

QUESTIONS FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING

Question 1

Can a safe access be provided to serve the allocation site 2 and 3 with the necessary visibility, for the scale of development proposed in Policy E9 and/or is it necessary for the capacity of the sites to be reduced.

Answer - Qualifying Body.

The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group identified potential development sites using an established process. The Local Authority then undertook an independent technical assessment of each site.

The independent technical assessments on site 2 and 3 indicated that they may be suitable providing issues such as access could be resolved. The presumption of the steering group is that these issues must be resolvable or the independent technical assessment would have said that the sites were unsuitable.

The steering group understands that different rules about safe access could apply depending on the number of houses to be built on each site and furthermore that these issues would normally be addressed as part of a full planning application for each site.

The steering group relies on professional opinion as to the scale of safe access to these sites. However, it notes that both sites are within the 30mph zone. The steering group also notes that visibility and hence safe access issues may not be dependent on the speed of law abiding drivers but on the speed of law breakers. If the latter maybe limiting measures would be appropriate.

Question 2

Should there be a requirement to provide a pedestrian route for residents of the two allocation sites, to the south of Gainsborough Road?

Answer - Qualifying Body

It may be considered preferable to provide a pedestrian route to the south of Gainsborough Road.

However there are other solutions that may resolve this matter.

A pavement exists to the North side of Gainsborough Road. A refuge or crossing point could be provided to enable safe access to this from the allocated sites. Incidentally, such a crossing would mirror the crossing point that exists to the west of the Mattersey Road junction at the other end of the village.

A public footpath also exists off this pavement that connects to the centre of village and avoids Gainsborough Road.

Question 3

What was the rationale for extending the allocation Site 3 beyond the site shown on Map 13- Preferred Option Site Allocation

Answer - Qualifying Body

Site 3 was put forward in the Bassetlaw District Council's (BDC) call for sites process held November 2015 - January 2016. An informal consultation event was held in December 2016 with five responses supporting this site as suitable and seven responses saying this site was less suitable due to its large size.

The landowner also attended this event and indicated a willingness to reduce the size of the site. The landowner was asked to discuss this issue with BDC.

All 11 sites put forward were technically assessed by BDC between January-February 2017. Site 3 was included in a formal consultation in March 2017 showing a smaller site. There were 27 responses saying yes to this site and 20 responses saying no.

The criteria used for inclusion of a site was that it received more positive responses than objections. Accordingly, the site was included in the draft plan.

The draft plan went out to Regulation 14 consultation in April- June 2017.

In response to the consultation the landowner requested that the size of the site be increased to a size less than the original proposal.

Following this response and additional responses requesting the inclusion of three new sites it was decided that the fairest course of action would be to ask BDC to technically reassess not only the resized Site 3 but also all the other previously submitted sites as well as technically assessing the three new sites that had been put forward in responses to the first Regulation 14 Consultation. These assessments were completed in August 2017.

The outcome of these technical assessments was that the resized site 3 may be suitable. It was agreed to include this site for consultation as part of a revised draft plan in a second Regulation 14 consultation.

The second Regulation 14 Consultation was held in November - December 2017. No significant objections were received regarding the inclusion of site 3.

Question 4

'Should NP 13 be designated as a housing site, either in full or in part, particularly bearing in mind that part of the site has been granted planning permission on appeal? What would be the potential capacity of the entire site and is there scope for a more limited development? What has changed since the appeal decision and is there a form of development that would better reflect the existing character of development in Everton?

Answer - Qualifying Body

The Parish Council questions the examiner's assertion that part of site NP 13 was granted planning permission on appeal and would like to draw the examiner's attention to a point of accuracy. The Parish Council understands the area that we have named site NP 13 was submitted for planning permission outside of the Neighbourhood Plan process and was refused on appeal. Pending the outcome of this appeal an application was submitted for five houses on part of the site.

Site 13 was submitted for planning permission for 14 houses plus cemetery and car park, Ref 16/01656/OUT dated 24th November 2016. This application went to appeal because of non-determination by the due date by BDC. The site was refused at appeal dated 14th August 2017, appeal decision APP/A3010/W/17/3173194. The appeal decision details the reasons for this refusal and we would like to draw to your attention paragraphs 12, 13 and 14 in this document. In the interim an outline application (17/00635/OUT) was submitted by the landowner for five dwellings on part of this site and was granted by BDC on 7th July 2017. The applicant has until July 2019 to submit an application for reserved matters.

Site 13 was put forward by the landowner for consideration in response to the first Regulation 14 Consultation in April - June 2017. In August 2017 BDC undertook a detailed technical assessment of NP 13 and concluded the site would not be suitable. Hence, this site was not included in the revised plan that went out to a second Regulation 14 consultation in November- December 2017. There were objections in response from the landowner and the agent arguing that site NP 13 should be included as part of the of the site already had planning consent. It was agreed that this element of the site would be included in the plan as a commitment.

The examiner has asked if the Parish Council thinks that there is scope for more limited development on site 13. Having followed the process as outlined, with the outcome of the site being unsuitable, we cannot see anyway that any further development on this site could be included in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Having followed an open and transparent process, including two Regulation 14 consultations, all sites have had equal opportunity to be considered for inclusion in the plan. There are several sites that have been excluded due to being assessed as unsuitable at the technical assessment and/or not having community support.

The inclusion of (17/00635/OUT) at this stage would undermine a process that has been plan led and empowers local people to shape their surroundings by involving them in shaping the plans policies and proposals through extensive consultation and engagement activities in line with NPPF Core Planning Principles. It would be unfair to other landowners who have sites that have been excluded and parishioners who have adhered to due process for the last three years.