

# Site Allocation Assessment Report

## Blyth Neighbourhood Plan

November 2018  
(Updated December 2019)

---

## TABLE OF CONTENT

---

1. Introduction .....	3
2. Screening Criteria Methodology .....	6
3. Site Assessment Performance Table.....	15
4. Conclusion.....	55

---

## TABLE OF FIGURE

---

Figure 1. Site Submitted as part of the Call for Sites .....	5
Figure 2 Site Assessment Criteria .....	6
Figure 3 Suitable and Not Suitable Sites.....	56

# 1. Introduction

---

- 1.1 This report assesses all the sites identified through the emerging Neighbourhood Plan for Blyth and their potential for being included as a housing allocation in the final plan. The sites that were considered came from two main sources:
  - a. sites identified through public consultation which the community felt were worthy of consideration.
  - b. other sites submitted to the District Council as part of the Local Plan “Call for Sites” (2016) in the Land Availability Assessment.
- 1.2 During the initial stages of the site allocation, a 5 week–long Call for Sites was held between 20 January to 28 of February 2018 allowing local land owners, developers, local residents and the District Council to identify sites which will be considered for development. The Call for Sites was advertised by leaflet, delivered to every house in the Parish. During this 5-week consultation, sites could be submitted via E-mail and Post to the Blyth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group contact person.
- 1.3 The Call for Sites ended on 28 February 2018, after this period no sites were taken for consideration. At the end of the 5-week period the potential sites were sent to Bassetlaw District Council Planning Department to be overlaid onto an OS Map. These sites have been consulted on with the different in-house planning teams of BDC, Conservation Officers at BDC, and the Highway Authority of Nottinghamshire County Council, which made comments with reasons for objecting to or supporting in principle each site.
- 1.4 From this, the sites have been tested against the screening criteria methodology (produced by BDC) separated into 10 different criteria. This assessment suggests whether a site is suitable for development for residential use, and whether or not it could be considered for allocation in the Plan. This Assessment has been performed by Open Plan Consultants Ltd, the planning consultancy commissioned by the Blyth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group to support them in the realisation of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 1.5 As part of this assessment, submitted sites were considered by local residents and other stakeholders at a public consultation event held on 07 October 2018. At this event, residents were able to express whether they supported or did not support each proposed site.

- 1.6 The sites proposed as part of the Call for Site can be identified in Figure 1 below: each site has been given a unique identifying code that it is later referred to in the assessment.
- 1.7 This Report assesses each site's development potential and includes initial feedback from the District Council's and County Council's experts. The assessment does not rank sites, it simply identifies any planning constraints and assist with the comparison of sites. For each site, the conclusion of the assessment is either that the site is unsuitable (i.e. subject to such serious planning constraints that cannot be allocated as part of a Neighbourhood Plan Policy), suitable (i.e. the site could be allocated), and suitable with conditions (i.e. the site could be allocated if certain conditions and requirements are met during development of the site).




Figure 1. Sites considered as part of the Assessment

## 2. Screening Criteria Methodology

---

2.1 The criteria used to assess each of the sites are as follow;

1: Initial assessment by Bassetlaw District Council
2: Landowner support
3: Local community support
4: Compatibility with neighbouring land uses
5: Impact upon agricultural land
6: Impact upon landscape character zones
7: Impact upon built environment
8: Impact upon natural environment
9: Impact upon heritage assets
10: Impact upon existing infrastructure

*Figure 2 Site Assessment Criteria*

- 2.2 Sites will be scored against each criterion using a traffic light system, with green indicating no conflicts, **amber** indicating some or minor issues (that can be overcome) and **red** indicating direct conflict
- 2.3 The criteria are not 'weighted'. Although the sites with the highest number of **green** lights are regarded as more desirable (with fewer adverse effects), sites will not be ranked on this basis alone. Likewise, **red** lights do not automatically discount sites. Rather, they simply show that the site has issues requiring greater mitigation or has impacts that may be balanced against other factors in the assessment (e.g. its ability to deliver significant local benefits).
- 2.4 As such, in instances where sites have accrued **amber** or **red** lights, mitigation measures can potentially deliver a range of benefits for the wider community. However, there are three key criteria which would preclude sites from being allocated if they were to score a **red** light: the initial assessment made in the Site Assessment Reports; the landowner being supportive of the site, and whether the local community is supportive of the proposal

## Screening Criteria

### 1. Initial assessment made in the Site Assessment Reports

- 2.5 The initial assessment of sites made through the Site Assessment Reports process will be a key factor in determining the suitability of a site to be allocated for housing in Blyth's Neighbourhood Plan. The initial assessment identifies any constraints to the development, as summarised below:

The site WOULD BE suitable for housing based on the consultation comments received through the Site Assessment Reports	G
The site MAY BE suitable for housing based on the consultation comments received through the Site Assessment Reports	A
The site MAY BE suitable for housing based on the consultation comments received through the Site Assessment Reports – but there is a restriction on the numbers of houses (maximum capacity is shown in brackets)	A (5)
The site WOULD NOT be supported based on the consultation comments received through the Site Assessment Reports	R

### 2. Is the landowner supportive of developing the site?

- 2.6 Ensuring that the landowner of the site is willing and able to bring the site forward for development is a key consideration when determining which sites should be allocated through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
- 2.7 Engaging with landowners is part of the Site Selection process and all landowners were invited to discuss their site and any potential issues with the site coming forward. It is fundamental to establish whether the site can be released for development (such as is there a long-term lease on the site or a restrictive covenant which would prevent the site being developed) and the willingness of the landowner to do so.
- 2.8 Feedback from each landowner was a major factor when determining the preferred sites. Without the landowner's support, it is unlikely that the site will come forward and therefore will have a significant impact on the delivery of the Neighbourhood Plan's aspirations. Sites will therefore be assessed as follows:

The landowner is in favour of the development taking place.	G
There are some concerns about the land ownership or uncertainty	A
No comments were expressed from the landowner/no known issues	W
There are strong concerns about the land ownership or the likelihood of the site coming forward.	R

### 3. Is the local community supportive of the development of the site?

2.9 Public opinion, where it is based on legitimate planning concerns, is a fundamental consideration in the site allocations process, which is strengthened further within Neighbourhood Planning. As such, on-going public consultation is integral to the continued preparation of the Plan.

2.10 The level of support expressed by respondents to consultation for or against a particular site, is a significant factor in the decision-making process of the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan. It will be particularly important where there are a number of sites in the Plan area between which it is difficult to decide, or which have equal 'scores.

2.11 It is recognised that land owners or prospective developers may hold their own independent consultation with local communities to gauge support for the development of a site. Where the results of these consultation exercises have been published, they were considered accordingly. However, conclusions will be primarily based on responses received through consultation undertaken on the Neighbourhood Plan.

2.12 Consultation responses on each site will be considered as follows (taking account of the fact that some sites may have had no comments made for or against them):

A majority of respondents expressed support for the development of the site for the proposed use	G
A balance of views was expressed for the development of the site for the proposed use	A
No comments were expressed about the development of the site for the proposed use	W
A majority of respondents expressed an objection to the development of the site for the proposed use	R

2.13 Notwithstanding this, such is the nature of planning that it is often impossible to reach a decision that pleases everyone. Attention was paid to the nature of community views and whether they are related chiefly to factors that can be overcome by the

development (e.g. upgrades to the highways network; new school provision; etc.), rather than ‘in principle’ objections.

