include a direct link to the Core Strategy webpage here:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">http://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/everything-else/planning-building/planning-policy/local-development-framework/core-strategy/the-core-strategy.aspx</p> <p>Paragraph 11: It would be helpful to the plan's clarity to refer to the full titles of these reports, prior to using their acronyms:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2013</p> <p>Paragraph 15: We would suggest removing this paragraph as it will no longer be relevant when the plan is adopted.</p>
4	Page 6/7	Paragraph 17: It is currently unclear which investment is being referred to in the final line of this paragraph. Does this refer to the Community Infrastructure Levy? We would suggest amending the wording to make it clear where this investment is expected to come from.
5	Page 7	Paragraph 22: Why is a higher proportion of people of working age significant? Whilst this is not incorrect it does need to be further explained, in order to draw out the implications of this for the Neighbourhood Plan.

MISSON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
6	Page 9	<p>Paragraph 31: Whilst this is not incorrect, a much fuller explanation is needed as to why the pre-dominance of detached housing has implications for the future sustainability of the village.</p> <p>Paragraph 35: We would recommend that this paragraph is edited to reflect that there is one scheduled ancient monument and one unregistered park and garden.</p> <p>Paragraph 38: The designation of a Conservation Area in Misson will be a matter for elected members. For this reason, the following revised wording for this paragraph is suggested:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">‘In recognition of the extent of the heritage assets in Misson, its special architecture and historic interest, Conservation Officers at Bassetlaw District Council carried out public consultation in July and August 2015 on a proposed Conservation Area for the historic core of Misson village.’</p> <p>Paragraph 39: Suggest replacing ‘this’ with ‘such a’ to reflect changes made in Paragraph 38.</p>
7	Page 10	<p>Add ‘(As July 2016)’ to the title for Map 2, to reflect that this is subject to change.</p> <p>Underneath the map we would like to see the following wording added as a footnote:</p> <p>‘Please note: the above map would be superseded in the event that a Conservation Area is designated. Such a designation would have an accompanying Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, which would contain up-to-date maps of all significant buildings within the Conservation Area. For further details on this process please contact the Conservation Team at Bassetlaw District Council.’</p>
8	Page 11	<p>Paragraph 43: This paragraph will need to be amended to reflect that are not selected by the Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, but are instead designated by the Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Records Centre. Please see the documentation at the following link in order to understand and accurately reference the designation procedures:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/events-markets-parks-and-museums/parks-and-open-spaces/nottinghamshire-biological-and-geological-record-centre-nbgrc/</p> <p>Paragraph 44: It would be helpful to insert wording noting that SSSIs</p>

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
		are designated by Natural England and that these are statutory designations.
9	Page 19	Whilst we are supportive of the aims set out here we believe it would be more appropriate to refer to these aims as contributing to achieving sustainable development, rather than providing a definitive definition. We would suggest rewording the first line of the paragraph to read: 'Across the plan area sustainable development includes:'
10	Page 20	<p>Paragraph 69 (and other places, including Paragraph 79): We would recommend replacing all abbreviations of a particular century (e.g. 20C) with the full wording (20th Century) as the current wording is somewhat confusing.</p> <p>Paragraph 70: Currently this sentence is confusing and unfinished, particularly the use of the word 'dropped'. It may benefit from being incorporated into Paragraph 69.</p>
11	Policy 1	We would recommend moving the contents of Appendix A into the policy, to explain what the guidelines are without requiring applicants to look elsewhere.
12	Page 21	<p>Paragraph 71: Currently the NPPF quote is not accurate – the word 'and' does not appear in the original quote and should be replaced with a comma for accuracy:</p> <p>http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/policy/achieving-sustainable-development/delivering-sustainable-development/7-requiring-good-design/#paragraph_56</p> <p>Paragraph 74: Recommend inserting '(SPD)' after Supplementary Document.</p> <p>Paragraph 75: This should refer to Appendix D rather than Appendix C?</p> <p>Paragraph 80: Is the reference to 'Coronations Street' correct or should this refer to 'Coronation Avenue'?</p>
13	Page 23	<p>Paragraph 87 – 92: The reference to Buildings for Life is helpful but needs to be accurately cited for the avoidance of any confusion. The correct shorthand is 'BfL 12' (with a small 'f' – this also needs to be corrected in other parts of the Plan). We would suggest including a link to the appropriate resource as a footnote:</p> <p>http://www.designcouncil.org.uk/resources/guide/building-</p>

