



# Consultation Statement

## September 2018

Misterton Parish Council

---



# Table of Content

1. What is the Consultation Statement?	4
2. Regulation 14 Pre-submission Consultation	5
3. Responses Received	6
4. Amendments to the Plan	37

## 1. What is the Consultation Statement?

- 1.1. This Consultation Statement document has been prepared to support the submission of the Misterton Neighbourhood Development Plan (the Plan), prepared for the parish of Misterton, for the period 2018 – 2035.
- 1.2. 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.
- 1.3. The Pre Submission Draft Misterton Neighbourhood Development Plan was made available for consultation in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Plan Regulations from Saturday 21st April until Friday 8th June 2018. This document provides a description of the amendments made to the document based on the comments received.

## 2. Regulation 14 Pre-submission Consultation

- 2.1. Consultation with the community and Statutory Consultees on the Draft Misterton Neighbourhood Plan began on Saturday 21st April and ended on Friday 8th June 2018. A drop-in consultation event has been held at The Misterton Centre & Library on the 9<sup>th</sup> June 2018.
- 2.2. The Misterton Neighbourhood Plan along with a range of supportive evidence based documents were available online and in hard copies at The Misterton Centre & Library. The Consultation exercise included a drop in session, access to the plan and supporting documents and a summary of key points. Steering group members were also in attendance to deal with any questions or provide further information. Questions asked to express Support or Objection to the Plan as a whole, and in particular to the Vision, Objectives, Policies, Community Aspirations and encouraged respondents to provide written comments. Comments could have been returned through email, on the Facebook page of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group or by regular post to The Misterton Centre. A leaflet with the above information was also distributed prior to the commencing of the consultation to all households.
- 2.3. Statutory Consultees were emailed in order to inform them of the Regulation 14 Consultation. The communication contained the Plan attached or a direct link to the online repository of the Plan documents.
- 2.4. All houses in the Parish were informed of the consultation documents and consultation periods via leaflets. Regulation 14 Consultation was publicised on the Parish Council website, in its newsletter and on its Facebook page as well.
- 2.5. The following tables present all the comments received from statutory and non-statutory consultees. Each comment is assigned a code that is referenced in the table where proposed amendments are defined.

### 3. Responses Received

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

#### Local Residents

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
01	General	I am disappointed in so much as the Neighbourhood Plan has not addressed the issue of tourist accommodation, namely the siting of caravans and holiday lodges. Misterton currently has three (planning) applications awaiting decision for caravans/lodges and would therefore like this comment passed to the steering committee.
02	General	Disappointed not to have a policy regarding renewable energy.
03	Section 9	The return of 18% of the questionnaires is very disappointing (731 households failed to return).
04	Section 13	A village hall would be a great asset to the village (of a reasonable size obviously) but is it affordable! Are lottery grants available
05	NP01	I agreed with this initially but have reservations that the maximum figure (51) could be achievable on the plot size.
06	NP03	I agreed with this initially but misread the plan I thought it was the plot on the village side of Coopers Bridge (One house is already built –planned for 6/8 agreed a few year back) I now realise looking at the plan currently it is on the other side of the bridge further up. However would still support this but what has happened re further development on the first site mentioned?
07	NP06	Initially agreed with this and my views have not changed.

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
08	NP11	Access from Grange Avenue. Due to low bridge majority of plant etc for development will have to pass via Gravelholes Lane/Groveswood Rd which is main thoroughfare to school. Heavy congestion already at certain times. Site traffic may also try and use Wharf Rd despite bridge weight limit. Should be addressed before planning approved. Also problems with staff site vehicles and parking during development. Designated parking zones should be provided for.
09	NP12	Access from Fox Covert Lane hence comments from above apply again. Low bridge recently flooded and does so regularly. Problems with parking at Millennium House & Dance School causing chaos with parking on verges particularly in wet weather so again site worker parking will be an issue.
10	Site Allocations	Infrastructure needs improving before any more houses. Marsh Lane- our toilets get backed up and overflow when it rains now let alone if more houses.
11	Section 15	Have left out the green spaces at the end of Hillside Avenue. The only trees on the avenue
12	General	I appreciate we have to look to the future and accept change is inevitable. Peoples needs change and have to be catered for in Education, Health and Housing. Having lived in our home 10 Church St Misterton for the past 47 years, it is in the last 12 years we have been subjected to severe flooding of raw sewage swelling up to our door step, over the patio, swamping the garden and fish pond with human excrement and all that goes with it. This first occurred on Easter Monday evening the 17th April 2006 and we have experienced the same on numerous occasions since then. Until significant improvements are made to the infrastructure in our village, I fear further development in building would be detrimental.
13	NP06	If the proposed houses are built on NP06 (17 in total) that would give a total of 101 houses on the estate. Given that most households have at least 2 cars, that means a potential, minimum, total of 202 cars would be traveling along Meadow Drive every day. This number of journeys would significantly increase if we apply the rule that people would go to work in the morning and return in the evening. It would increase yet again with miscellaneous trips.

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
		<p>The one and only access road into and out of the estate is Meadow Drive. It is currently a heavily used road by all residents of the 84 houses. Any increase to these numbers would have a detrimental effect not only on the residents close by but also on the road itself.</p> <p>I am currently in consultation with County Emergency Services as to the viability/ legality of placing more residential housing on an estate that has only one access road for residents and Emergency Service vehicles.</p> <p>It is a natural choke point as it is, if something were to happen on the access road then no further access would be possible for any residents to get to their homes or indeed no access would be possible for any Emergency Service vehicles. This could cause a delay in response to an emergency on the estate, leading to a fatality.</p> <p>Given that the one access road is a natural pinch point at the moment I think it very unwise to plan further development on the site. You are inviting a catastrophe. It is only a matter of time and if it does happen as explained above, I shall be the first to air my views to the national press.</p>
14	NP06	<p>The access to the possible development is a single road onto A161. Meadow Drive – with the A161 is, in my view, a dangerous junction with busy traffic along the A161 in both directions. The A161 has an outside curve arcing to Meadow Drive in both directions and sever bends on either side of the junction. The A161 from Gainsborough is downhill and often frequented by speeding vehicles. The junction access from Meadow Drive and also in both directions from the A161 is made more difficult by parked vehicles near the junction on Meadow Drive. The road is narrow and should there be a major incident along it, fire traffic etc residents will be trapped in or kept out, congesting the A161 by additional parked vehicles; and what of access for emergency vehicles to rescue and attend to those who may be suffering, the elderly, young children and others.</p> <p>Meadow Drive is the only access to and from the development, which is already servicing 84 houses with approximately 2 cars per household, maybe sometimes 3 or more. So currently there are 84 x 2 i.e. 168 vehicles using the dangerous access; how many times a day we do not know, but if the development were to go ahead that could be 84+17 i.e. 101 houses and 202 cars.</p>
15	NP06	<p>NP06 is an area that floods. We have personal knowledge of this. The field to the rear of our house, floods quite heavily at the bottom, to Wellington boot depth. The field is adjacent to NP06.. An occupant next to both the field and N06 has walked the public footpath between the field and NP06 in times of flooding wearing wellington boots. [They] report the water level has been quite high up to her boots. I do not see any mention of either of these problems in the Neighbourhood plan documents. We raise a concern which needs to be strongly considered.</p>



Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
16	General	I also suggest you need to reconsider the Newell's site which is currently an eyesore. This was formerly an engineering works and much of the infrastructure drains etc must surely still exist. Building in this area would make a string visual impact in favour of the village, and meet most f the housing needs.
17	NP01	This would be on the outskirts of the village so causing minimum disruption in the village
18	NP03	As NP01
19	NP06	Moved here as quiet and low traffic volume. This area floods every winter and is a lovely wildlife area. It has many ducks/swans on this land. My garden runs all one length of this area. We have access over this land from the gate to the back of our fence so we can get our caravan in and out. We have a key to the gate. the access was agreed when the land was originally purchased to go with the house. There are few green areas mid village and surely it would be better to build outwards of the village i.e NP01, NP03, NP11 and keep traffic in the centre to a minimum.
20	Section 3	Like – car ownership considered therefore adequate parking Dislike- when considering housing types, bungalows, houses, flats not considered until later.
21	Section 9	Like - Traditional housing style preferred to prevent new housing looking out of place.
22	Section 10	Like - bungalows considered not only for retirement but disabled friendly?
23	Section 1	Dislike – map difficult to interpret.
24	Section 2	Like –detailed and thorough.

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
25	Section 3	Like- Interesting especially for newcomers.
26	Section 4	Like- liked these. Have they received equal weighting?
27	Section 5	Like –Noble
28	Section 6	Like- Sound objectives should 1 and 4 be swapped putting environment first?
29	Section 7 & 9	Like- Excellent. Like Crucial
30	Section 10	Like- Takes up most of the plan. Dislike- map unclear to say the least.
31	Section 11	Dislike- Not dealt with sufficiently.
32	Section 13	Like- key. Dislike- don't like the map.
33	NP01	No problem with the area but would like number of houses to be 25-30
34	NP11	Again this area is ok so long as it does not impinge on the green spaces. Number 30-35
35	NP12	This links with NP11 creating a sprawl of houses. 23-25 would be better.

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
36	General	Overall, we feel that the plan should give more attention to the growth of business and employment prospects. Development needs to be sustainable. If there is no employment locally, Misterton will become a dormitory town.

### Landowner

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
37	Site Allocations	<p>We act on behalf of local landowners who are in control of land adjacent to Misterton Primary School. In this regard the nature of sustainable development requires good access to established and important community facilities.</p> <p>In most small villages the primary school is an increasingly important component of community infrastructure, facilitating, not only its primary education role, but a full and proper integration of other community activities.</p> <p>Accessibility, particularly on foot, is a key influencing factor. The attached plan demonstrates how a relatively modest housing scheme could be laid out alongside the primary school, providing a range of housing types and tenures.</p> <p>It also shows the provision of outdoor playing space which could be shared between the school and the wider community, reinforcing the association between community elements.</p> <p>We have understood the local concerns with regard to the scale of development and the proximity of development to existing dwellings. Therefore, we have sought to retain a significant part of the site in agricultural use and to ensure that public access is gained with the creation of a perimeter footpath route set in a newly landscaped corridor. In addition, we can make space available to provide off-street parking, which might alleviate school time problems on Grove Wood Road.</p>

## Anglian Water

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
38	Policy 7	Improvements to the existing water supply network are expected to be required to enable the development of this site. Reference to this requirement should be included in Policy 7.
39	Policy 8	<p>Improvements to the existing water supply network are expected to be required to enable the development of this site. Reference to this requirement should be included in Policy 8.</p> <p>There is an existing water main in Anglian Water's ownership which crosses the frontage of this site. There is a need to consider the existing asset in Anglian Water's ownership as part of the design of this development.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed that the following wording should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan to follow Policy 8:</p> <p><i>'An existing water main crosses the frontage of this site, therefore the site layout should be designed to take these into account. This existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing water main should be located in highways or public open space. If it is not possible to avoid our asset a formal application to divert Anglian Water's existing asset may be required.'</i></p> <p>In addition it proposed that the following wording should be included in Policy 8:</p> <p><i>'d) that suitable access is safeguarded for the maintenance of water infrastructure;'</i></p>
40	Policy 9	<p>Improvements to the existing water supply network are expected to be required to enable the development of this site. Reference to this requirement should be included in Policy 9.</p> <p>There is an existing water main in Anglian Water's ownership which crosses the frontage of this site. There is a need to consider the existing asset in Anglian Water's ownership as part of the design of this development.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed that the following wording should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan to follow Policy 9:</p>

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
		<p><i>'An existing water main crosses the frontage of this site, therefore the site layout should be designed to take these into account. This existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing water main should be located in highways or public open space. If it is not possible to avoid our asset a formal application to divert Anglian Water's existing asset may be required.'</i></p> <p>In addition it proposed that the following wording should be included in Policy 9:</p> <p><i>'d) that suitable access is safeguarded for the maintenance of water infrastructure;'</i></p>
41	Policy 10	Improvements to the existing water supply network are expected to be required to enable the development of this site. Reference to this requirement should be included in Policy 10.
42	Policy 11	Improvements to the existing water supply network are expected to be required to enable the development of this site. Reference to this requirement should be included in Policy 11.
43	Policy 12	<p>Improvements to the existing water supply network are expected to be required to enable the development of this site. Reference to this requirement should be included in Policy 12.</p> <p>There is an existing water main in Anglian Water's ownership which crosses the frontage of this site. There is a need to consider the existing asset in Anglian Water's ownership as part of the design of this development.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed that the following wording should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan to follow Policy 12:</p> <p><i>'An existing water main crosses the frontage of this site, therefore the site layout should be designed to take these into account. This existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing water main should be located in highways or public open space. If it is not possible to avoid our asset a formal application to divert Anglian Water's existing asset may be required.'</i></p> <p>In addition it proposed that the following wording should be included in Policy 12:</p> <p><i>'d) that suitable access is safeguarded for the maintenance of water infrastructure;'</i></p>

## BDC Conservation

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
44	Policy 8	<p>We have looked through the Draft Misterton NP and overall Conservation has no major concerns. However, it is suggested that Policy 8, which covers the allocated site to the west of Church Street, be reconsidered given the historic setting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The land identified above is allocated for residential development of, up to and including, 12 new homes.</li> <li>2. Development proposals will be supported provided they take into consideration the findings of the Neighbourhood Profile Report, are in line with all other relevant Policies and give consideration to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a) The proposal is of a design, scale and layout which preserves or enhances the setting of nearby heritage assets, especially the grade II listed 8 Church Street adjacent;</i></li> <li><i>b) The proposal comprises buildings of a maximum of two storeys in height;</i></li> <li><i>c) The proposal utilises facing materials which have regard to historic buildings in the vicinity;</i></li> <li><i>d) The proposed boundary treatment(s) have regard to the setting of adjacent heritage assets;</i></li> <li><i>e) The proposal includes a Heritage Statement which adequately addresses the impact(s) on the setting of nearby heritage assets;</i></li> <li>f) The location of the site's access and pedestrian connections, reflecting preferences identified in the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment document; and</li> <li>g) Reflecting the density of surrounding development, having regard to Figure 4.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

