

# **Lound Neighbourhood Development Plan 2021 - 2037**

**A report to Bassetlaw District Council on the Lound  
Neighbourhood Development Plan**

**Andrew Ashcroft  
Independent Examiner  
BA (Hons) MA, DMS, MRTPI**

**Director – Andrew Ashcroft Planning Limited**

## **Executive Summary**

- 1 I was appointed by Bassetlaw District Council in June 2021 to carry out the independent examination of the Lound Neighbourhood Development Plan.
- 2 The examination was undertaken by way of written representations. I visited the neighbourhood plan area on 1 July 2021.
- 3 The Plan includes a variety of policies and seeks to bring forward positive and sustainable development in the neighbourhood area. There is a very clear focus on bringing forward housing allocations, designating local green spaces and safeguarding its distinctive character.
- 4 The Plan has been underpinned by community support and engagement. It is clear that all sections of the community have been engaged in its preparation.
- 5 Subject to a series of recommended modifications set out in this report I have concluded that the Lound Neighbourhood Plan meets all the necessary legal requirements and should proceed to referendum.
- 6 I recommend that the referendum should be held within the neighbourhood area.

**Andrew Ashcroft**  
**Independent Examiner**  
**25 August 2021**

## **1 Introduction**

- 1.1 This report sets out the findings of the independent examination of the Lound Neighbourhood Development Plan 2021-2037 ('the Plan').
- 1.2 The Plan has been submitted to Bassetlaw District Council (BDC) by Lound Parish Council (LPC) in its capacity as the qualifying body responsible for preparing the neighbourhood plan.
- 1.3 Neighbourhood plans were introduced into the planning process by the Localism Act 2011. They aim to allow local communities to take responsibility for guiding development in their area. This approach was subsequently embedded in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the most recent version of which was published earlier this year.
- 1.4 The role of an independent examiner is clearly defined in the legislation. I have been appointed to examine whether or not the submitted Plan meets the basic conditions and Convention Rights and other statutory requirements. It is not within my remit to examine or to propose an alternative plan, or a potentially more sustainable plan except where this arises as a result of my recommended modifications to ensure that the plan meets the basic conditions and the other relevant requirements.
- 1.5 A neighbourhood plan can be narrow or broad in scope. Any plan can include whatever range of policies it sees as appropriate to its designated neighbourhood area. The submitted Plan has been designed to be distinctive in general terms, and to be complementary to the development plan in particular. It seeks to provide a context in which the neighbourhood area can maintain its distinctiveness and identity. It proposes a range of policies which include the identification of housing allocations and the designation of a series of Local Green Spaces.
- 1.6 Within the context set out above this report assesses whether the Plan is legally compliant and meets the basic conditions that apply to neighbourhood plans. It also considers the content of the Plan and, where necessary, recommends changes to its policies and supporting text.
- 1.7 This report also provides a recommendation as to whether the Plan should proceed to referendum. If this is the case and that referendum results in a positive outcome the Plan would then be used to determine planning applications within the neighbourhood area and will sit as part of the wider development plan.

## **2 The Role of the Independent Examiner**

- 2.1 The examiner's role is to ensure that any submitted neighbourhood plan meets the relevant legislative and procedural requirements.
- 2.2 I was appointed by BDC, with the consent of LPC, to conduct the examination of the Plan and to prepare this report. I am independent of both the BDC and LPC. I do not have any interest in any land that may be affected by the Plan.
- 2.3 I possess the appropriate qualifications and experience to undertake this role. I am a Director of Andrew Ashcroft Planning Limited. In previous roles, I have over 35 years' experience in various local authorities at either Head of Planning or Service Director level. I am a chartered town planner and have significant experience of undertaking other neighbourhood plan examinations and health checks. I am a member of the Royal Town Planning Institute and the Neighbourhood Planning Independent Examiner Referral System.

### *Examination Outcomes*

- 2.4 In my role as the independent examiner of the Plan I am required to recommend one of the following outcomes of the examination:
- (a) that the Plan is submitted to a referendum; or
  - (b) that the Plan should proceed to referendum as modified (based on my recommendations); or
  - (c) that the Plan does not proceed to referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.
- 2.5 The outcome of the examination is set out in Section 8 of this report.

### *Other examination matters*

- 2.6 In examining the Plan I am required to check whether:
- the policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood plan area; and
  - the Plan meets the requirements of Section 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (the Plan must specify the period to which it has effect, must not include provision about development that is excluded development, and must not relate to more than one neighbourhood area); and
  - the Plan has been prepared for an area that has been designated under Section 61G of the Localism Act and has been developed and submitted for examination by a qualifying body.
- 2.7 Having addressed the matters identified in paragraph 2.6 of this report I am satisfied that all of the points have been met.

### 3 Procedural Matters

3.1 In undertaking this examination I have considered the following documents:

- the submission Plan.
- the Character Assessment
- the Basic Conditions Statement.
- the Consultation Statement.
- the Design Code (October 2018).
- the representations made to the Plan.
- the Parish Council's responses to the Clarification Note.
- the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy 2011.
- the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021).
- Planning Practice Guidance (March 2014 and subsequent updates).
- relevant Ministerial Statements.

3.2 I visited the neighbourhood area on 1 July 2021. I looked at its overall character and appearance and at those areas affected by policies in the Plan in particular. My visit is covered in more detail in paragraphs 5.9 to 5.16 of this report.