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
		<p>life-12-third-edition</p> <p>Paragraph 88: Recommend inserting ‘Successful Places’ between ‘Bassetlaw’s’ and ‘Supplementary Planning Document’.</p>
14	Policy 2:	<p>Part 2: For clarity we would recommend replacing ‘on plot space’ with ‘off-street’. Additionally, it is unclear what is meant by ‘reduce the appearance of built form on the approach to the village’. Would it be more accurate to use the wording ‘to maintain the existing character’?</p> <p>To improve the visual clarity of the policy we would recommend inseting Parts 4a, 4b and 4c.</p> <p>Part 4c: We would recommend rewording the text contained in the brackets to read:</p> <p>‘(for example, natural red clay non-interlocking pantiles, natural slates, or plain clay tiles, together with red bricks of an appropriate size, colour and texture, with traditional brick bonds e.g. Flemish, English, Garden Wall etc.)’</p> <p>Part 5b: Recommend replacing ‘boundary treatment, for example walls, made from red brick’ with ‘appropriate boundary treatments such as red brick walls, traditional railings’.</p> <p>Part 6: In the text contained in brackets we would recommend inserting ‘or railings’ between ‘red brick’ and ‘with’.</p> <p>Part 7: Currently this part of the policy does not read clearly and would benefit from rewording. In particular the requirement to address local distinctiveness already appears under Part 1 of the policy and does not need to be repeated here. We would suggest the following wording:</p> <p>‘The use of industry standards for good design (Building for Life 12 or the most recent national standards) is encouraged, both for developing design concepts and testing the quality of the final design proposal.’</p>
15	Page 25	<p>Paragraph 97: ‘Starter Homes’ has a particular meaning under the 2016 Housing and Planning Act and it is unclear whether it is this type of starter home that is being referred to. We would recommend either the term ‘starter homes’ is replaced, or the sentence is amended to clarify that this is a reference to the meaning of Starter Homes envisaged by the Act.</p>

MISSON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
16	Page 27	<p>Paragraph 106: In order to reflect the comments made about Paragraph 38 we would recommend deleting this paragraph entirely and replacing with the following wording:</p> <p>‘There are numerous heritage assets within Misson Village, both designated and non-designated. Should a Conservation Area be created then the whole of that area would be a designated heritage asset. Whether a Conservation Area is designated or not, development affecting heritage assets within the village would be subject to Policy DM8 in Bassetlaw District Council’s Core Strategy.’</p> <p>Paragraph 107: In line with above comments we recommend replacing ‘The Conservation Area Appraisal will’ with ‘Should a Conservation Area be designated, the accompanying Conservation Area Appraisal would’.</p>
17	Page 28	<p>Paragraph 114: This paragraph misinterprets Policy CS8 in the Core Strategy. The need for community support is specifically related to the provision of community facilities outside of the Development Boundary and is not necessary for proposals within the Development Boundary. The text will need to be updated to reflect this.</p>
18	Policy 5: Enhancing the provision of community facilities	<p>Part 1a should be removed or amended as applicants should not be required to demonstrate a local need for proposed development inside the existing development boundary. This would be an unreasonable demand as developers will generally only take on the financial risk of opening a new facility, especially if it is a commercial enterprise e.g. a local shop, where they are confident of its viability.</p>
19	Page 28/29	<p>Paragraph 116: Should read ‘Pinfold’ rather than ‘Pinfolds’. Recommend replacing ‘Moat’ with ‘moated enclosure at Gibdyke (a Scheduled Ancient Monument)’. Recommend rewriting final part of this sentence to read ‘both require some form of maintenance’, and adding a new sentence at the end of the paragraph, to read: ‘With regard to the site at Gibdyke, this may be subject to the need for Scheduled Monument Consent.’</p>
20	Page 29	<p>Paragraph 119: Reference to NPPF Paragraph 134 should be changed to refer to NPPF Paragraph 132.</p>
21	Policy 6: Protecting and Enhancing Heritage Assets	<p>Recommend adding to the end of Part 1:</p> <p>‘, provided such schemes preserve or enhance the listed building’s special interest.’</p> <p>To improve the visual clarity of the policy we would recommend</p>