## National Farmers Union

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
45	General	<p>Our general comments on the neighbourhood plan are as follows:-</p> <p>The NFU has 4,800 farmer members out of the 6,000 farmers in the East Midlands region who are commercial farmers. About 80 per cent of land within this part of Nottinghamshire is farmed. The viability and success of farmers near Misterton is crucial to the local economy and the environment. Farmers need local plan policies which enable:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New farm buildings needed by the business. This could be for regulatory reasons (e.g. new slurry stores) or because new or more crops and livestock are being farmed (grain stores, barns, livestock housing etc).</li> <li>- Farm and rural diversification. Some farmers will be in a good position to diversify into equine businesses, on farm leisure and tourism and in other sectors which will help boost the local economy and support the farm business.</li> <li>- On farm renewable energy. Farms can be ideal places for wind turbines, pv, solar, anaerobic digestion, biomass and biofuels plant provided they do not cause nuisance to others. The UK must meet a target of 15% renewables by 2020. Currently we are not meeting this target but on farm renewables can help us to meet it.</li> <li>- Conversion of vernacular buildings on farms into new business use or residential use. This enables parts of older buildings to be preserved whilst helping the economy and the farm business.</li> <li>- Fast broadband and mobile connectivity. Rural businesses depend on these but so often these are not provided and planning can be an obstacle to their provision rather than the enabler that it should be.</li> </ul> <p>The NFU will be looking to see that the neighbourhood plan has policies which positively encourage the above and do not deter them because of, for example, restrictive landscape designations and sustainable transport policies which imply that all development needs to be by a bus stop. There can also be issues about new buildings being sited too close to noisy or smelly farm buildings which cause nuisance to new householders and lead to abatement notices being served on longstanding businesses. We would urge the local planning authority to be especially careful before granting permission to residential development near to bad neighbour uses.</p>

## NCC Highways

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
46	Policy 2	2: Where practicable plot sizes should be large enough to accommodate a minimum of 2 off street parking spaces.  This might not be enough for larger dwellings. The parking policy would be better increasing by the number of bedrooms.
47	Policy 7	<i>2.b) The location of the sites access and pedestrian connections, reflecting preferences identified in the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment document;</i>  I could not find any highway related preferences in the Site Assessment document. The Highway Authority has reported on each potential allocation. The policy would be better seeking the pertinent bits:  <i>'The site is located adjacent a series of bends. A junction to a development would need to be located in a position where sufficient visibility is achievable, preferably as close to the village as possible where vehicles speeds will be lower. A pedestrian connection will be required towards the southern end of the site in any event'.</i>
48	Policy 8	2.b) I could not find any highway related preferences in the Site Assessment document. The Highway Authority has reported on each potential allocation. The policy would be better seeking the pertinent bits:  <i>'It must be demonstrated that acceptable visibility can be achieved at a junction with Church Street including in a forward direction around the bend. Alternatively access may be achievable from Cornley Road. However this would need to include road widening sufficient for two vehicles to pass and the provision of a footway up to Carr Lane. A pedestrian connection would be required directly to Church Street to minimise walking distances'.</i>
49	Policy 9	2.b) I could not find any highway related preferences in the Site Assessment document. The Highway Authority has reported on each potential allocation. The policy would be better seeking the pertinent bits:  <i>'No objection in principle. Any accesses would need to accommodate the bus stop fronting the site'.</i>



Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
50	Policy 10	2.a) I could not find any highway related preferences in the Site Assessment document. However, there were no site specific highway requirements.
51	Policy 11	<p>2.a) I could not find any highway related preferences in the Site Assessment document. The Highway Authority has reported on each potential allocation. The policy would be better seeking the pertinent bits:</p> <p><i>'The site should be served from both Grange Walk and Grange Drive.</i></p> <p><i><del>The Highway Authority would usually require a site of above 150 units including existing dwellings to have at least two points of access. This development would be served from a cul-de-sac from the junction of Grange Avenue with Fox Covert Lane. A further point of access should be safeguarded through site NP12'.</del></i></p> <p><i>A Transport Assessment would be required for a development above 80 units prepared in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance'</i></p>
52	Policy 12	<p>2.a) I could not find any highway related preferences in the Site Assessment document. The Highway Authority has reported on each potential allocation. The policy would be better seeking the pertinent bits:</p> <p><i>'No objection in principle subject to it being demonstrated that satisfactory visibility is achievable at the junction with Fox Covert Lane avoiding trees.</i></p> <p><i>A Transport Assessment would be required for a development above 80 units prepared in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance.</i></p> <p><i>Access should be safeguarded through to site NP11'.</i></p>

## Historic England

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
53	General	<p>The area covered by your Neighbourhood Plan includes a number of important designated heritage assets including one Grade I, two Grade II* and 22 Grade II Listed Buildings. In line with national planning policy, it will be important that the strategy for this area safeguards those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets so that they can be enjoyed by future generations of the area.</p> <p>If you have not already done so, we would recommend that you speak to the planning and conservation team at Bassetlaw District Council together with the staff at Nottinghamshire County Council archaeological advisory service who look after the Historic Environment Record. They should be able to provide details of the designated heritage assets in the area together with locally-important buildings, archaeological remains and landscapes. Some Historic Environment Records may also be available on-line via the Heritage Gateway (<a href="http://www.heritagegateway.org.uk">www.heritagegateway.org.uk</a> <a href="http://www.heritagegateway.org.uk">http://www.heritagegateway.org.uk</a>).</p> <p>It may also be useful to involve local voluntary groups such as the local Civic Society or local historic groups in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Historic England has produced advice which your community might find helpful in helping to identify what it is about your area which makes it distinctive and how you might go about ensuring that the character of the area is retained. These can be found at:- <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/">https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/</a></p> <p>You may also find the advice in “<i>Planning for the Environment at the Neighbourhood Level</i>” useful. This has been produced by Historic England, Natural England, the Environment Agency and the Forestry Commission. As well as giving ideas on how you might improve your local environment, it also contains some useful further sources of information. This can be downloaded from: <a href="http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf">http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf</a></p> <p>If you envisage including new housing allocations in your plan, we refer you to our published advice available on our website, “Housing Allocations in Local Plans” as this relates equally to neighbourhood planning. This can be found at <a href="https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/heag074-he-and-site-allocation-local-plans.pdf/">https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/heag074-he-and-site-allocation-local-plans.pdf/</a></p>

## Natural England

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
54	General	<p>We support Policy 18: Improving Green Infrastructure and Policy 19: Local Green Space which will help to improve access to nature and enhance connectivity and biodiversity within the Misterton area.</p> <p><u>Allocations</u></p> <p>We note that all of the site allocations are within Impact Risk Zones (IRZ's) for discharge of ground or surface water. This means that we would expect to be consulted on any planning applications that plan to discharge to ground or to surface water. For Further information on Natural England's IRZ's see relevant document</p> <p><u>Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land</u></p> <p>We have not checked the agricultural land classification of the proposed allocations, but we advise you ensure that any allocations on best and most versatile land are justified in line with para 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Additionally we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>(Annex 1 Neighbourhood planning and the natural environment: information issues and opportunities)</p>