#### 4. Will development of the site be compatible with existing and/or proposed neighbouring land uses?

2.14 From the point of view of both existing public amenity and that of the occupiers of new development sites, it will be essential to ensure that new development is compatible with its surroundings, taking into consideration, for example, issues of noise, odour, light or privacy. For example, new housing is unlikely to be compatible with an existing heavy industrial site and vice versa. Sites will be classified as follows:

Is compatible with existing and proposed uses	G
Likely to be compatible with existing and proposed uses	A
Likely to be incompatible with existing and proposed uses	R

#### 5. Will the site result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land?

2.15 Natural England’s Agricultural Land Classification separates land into five grades (and further subdivides grade 3 into 3a and 3b). Grades 1, 2 and 3a are regarded as the best and most versatile agricultural land. Grades 3b, 4 and 5, are seen as being of poorer quality. Under Schedule 5 of the Development Management Procedure Order<sup>11</sup> Natural England must be consulted for single (individual) applications for the following:

*‘Development which is not for agricultural purposes and is not in accordance with the provisions of a development plan and involves— (i) the loss of not less than 20 hectares of grades 1, 2 or 3a agricultural land which is for the time being used (or was last used) for agricultural purposes; or (ii) the loss of less than 20 hectares of grades 1, 2 or 3a agricultural land which is for the time being used (or was last used) for agricultural purposes, in circumstances in which the development is likely to lead to a further loss of agricultural land amounting cumulatively to 20 hectares or more’ (Schedule 5, para. x).*

2.16 Advice may also be sought from Natural England regarding the potential impact of cumulative loss of agricultural land (in order to avoid future site allocations being

refused planning permission on this basis).

2.17 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states (para. 112) that:

*‘Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality’*

2.18 Bassetlaw District Council acknowledges that the rural character of Bassetlaw is one of the District’s most distinctive and valued features. To ensure that loss of land most valuable for agricultural purposes is minimised wherever possible, the Plan should seek to allocate known areas of poorer quality land, unless there are benefits (identified through the other screening criteria) to be achieved that outweigh retention of the land for agricultural use.

2.19 Because data to distinguish between grade 3a and 3b land across Bassetlaw is currently unavailable, sites located on grade 3 land will be categorised as amber. It is felt that this represents a precautionary approach that is neither unnecessarily restrictive nor dismissive of the potential value of sites currently in agricultural use. Sites have been assessed as follows:

Impact on agricultural	G
Impact on grades 3, 4 or 5 agricultural land	A
Impact on grades 1 or 2 agricultural land	R

## 6. Is the site in a landscape character Policy Zone that should be conserved?

2.20 The importance of protecting the District’s landscape character is recognised in Bassetlaw District Council’s Core Strategy Development Management Policy DM9.

2.21 Although individual sites have their own characteristics, they nevertheless form part of a wider landscape unit. The Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment assesses the District in terms of landscape condition and sensitivity, identifying Policy Zones (based on recommended landscape actions) in the following way;

<b>Policy Zone Category</b>	<b>Recommended Landscape Actions</b>
Conserve	Actions that encourage the conservation of distinctive features and features in good condition
Conserve and Reinforce	Actions that conserve distinctive features and features in good condition, and strengthen and reinforce those features that may be vulnerable
Conserve and Restore	Actions that encourage the conservation of distinctive features in good condition, whilst restoring elements or areas in poorer condition and removing or mitigating detracting features
Conserve and Create	Actions that conserve distinctive features and features in good condition, whilst creating new features or areas where they have been lost or are in poor condition
Reinforce	Actions that strengthen or reinforce distinctive features and patterns in the landscape
Restore	Actions that encourage the restoration of distinctive features and the removal or mitigation of detracting features
Reinforce and Create	Actions that strengthen or reinforce distinctive features and patterns in the landscape, whilst creating new features or areas where they have been lost or are in poor condition
Restore and Create	Actions that restore distinctive features and the removal or mitigation of detracting features, whilst creating new features or areas where they have been lost or are in poor condition
Create	Actions that create new features or areas where existing elements are lost or are in poor condition

2.22 Policy Zones where landscape needs to be conserved are the most sensitive to the potential impacts of new development, whereas areas that need new landscape character creating are least sensitive (and may benefit from appropriately designed schemes that could introduce new or enhanced landscape character features). The Sites have been assessed as follows;

In Policy Zone 'Create'	G
In Policy Zone 'Restore and Create'	G
In Policy Zone 'Reinforce and Create'	G
In Policy Zone 'Reinforce'	A
In Policy Zone 'Restore'	A
In Policy Zone 'Conserve and Create'	A
In Policy Zone 'Conserve and Restore'	R
In Policy Zone 'Conserve and Reinforce'	R
In Policy Zone 'Conserve'	R

No relevant Policy Zone – site lies within an urban area	W
--	---

**7. Will the development detract from or enhance the existing built character of the neighbourhood?**

- 2.23 Many settlements within Bassetlaw have a sensitive built form, which it is desirable to protect and enhance. Conversely, there are a number of areas that would benefit from new development where it would result in a positive impact on a derelict site or poor-quality streetscape.
- 2.24 Assessing the aesthetic merits of a design is an inherently subjective process and while it is clearly not possible to assess the impact of a development scheme at this early stage, some sites may represent more logical extensions to the existing built form or, in terms of urban design considerations, offer better connectivity/legibility. Sites have been assessed as follows:

Likely to complement the existing built character/character areas	G
Likely to lead to the existing character of the locality being slightly altered	A
Likely to detract from the existing built character as a standalone development	R

**8. Will the development detract from or enhance the Natural Environment of the neighbourhood?**

- 2.25 There are no sites being considered within the Neighbourhood Plan for Misterton with formal designations such as Local Wildlife Site or Sites of Special Scientific Interest. If there were, these would have been assessed as not suitable in the Site Assessment Reports. However, the potential impact of development on the natural environment is a key consideration.
- 2.26 Green Infrastructure is a network of multi-functional green spaces in both rural and urban areas and forms an important part of the Natural Environment. The development of a greenfield site may not, by definition, lead to the loss of a Green Infrastructure asset. These green spaces support natural and ecological processes and are integral to the health and quality of sustainable communities.
- 2.27 In line with the District Council’s Core Strategy Policy DM9 (Green Infrastructure; Biodiversity

& Geodiversity; Landscape; Open Space and Sports Facilities), while it is important to minimise adverse impacts on Green Infrastructure assets, new development can also generate opportunities to protect, enhance, restore and even create habitats and species' populations. They may also provide opportunities to create, enhance or provide greater access to green spaces. These opportunities were considered through the screening process, taking into account all information that is available. Sites have been assessed as follows:

Likely to enhance the Natural Environment	G
Unlikely to detract from or result in significant loss of Natural Environment	A
Likely to detract from or result in significant loss of Natural Environment	R
No designations nearby	W

### 9. Will the site impact upon identified heritage assets (including setting)?

2.28 Some sites that are determined to have a significant adverse impact on identified heritage assets within the original Site Assessment Reports may be discounted at the outset. A further assessment of remaining sites will be made at this stage to ensure any harmful impacts as well opportunities to enhance assets are identified.

2.29 Identified heritage assets include: Listed Buildings; scheduled monuments; war memorials; historic wreck sites; parks; historic gardens; conservation areas, archaeological sites as well as non-designated heritage assets (a list of which is maintained by Bassetlaw District Council). Sites have been assessed as follows:

Site has no negative impact or offers potential to enhance identified heritage assets	G
Some likely harmful impacts, however these can be mitigated	A
Likely harmful impacts, mitigation unlikely to resolve this	R
Site has no impact upon identified heritage assets	W

## 10. What impact would developing the site have on existing infrastructure?

2.30 Blyth is a small village with limited infrastructure and developing sites in the village will need to respect this. There are a number of local infrastructure issues which have been identified through the Neighbourhood Plan process including:

2.31 This criterion assesses the impact of new development on these local infrastructure problems and whether development could improve/enhance the infrastructure or have a harmful impact. The existing services and facilities are shown on the map below:

Site offers potential to enhance local infrastructure	G
Likely harmful impacts on local infrastructure which is likely to be mitigated	A
Likely harmful impacts on local infrastructure which is unlikely to be mitigated	R
Site has no impact upon existing infrastructure, services and facilities	W

### 3. Site Assessment Performance Table


---

3.1 The following sites have been assessed and are presented in performance tables:

1. NP01: Land east of Bawtry Road
2. NP02: Land east of Bawtry Road (Woodlea)
3. NP03: Land east of Bawtry Road (to the rear of The Mound)
4. NP04: Land east of Bawtry Road (to the south of the pumping station)
5. NP05: Land East of Bawtry Road (at Lynwood)
6. NP06: Land to the south of Retford Road
7. NP07: Land to the north of Blyth Road
8. NP08: Land at Park Farm, Worksop Road
9. NP09: Land to the east of Spital Road (to the rear of Old Police House)
10. NP10: Land to the east of Bawtry Road (at Enfield)
11. BDC01: Land west of Bawtry Road
12. BDC02: Land to the north of Retford Road
13. BDC03: Land to the east of Spital Road
14. BDC04: : Land to the west of Spital Road

**Site Reference** | **NP01**

NP01



© Crown copyright and database right 2018. Ordnance Survey Licence number 0100058728.