MISSON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
		insetting Parts 2a and 2b.
22	Page 30	<p>Paragraph 124: Missing 'of' between 'allocation' and '7.2'. Stray bracket on the beginning of the second sentence.</p> <p>Paragraph 125: We are concerned that quote snippets from the now withdrawn LDF Site Allocations Sustainability Appraisal are reproduced without their context i.e. no indication of the Sustainability Appraisal objective to which they refer. As such it would be helpful to give further detail, including referring to the fact that the Site Allocations document has now been withdrawn, in light of the Council beginning to prepare a new Local Plan.</p> <p>Paragraph 126: It is unclear what is meant by the reference to Policy 2 in this sentence. It is intended to clarify that development on this site would need to be in accordance with Policy 2: Design Principles for Residential Development?</p>
23	Page 31	The purpose of the table between paragraphs 130 and 131 is unclear. It is assumed that it indicates community support for different options for redeveloping the Misson Mill site. However, it would be helpful to the clarity of this section to give the table a full title and number, and to refer to the table in the text.
24	Page 32	Paragraph 124: Missing full stop at the end of the paragraph.
25	Policy 7: Mixed Use Development on the Misson Mill Site	<p>Because Misson Mill is on land that is designated as Flood Zone 2 it will be necessary for any development on this site to demonstrate that it has satisfied the requirements of the sequential test and the exceptions test (See National Planning Policy Framework, paragraphs 100-104). In order to achieve this the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group will need to show that they have undertaken work to address this and this work will need to be referred to in the supporting text.</p> <p>To demonstrate that the risk of flooding has been addressed Policy should be edited to include a new criterion requiring any application to redevelop the site to be accompanied by a site-specific flood risk assessment.</p> <p>Part 5: It is unclear where the size of the on-site open space requirement has come from. It would be helpful to make reference in the supporting text to evidence supporting this need, for example the 2012 Bassetlaw Open Space Study.</p> <p>Part 7: CABE Design Council have ended their accredited assessor</p>

MISSON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
		scheme and describe BfL 12 as a tool to be used in discussions between developers and local authorities. For this reason, the requirement for applicants to produce a report is overly onerous and we would recommend that Part 7 of the policy is removed.
26	Page 34	Paragraph 148: The government has abandoned its commitment to Zero Carbon homes and the policy described is for London only, to be applied through the London Plan. For this reason, we would recommend removing this paragraph entirely.
27	Page 36	<p>Paragraph 164: The Landscape Character Assessment to which the Plan refers is titled the 'Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment', rather than the 'Nottinghamshire Landscape Character Assessment'. Whilst this study is derived from the Nottinghamshire wide methodology the assessment is specifically for Bassetlaw. The text should be updated to reflect this.</p> <p>Paragraph 164: Misson falls within the Idle Lowlands Landscape Character Area. The text should make clear this is the Idle Lowlands Policy Zone 2, as there are four other Character Areas to which Policy 2 could relate.</p>
28	Page 39	Paragraph 170: Recommend inserting the word 'proposed' before 'designation' in the second sentence, and replacing the word 'will' with 'would'. This is so as to be consistent with the changes recommended to paragraph 38. The chunk of text following this paragraph is currently missing a paragraph number.
29	Policy 10:	<p>Part 1a: The Landscape Character Assessment does not define the ecological value of sites. For this reason, either the reference to 'ecological value', or the reference to the 'Landscape Character Assessment Study' will need to be removed in order for this part of the policy to be accurate.</p> <p>Part 2: With the exception of the reference to cycling this part of the policy largely repeats Part 1b and should could be considered for removal.</p> <p>Part 3: In order for this part of the policy to be applied this will need to make specific reference to, either green infrastructure assets defined in the Bassetlaw Green Infrastructure Study 2010, or should list locally significant green infrastructure assets.</p>
30	Page 40	Paragraphs 171, 172, 175 and 177: BDC and Bassetlaw District Council are used inconsistently in these paragraphs.