## Nottinghamshire County Council

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
55	Policy 1	<p>Minerals and Waste</p> <p>Areas of this designated neighbourhood plan area are partially within a Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Area for sand and gravel. Policy 1 (Sustainable Development) of this draft neighbourhood plan states (in Policy 1: 2. a-d) criteria that development must meet in order to be supported within the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>The development types (of which it is stated development must meet one of to be supported) does not include potential minerals development and as minerals can only be worked where they are found (as recognised in paragraph 142 of the National Planning Policy Framework), it is unlikely that any minerals development within the neighbourhood plan area would fall under the acceptable sites criteria set out in Policy 1:2.d for business/employment land use.</p> <p>Therefore consideration should be given for amending this policy to acknowledge that the determination of minerals development is the responsibility of the minerals planning authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) and that Policy 1 of this neighbourhood plan does not seek to unduly restrict potential areas of future minerals extraction within the neighbourhood plan area.</p>
56	General	<p><u>Public Health</u></p> <p>The Nottinghamshire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) provides a picture of the current and future health needs of the local population:  <a href="http://jsna.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/insight/Strategic-Framework/Nottinghamshire-JSNA.aspx">http://jsna.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/insight/Strategic-Framework/Nottinghamshire-JSNA.aspx</a>  This states the importance that the natural and build environment has on health.</p> <p>The Nottinghamshire Health and Wellbeing Strategy sets out the ambitions and priorities for the Health and Wellbeing Board with the overall vision to improve the health and wellbeing of people in Nottinghamshire:  <a href="http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/caring/yourhealth/developing-health-services/health-andwellbeingboard/strategy/">http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/caring/yourhealth/developing-health-services/health-andwellbeingboard/strategy/</a></p> <p>The 'Spatial Planning for Health and Wellbeing of Nottinghamshire' document approved by the Nottinghamshire Health and Wellbeing Board in May 2016 with the Planning and Health Engagement</p>

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
		<p>Protocol 2017 identifies that local planning policies play a vital role in ensuring the health and wellbeing of the population and how planning impact on health and wellbeing locally matters. In addition a health checklist is included to be used when developing local plans and assessing planning applications:  <a href="http://www.nottinghamshireinsight.org.uk/search?q=Spatial+Planning">http://www.nottinghamshireinsight.org.uk/search?q=Spatial+Planning</a></p> <p>It is recommended that this checklist is completed to enable the potential positive and negative impacts of the neighbourhood plan on health and wellbeing to be considered in a consistent, systematic and objective way, identifying opportunities for maximising potential health gains and minimizing harm and addressing inequalities taking account of the wider determinants of health.</p> <p>Obesity is a major public health challenge for Nottinghamshire. Obesity in 10-11 year olds in this area is similar not better than the England average Obesity levels for this It is recommended that the six themes recommended by the TCPA document 'Planning Health Weight Environments' –  <a href="http://www.tcpa.org.uk/data/files/Health_and_planning/Health_2014/PHWE_Report_Final.pdf">http://www.tcpa.org.uk/data/files/Health_and_planning/Health_2014/PHWE_Report_Final.pdf</a>  are considered to promote a healthy lifestyle as part of this application</p>
57	Policy 1	<p><u>Travel and Transport</u></p> <p>Transport and Travel Services (TTS) welcomes the draft Plan and the emphasis on sustainable development, including the Sustainable Development Principles at 9.7 and Policy 1 covering sustainable development. However, a suggested an omission from the document is any mention of transport including public transport facilities, a key component which it is suggested should be included as part of the vision and objectives set out in the document.</p> <p>The importance of the role of public transport facilities is emphasised by the potential for up to 190 new dwellings in Misterton, which could be delivered within the life of the plan.</p> <p><u>Current Misterton Bus Network</u></p> <p>Misterton is served by Stagecoach East Midlands Services 97 and 98 between Gainsborough and Retford/Doncaster, which provide a combined approximate hourly service from the village with Retford/Doncaster served 2-hourly during the day. This is currently supplemented by school services. Nottinghamshire County Council provides funding to the network in Bassetlaw. Service performance is reviewed by the council as part of the Strategic Passenger Transport Framework, which will be considered as part</p>

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
		of future funding reviews. This could be referred to within the plan.
58	Objectives	<p><u>The Objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan</u></p> <p>Community Objective 2 Employment: To provide an environment in the Plan area for local employment opportunities and support economic growth and development in identified sustainable locations.</p> <p>The provision of quality public transport services is an important factor in supporting the above objective.</p> <p><u>The Need for Sustainable Development in Misterton</u></p> <p>It is noted that ‘Social’, ‘Environment’ and ‘Economic’ are stated as key issues within Section 4 of the plan. It is suggested that the role of the local public transport network should be included as part of the identified issues as part of the above.</p>
59	General	<p>TTS note the emphasis in the plan on development and the potential for the number of Bassetlaw Local Plan and that “market-led housing growth of an appropriate scale will be supported in the District’s smaller villages where they have ready access to key services Developer funding for the provision of local bus services and bus stop facilities will therefore be an important consideration to support a vibrant and sustainable community, including access to key services including education, work and shopping.</p> <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> <p>In particular Transport &amp; 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, and complemented by Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) and Traffic Light Priority (TLP) where appropriate, 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> <p><u>Community Transport</u></p> <p>The document doesn’t make reference the important role of Community Transport in delivering transport provision, especially in</p>

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
		<p>rural areas. A number of important community transport providers are based in Bassetlaw, and it is suggested that reference to their work, and the potential for Community Transport and related services i.e. taxi buses to complement the local bus network is explored.</p> <p>The limited references in the document to accessibility to key services could be significantly enhanced through reference to the role of Community Transport and the opportunity to support its future development.</p> <p><u>Taxis</u></p> <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.</p>

## Sport England

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
60		<p>Planning policy, within the <b>National Planning Policy Framework</b> (NPPF), identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important.</p> <p>It is essential therefore that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 73 and 74. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's statutory consultee role in <b>protecting playing fields</b> and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England's playing fields policy is set out in our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document.</p>

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
		<p><a href="http://www.sportengland.org/playingfieldspolicy">http://www.sportengland.org/playingfieldspolicy</a></p> <p>Sport England provides guidance on <b>developing planning policy</b> for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded.</p> <p><a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/</a></p> <p>Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Par 74 of the NPPF, this takes the form of <b>assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities</b>. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.</p> <p>Where such evidence does not already exist then relevant planning policies in a neighbourhood plan should be based on a proportionate assessment of the need for sporting provision in its area. Developed in consultation with the local sporting and wider community any assessment should be used to provide key recommendations and deliverable actions. These should set out what provision is required to ensure the current and future needs of the community for sport can be met and, in turn, be able to support the development and implementation of planning policies. Sport England's guidance on assessing needs may help with such work.</p> <p><a href="http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance">http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance</a></p> <p>If <b>new or improved sports facilities</b> are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes.</p> <p><a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/</a></p> <p>Any <b>new housing</b> developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or</p>



Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
		<p>neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place.</p> <p>In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links below, consideration should also be given to how <b>any new development</b>, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England's Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing planning policies and developing or assessing individual proposals.</p> <p>Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. The guidance, and its accompanying checklist, could also be used at the evidence gathering stage of developing a neighbourhood plan to help undertake an assessment of how the design and layout of the area currently enables people to lead active lifestyles and what could be improved.</p> <p>NPPF Section 8: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities</a></p> <p>PPG Health and wellbeing section: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing</a></p> <p>Sport England's Active Design Guidance: <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign">https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign</a></p>

## Highways England

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
61	General	<p>We encourage all parties promoting and preparing plans or planning applications that could have an impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) to engage with us as early as possible. We can then work together to assess the impact of any proposed development and any associated mitigation works scheme to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the SRN.</p> <p>At present we have no comments to make but please keep us informed of any future developments in the process.</p>

## Bassetlaw District Council

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
62	General	Bassetlaw District Council considers the Draft MNP to be generally compliant with the requirements of the relevant basic conditions for Neighbourhood Plans, as set out in Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
63	General	The plan is very well presented, with a clear layout and coherent and logical structure. This will facilitate ease of use by Council Officers using the plan in the decision making process.  Avoid directly quoting existing policy in order to future proof the document.
64	General	It is not necessary for all policies within the plan to state that proposals should meet <i>'all relevant requirements set out in other policies'</i>
65	General	Allocation policies should set an upper or a lower limit to the number of residential units to be delivered on site. Use of the phrase <i>'up to and including'</i> lacks clarity.
66	General	While it is appreciated that the site references for proposed allocations are derived from the site selection process, the next draft of the plan should attribute new tags to them and follow a linear pattern to avoid confusion (e.g. H1, H2, H3 ...)
67	Para 1.7	The BDC Core Strategy's full title (which should be referenced at least once and thereafter shortened) is the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD. In the interests of clarity, the reference to the Council's Site Allocations document should make clear that this is the Local Development Framework (LDF) Site Allocations document.  <i>'There is also the general consensus that sustainable local development is better directed from the bottom up utilising the Neighbourhood Plan process rather than top down from the BDC.'</i> This statement is not entirely accurate and should be rephrased. Neighbourhood Planning is a Government initiative that provides communities with the opportunity to influence development in their locality. The current wording appears somewhat negative.

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
68	Para 1.9	Although the Core Strategy was adopted in 2011, its base date is 2010. Similarly, although the most recently published draft of the emerging Bassetlaw Plan states that the plan period is up to 2034, this is now likely to be 2035. Amend all references accordingly.
69	Section 3	This section would benefit from more detail about the context of the local area. The reference to the ‘special water environment’ should reference the fact that the stretch of the Chesterfield Canal in question is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), which is the highest national habitat designation ( <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/protected-areas-sites-of-specialscientific-interest">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/protected-areas-sites-of-specialscientific-interest</a> ). Likewise, this section makes no reference to the fact that the western part of the plan area falls within the nationally significant Humberhead Levels Nature Improvement Area: <a href="http://www.ywt.org.uk/what-we-do/creating-living-landscapes-and-living-seas/south/humberheadlevels-partnership">http://www.ywt.org.uk/what-we-do/creating-living-landscapes-and-living-seas/south/humberheadlevels-partnership</a>
70	Section 5 & 6	BDC welcomes the concise and focused approach of the vision and objectives of the plan.
71	Para 9.7	While the Council does not object to the MNP acknowledging the sentiments expressed in the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan, direct quotes should be avoided, as it is only a consultation draft that carries no material weight and is likely to undergo a significant rewrite in its next iteration. We therefore recommend paraphrasing the relevant issues.
72	Para 9.8	This paragraph should be reworded to reflect the fact that Misterton already is a sustainable community. In addition, it gives the impression that the features listed in the bullet points are the things that are under threat from an ageing population! Furthermore, the environmental assets of the area are far more wide ranging and should thus be reflected here.
73	Policy 1	<p><b>Part 1:</b> Prior to it being mentioned in this policy, there is no mention of specific environmental assets in the plan area. If these are to be ‘maximised’ the principle should be elaborated upon in the supporting text (as noted above).</p> <p><b>Part 2:</b> The wording of this section could be simplified, while it is questioned whether ‘viability’ is the appropriate term to use here.</p>

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
74	Section 10	<b>Figure 2 Neighbourhood Profile Map:</b> This map would benefit from a key that gives a brief description of the character of each area.
75	Policy 2	<p><b>Part 3:</b> Give ‘Building for Life 12’ its full title within the policy and make clear that it should be used by developers at the outset of designing their schemes. There is concern about integrating it in to policies insofar as Planning Officers are not trained as BfL assessors.</p> <p><b>Part 4:</b> Incorporating renewable energy technology in to new developments is typically above and beyond the requirements of current Building Regulations. The MNP Steering Group should be aware of the potential implications such a requirement may have on the viability of development (i.e. cost to developers and the potential knock-on effects to other aspirations in the plan).</p>
76	Para 10.7	<p>Avoid reference to the LDF Site Allocations document. It is withdrawn and has no bearing on this plan. Similarly, avoid direct reference of current policy (as noted above). Suggested wording:</p> <p><i>Pursuing levels of growth that will sustain the community requires that the density of the development is in keeping with the existing built up area. Current national and local planning policy advises that development should deliver housing at densities that reflect the specific characteristics of the site and it’s surrounding area.</i></p>
77	Para 10.12	The Strategic Housing Market Assessment was published in 2013 (not 2014). In order to be found sound emerging plans should be based on the most up to date evidence. As such the 2017 OAN SHMA Update should also be referenced. Similarly, BDC express concern at the reliance on the Misterton Housing Needs Survey 2012 as it places a lot of emphasis on evidence that is effectively only a snapshot in time. While we appreciate that this is a very bespoke piece of work for an area of limited geographical scale, evidence of this age would be questioned if used relied upon for the emerging Local Plan. Given that it pre-dates the SHMA, the later document should take precedence. Paragraph 10.20 stands as an example of this, whereby in the six years since the 2012 assessment was undertaken, there is a greater likelihood of increased need from new household formation etc.
78	Policy 4	As noted above, in light of the age of the document, the Bassetlaw SHMA 2013 and subsequent OAN Update 2017 should be used as the basis for housing needs instead of 2012 Misterton Housing Needs Survey

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
79	Para 10.18	Starter Homes should be included within the mix of housing.
80	Policy 5	It is considered that a policy affecting allocation of affordable housing should be in a housing strategy document and is misplaced in a development plan document. However, should the steering group wish to push for the criteria to be adopted by some other means, BDC has concerns that the stringent nature of the criteria could potentially hinder the delivery of affordable housing in the locality and therefore fail to meet local need and achieve its objective. It is felt that any prospective housing provider considering taking on affordable units delivered through new development may struggle to fill them under these criteria.
81	Policy 6	<p>Criterion a – it is questioned whether this description of infill development is adequate for consistently judging planning applications. Rather than reinventing the wheel it is suggested that the Steering Group look at a range of infill development policies from other development plans to find best practice examples to draw upon.</p> <p>Criterion b – ‘reduce’ should be replaced by ‘should not cause unacceptable harm ...’ as any amount of development on an infill plot will result in a measure of reduced privacy or amenity.</p> <p>The question is, whether or not the impact is acceptable.</p> <p>Criterion c – it is unclear what this catchall criterion is aimed at addressing. Between BDC’s own policies and other policies contained within the MNP, unless there is something specific which should be highlighted, there should be sufficient coverage for all eventualities. Policies should be specific and not vague as is the case here.</p>
82	Para 10.26	In the interests of clarity, make clear the MNP supports the new homes requirement of the District-wide plan.
83	Policy 7	BDC has concerns about access to the site from the main road. However, we defer to any comment from NCC Highways as to the suitability of this site.
84	Policy 8	The preferences and opinions of local residents should not form the basis of policy criteria as in Part 2 criterion b. The background text is the place to reference the evidence underpinning the policy.

