

**Blyth Neighbourhood Development Plan**  
**Examiner's Clarification Note – dated 22 October 2019**

Further to receiving your comments on the Blyth Neighbourhood Development Plan, please find below our considered responses to your Clarification Note.

First, thank you very much for your initial assessment of the Plan. As you are not doubt aware, these Plans have many hours of input from the residents as well as the Steering Group who are leading on this. Your positive comments are most welcomed and appreciated.

Second, we have endeavoured to answer the majority of your queries. We have now been privy to the consultee's comments, and these need to be placed before Blyth Parish Council at its next meeting on Monday 4 November. We anticipate being able to address your remaining comments promptly after that.

Therefore, please find below the comments on your helpful Note.

**Policy 2**

Is the word 'only' necessary given the remainder of policy's contents?

**The Group is agreeable to this word being removed.**

**Policy 3**

Does the policy address an issue which is primarily for Bassetlaw District Council to consider under its responsibilities under the Housing Act rather than the Planning Acts? As such is it a land-use policy?

**This policy was added to reflect the consultees preference. It is now apparent that Policy 3 is replicating a similar one from the District Council policy, and thus can be removed.**

**Policy 4**

I can see that the supporting text highlights how the issue is addressed in the NPPF. Nevertheless, is a specific policy necessary in the Plan given that the issue is already addressed in NPPF. In any event its first two parts are simply statements of process rather than policy.

**We are agreeable to this Policy being removed, and elements being incorporated into the section 6.5.**

**Policy 5**

Is the word 'only' necessary given the remainder of policy's contents?

**The Group is agreeable to the word 'only' being removed.**

In b) are the detailed standards necessary given the initial part of the criterion? In any event how have those standards been calculated?

In reflecting on your comments, the Group proposes that 1b ends after the wording ‘...surrounding area’, thus the following text and sub-points (i, ii, and iii) are omitted.

### **Policy 8**

What discussions have taken place with the site owners?

The site owners initially engaged during the call for sites, invitations (and any discussions that took place) at the site assessment consultation event, Statutory - Draft Plan consultation (they were directly consulted) and the Submission Consultation. This plot was also promoted in the site assessment day, with the site owner’s knowledge.

Is the site deliverable?

This site is deliverable. It is noteworthy that the site owner has completed building 10 dwellings adjacent to the site within the last 12 months. He has already included access for the next stage of development up to the boundary, future proofing it for access of a road and other services.

On what basis has the figure of 53 dwellings been identified as a ceiling?

This figure is based on the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan requirements to achieve the 20 per cent cap on development in rural areas, with a 10 per cent requirement. It is specifically in line with Rural Policy 8 of the same document, and the number of dwellings reflect the upper limit for flexibility and to offer more affordable housing.

The site in reality could include more houses, however, it has some restrictions including overhead cables and the need for a noise bund between the houses and A1. These restrictions were taken into account when it was determined to propose 53 dwellings to the site to make the prerequisite dwelling numbers.

Should the policy require an appropriate level of affordable housing on the site?

It is the Groups expectation that appropriate levels of affordable housing will be situated on this site, and that it will be addressed by Bassetlaw District Council through the planning application process. The Group perceive this site to be the only sizable site within Blyth which would include affordable housing.

### **Policy 10**

This is an excellent policy

However, in part 2 is there any need for ‘across the plan area’?

The Group is agreeable to the phrase being removed.

### **Policy 12**

I recognise that the Planning Practice Guidance does not identify any maximum size for a local green space. However, at 12 ha in size, is proposed local green space e (the Park and Gardens of the former Blyth Hall) ‘local in character and not an extensive tract of land’?

The green space highlighted is a sub-division of an ‘unregistered Park and Garden’. The segment is approximately 30 per cent of the whole area and was deemed by the residents

as having views across that area that gives character to the village. It is an area which residents use, appreciate and utilize regularly.

Not only is this green space central to the village, anything larger would have been far too big. The 'boundary' of this area was taken from natural occurring features as it is curtailed by the old bridge and the river.

It is notable that it excludes the Cricket Club to the east of the green space, as this is a community facility.

Does the Park and Garden enjoy any statutory protection?

As mentioned above the Park and Gardens are unregistered.

### **Representations**

Does the Parish Council wish to comment on any of the representations made to the Plan? In particular does it wish to comment on the representation from Heyford Developments in general terms, and the Sustainability Appraisal and Policy 8 in particular?

The Group only had sight of the representations on 29 October. As mentioned above, we hope to revert to you on this matter after 4 November. We currently cannot comment on whether this element will be challenging to achieve within your deadline of 8 November. We will endeavour to keep you up to date with developments.

Rachel Graham

Clerk to Blyth Parish Council – on behalf of Blyth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group