MISSON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
31	Appendix C	<p>Project 3: Recommend changing 'Moat' for 'moated site at Gibdyke', 'Pinfolds' for 'Pinfold' and adding the follow wording to the end of the project description:</p> <p>'It is acknowledged that the moated site at Gibdyke is a Scheduled Ancient Monument, and therefore the advice of Historic England and the Conservation Team at BDC would be sought before any works take place.'</p> <p>Project 6: Recommend adding the following wording to the end of the project description:</p> <p>'This would be subject to obtaining planning permission and a church faculty. The advice of Historic England and the Conservation Team at BDC would be sought.'</p>
32	Appendix D	<p>The correct title for the Supplementary Planning Document is 'Successful Places' and it was produced for Bassetlaw District Council, Bolsover District Council, Chesterfield Borough Council and North East Derbyshire District Council. The title will need to be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>We would additionally recommend including a fuller explanation of the purpose of this Appendix and how the passages highlighted have been chosen.</p>

Environment Agency

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
1		The Environment Agency has no comment as to whether the Plan should be subject to SEA legislation and are satisfied that the Plan is unlikely to have any significant environmental effects within our remit.

Highways England

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
1		<p>Upon review of the Misson Neighbourhood Development Plan V3.1, we have based this response on the preferred option for Misson Mill. We have assumed a total site size of 7.2ha with 50 dwellings, 30 dwellings per hectare and 5.53ha for B1/B2/B8 use which is split evenly.</p> <p>Taking these assumptions into account, the Highways England Network Analysis Tool (NAT) shows 23 trips on to the A1(M) north of Junction 34 in the AM peak and 27 trips in the PM peak. Therefore, we would consider the impact of the traffic on the SRN from these proposals as limited at this time.</p>

Natural England

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
1		<p>Natural England generally welcomes the draft Neighbourhood Plan that sets out the development management policies which will guide the future sustainable development of the Misson parish up to 2031.</p> <p>We are pleased that the vision values the countryside and wants everyone to enjoy the rural environment. We particularly welcome community objectives 1, 4, 5 and 7 which aim to protect and enhance the natural environment and improve people's access to it.</p>
2		<p>We note that the plan proposes the Misson Mill site allocation which we consider has potential to impact on the River Idle Washlands Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), as identified by Natural England's SSSI Impact Risk Zones (IRZs). Policy 7 aims to guide the nature of the development at the Misson Mill site and while this policy recognises the importance of the adjacent Local Wildlife Site and seeks to protect it, we are concerned that the nearby River Idle Washlands SSSI is not mentioned and there are no site specific</p>

MISSON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTATION STATEMENT

		<p>requirements to avoid impacts on this site.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan as it progresses should avoid any proposal or activity that would be likely to damage or destroy the interest features of this SSSI or should identify such mitigation measures as may be required in order to avoid, minimise or reduce any adverse significant effects. We recommend the policy could be amended to include “it does not cause harm to the River Idle Washlands Site of Special Scientific Interest”.</p>
3		<p>We are pleased Policy 10 seeks to enhance green infrastructure and encourages the improvement of walking and cycling routes across the plan area. Rights of way can form an important part of the green infrastructure network by offering opportunities for people to access green space and the wider countryside and providing ecological corridors for the benefit of wildlife. We fully support the aim to increase access along the River Idle, however any proposals should have regard to the nature conservation value of the area and ensure that they are designed and managed appropriately to avoid any adverse effects on the notified features of the SSSI.</p>

Nottinghamshire County Council

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
1		<p>There is currently limited reference to promoting the health & wellbeing of the population in the plan and the importance that spatial planning has on both physical and mental health.</p>
2		<p>It is recommended that this checklist is completed to enable the potential positive and negative impacts of the plan on health and wellbeing to be considered in a consistent, systematic and objective way, identifying opportunities for maximising potential health gains and minimising harm and addressing inequalities taking account of the wider determinants of health.</p>
3		<p>The adopted Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Core Strategy (adopted 10 December 2013) (full title Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Replacement Waste Local Plan, Part 1: Waste Core Strategy) and the saved, non-replaced policies of the Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Local Plan (adopted</p>