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
		Consider the way the policy reads as a whole; looking at each criterion in isolation following the colon. Criterion c does not work in this regard.
85	Policy 9	<p>Spelling error in the title – of/off</p> <p>BDC raises objection to this site as an allocation as it is considered separate from the existing built form of the village when assessed under the criteria used to inform site assessments for the Council’s own Land Availability Assessment. This states that the continuous built form of the settlement excludes individual buildings and groups of dispersed, or intermittent buildings that are clearly detached from the continuous built-up area of the settlement. In this location the Chesterfield Canal forms a strong southern boundary to the village. A site visit reinforced our opinion that existing buildings are intermittent, with distinct gaps and no corresponding pattern of development on the opposite side of the road. Furthermore, the trees and other vegetation that currently occupy the site further suggests that this group of buildings is not a part of the village, but is peripheral.</p>
86	Policy 10 (NP06), Policy 11 (NP11) and Policy 12 (NP12):	These sites appear to be logical extensions of the existing estates that they adjoin.
87	Policy 13	<p>Paragraph 10.33: The current text on self and custom build should be amended to reflect that which is on BDC’s website (<a href="http://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/everything-else/planning-building/bassetlawcustom-self-build-advice.aspx">http://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/everything-else/planning-building/bassetlawcustom-self-build-advice.aspx</a>). All relevant authorities are required to address self and custom build, as set out in the Self-build and Custom Homebuilding Act 2015 (as amended by the Housing and Planning Act 2016).</p> <p>In its current guise, this policy is unnecessary. Unless it sets out clear parameters that add more detail at the local level, it is suggested that it is deleted.</p>
88	Policy 14	<b>Paragraph 11.2:</b> This paragraph should avoid direct reference to the Core Strategy. BDC is currently undertaking an Economic Development Needs Assessment which will review existing employment land. Emerging policy will be expected to hold the

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
		<p>NPPF's presumption to avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose.</p> <p>The NPPF (paragraph 22) requires land allocations to be reviewed regularly. Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities.</p>
89	Para 11.3	<p>Given the emphasis this section puts on provision of cycling related infrastructure, the Steering Group may want to consider inclusion of a policy specifically aimed at increasing cycling infrastructure alongside new development – i.e. dedicated cycle routes and safe storage – with a view to supporting a localised 'modal shift' (see NCC's website).  <a href="http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/planning-and-environment/walking-cyclingand-rights-of-way/cycling">http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/planning-and-environment/walking-cyclingand-rights-of-way/cycling</a></p>
90	Figure 5	<p>For use in the next draft of the plan it is recommended that the Steering Group contact's BDC's GIS Team to request an Ordnance Survey map of the site, as with the proposed residential allocations.</p>
91	Part 1	<p>It is the opinion of the Planning Policy Team that B1, B2 and B8 uses may be too narrow a range to provide viable options for the continued use of the industrial estate. In light of comments above, relating to NPPF paragraph 22, while B1/B2/B8 uses may be prioritised, it may be worthwhile considering adopting the NPPF's wider definition of economic development to facilitate scope for a greater range of uses. Economic development is defined as development, including those within the B Use Classes, public and community uses and main town centre uses (but excluding housing development).</p>
92	Part 1, criterion a	<p>The policy should acknowledge the fact that the site is within flood zone 3, therefore new economic development on this site may not be appropriate. BDC consider that the emphasis should be on re-use of existing/vacant units within the site. Extension of the site would not ordinarily be supported, given the availability of 'sequentially preferable' land elsewhere in the locality. This may need to be reflected in the economic growth policy affecting the rest of the plan area.</p>

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
93	Part 1, criterion c	‘Modernisation’ may be a more appropriate term to regeneration.
94	Para 11.7	The first bullet point over-generalises as B2 and B8 uses are not exclusively large scale.
95	Para 11.13	It is unclear what relevance the previously permissioned ‘live-work’ units have to the MNP. ‘Live-work’ units were very much of their time and is a term that has now (in our experience) largely been abandoned due to more widespread flexible working patterns and high-speed internet access. Given that the market did not deliver the units in question it is considered unlikely that they will come forward.
96	Policy 15	<p><b>Part 1, criterion a:</b> As mentioned in relation to Policy 14, a more flexible definition of economic development should be adopted.</p> <p><b>Part 1, criterion b:</b> What is the rationale for these thresholds? BDC consider these to be somewhat arbitrary – particularly if, on a case by case basis, proposals are judged in terms of their suitability/appropriateness under criterion d. It is therefore suggested that these arbitrary thresholds are removed.</p> <p><b>Part 2:</b> This section of the policy is clunky. It should be rewritten to be more succinct. Again, look at examples from other places as a guide to how policies should be structured.</p>
97	Policy 16	<p><b>Part 1:</b> The criteria listed do not work when read individually, following the colon at the start of Part 1.</p> <p><b>Part 2:</b> BDC questions whether this is necessary given the essential nature of broadband connection (<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/new-build-homes-superfastbroadband-connectivity-options">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/new-build-homes-superfastbroadband-connectivity-options</a>). It is unlikely that inclusion of such policy wording will speed up the rate of delivery of new infrastructure to the wider area.</p>
98	Para 13.2/3	Avoid unnecessary direct quotation of the Core Strategy and NPPF (imminently due to be updated).
99	Policy 17	The criteria listed in Part 3 of the policy repeat that which is already listed in the Core Strategy, therefore is considered unnecessary.



Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
100	Para 14.1	In explaining the context to Green Infrastructure there should be more emphasis on multifunctional green spaces, with a more expansive understanding – it is all green space, not just designated sites. See the Town and Country Planning Association’s publications for good examples:  <a href="https://www.tcpa.org.uk/Pages/Category/green-infrastructure">https://www.tcpa.org.uk/Pages/Category/green-infrastructure</a>
101	Para 14.3	Amend the reference to BDC’s Green Infrastructure Study (not survey). Also, in the interests of consistency, the Council prefers use the term Local Wildlife Site (LWS) instead of Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC).
102	Policy 18	<b>Part 1:</b> Green Infrastructure (GI) is a broad concept; walking and cycling infrastructure are integral parts. Further reading on the subject may help refine the policy.
103	Figure 7	Figure 7 provides a very limited representation of local GI and only focuses on designated sites. The plan should show public rights of way, recreation facilities, allotments, the cemetery etc.  Consider breaking down the policy in to discreet sections on protection of landscape and Biodiversity
104	Policy 19	In response to the proposed LGS designations BDC raises the following issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Old School Field: Given the secluded location with limited access it is questioned whether this site is of demonstrable local significance.</li> <li>- Church Meadow: this site is supported.</li> <li>- Windmill Gardens: This site is supported.</li> <li>- Land between the Chesterfield Canal and the Church Farm estate: this site was initially put forward to the Council as a potential housing site and was assessed as being potentially suitable. Although the whole site is accessible from the existing public right of way, if it is accessible only on a permissive basis it is not considered a public open space. At present BDC cannot support this as a LGS designation.</li> <li>- Grange Estate Open Land: While the Council does not necessarily object to this site as a LGS, the ‘special’ significance is nonetheless questioned.</li> <li>- Grange Estate Recreation Area: This site is supported.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Misterton Sports Field: This site is supported.</li> <li>- Community Gardens: This site is supported.</li> <li>- Primary School Fields: It is questioned whether this site satisfies the NPPF test in terms of local significance.</li> <li>- Chesterfield Canal Towpath: BDC do not believe that this meets the requirements set out in the NPPF as it is a linear path covering an extensive area, rather than a defined site. Furthermore, it is adequately protected as a formal public right of way.</li> </ul> <p>Each of the above sites should be supported by an explanation of their significance and reasons for their designation.</p>

## Canal &amp; River Trust

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
105	Policy 19	<p>The Chesterfield Canal and adjacent towpath are owned by the Trust, and lies within the Neighbourhood Plan Area. We note that the towpath alongside the canal is proposed to be designed as a Local Green Space under draft Policy 19 (land parcel 10).</p> <p>The Trust note that the Local Green Space Assessment makes special reference to the popularity of the towpath for walkers, and the designation of the towpath as a Local Wildlife Site. As such, we are confident that the policy proposed is based on a desire to protect this valued asset which, in principle, we support.</p> <p>However, the Trust does have significant concerns that the designation of the canal towpath as a Local Green Space may have <b>unintended consequences</b>. Such a designation, under the provisions of paragraph 76 of the National Planning Policy Framework, would rule out all development on the towpath (except in very special circumstances) which could limit the ability for the Trust to undertake improvements to both maintain and enhance the local community's enjoyment of the canal. This could include the provision of facilities to enhance the use of the waterway by boaters, improvements to the towpath for walkers, the provision of facilities for fishing, and changes to the use and operation of moorings that could be required to promote allow boaters and visitors to moor in the village.</p> <p>The Trust is a Statutory Undertaker with a responsibility for regulating navigation on the waterway, and has a duty to 'provide to such an extent as they may feel expedient, services and facilities on the inland waterways owned and managed by them' as set out at Section 10(1) (a) of the Transport Act 1962. The canal forms part of the Trust's operational land. In accordance with the charitable aims of the Trust, we will continue to manage the canal as it is presently laid out. Any designation of the area as Local Green Space could restrict future proposals that may be outside the scope of the Trust's Permitted Development Rights as a Statutory Undertaker, but which are nonetheless in accordance with the charitable aims of the Trust.</p> <p>The Trust therefore suggest that the proposed Local Green Space allocation for the towpath is deleted from the plan. Instead, it could be replaced by policy wording that clearly sets out the community's aspirations for the canal corridor. The Trust note that the Neighbourhood Plan does identify the canal corridor within draft Policy 18 as a Green Corridor. The Trust respectfully suggest that the policy wording could be expanded to set out the community's aspirations for land next to the waterway, which could meet the community's aspirations for the future management of the towpath, without imposing a Local Green Space designation that could limit the ability of the Trust to undertake potentially necessary development to manage and operate the canal.</p>

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
106	General	<p>The Trust welcome the aspirations of the Local Plan to ensure that development will protect and enhance existing green infrastructure assets under Policy 18. As mentioned previously, there may be opportunities to expand the wording of this policy to identify aspirations for the towpath alongside the canal.</p> <p>As identified in paragraph 14.8, it is recognised that there are aspirations to securing improvements to the footpath network to ensure a better network of pedestrian and cycle routes. This could improve linkages to Green Corridors alongside the Chesterfield Canal and River Trent. The Parish Council may therefore wish to consider if there are opportunities to refer to the potential for such improvements within the wording of Policy 18, which could bring benefits for the local community.</p> <p>New developments in the village may result in additional demands on walking and cycling routes, and such demands may require in the need for improvements to be made to these routes. We would welcome additional text that advises developers of the need to ensure that their proposed development does not result in damage to off-site footpaths, and the possibility that developers may be required to fund off-site improvements directly linked to any additional usage the development may bring.</p>

## Coal Board

Ref.	Section of Draft Plan	Comment
107	General	<p>As you will be aware the Neighbourhood Plan area lies within the current defined deep coalfield. However the Neighbourhood Plan area does not contain any surface coal resources or recorded surface risks from past coal mining activity. Therefore The Coal Authority has no specific comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

## 4. Amendments to the 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 Plan, or if the comment has not resulted in an amendment reasons are given as to why this decision has been reached.

Ref.	Comment Source	Amendment Required?	Amendments Made
1	Local Resident	Yes	Policy 15 and supporting text amended to refer to tourism.
2	Local Resident	Yes	Policy 1 amended to incorporate support for renewable energy facilities.
3	Local Resident	No – general comment	
4	Local Resident	No – addressed elsewhere in Plan	
5	Local Resident	No – figure was always 6-12	
6	Local Resident	No - support	
7	Local Resident	No – general comment	
8	Local Resident	No – addressed at planning application stage	

Ref.	Comment Source	Amendment Required?	Amendments Made
9	Local Resident	No – general comment	
10	Local Resident	No – addressed at planning application stage	
11	Local Resident	Yes	Site added to LGS Assessment and Policy 19 following assessment.
12	Local Resident	No – addressed at planning application stage	
13	Local Resident	No – addressed at planning application stage, no issues raised.	
14	Local Resident	No – addressed at planning application stage, no issues raised.	
15	Local Resident	No – not in identified flood risk area	
16	Local Resident	Yes	Brownfield map to be added to identify current brownfield sites, at Policy 6.
17	Local Resident	No - support	
18	Local Resident	No - support	

Ref.	Comment Source	Amendment Required?	Amendments Made
19	Local Resident	No – not in identified flood risk area, addressed at planning application stage	
20	Local Resident	No – supportive, not available in Census data	
21	Local Resident	No - support	
22	Local Resident	Yes	Policy 2 amended to reference future proofing.
23	Local Resident	No – map needed at this scale to demonstrate Plan area	
24	Local Resident	No - support	
25	Local Resident	No - support	
26	Local Resident	No - support	
27	Local Resident	No - support	
28	Local Resident	No - support	

Ref.	Comment Source	Amendment Required?	Amendments Made
29	Local Resident	No - support	
30	Local Resident	No – Support, it is felt that the Map is clear and relates to Profile document.	
31	Local Resident	Yes	Feedback from Business Survey added to Section 11.
32	Local Resident	Yes	Key added to Figure 6 reflecting lettering within Policy 17.
33	Local Resident	No – numbers based on site capacity, dealt with at planning application stage.	
34	Local Resident	No - numbers based on site capacity, dealt with at planning application stage.	
35	Local Resident	No - numbers based on site capacity, dealt with at planning application stage.	
36	Local Resident	No - plan does support employment growth and sustainability.	