<b>Site Information</b>			
Land east of Bawtry Road			
Indicative Capacity	(None given-Presumption for North Blyth is 6.5 Dwellings/Hectares) Approximately 5 dwellings.		
Site Area (Hectares)	0.8ha		
<b>Site Performance</b>			
Site Assessment Reports	<b>R</b>	Landscape Character	<b>A</b>
Landowner Support	<b>G</b>	Built Character	<b>R</b>
Community Support	<b>A</b>	Natural Environment	<b>R</b>
Neighbouring Land Uses	<b>A</b>	Heritage Assets	<b>R</b>
Agricultural Land Classification	<b>A</b>	Infrastructure Impact	<b>R</b>
<b>Bassetlaw District Council Comments</b>			
BDC Planning Policy	The site lies within the Serlby Park unregistered park and garden. Development here is likely to have an adverse impact on the wider setting of this heritage asset. The well-established tree belt to the south of the site forms a strong natural boundary to the edge of Blyth North.		Suitable Site?  No
Drainage	No objection to any of the sites identified through consultation. There is no recorded history of flooding and the ground conditions are generally suitable for SUDs/infiltration/soakaways.		
Highways	<b>The site isn't in a particularly sustainable location.</b> It would also be served from an 'A' road where vehicle speeds can be expected to be high leading to greater potential for high severity accidents. Access would be better shared with NP02 which has been accepted by the Highway Authority for residential development. The speed-limit and village gateway would require moving north of any proposed site access. The site doesn't but the highway such that access can be achieved directly without adjusting the site area. However, there is an existing access. This is likely to be in too close proximity to the access proposed to serve NP02 if the size of the development warranted a formal junction > 5 dwellings.		
Conservation	This site is within the Serlby Hall unregistered park & garden and is also in the wider setting of Serlby Hall (grade I listed). The site forms part of the rural hinterland around the more formal parkland around Serlby, with the existing tree belt helping to define the Serlby estate parkland and farmland character from the land adjacent. With the above constraints in mind, Conservation considers that development on this site may have the potential to harm the character of the unregistered park & garden and the setting of Serlby Hall. Therefore, <b>Conservation would object to this site being allocated</b>		


### Consultation Comments

From the Consultation, the biggest concerns from the proposed development is the need for the green areas to be preserved. Also, the concerns about the safety issues in relation to access on to Bawtry Road. Overall, from the voting result, 11 people voted 'Yes' to the development site, 17 people voted 'Maybe' to the development site and 12 people voted 'No' to the development site. Therefore, a balance of views was expressed for the development of the site for the proposed use.

### Conclusion


**Not Suitable for Allocation** - This site is not suitable due it to not being supported in the comments received through the Site Assessment Reports. This includes initial feedback from the District Council's Planning teams, the Conservation Officer, Highways Authorities. Furthermore, the site is not deemed suitable according to the assessment criteria based on the level of impacts of the development on the built character, natural environment, heritage asset and infrastructure effects around the site. **Therefore, this site is not supported for residential development.**

NP02




<b>Site Information</b>			
Land east of Bawtry Road (Woodlea)			
Indicative Capacity	(None Given-Presumption for North Blyth is 6.5 Dwellings/Hectares). Approximately 5 dwellings.		
Site Area (Hectares)	0.8ha		
<b>Site Performance</b>			
Site Assessment Reports	<b>R</b>	Landscape Character	<b>G</b>
Landowner Support	<b>G</b>	Built Character	<b>R</b>
Community Support	<b>G</b>	Natural Environment	<b>A</b>
Neighbouring Land Uses	<b>R</b>	Heritage Assets	<b>A</b>
Agricultural Land Classification	<b>A</b>	Infrastructure Impact	<b>A</b>
<b>Bassetlaw District Council Comments</b>			
BDC Planning Policy	Planning application 18/00342/OUT pending. Given the pattern of development to the south of the site it would be desirable to maintain the prevailing character (NPPF para. 122d) to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties.		Suitable Site?  No
Drainage	No objection to any of the sites identified through consultation. There is no recorded history of flooding and the ground conditions are generally suitable for SUDs/infiltration/soakaways.		
Highways	Accepted in accordance with planning application reference 18/00342/OUT subject to conditions		
Conservation	This site is adjacent to the Serlby unregistered park & garden, but comprises land associated with Woodlea. The site is well screened from the unregistered park & garden by mature trees and hedges around the north and east boundaries. Subject to this tree/hedge screening being retained, Conservation <b>has no objection to the principle</b> of development in this instance.		
<b>Consultation Comments</b>			
From the Consultation, there were no major objection to the development site, however, comments were made to make the site suitable for a mixture of good designed bungalows, 2 and 3 bedroomed houses. Overall, from the voting result, 16 people voted 'Yes' to the development site with no one voting for 'maybe' and 'no' for the development of the site. Therefore, the majority of respondents expressed support for the development of the site for the proposed use.			
<b>Conclusion</b>			
<b>Not Suitable for Allocation</b> - This site is not suitable due to not being supported in the comments received through the Site Assessment Reports of the included initial feedback from the District Council's Planning teams and Information from the Local Planning Policy the Site Assessment Reports. This includes initial feedback from the District Council's Planning teams, the Conservation Officer, Highways Authorities. Furthermore, the site is not deemed suitable according to the assessment criteria based on the level of impacts of the development on the built character, but also a potential concern with the natural environment, heritage asset and infrastructure effects around the site. <b>Therefore, this site is not supported for a residential development use.</b>			

**Site Reference** NP03



<b>Site Information</b>			
Land east of Bawtry Road (to the rear of The Mound)			
Indicative Capacity	(None Given-Presumption for North Blyth is 6.5 Dwellings/Hectares). Approximately 3 dwellings.		
Site Area (Hectares)	0.5ha		
<b>Site Performance</b>			
Site Assessment Reports	A(1)	Landscape Character	G
Landowner Support	G	Built Character	G
Community Support	A	Natural Environment	A
Neighbouring Land Uses	G	Heritage Assets	G
Agricultural Land Classification	A	Infrastructure Impact	G
<b>Bassetlaw District Council Comments</b>			
BDC Planning Policy	Potentially suitable for a single dwelling	Suitable Site?	Yes
Drainage	There is no recorded history of flooding as far as I am aware, and the ground conditions are generally suitable for SUDs/infiltration/soakaways. For sites NP03, which are adjacent to watercourses I would recommend an FRA is provided if allocated to determine flood risk and FFL.		
Highways	The site does not abut the highway, so it is not clear how access would be achieved. The existing track to the north of the site does appear wide enough to serve additional development.		
Conservation	There are no heritage constraints associated with this site. Therefore, <b>no objection in principle.</b>		
<b>Consultation Comments</b>			
From the Consultation, the biggest concern from the proposed development is the consideration for access to the site from the road. Overall, from the voting results, 12 people voted 'Yes' to the development site, 14 people voted 'Maybe' to the development site and 3 people voted 'No' to the development site. Therefore, a balance of views was expressed for the development of the site for the proposed use.			
<b>Conclusion</b>			
<del><b>Suitable for Allocation</b> - This site scores generally positive but based on initial feedback from BDC the maximum capacity of the site should be for one dwelling, inferior to the indicative capacity obtained applying the 6.5 dwelling/hectare ratio. Moreover, due to proximity to the watercourse a Flood Risk Assessment must be considered. <b>The site may be acceptable for residential development for one dwelling if serious consideration is given to flood risk and protection of the natural environment</b></del>			
<b>**Due to the initial response containing a mistake from Nottingham County Council Highways, site NP03 has been reassessed, due to the confirmation received from Highways that access is <u>not suitable</u> for any development. The decision was made after Regulation 14, in discussion with the Steering Group, Bassetlaw District Council and Nottingham County Council to consider the site as not suitable for development.</b>			
**			