MISSON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
		2002), along with the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan (adopted 2005) (and emerging replacement plan) form part of the development plan for the area. As such the County Council recommends that the Parish Council has regard to the relevant policies in these plans as part of the development of their Neighbourhood Plan.
4		In terms of the Waste Core Strategy, the County Council's indicate that there are no existing waste management facilities within the Misson Neighbourhood Plan Area and so no concern is raised in accordance with Policy WCS10 which covers the safeguarding our existing waste management facilities.
5	Policy 2	The County Council would draw the Parish Council's attention to Policy WCS2 which sets out that all development should be 'designed, constructed and implemented to minimise the creation of waste, maximise the use of recycled materials and assist the collection, separation, sorting, recycling and recovery of waste'. The Parish Council may therefore wish to consider including an appropriate reference to these wider waste management issues within all development as well as local waste management sites, to ensure sustainable design of future development in the village.
6		The County Council would particularly draw the Parish Council's attention to the presence of various sand and gravel quarries within the area (as recognised in the Plan at paragraph 27). Policy MP2 of Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan Submission Draft (March 2016) identifies a number of existing and proposed sites (including an extension to Bawtry Road Quarry) to maintain future supply of the mineral. Policy DM13 of the Minerals Local Plan concerns safeguarding and consultation areas for minerals. The vast majority of the Misson Neighbourhood Plan Area is covered by a safeguarding and consultation area for sand and gravel. The County Council would draw the Parish Council's attention to the provisions of DM13, particularly in relation to any Sustainability Appraisal and site allocation process.
7	Clause 23	<p>The timetable for services to Misson as shown in the Neighbourhood Plan is out of date as Unity Coaches ceased operations in April of this year.</p> <p>Misson is now served by Stagecoach service 27. This service forms part of the 'Bassetlaw Belles' network which whilst being predominantly commercial, nevertheless receives substantial subsidies from this Authority.</p>

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
8	Clause 61	<p>TTS have reviewed the plan objectives, and Design Guide. Transport and Travel Services welcomes the draft Plan and the emphasis on sustainable development. However, a key omission from the document is any mention of public transport apart from a reference to “<i>Poor public transport – infrequent</i>” as a weakness in the SWOT analysis, and “... <i>the limited public transport access to local services</i>” at Section 81.</p> <p>It is suggested that the Plan is amended to make reference in the Objectives, and elsewhere, to the important role of public transport provision and bus stopping facilities in sustainable development, including providing access to key services such as education, work and shopping facilities.</p>
9	Clause 91	<p>TTS request that developer contributions towards improved public transport services and infrastructure is specified as a criterion to be met for a site to be supported by the Neighbourhood Development Plan. It is suggested that sites/schemes that afford access to existing public transport facilities should be given priority for development.</p>
10	Clause 91	<p>In particular Transport & Travel Services will wish to explore with developers the provision of contributions for the provision of public transport services and waiting facilities including real time departure displays and raised kerbs, through Section 106 agreements. A statement within the plan which supports this approach will complement other strategic documents, and enable the council to effectively negotiate for suitable developer contributions.</p>
11	Clause 61	<p>Community transport services are provided in the Bassetlaw area Bassetlaw Action Centre and Community Transport for Town and County. It is suggested that reference to their work is included within the Plan, together with the potential for Community Transport and related services i.e. taxi buses to complement the local bus network.</p> <p>In this regard the Council would encourage the local community to engage with local community transport providers to consider opportunities for local transport services.</p>
12	Clause 61	<p>There is no reference in the document to the role of taxis, which are licensed by Bassetlaw District Council and play an important role in the local economy. It is suggested reference to the role of taxis is included in the plan.</p>

Severn Trent

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
1		Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your consultation. We currently have no specific comments to make, but please keep us informed when your plans are further developed when we will be able to offer more detailed comments and advice.

MISSON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Amendments to the Neighbourhood Plan

- 3.1 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
2	BDC	Yes	Inserted the word 'ensure' before parts C, D, E & F Amended the word 'legal' to 'statutory'
3	BDC	Yes	Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD given full title and link included. Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014 and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2013 reports give full titles. Paragraph removed
4	BDC	Yes	Amended to clarify how PC intend to use CIL and other funding opportunities to deliver identified community projects see para 18 and 19
5	BDC	Yes	Table 1 amended and text added at para 23 and 24
6	BDC	Yes	Paragraph expanded to provide more detail
7	BDC	Yes	Additional wording added to title of Map 2 and footnote added as requested
8	BDC	Yes	Paragraph amended to accurately reflect designation of Wildlife sites Paragraph amended to accurately reflect designation of SSSIs
10	BDC	Yes	20C amended to 20 th Century
11	BDC	Yes	Contents of Appendix A moved into Policy 1
12	BDC	Yes	Amendments made as suggested - NPPF quote amended, SPD inserted, Appendix changed from C to D and street name amended
13	BDC	Yes	Amendments made as suggested - BfL 12 abbreviated amended, link included, additional wording inserted
14	BDC	Yes	Policy 2 - All suggested amendments incorporated

