

Walkeringham Parish Council

11th February 2020

Bassetlaw District Council
Queen's Buildings
Potter Street
Worksop
Notts
S80 2AH

For the attention of Mr W Wilson, Interim Lead Neighbourhood Planner

Dear Will

Walkeringham Parish Council – Clarification

As requested, please find attached the Parish Council's response to the Independent Examiner's clarification notes.

Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Angela Hayward
Clerk to the Parish Council

Clerk: Angela Hayward
Lindale Villa, Gringley Road, Walkeringham, DN10 4HT
Tel: 01427 891118
Email: clerk@walkeringhamparishcouncil.org.uk



Response to Examiners Clarification Notes: Walkeringham Parish Council

Policy 1 – to what extent can the definition of infill in para 106 underpinned by evidence?

The definition of infill as set out in para 106 is appropriate to the scale of the small gaps between existing buildings in the context of Walkeringham village (outside of the areas defined later as significant green gaps).

Could the third part of the policy be modified to relate to plot sizes and design characteristics and move away from the prescriptive approach?

The examiners proposed amendments seem reasonable but the Parish Council are wary of losing this local and specific definition of infill as in a Neighbourhood Plan in Bassetlaw it has resulted in unintended consequences. Here the clause referring to infill as being for one or two dwellings was removed in error by BDC from the policy although it was retained in the justification text during the making of amendments to the NP after examination– this has led to several planning applications being submitted for a large number of houses on infill sites that the community would have considered too big for infill development.

Policy 1 (3) was added to ensure this did not arise in Walkeringham and the Parish Council would strongly encourage the examiner to retain this.

Policy 2 – the issues relating to this policy evolved as discussions progressed about the policy framework requirements to ensure development did not harm the rural character. The policy could be divided into natural environment and landscape character further divisions would break up the overall sense of what Policy 2 was seeking to achieve.

The green gaps policy does not seek to prevent all development in these locations, rather it was intended to ensure that proposals that did not affect the sense of openness so small scale sensitively designed development may be acceptable. It is not intended to be as onerous as green belt.

The Parish Council agree that para 114 sets out the principal issues relating to the green gaps but an important part of the community engagement (and the general support for the scale of development implicit in the site allocations) is that there was a recognition of the contribution these gaps made to the character of the parish. Their identification on a map provides transparency about the location of these gaps and some certainty about their protection.

Policy 3 part 6 – the NPPF requires some flexibility WRT materials and appearance where the design is innovative (para 79 e). Whilst the Walkeringham Character and Design Guide supports the use of traditional materials, part 6 was added to reflect the NPPF requirement and in recognition of the opportunity to encourage the use of materials and layout that means that new development has a lesser impact on the environment. If the examiner is content that this could be expressed in the justification text in such a way that policy 3 is



considered to be in conformity with national policy then the Parish Council would be satisfied with that approach.

Policy 3 part 8 - the key principal and the process of producing a neighbourhood plan has reflects the community's desire to secure high quality design. It was considered that encouraging the use of BfL12 within the policy reflects NPPF requirements (see para 129 and footnote 47) and highlights to developers the importance of this approach to local people. The Parish Council would prefer to keep part 8 within the policy box.

Policy 4 – the examiners modification would strengthen the intent and the modification would be supported.

BDC comment questions viability of requirement for M4(2) standards on all 1-3 bed properties because the viability assessment for the Local Plan in 2017 considered that across the parish as a whole this was not viable. However, the Parish Council notes that the average house prices in Walkeringham are above the average compared to surrounding towns and villages— see Submission Plan para 159 with Gainsborough and Misterton referenced.

It should also be noted that the provision of life time homes (that are adaptable and accessible) would represent more sustainable development than homes that are not adaptable and accessible.

Possible amended wording that could add at the end of Policy 4 (2) unless it can be demonstrated that this is unviable.

Policy 5 - there is not a definition for what constitutes an extensive tract of land (as far as the Parish Council are aware). The Moor has a historic function and its value to the community is set out in table 9. It has a higher significance in this regard than the other significant green gaps. The boundary of the proposed LGS is different to the significant green gap.

Policy 5 (2) – is intended to provide clarity WRT the significance of the designation of LGS's for developers, decision makers and the community (see NPPF para 16 (d)). In this context the Parish Council would prefer criteria 2 of Policy 5 to be retained within the policy if possible.

Policy 6 (4) reflects a local issue on a site outside the development boundary and next to a SSSI that includes a non-designated heritage asset (which is the brickworks chimney). The community support the reuse of the site for employment with the retention of the chimney. The specific reference to the site was removed after Reg 14 comments. The Parish Council consider that Policy 5 (5) may be sufficient to cover this matter.



Policy 7 (4) the community want to ensure that if the village hall site were proposed for housing that the community provision of a village hall would be relocated and not be lost to the village. It is possible that wording relating to legal agreements could provide this assurance.

Policies 8-15 high quality – the Parish Council agree that the definition of high quality development for Walkeringham is set out in Policy 3.

Policies 10/11 – the Parish Council have not tested the viability impact of the proposed development phasing.

There is local concern, reflected in comments from highways about the need to ensure safe access from Fountain Hill Road. Where reference is made to the need for a shared access in Policy 10 (3) and Policy 11 (1) (g) it is suggested that wording could be amended to require an access point that allows for adaption to accommodate further vehicle movements if/when adjacent sites are developed.

Monitoring – the Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared in close collaboration with BDC and the principles in the emerging Local Plan and the Parish Council would support wording that reflects this.

February 2020