NP04




<b>Site Information</b>			
Land east of Bawtry Road (to the south of the pumping station)			
Indicative Capacity	(None Given-Presumption for North Blyth is 6.5 Dwellings/Hectares). Approximately 55 dwellings		
Site Area (Hectares)	8.4ha		
<b>Site Performance</b>			
Site Assessment Reports	A	Landscape Character	G
Landowner Support	G	Built Character	R
Community Support	A	Natural Environment	A
Neighbouring Land Uses	R	Heritage Assets	R
Agricultural Land Classification	A	Infrastructure Impact	A
<b>Bassetlaw District Council Comments</b>			
BDC Planning Policy	Development of the whole site is unlikely to be supported, but a scheme that maintains the prevailing character potentially could (NPPF para. 122d)		Suitable Site? Yes
Drainage	No objection to any of the sites identified through consultation. There is no recorded history of flooding and the ground conditions are generally suitable for SUDs/infiltration/soakaways.		
Highways	No objection in principle subject to satisfactory details of access. A transport assessment would be required for a development in excess of 80 dwellings.		
Conservation	This site is within the setting of Serlby unregistered park & garden and in the wider setting of Serlby Hall. The site affords open views towards formal parkland to the north east and east and contributes to its rural setting. Conservation is concerned that development on this site would interrupt those views and would therefore harm the setting of those heritage assets. Therefore, Conservation would <b>object</b> to this site being allocated.		
<b>Consultation Comments</b>			
From the Consultation, the biggest concerns from the proposed development is the levels of traffic caused by the proposed residential sites. Also, the potential issue of accessing the site from the road was commented. Additionally, concerns about flood plains/flooding/water run-off for the sites were commented on. Local people also have concerns about the size of actual development on the site. Overall, from the voting result, 13 people voted 'Yes' to the development site, 29 people voted 'Maybe' to the development site and 4 people voted 'No' to the development site. Therefore, a balance of views was expressed for the development of the site for the proposed use.			
<b>Conclusion</b>			
<b>Suitable for Allocation</b> - This site may not be suitable due to it not being supported in the comments received through the Site Assessment Reports, in particular, there are strong conservation concerns due to its impact on the setting of Selby Hall and surrounding built character. Moreover, due to proximity to the watercourse a Flood Risk Assessment must be considered. In any case, development proposals will need to consider only a portion of the site, as the totality of it will not be supported. <b>The site may be acceptable for residential development if serious consideration is given to flood risk, protection of the natural environment and Design and layout of the site.</b>			



<b>Site Information</b>			
Land east of Bawtry Road (at Lynwood)			
Indicative Capacity	(None Given-Presumption for Blyth is 11.1 Dwellings/Hectares) Approximately 2 dwellings		
Site Area (Hectares)	0.2		
<b>Site Performance</b>			
Site Assessment Reports	G	Landscape Character	G
Landowner Support	G	Built Character	G
Community Support	G	Natural Environment	A
Neighbouring Land Uses	G	Heritage Assets	G
Agricultural Land Classification	A	Infrastructure Impact	W
<b>Bassetlaw District Council Comments</b>			
BDC Planning Policy	No significant constraints identified	Suitable Site?	Yes
Drainage	No objection to any of the sites identified through consultation. There is no recorded history of flooding and the ground conditions are generally suitable for SUDs/infiltration/soakaways.		
Highways	Likely to be acceptable for a single dwelling subject to access improvements.		
Conservation	This site is within the setting of High House and High House Barn, grade II listed buildings. The site is located to the north east, on land formerly occupied by agricultural buildings associated with High House (these were demolished in the mid-20th century). Given that the site contained buildings until relatively recently, Conservation has <b>no objection to the principle</b> of development here, subject to a suitable design, scale, layout and materials.		
<b>Consultation Comments</b>			
From the Consultation, the biggest concern from the proposed development was the traffic speed (mph) on the main road from the proposed site. Overall, from the voting result, 17 people voted 'Yes' to the development site, 16 people voted 'Maybe' to the development site and 0 people voted 'No' to the development site. Therefore, a majority of respondents expressed support for the development of the site for the proposed use			
<b>Conclusion</b>			
<b>Suitable for Allocation</b> – This site is suitable and is supported in principle in the comments received through the Site Assessment Reports. This includes initial feedback from the District Council's Planning teams, the Conservation Officer, the Highways Authority. The development site has little to no impact on local character, and with adequate design solutions can protect and promote the character and heritage of Blyth, while having no detrimental effect on local infrastructure. The development site is in keeping with the neighbouring land uses. <b>Therefore, this site is acceptable for residential use.</b>			


NP06



<b>Site Information</b>			
Land to the south of Retford Road			
Indicative Capacity	(None Given-Presumption for Blyth is 11.1 Dwellings/Hectares) Approximately 6 dwellings.		
Site Area (Hectares)	0.5		
<b>Site Performance</b>			
Site Assessment Reports	G	Landscape Character	G
Landowner Support	G	Built Character	A
Community Support	A	Natural Environment	A
Neighbouring Land Uses	G	Heritage Assets	G
Agricultural Land Classification	A	Infrastructure Impact	A
<b>Bassetlaw District Council Comments</b>			
BDC Planning Policy	No significant constraints identified	Suitable Site?	Yes
Drainage	No objection to any of the sites identified through consultation. There is no recorded history of flooding and the ground conditions are generally suitable for SUDs/infiltration/soakaways.		
Highways	Likely to be acceptable to serve 5 dwellings including existing properties subject to access improvements. A larger development would likely require the demolition of a dwelling in order to provide a road to the rear of the site.		
Conservation	There are no heritage constraints associated with this site. Therefore, <b>no objection</b> in principle.		
<b>Consultation Comments</b>			
From the Consultation, the biggest concerns from the proposed development being to close proximity of the school. Also, the concerns in relation to access to the proposed site. Overall, from the voting result, 10 people voted 'Yes' to the development site, 16 people voted 'Maybe' to the development site and 16 people voted 'No' to the development site. Due to the same number of votes between 'maybe' and 'no' votes, this means that a definitive answer of No cannot be given to the proposed site and therefore shows, a balance of views was expressed for the development of the site for the proposed use.			
<b>Conclusion</b>			
<b>Suitable for Allocation</b> – This site is suitable and is supported in principle in the comments received through the Site Assessment Reports. This includes initial feedback from the District Council's Planning teams, the Conservation Officer, the Highways Authority. The development site has little to no impact on local character, and with adequate access will not have a detrimental impact on local infrastructure. A maximum of 5 dwellings should be considered for the site, unless demolition of one of the existing dwellings to ensure wider access is proposed. <b>Therefore, this site is acceptable for residential use.</b>			

**Site Reference** | **NP07**

NP07



Any queries on the precise location and alignment of any right of way must be made to the Definitive Map team at Nottinghamshire County Council.  
 © Crown copyright and database right 2018. Ordnance Survey Licence number 0100058728.




<b>Site Information</b>			
Land to the north of Blyth Road			
Indicative Capacity	(None Given-Presumption for Blyth is 11.1 Dwellings/Hectares) Approximately 18 dwellings		
Site Area (Hectares)	1.6ha		
<b>Site Performance</b>			
Site Assessment Reports	A	Landscape Character	A
Landowner Support	G	Built Character	A
Community Support	R	Natural Environment	R
Neighbouring Land Uses	A	Heritage Assets	R
Agricultural Land Classification	A	Infrastructure Impact	R
<b>Bassetlaw District Council Comments</b>			
BDC Planning Policy	The site falls within the Serlby Park unregistered park and garden. Development here is likely to have an adverse impact on the wider setting of this heritage asset. Separate from the main built up area of the village		Suitable Site?  Yes
Drainage	No objection to any of the sites identified through consultation. There is no recorded history of flooding and the ground conditions are generally suitable for SUDs/infiltration/soakaways.		
Highways	This is not the most sustainable of locations. It is presumed this would be ribbon development with direct access to each dwelling from Blyth Road. A 30/40 mph speed limit would require introducing the length of the site from Retford Road along with a system of street lights as well as a 2.0m footway across the frontage linking with the existing footway on Retford Road. The latter would require a kerb and therefore the introduction of carriageway drainage. Visibility from accesses is likely to require the setting back of large parts of the frontage due to the road alignment. These works may give rise to viability concerns.		
Conservation	This site is within the Serlby Hall unregistered park & garden and is within the setting of the grade II listed South Lodge. The site is also in the wider setting of The Mantles (also grade II listed) and of Serlby Hall (grade I). The site currently forms an important part of the unregistered park & garden, affording views from several points towards the parkland at Serlby Hall. The site also forms part of the open character of land around South Lodge and contributes to the rural setting of The Mantles. Given the above heritage constraints, Conservation would <b>object</b> to this site being allocated.		
<b>Consultation Comments</b>			
From the Consultation, the biggest concerns from the proposed development is the safety issues in relation to vehicle access and pedestrian safety when accessing the site. Also, the concerns about the drainage and flooding of the sites and finally concerns over the proposed site being too far away from the village and therefore not within character of the local space. Overall, from the voting result, 2 people voted 'Yes' to the development site, 8 people voted 'Maybe' to the development site and 42 people voted 'No' to the development site. Therefore, the majority of respondents expressed an objection to the development of the site for the proposed use.			