MISSON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Comment Number	Comment Source	Amendment Required?	Amendments to the NP
15	BDC	Yes	Clarification given to Starter Homes
16	BCD	Yes	Amendments made as suggested
17	BDC	Yes	Updated to accurately reflect Policy CS8 in the Core Strategy
18	BDC	Yes	Amendments made to Policy 5 wording
19	BDC	Yes	Amendments made as suggested to details regarding heritage assets
20	BDC	Yes	Amendment made to accurately reflect NPPF Paragraph referred to
21	BDC	Yes	Amendments made to Policy 6 as suggested
22	BDC	Yes	Amendment made to grammar, additional information included regarding Site Allocations document being withdrawn and confirmation included of Policy 2
23	BDC	Yes	Clarity given to purpose of table and full title and number
25	BDC	Yes	Misson Mill Site was identified in the Sustainability Appraisal undertaken by BDC in 2013 to support site allocation development plan document. The SA considered flood risk of this and other sites as part of its appraisal process. Policy 7.7 added requirement to undertake specific flood risk assessment
26	BDC	Yes	Paragraph removed as suggested
27	BDC	Yes	Nottinghamshire amended to Bassetlaw and Idle Lowlands Policy Zone 2 inserted for clarity
28	BDC	Yes	Amendments made as suggested
29	BDC	Yes	Policy 10 – amendments made as suggested to ensure policy is accurate
31	BDC	Yes	Appendix C – amendments made to terminology and confirmation added that advice / planning permission would be sought before embarking on any projects
32	BDC	Yes	Appendix D – full title given to document name and explanation inserted as to the purpose of the appendix

MISSON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Comment Number	Comment Source	Amendment Required?	Amendments to the NP
2	NE	Yes	Policy 7 - wording added 'it does not cause harm to the River Idle Washlands Site of Special Scientific Interest' to address concerns raised.
3	NE	Yes	Policy 10 – wording added 'Any proposals should have regard to the nature conservation value of the area and ensure that they are designed and managed appropriately to avoid any adverse effects on the notified features of the SSSI' to address concerns
1	NCC	Yes	Link between NP policy approach and mental health made at para 28 in context of social cohesion and the NP vision's requirement that Misson will be a friendly place Link to health benefits of physical activity made at para 172
2	NCC	No	The checklist was reviewed with the Steering Group and it was considered all relevant topics had been covered in the plan
3 and 5	NCC	Yes	Role of county policies in working alongside NP and district policies highlighted. Para 64 and 65 amended Also ref to WCSP2 added at para 160 in relation to energy efficiency.
6	NCC	No	NP not doing site allocation but providing specific planning policy detail on site already identified i.e. Misson mill so no NP specific SA or site allocation assessment has been undertaken.
7	NCC	Yes	Details of Mission bus service updated
8	NCC		<i>Suggestion to make reference to important role of public transport not included in Objectives at present</i>
9	NCC	Yes	Paragraph inserted to make reference to request that developer contributes towards improved public transport services.
10	NCC	Yes	NCC requirements relating to developer contributions for transport, travel and infrastructure have also been added to a general section on how the NP policies work together with other policies
11	NCC	Yes	Reference to transports services provided in the Bassetlaw area

MISSION NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Comment Number	Comment Source	Amendment Required?	Amendments to the NP
			included
12	NCC	No	The Steering Group did not consider that reference to taxi was relevant to the Neighbourhood Plan

4 Appendix A

Copies of the Neighbourhood Plan and Design Guide was circulated to the following Organisations

English Heritage

Coal Authority

Marine Management Authority

Highways Authority

Homes & Communities Agency

Severn Trent Water

Environment Agency

National Trust

Natural England

Anglian Water

Nottinghamshire County Council

Documents were also sent to any landowners or agents registered on BDC database as well as neighbouring Parish Councils and Local Authorities.