

## **Policies 1-7 General**

**I understand the relationship of the proposed yield of the various sites to existing commitments and to the strategic growth targets included in the emerging Local Plan. However:**

- **are the indicated yields directly related to the characteristics and the likely capacity of the sites concerned?** Yes, the number of dwellings is based on the size and character of the site and its relationship to any neighbouring development i.e. linear, cluster etc.. This is also supported by the Rampton and Woodbeck Character Assessment that has identified character areas around the settlements.
- **are the details in each policy about the maximum yields necessary given the interplay between Sections C/D/E of Policy ST2 of the emerging Local Plan?** Policy ST2 in the emerging LP was published after the drafting of the Neighbourhood Plan, so no bearing was given to the wording of ST2 during the production of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- **Is each site viable and deliverable in the Plan period?** Yes, each landowner has stated that they intend to develop the sites over the plan period. Some sites have either has pre-application advice or have planning permission.

**As the Parish Council acknowledges in the Basic Conditions Statement the submitted Plan will ultimately be assessed against the basic conditions on the basis of the current development plan. In this context how has the Parish Council assessed these policies against Policy CS8 of the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy?**

Yes, Policy CS8 is supportive of some residential development in Rural Service Centres of which Rampton is identified as one of them. As the Neighbourhood Plan Area also covers Woodbeck, the Neighbourhood Plan Group felt it was important to also include Woodbeck due to it including a very large local employer and there is a need for key work accommodation and additional housing. Woodbeck is also close to Rampton's facilities such as the primary school and shop. In addition, there is also the ability for a Neighbourhood Plan to propose additional growth to the Core Strategy so long as it is justified.

### **Policy 1**

**As submitted, it is not a policy. Instead it is a list of proposed allocations.**

**I am minded to recommend a modification so that the policy supports the development of the component sites (as detailed in later policies).**

**Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?** Agreed. Happy for you to make the modification.

### **Policy 5 (NP07)**

**This site is different to other proposed allocated sites in terms of its relationship to the existing built up part of Rampton.** The site is the next logical extension along Treswell Road and is close to site NP14 which is currently under construction. Discussions with the landowner have supported the sites inclusion and its deliverability. In addition, the identified site form part of a much larger area that was originally submitted during the "call for land" consultation. Feedback from consultation has led to the site being reduced to the area now identified in the Plan.

**In what way has the Parish Council assessed its suitability and location to accommodate new development?**

**Does the Parish Council have any views on the District Council comments (within the supporting text) about its development in relation to nearby committed sites?**

The Neighbourhood Plan Group commissioned some technical support for the assessment of sites from the Government appointed AECOM consultancy. They assessed each site that was put forward for consideration for their planning constraints and their potential suitability for allocation. The report was published and formed part of the consultation with the public on the sites submitted. Following this consultation and the recommendations in the report, the sites were narrowed down – with some only partly being included.

These were then included in the draft Neighbourhood Plan and were subject to public consultation through Regulation 14. The feedback from this consultation held to shape the submission document.

### **Policy 8**

**I understand the role and purpose of this policy.**

**However please can the Parish Council comment on the following observations:**

- **Part 1 reads as a double negative policy. As I read this part of the policy it offers support to new development inside the development boundary subject to design and amenity considerations. Is this the Parish Council's intention?** Yes, it accepts the principle of residential development within the development boundary subject to the usual policy requirements.
- **Is Part 2 of the policy necessary? In effect is it the reverse of criteria a) and c) of Part 1 of the policy?** Agreed. Suggest this part could be removed from the policy.
- **Part 3 does not read as a policy. Is its intention to support small scale development immediately adjacent to the development boundaries?** Yes, it is to some residential development to meet the remaining (unallocated) identified housing requirement where it cannot be met within the existing development boundaries.

### **Policies 9/10**

**These two policies are excellent in their approach and wording. Thank you.**

### **Policy 11**

**Has the Parish Council undertaken any detailed assessment of the proposed local green spaces (LGSs)?** The Rampton and Woodbeck Character Assessment identifies the majority of them as important green spaces, but a table was produced to look at how they comply with the criteria identified in the NPPF. We agree however that LGS2 and LGS7 should be removed as there is little merit on preserving them due to them being in private ownership.

**I can see from electronic maps that the LGSs in Woodbeck reflect the very special circumstances of that settlement. Nevertheless, is it appropriate for LGSs to overlap with residential curtilages (as in proposed LGS 8/9)?** The curtilages of those buildings for LGS8/9 are those of temporary accommodation or offices, they do not include private or permanent residential units and contribute positively towards local character and form part of the original character of the community.

### Policy 13

Should the policy take account of commercial viability given that several of the identified amenities are commercial organisations (2/6/7)? Yes, the policy could include the need for a period of marketing the existing use(s) before it is released to another use?

Should there be a number 1 on either Map 9 or 10? Number 1 on Map 9 was removed. The numbering could be revised.

### Policy 14

I can see that this is a general policy. However, it includes a mixture of policy and supporting text. I am minded to recommend a modification so that the supporting text element is relocated to that part of the Plan.

Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition? Agreed. Happy for this modification.

In addition, the policy merely requires a developer to 'give consideration' to such matters. As drafted, this could have unintended consequences. I am minded to recommend a modification so that development proposals are required to 'take account of' the issues addressed in the policy

Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition? Agreed. This modification will help to clarify the policy requirement.

### 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 representations from:

- Foljambe Estate; No additional comments
- Nottinghamshire County Council Highways; and No additional comments
- Severn Trent Water? No additional comments