## Conclusion

**Not Suitable for Allocation** - This site may not be suitable due to it not being supported in the comments received through the Site Assessment Reports, in particular, there are strong conservation concerns due to its impact on the setting of Selby Hall (Grade I) and in the wider setting of The Mantles (also grade II listed). Moreover, due to its location there are serious viability concerns, and extensive work in terms of infrastructure are required. Finally, the development would represent a linear extension of the Blyth main built up area eastward. From the Blyth Housing Sites Consultation Results, the majority of respondents expressed an objection to the development of the site for the proposed use. **Therefore, the site is objected and is not suitable for allocation.**

**Site Reference NP08:**

NP08




<b>Site Information</b>			
Land at Park Farm, Worksop Road			
Indicative Capacity	(None Given-Presumption for Blyth is 11.1 Dwellings/Hectares). Approximately 41 dwellings		
Site Area (Hectares)	3.7ha		
<b>Site Performance</b>			
Site Assessment Reports	<b>R</b>	Landscape Character	<b>R</b>
Landowner Support	<b>G</b>	Built Character	<b>A</b>
Community Support	<b>R</b>	Natural Environment	<b>A</b>
Neighbouring Land Uses	<b>R</b>	Heritage Assets	<b>R</b>
Agricultural Land Classification	<b>A</b>	Infrastructure Impact	<b>A</b>
<b>Bassetlaw District Council Comments</b>			
BDC Planning Policy	No significant constraints identified		Suitable Site? No
Drainage	No objection to any of the sites identified through consultation. There is no recorded history of flooding and the ground conditions are generally suitable for SUDs/infiltration/soakaways.		
Highways	No objection in principle subject to satisfactory details of access. A transport assessment would be required for a development in excess of 80 dwellings. A 2.0m wide footway would be required the length of the site frontage and connecting with the footway towards High street. The 30mpg speed-limit will require extending and it is likely the adjacent bus stop will require upgrading.		
Conservation	<p>Part of this site is within the Blyth Conservation Area and the rest is within its setting. The site is also in the setting of several Listed Buildings, including Park Farm (grade II), the former village School (grade II) and St Mary &amp; St Martin's Church (grade I). The St Johns Chapel structure nearby is also grade II listed and a Scheduled Ancient Monument. The tree-lined footway to the west is part of the Blyth Hall unregistered park &amp; garden. The site comprises a range of large mid-20<sup>th</sup> century agricultural buildings in the centre (A), together with a small area of open space to the east together with Park Farm and the former School (B) and a larger area of open space to the west (C).</p>  <p>With regard to development on the <u>central area containing the agricultural buildings</u> (shown as A above), there are <b>no concerns with the principle</b> of development on this part of the site, subject to an acceptable design, scale, layout, materials and boundary treatments.</p>		

	<p>With regard to development on site B, which includes Park Farm, the former school and a small area of open space, Conservation has strong concerns with development here. Whilst there are concerns with how Park Farm and the former school would themselves be affected (this isn't made clear in the consultation document), Conservation would not support development on the open space adjacent. This forms an important part of the open character of this part of the Conservation Area and the siting of those nearby Listed Buildings. In addition, key views are afforded towards the grade I listed Church of St Mary &amp; St Martin. With this in mind, Conservation would strongly <b>object</b> to this site being allocated.</p> <p>With regard to the west part of the site, which I have labelled C, this site also contributes to the rural and open setting of the Conservation Area and those nearby Listed Buildings. In addition, the views which are currently afforded towards St Mary &amp; St Martin's Church are amongst the most significant and memorable of any towards that structure. Finally, the site contributes to the setting of the Blyth Hall unregistered park &amp; garden, the tree-lined avenue being especially significant, a surviving route to the former Blyth Hall. With this in mind, Conservation would strongly <b>object</b> to this part of the site being allocated.</p>
<b>Consultation Comments</b>	
<p>From the Consultation, the biggest concerns from the proposed development is the potentials threat to the villages character, environment and vista. Also, the concerns about the environmental status of the site and presence of mature oak trees and public footpaths. Finally, concerns about vehicles ability to access the site. Overall, from the voting result, 13 people voted 'Yes' to the development site, 11 people voted 'Maybe' to the development site and 44 people voted 'No' to the development site. Therefore, the majority of respondents expressed an objection to the development of the site for the proposed use.</p>	
<b>Conclusion</b>	
<p><b>Not Suitable for Allocation</b> - This site is not suitable due to not being supported in the comments received through the Site Assessment Reports. This includes initial feedback from the District Council's Planning teams, the Conservation Officer, the Highways Authority. Furthermore, it is deemed not suitable according to the assessment criteria based on the level of impacts of the development on the built character and neighbouring uses. Furthermore, from the Blyth Housing Sites Consultation Results, the majority of respondents expressed an objection to the development of the site for the proposed use. <b>Therefore, the site is objected to and is not suitable for allocation.</b></p>	

**Site Reference**

**NP09**

NP09



Any queries on the precise location and alignment of any right of way must be made to the Definitive Map team at Nottinghamshire County Council.  
 © Crown copyright and database right 2018. Ordnance Survey Licence number 0100058728



<b>Site Information</b>			
Land to the east of Spital Road (to the rear of Old Police House)			
Indicative Capacity	(None Given-Presumption for Blyth is 11.1 Dwellings/Hectares) Approximately 1 dwelling.		
Site Area (Hectares)	0.05ha		
<b>Site Performance</b>			
Site Assessment Reports	<b>R</b>	Landscape Character	<b>A</b>
Landowner Support	<b>G</b>	Built Character	<b>R</b>
Community Support	<b>G</b>	Natural Environment	<b>R</b>
Neighbouring Land Uses	<b>R</b>	Heritage Assets	<b>R</b>
Agricultural Land Classification	<b>A</b>	Infrastructure Impact	<b>A</b>
<b>Bassetlaw District Council Comments</b>			
Planning Policy	Development would potentially have adverse impacts on the setting of the non-designated heritage asset Conflicts with the prevailing character of this part of the village		Suitable Site?  No
Drainage	No objection to any of the sites identified through consultation. There is no recorded history of flooding and the ground conditions are generally suitable for SUDs/infiltration/soakaways.		
Highways	The driveway would require widening sufficiently so two cars can pass at the junction with Spital Road and visibility to the south of the drive requires improvement. Whilst the latter would likely require land outside of the applicant's control, this would likely be improved anyway on completion of the adjacent development 17/01759/FUL		
Conservation	This site is to the rear of The Old Police House, regarded as a non-designated heritage asset identified in line with the Council's adopted criteria. The building is a type-B police house, built in 1949 and designed by Nottinghamshire County Council architect E.W. Roberts. There are only a few other examples of this type of police house around the district. The character of this part of Blyth is of buildings close to the road with long rear gardens. It is considered that the addition of a dwelling to the rear of the plot would be out of character with the surroundings and would unduly affect the setting of the non-designated heritage asset. On this basis, Conservation would <b>object</b> to this site being allocated.		
<b>Consultation Comments</b>			
From the Consultation, there were not significant concerns from the proposed development. Overall, from the voting result, 30 people voted 'Yes' to the development site with 3 people voting for 'maybe' and 6 people voting 'no' for the development of the site. Therefore, the majority of respondents expressed support for the development of the site for the proposed use.			