Ref.	Comment Source	Amendment Required?	Amendments Made
37	Landowner	No - Welcome reduction in size but not identified through the process as a preferred allocation site by the local community, potential to be included on review of Plan if local community support alters.	
38	Anglian Water	No – will be addressed at planning application stage. Comments to be added to Site Assessment document for each site for records.	
39	Anglian Water	No – will be addressed at planning application stage. Comments to be added to Site Assessment document for each site for records.	
40	Anglian Water	No – will be addressed at planning application stage. Comments to be added to Site Assessment document for each site for records.	
41	Anglian Water	No – will be addressed at planning application stage. Comments to be added to Site Assessment document for each site for records.	

Ref.	Comment Source	Amendment Required?	Amendments Made
42	Anglian Water	No – will be addressed at planning application stage. Comments to be added to Site Assessment document for each site for records.	
43	Anglian Water	No – will be addressed at planning application stage. Comments to be added to Site Assessment document for each site for records.	
44	BDC Conversation	Yes	Policy 8 to be amended as suggested.
45	National Farmers Union	No – no amendments proposed.	
46	NCC Highways	Yes	Reference added to parking standards document.
47	NCC Highways	No – comments to be added to Site Assessment document.	
48	NCC Highways	No – comments to be added to Site Assessment document.	
49	NCC Highways	No – comments to be added to Site Assessment document.	

Ref.	Comment Source	Amendment Required?	Amendments Made
50	NCC Highways	No	
51	NCC Highways	No – comments to be added to Site Assessment document.	
52	NCC Highways	No – comments to be added to Site Assessment document.	
53	Historic England	No – no amendments proposed	
54	Natural England	No – support, addressed in site allocations work	
55	Nottinghamshire County Council	No – not with the remit of the Neighborhood Plan	
56	Nottinghamshire County Council	No – addressed in the Plan	
57	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Reference to sustainable transport added to Policy 1.
58	Nottinghamshire County Council	Yes	Objective 2 amended to include reference to sustainable and public transport.
59	Nottinghamshire County Council	No – addressed at planning application stage	

Ref.	Comment Source	Amendment Required?	Amendments Made
60	Sport England	No – comments addressed in Plan	
61	Highways England	No	
62	Bassetlaw District Council	No - support	
63	Bassetlaw District Council	No - support	
64	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	References throughout several Policies deleted as suggested.
65	Bassetlaw District Council	No - Current description provided adequate clarify and enables developer flexibility	
66	Bassetlaw District Council	No - Process referenced these throughout and would be confusing to the public to change at this stage	
67	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	References amended as suggested and paragraph 1.7 amended.
68	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	All dates amended to 2035.
69	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Paragraph 3.4 amended to incorporate comments.

Ref.	Comment Source	Amendment Required?	Amendments Made
70	Bassetlaw District Council	No - support	
71	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Paragraph 9.7 context amended but wording remains.
72	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Paragraph 9.8 amended as suggested.
73	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Policy 1 amended as suggested, viability amended to sustainability.
74	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Key to be added to Figure 2.
75	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Policy 2, part 3 amended to give full title, part 4 noted - No change felt necessary as developers should have regard to renewable technology
76	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Paragraph 10.7 amended as suggested.
77	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Paragraphs 10.12 and 10.20 amended.
78	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Policy 4 amended as suggested.
79	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Paragraph 10.18 amended to include reference to starter homes.
80	Bassetlaw District Council	No – Ensuring local people can access affordable housing in Misterton is a key aim of this Plan	

Ref.	Comment Source	Amendment Required?	Amendments Made
		and the local community. It is felt that Policy 5 allows for enough flexibility if the local connection criteria are not met, and would not impact affordable housing delivery.	
81	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Policy 6 amended as suggested, part c deleted.
82	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Paragraph 10.26 amended as suggested.
83	Bassetlaw District Council	No – Highways raised no concerns.	
84	Bassetlaw District Council	No – the preferences referenced are those of Statutory Consultees not local residents.	
85	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	<p>Policy 9 title amended as suggested.</p> <p>Although it is agreed this site is somewhat separated from the main built form of the village, although granted permission to the north of the Canal will reduce this. This site was deemed suitable through the Site Assessment process and had no constraints identified. In addition, the site received significant support from the local community and the current landowner has indicated that the site is available for development and will be brought forward within the Plan period. The site is also located between existing residential developments and is not currently used, being overgrown and aesthetically unpleasing at a key gateway to the settlement.</p> <p>It is felt that these reasoning's negate the sites separation from the main built form of the village, and is therefore included to help fulfill the housing requirements for the</p>

Ref.	Comment Source	Amendment Required?	Amendments Made
			Plan area, particularly having regard to the significant development constraints experienced across the Plan area.
86	Bassetlaw District Council	No – support for the Plan.	
87	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Policy 13 and supporting text deleted as suggested.
88	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Paragraph 11.2 amended as suggested. Site already used for employment.
89	Bassetlaw District Council	No - Reducing car usage etc. and local employment dealt with through wider sustainable development principles	
90	Bassetlaw District Council	No – further advised BDC to maintain map as current.	
91	Bassetlaw District Council	No - Not suitable for public and community uses or main town centre uses due to isolated location	
92	Bassetlaw District Council	No – contradictory comment, existing sites in Floodzone	
93	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Policy 14, Part 1, criterion c amended as suggested.

Ref.	Comment Source	Amendment Required?	Amendments Made
94	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Paragraph 11.7 amended as suggested.
95	Bassetlaw District Council	No – plan only supports such development, local consultation supports	
96	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Policy 15 part 1 criterion b deleted as suggested. Policy 15 part 2 amended for clarity.
97	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Policy 16 amended as suggested, part 2 deleted.
98	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Paragraph 13.2 and 13.2 amended as suggested.
99	Bassetlaw District Council	No – although repetition is noted, maintained for local community.	
100	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Paragraph 14.1 amended as suggested.
101	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Paragraph 14.3 amended as suggested.
102	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	Policy 18 amended, reference to walking and cycling maintained for clarity and local residents understanding.
103	Bassetlaw District Council	Yes	New Figure 7 to be reviewed and replaced if possible



Ref.	Comment Source	Amendment Required?	Amendments Made
104	Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Yes</p> <p>No - Regarding the site 'Land between the Chesterfield Canal and the Church Farm estate' – site size retained to reflect local community wishes.</p> <p>Local Green Spaces Assessment is included in evidence base for the Plan, provides all justification.</p>	Policy 19 amended in places, Towpath removed, additional site added.
105	Canal & River Trust	Yes	Towpath deleted as LGS as above.
106	Canal & River Trust	No – comments already addressed through Policy 18.	
107	Coal Board	No – no amendments proposed	