## Conclusion

**Not Suitable for Allocation** - This site is not suitable due to it not being supported in the comments received through the Site Assessment Reports of the included initial feedback from the District Council's Planning teams and Information from the Local Planning Policy the Site Assessment Reports. In particular, the site rises concerns in terms of impact on the non-designated heritage asset of the Old Police House, as well on existing built character. Furthermore, to ensure access to the site it is believed that acquisition of land outside the applicant control would be necessary. **Therefore, this site is not supported for a residential development use**

# Site Reference

# NP10

NP10




Bassellaw  
DISTRICT COUNCIL




<b>Site Information</b>			
Land to the east of Bawtry Road (at Enfield)			
Indicative Capacity	(None Given-Presumption for North Blyth is 6.5 Dwellings/Hectares). Approximately 1 dwelling		
Site Area (Hectares)	0.2		
<b>Site Performance</b>			
Site Assessment Reports	<b>R</b>	Landscape Character	<b>G</b>
Landowner Support	<b>G</b>	Built Character	<b>R</b>
Community Support	<b>G</b>	Natural Environment	<b>A</b>
Neighbouring Land Uses	<b>R</b>	Heritage Assets	<b>W</b>
Agricultural Land Classification	<b>A</b>	Infrastructure Impact	<b>A</b>
<b>Bassetlaw District Council Comments</b>			
BDC Planning Policy	Given the surrounding pattern of development it would be desirable to maintain the prevailing character (NPPF para. 122d) to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties		Suitable Site?  No
Drainage	No objection to any of the sites identified through consultation. There is no recorded history of flooding and the ground conditions are generally suitable for SUDs/infiltration/soakaways.		
Highways	No objections to the land serving no more than five dwelling (including existing) from a private drive. The access would require widening with adequate parking and manoeuvring arrangements to allow access and egress in a forward direction provided on site.		
Conservation	No heritage assets would be affected by development there, although I would not imagine back-land development on that site would comply with design policies in the NPPF and Bassetlaw Core Strategy, that street having a regimented character of detached dwellings on the same alignment. However, I would defer to the views of my colleagues in the Development Team on that matter.		
<b>Consultation Comments</b>			
From the Consultation, the most significant concern was about the number of dwellings being on the proposed development. Overall, from the voting result, 18 people voted 'Yes' to the development site, 8 people voted 'Maybe' to the development site and 3 people voted 'No' to the development site. Overall, from the voting result, 30 people voted 'Yes' to the development site with 3 people voting for 'maybe' and 6 people voting 'no' for the development of the site. Therefore, the majority of respondents expressed support for the development of the site for the proposed use.			
<b>Conclusion</b>			
<b>Not Suitable for Allocation</b> - This site is not suitable due to it not being supported in the comments received through the Site Assessment Reports. This includes initial feedback from the District Council's Planning teams, the Conservation Officer, the Highways Authority. In particular, development on the back land would have a detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding development, characterised by detached dwellings on the same alignment facing the main road and with large rear gardens. <b>Therefore, this site is not supported for residential development use.</b>			

BDC01




<b>Site Information</b>			
Land west of Bawtry Road			
Indicative Capacity	(None Given-Presumption for North Blyth is 6.5 Dwellings/Hectares) Approximately 3 dwellings		
Site Area (Hectares)	0.4ha		
<b>Site Performance</b>			
Site Assessment Reports	G	Landscape Character	G
Landowner Support	G	Built Character	G
Community Support	W	Natural Environment	A
Neighbouring Land Uses	G	Heritage Assets	W
Agricultural Land Classification	A	Infrastructure Impact	G
<b>Bassetlaw District Council Comments</b>			
BDC Planning Policy	This site has planning permission (PA ref 16/01125/FUL)	Suitable Site?	Yes
Drainage	No objection to any of the sites identified through consultation. There is no recorded history of flooding and the ground conditions are generally suitable for SUDs/infiltration/soakaways.		
Highways	Accepted in accordance with planning application reference 16/01125/FUL subject to conditions		
Conservation	There are no heritage constraints associated with this site. Therefore, no objection in principle.		
<b>Consultation Comments</b>			
<i>No specific comments as development already approved for 10 dwellings.</i>			
<b>Conclusion</b>			
<p><b>Suitable for Allocation</b> – This site is suitable and is supported based on the statutory consultation comments received through the Site Assessment Reports. The site is generally supported based on feedback from the District Council’s Planning teams and Highways authorities. The development site has little to no impact on local character, conservation and the heritage of Blyth while having no detrimental effect on local infrastructure. The development site is in keeping with the neighbouring land uses.</p>			

BDC02



<b>Site Information</b>			
Land to the north of Retford Road			
Indicative Capacity	(None Given-Presumption for Blyth is 11.1 Dwellings/Hectares) Approximately 3 dwellings		
Site Area (Hectares)	0.2ha		
<b>Site Performance</b>			
Site Assessment Reports	G	Landscape Character	G
Landowner Support	G	Built Character	G
Community Support	G	Natural Environment	A
Neighbouring Land Uses	G	Heritage Assets	W
Agricultural Land Classification	A	Infrastructure Impact	W
<b>Bassetlaw District Council Comments</b>			
BDC Planning Policy	Developable area reduced by flood risk	Suitable Site?	Yes
Drainage	No objection to any of the sites identified through consultation. There is no recorded history of flooding and the ground conditions are generally suitable for SUDs/infiltration/soakaways. For sites BDC02 which are adjacent to watercourses I would recommend an FRA is provided if allocated to determine flood risk and FFL.		
Highways	<b>No objection</b> to a residential development subject to satisfactory details of access and layout.		
Conservation	There are no heritage constraints associated with this site. Therefore, <b>no objection in principle</b> .		
<b>Consultation Comments</b>			
From the Consultation, the most significant concern was about the site causing further issues with flooding. Also, comments were made about if the site were going to provide 3-bedroom houses. Overall, from the voting result, 27 people voted 'Yes' to the development site with 16 people voting for 'maybe' and 13 people voting 'no' for the development of the site. Therefore, the majority of respondents expressed support for the development of the site for the proposed use.			
<b>Conclusion</b>			
<b>Suitable for Allocation</b> – This site is suitable and is supported based on the statutory consultation comments received through the Site Assessment Reports. The site is generally supported based on feedback from the District Council's Planning teams, Information from the Planning Policy and Highways authorities. The development site has little to no impact on local character, conservation and the heritage of Blyth while having no effect on local infrastructure. Developable area will need to be reduced in the area adjacent to the watercourse and a Flood Risk Assessment is recommended.			

BDC03




Any queries on the precise location and alignment of any right of way must be made to the Definitive Map team at Nottinghamshire County Council.  
© Crown copyright and database right 2018. Ordnance Survey Licence number 010005672



<b>Site Information</b>			
Land to the east of Spital Road			
Indicative Capacity	(None Given-Presumption for Blyth is 11.1 Dwellings/Hectares). Approximately 86 dwellings		
Site Area (Hectares)	7.8ha		
<b>Site Performance</b>			
Site Assessment Reports	A	Landscape Character	A
Landowner Support	G	Built Character	A
Community Support	A	Natural Environment	A
Neighbouring Land Uses	A	Heritage Assets	A
Agricultural Land Classification	A	Infrastructure Impact	G
<b>Bassetlaw District Council Comments</b>			
BDC Planning Policy	No significant constraints identified, although overhead power lines Likely need to provide a buffer to the A1 for air quality reasons may restrict developable area Part of the site already has permission (LAA374)		Suitable Site?  Yes
Drainage	No objection to any of the sites identified through consultation. There is no recorded history of flooding and the ground conditions are generally suitable for SUDs/infiltration/soakaways.		
Highways	No objection in principle subject to satisfactory details of access and Transport Assessment should the development exceed 80 dwellings. A 2.0m footway will be required across the site frontage connecting into the village. The speed limit will require relocating south of the site including the extension of the street lighting. Site levels could be challenging. Two points of access would be required if the development exceeds 150 units.		
Conservation	<p>The site is opposite the grade II listed Spital House and is also in the setting of the Blyth &amp; Hodsock War Memorial (grade II) and Blyth Cemetery unregistered park &amp; garden. Views are afforded across the site, primarily from the south, of the Church of St Mary &amp; St Martin (grade I listed). To the north of the site is the Old Police House, a non-designated heritage asset.</p> <p>Planning permission was recently granted for 10 dwellings on land to the south of the Old Police House. Therefore, Conservation has no concerns with that part of the site.</p> <p>With regard to the wider site, whilst the setting of several nearby heritage assets is noted, the site itself is of limited landscape value, merely being agricultural land between Spital Road and the A1 (built c1960). Whilst the site does contribute to the rural setting of nearby heritage assets, the loss of this open space could be mitigated with appropriate boundary treatments, scale, design, layout and materials. Furthermore, although the site affords views towards the Church of St Mary &amp; St Martin (grade I), these could be retained with a careful layout.</p>		

	<p>With the above in mind, Conservation has <b>no concerns to the principle</b> of development, subject to consideration of the views of the church, together with suitable design, layout, scale, materials and boundary treatments.</p>
<p><b>Consultation Comments</b></p>	
<p>From the Consultation, the biggest concerns from the proposed development would bring to many houses to the villages and create excess traffic issues for local people. Also, another concern was the damage to the natural environment and the destroying of farmland. Finally, comments suggested that people had no objectives if the development had provisions for affordable/mixed/smaller housing. Overall, from the voting result, 19 people voted 'Yes' to the development site, 14 people voted 'Maybe' to the development site and 19 people voted 'No' to the development site. Due to the same number of votes between 'yes' and 'no' votes, this means that a definitive answer of No cannot be given to the proposed site and therefore shows, a balance of views was expressed for the development of the site for the proposed use.</p>	
<p><b>Conclusion</b></p>	
<p><b>Suitable for Allocation</b> - This site scored generally positively, although a number of concerns regarding infrastructure and impact on natural environment and built character have been raised. The site is located nearby a number of heritage assets and contributes to the rural setting of village, although it is believed that through appropriate design and layout solutions impact can be mitigated; the site is still at the edge of the main built up area and will quite substantially extend the village southward. The developable area may be reduced to accommodate a buffer with the A1 and a buffer around the power line in the south of the site. <b>The site may be acceptable for residential development if serious consideration is given to flood risk, protection of the natural environment and the design, character and layout of the site.</b></p>	

BDC04



<b>Site Information</b>			
Land to the west of Spital Road			
Indicative Capacity	(None Given-Presumption for Blyth is 11.1 Dwellings/Hectares). Approximately 42 dwellings.		
Site Area (Hectares)	3.8ha		
<b>Site Performance</b>			
Site Assessment Reports	A	Landscape Character	R
Landowner Support	G	Built Character	A
Community Support	R	Natural Environment	A
Neighbouring Land Uses	A	Heritage Assets	A
Agricultural Land Classification	A	Infrastructure Impact	A
<b>Bassetlaw District Council Comments</b>			
BDC Planning Policy	No significant constraints identified, although overhead power lines. Likely need to provide a buffer to the A1 for air quality reasons may restrict developable area. Part of the site already has permission (LAA374)		Suitable Site?  Yes
Drainage	No objection to any of the sites identified through consultation. There is no recorded history of flooding and the ground conditions are generally suitable for SUDs/infiltration/soakaways.		
Highways	No objection in principle subject to satisfactory details of access and Transport Assessment should the development exceed 80 dwellings. The speed limit will require relocating south of the site.		
Conservation	<p>This site is in the setting of the grade II listed Spital House and is also adjacent to Blyth Cemetery unregistered park &amp; garden (which itself contains the Blyth &amp; Hodsock War Memorial, grade II).</p> <p>The land is currently agricultural in nature, sited between a 1950s housing estate and the Spital House complex (which includes the grade II listed former country house, associated stable/agricultural buildings and 1920s/30s workers cottages).</p> <p>In terms of the views from Worksop Road to the west, these are from a significant distance away and are merely incidental (rather than planned).</p> <p>In relation to the site as viewed from Spital Road, the Listed Building itself is hidden behind the workers house to the north, and large hedges help to provide screening alongside the road. Although the rural setting would be affected, this impact could be mitigated with suitable design, scale, layout, materials and landscaping. It is also suggested a landscape buffer be retained between the Spital House complex and any development.</p> <p>With this in mind, there are no concerns with the principle of development, subject to a suitable design, scale, layout, materials and landscaping (including a landscaping buffer at the southern end of the site)</p>		

### Consultation Comments

From the Consultation, the biggest concerns from the proposed development would bring to many houses to the villages and create excess traffic issues for local people. Also, another concern was the damage to the natural environment and the destroying of farmland. Finally, comments suggested that people had voted 'maybe' if the development had provisions for homes and bungalows. Overall, from the voting result, 8 people voted 'Yes' to the development site, 20 people voted 'Maybe' to the development site and 27 people voted 'No' to the development site. Therefore, the majority of respondents expressed an objection to the development of the site for the proposed use.

### Conclusion

**Not Suitable for Allocation** - This site scored generally positively, although a number of concerns regarding infrastructure and impact on natural environment and built character have been raised. In particular, development of the site may negatively impact a number of views and the rural setting; it is believed that through appropriate design and layout solutions this impact can be mitigated. The site is still at the edge of the main built up area and will quite substantially extend the village southward. **Finally, from the Blyth Housing Sites Consultation Results, the majority of respondents expressed an objection to the development of the site for the proposed use. Therefore, the site is objected and is not suitable for allocation.**

Site Ref	Site Assessment Reports	Landowner Support	Community Support	Neighbouring land uses	Agricultural Land Classification	Landscape Character	Built Character	Natural Environment	Heritage Assets	Infrastructure Impact	Conclusion	Allocation Yes/No
NP01	R	G	G	A	A	A	R	R	R	R	<b>Not Suitable for Allocation</b> - This site is not suitable due it to not being supported in the comments received through the Site Assessment Reports. This includes initial feedback from the District Council's Planning teams, the Conservation Officer, Highways Authorities. Furthermore, the site is not deemed suitable according to the assessment criteria based on the level of impacts of the development on the built character, natural environment, heritage asset and infrastructure effects around the site. <b>Therefore, this site is not supported for residential development.</b>	
NP02	R	G	G	R	A	G	R	A	A	A	<b>Not Suitable for Allocation</b> - This site is not suitable due to not being supported in the comments received through the Site Assessment Reports of the included initial feedback from the District Council's Planning teams and Information from the Local Planning Policy the Site Assessment Reports. This includes initial feedback from the District Council's Planning teams, the Conservation Officer, Highways Authorities. Furthermore, the site is not deemed suitable according to the assessment criteria based on the level of impacts of the development on the built character, but also a potential concern with the natural environment, heritage asset and infrastructure effects around the site. <b>Therefore, this site is not supported for a residential development use.</b>	
NP03	A(1)	G	A	G	A	G	G	A	G	G	<del><b>Suitable for Allocation</b> - This site scores generally positive but based on initial feedback from BDC the maximum capacity of the site should be for one dwelling, inferior to the indicative capacity obtained applying the 6.5 dwelling/hectare ratio. Moreover, due to proximity to the watercourse a Flood Risk Assessment must be considered. <b>The site may be acceptable for residential development for one dwelling if serious consideration is given to flood risk and protection of the natural environment</b></del> <b>** Due to the initial response containing a mistake from Nottingham County Council Highways, site NP03 has been reassessed, due to the confirmation received from Highways that access is not suitable for any development. The decision was made after Regulation 14, in discussion with the Steering Group, Bassetlaw District Council and Nottingham County Council to consider the site as not suitable for development.**</b>	

Site Ref	Site Assessment Reports	Landowner Support	Community Support	Neighbouring land uses	Agricultural Land Classification	Landscape Character	Built Character	Natural Environment	Heritage Assets	Infrastructure Impact	Conclusion	Allocation Yes/No
NP04	A	G	A	R	A	G	R	A	R	A	<b>Suitable for Allocation</b> - This site may not be suitable due to it not being supported in the comments received through the Site Assessment Reports, in particular, there are strong conservation concerns due to its impact on the setting of Selby Hall and surrounding built character. Moreover, due to proximity to the watercourse a Flood Risk Assessment must be considered. In any case, development proposals will need to consider only a portion of the site, as the totality of it will not be supported. <b>The site may be acceptable for residential development if serious consideration is given to flood risk, protection of the natural environment and Design and layout of the site.</b>	
NP05	G	G	G	G	A	G	G	A	G	W	<b>Suitable for Allocation</b> – This site is suitable and is supported in principle in the comments received through the Site Assessment Reports. This includes initial feedback from the District Council’s Planning teams, the Conservation Officer, the Highways Authority. The development site has little to no impact on local character, and with adequate design solutions can protect and promote the character and heritage of Blyth, while having no detrimental effect on local infrastructure. The development site is in keeping with the neighbouring land uses. <b>Therefore, this site is acceptable for residential use.</b>	
NP06	G	G	A	G	A	G	A	A	G	A	<b>Suitable for Allocation</b> – This site is suitable and is supported in principle in the comments received through the Site Assessment Reports. This includes initial feedback from the District Council’s Planning teams, the Conservation Officer, the Highways Authority. The development site has little to no impact on local character, and with adequate access will not have a detrimental impact on local infrastructure. A maximum of 5 dwellings should be considered for the site, unless demolition of one of the existing dwellings to ensure wider access is proposed. <b>Therefore, this site is acceptable for residential use.</b>	

Site Ref	Site Assessment Reports	Landowner Support	Community Support	Neighbouring land uses	Agricultural Land Classification	Landscape Character	Built Character	Natural Environment	Heritage Assets	Infrastructure Impact	Conclusion	Allocation Yes/No
NP07	A	G	R	A	A	A	A	R	R	R	<b>Not Suitable for Allocation</b> - This site may not be suitable due to it not being supported in the comments received through the Site Assessment Reports, in particular, there are strong conservation concerns due to its impact on the setting of Selby Hall (Grade I) and in the wider setting of The Mantles (also grade II listed). Moreover, due to its location there are serious viability concerns, and extensive work in terms of infrastructure are required. Finally, the development would represent a linear extension of the Blyth main built up area eastward. From the Blyth Housing Sites Consultation Results, the majority of respondents expressed an objection to the development of the site for the proposed use. <b>Therefore, the site is objected and is not suitable for allocation.</b>	
NP08	R	G	R	R	A	R	A	A	R	A	<b>Not Suitable for Allocation</b> - This site is not suitable due to not being supported in the comments received through the Site Assessment Reports. This includes initial feedback from the District Council's Planning teams, the Conservation Officer, the Highways Authority. Furthermore, it is deemed not suitable according to the assessment criteria based on the level of impacts of the development on the built character and neighbouring uses. Furthermore, from the Blyth Housing Sites Consultation Results, the majority of respondents expressed an objection to the development of the site for the proposed use. <b>Therefore, the site is objected and is not suitable for allocation.</b>	
NP09	R	G	G	R	A	A	R	R	R	A	<b>Not Suitable for Allocation</b> - This site is not suitable due to it not being supported in the comments received through the Site Assessment Reports of the included initial feedback from the District Council's Planning teams and Information from the Local Planning Policy the Site Assessment Reports. In particular, the site rises concerns in terms of impact on the non-designated heritage asset of the Old Police House, as well on existing built character. Furthermore, to ensure access to the site it is believed that acquisition of land outside the applicant control would be necessary. <b>Therefore, this site is not supported for a residential development use</b>	

Site Ref	Site Assessment Reports	Landowner Support	Community Support	Neighbouring land uses	Agricultural Land Classification	Landscape Character	Built Character	Natural Environment	Heritage Assets	Infrastructure Impact	Conclusion	Allocation Yes/No
NP10	R	G	G	R	A	G	R	A	W	A	<b>Not Suitable for Allocation</b> - This site is not suitable due to it not being supported in the comments received through the Site Assessment Reports. This includes initial feedback from the District Council's Planning teams, the Conservation Officer, the Highways Authority. In particular, development on the back land would have a detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding development, characterised by detached dwellings on the same alignment facing the main road and with large rear gardens. <b>Therefore, this site is not supported for residential development use.</b>	
BDC 01	G	G	W	G	A	G	G	A	W	G	<b>Suitable for Allocation</b> – This site is suitable and is supported based on the statutory consultation comments received through the Site Assessment Reports. The site is generally supported based on feedback from the District Council's Planning teams and Highways authorities. The development site has little to no impact on local character, conservation and the heritage of Blyth while having no detrimental effect on local infrastructure. The development site is in keeping with the neighbouring land uses.	
BDC 02	G	G	G	G	A	G	G	A	W	W	<b>Suitable for Allocation</b> – This site is suitable and is supported based on the statutory consultation comments received through the Site Assessment Reports. The site is generally supported based on feedback from the District Council's Planning teams, Information from the Planning Policy and Highways authorities. The development site has little to no impact on local character, conservation and the heritage of Blyth while having no effect on local infrastructure. Developable area will need to be reduced in the area adjacent to the watercourse and a Flood Risk Assessment is recommended.	

Site Ref	Site Assessment Reports	Landowner Support	Community Support	Neighbouring land uses	Agricultural Land Classification	Landscape Character	Built Character	Natural Environment	Heritage Assets	Infrastructure Impact	Conclusion	Allocation Yes/No
BDC 03	A	G	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	G	<b>Suitable for Allocation</b> - This site scored generally positively, although a number of concerns regarding infrastructure and impact on natural environment and built character have been raised. The site is located nearby a number of heritage assets and contributes to the rural setting of village, although it is believed that through appropriate design and layout solutions impact can be mitigated; the site is still at the edge of the main built up area and will quite substantially extend the village southward. The developable area may be reduced to accommodate a buffer with the A1 and a buffer around the power line in the south of the site. <b>The site may be acceptable for residential development if serious consideration is given to flood risk, protection of the natural environment and the design, character and layout of the site.</b>	
BDC 04	A	G	R	A	A	R	A	A	A	A	<b>Not Suitable for Allocation</b> - This site scored generally positively, although a number of concerns regarding infrastructure and impact on natural environment and built character have been raised. In particular, development of the site may negatively impact a number of views and the rural setting; it is believed that through appropriate design and layout solutions this impact can be mitigated. The site is still at the edge of the main built up area and will quite substantially extend the village southward. <b>Finally, from the Blyth Housing Sites Consultation Results, the majority of respondents expressed an objection to the development of the site for the proposed use. Therefore, the site is objected and is not suitable for allocation.</b>	

## 4. Conclusion

---

4.1 In conclusion, the following sites are considered suitable or potentially suitable for residential development and for allocation as part of a specific policy in the Blyth Neighbourhood Plan. Exact location of these sites is marked in green in Figure 3:

1. ~~NP03: Land east of Bawtry Road (to the rear of The Mound)~~
2. NP04: Land east of Bawtry Road (to the south of the pumping station)
3. NP05: Land East of Bawtry Road (at Lynwood)
4. NP06: Land to the south of Retford Road
5. BDC01: Land west of Bawtry Road
6. BDC02: Land to the north of Retford Road
7. BDC03: Land to the east of Spital Road

4.2 The following site are not deemed suitable from a planning point of view, meaning that such sites are very likely to be rejected based on planning material considerations or were not supported by the local community. Exact location of such sites is marked in red in Figure 3:

1. NP01: Land east of Bawtry Road
2. NP02: Land east of Bawtry Road (Woodlea)
3. **NP03: Land east of Bawtry Road (to the rear of The Mound)**
4. NP07: Land to the north of Blyth Road
5. NP08: Land at Park Farm, Worksop Road
6. NP09: Land to the east of Spital Road (to the rear of Old Police House)
7. NP10: Land to the east of Bawtry Road (at Enfield)
8. BDC04: Land to the west of Spital Road

Blyth




Figure 3 Suitable, and Not Suitable Sites