3.3 It is a general rule that neighbourhood plan examinations should be held by written representations only. Having considered all the information before me, including the representations made to the submitted plan, I concluded that the Plan could be examined by way of written representations.

## 4 Consultation

### *Consultation Process*

- 4.1 Policies in made neighbourhood plans become the basis for local planning and development control decisions. As such the regulations require neighbourhood plans to be supported and underpinned by public consultation.
- 4.2 In accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 LPC has prepared a Consultation Statement. This Statement is proportionate to the neighbourhood area and its policies.
- 4.3 The Statement records the various activities that were held to engage the local community and the feedback from each event. It also provides specific details on the consultation processes that took place on the pre-submission version of the Plan (August to September 2020).
- 4.4 The Statement sets out details of the comprehensive range of consultation events that were carried out in relation to the early stages of the Plan. They include the following events and processes:
- the residents' survey (May/June 2016);
  - the survey of businesses, clubs and organisations (November 2016);
  - the open meeting (February 2017); and
  - the open events (June/July 2018).
- 4.5 The details in the Statement set out the nature of the community questionnaire, other consultation exercises and the responses received. They demonstrate the way in which those responsible for the preparation of the Plan sought to address the expectations of the wider community. A significant part the Statement sets out how the submitted Plan took account of consultation feedback at the pre-submission phase. It does so in a proportionate and effective way.
- 4.6 Consultation on the submitted plan was undertaken by BDC. This exercise generated representations from the following persons and organisations:
- Bassetlaw District Council;
  - Canal and River Trust;
  - The Coal Authority;
  - Historic England;
  - National Grid;
  - Natural England;
  - Nottinghamshire County Council;
  - Severn Trent Water; and
  - Sport England.

- 4.7 Representations were also received from two local residents.
- 4.8 I have taken account of all the representations in preparing this report. Where it is appropriate to do so I refer to specific representations on a policy-by-policy basis.

## 5 The Neighbourhood Area and the Development Plan Context

### *The Neighbourhood Area*

- 5.1 The neighbourhood area is the parish of Lound. It is located approximately four miles to the north of Retford. Its population in 2011 was 471 persons living in 210 households. It was designated as a neighbourhood area on 7 July 2016.
- 5.2 As the Plan describes Lound is situated on an undulating, gravelly ridge, 10-15m above sea level and just above the western edge of the floodplain of the River Idle. It is a linear village with its main artery, the old medieval road (now Town Street) running roughly north to south. It has a good mix of vernacular buildings and more modern houses.
- 5.3 The remainder of the neighbourhood area is attractive countryside. The River Idle floodplain contains valuable sand and gravel deposits, which were quarried over many decades. These have now largely been worked out. Some of the old workings have been reclaimed using power station ash, others restored to open water with islands or turned to leisure activities such as water skiing and fishing.

### *Development Plan Context*

- 5.4 The development plan covering the neighbourhood plan area is the Bassetlaw District Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2010 - 2028 ('the Core Strategy'). The Core Strategy sets out a vision, objectives, a spatial strategy and overarching planning policies that guide new development in the Plan period.
- 5.5 Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy provides a focus for new development based around the existing principal settlements in the District. Lound is identified as one of a series of other settlements that have limited or no services and facilities or access to public transport and which are unsuitable for growth (and as addressed in Policy CS9).
- 5.6 Policy CS9 of the Core Strategy sets out the limited development opportunities and requirements for the other settlements in the District's settlement hierarchy. In summary these include:

Housing Development - Proposals for the development of housing within these settlements, other than for conversions or replacement dwellings in line with Policies DM2 and DM3, will not be supported. All housing development resulting in a net gain of one or more units will be required to contribute towards the achievement of the District's rural affordable housing targets. This will be either through on-site provision (where appropriate) or through a financial contribution to the delivery or improvement of rural affordable housing.



Employment Development - Developments which deliver rural employment opportunities, of a scale and type appropriate to the settlement and surrounding land uses, and in line with policies DM1 - DM3 and other material considerations, will be supported

Community Facilities - Proposals for the provision of rural community services and facilities will be supported where they are of a scale appropriate to, and in accord with the role of, the settlement; where need and viability is proven; and where explicit community support is demonstrated. Proposals that will result in the loss of sites or premises currently, or previously, used for services and facilities will not be supported unless a series of circumstances are met.

- 5.7 The submitted Plan has been prepared within its wider adopted development plan context. In doing so it has relied on up-to-date information and research that has underpinned existing planning policy documents in the District. This is good practice and reflects key elements in Planning Practice Guidance on this matter. It is clear that the submitted Plan seeks to add value to the Core Strategy and to give a local dimension to the delivery of its policies. This is captured in the Basic Conditions Statement.
- 5.8 The District Council has started work on the production of a new Local Plan. Once adopted it will replace the Core Strategy. Focussed consultation on the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan took place in June and July 2021 whilst the neighbourhood plan examination was taking place. This process followed on from earlier consultation on the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan in November 2020 which included strategic policies and proposed site allocations. Whilst BDC has made good progress on the emerging Plan it is not at a sufficiently-advanced stage to play any significant role in the examination of the submitted neighbourhood plan.

*Visit to the neighbourhood area*

- 5.9 I visited the neighbourhood area on 1 July 2021. I approached from Babworth and Sutton from the south. This helped me to understand the neighbourhood area in its wider landscape context.
- 5.10 I looked initially at the historic core of the village. I saw the way in which a range of buildings were arranged off Town Street. In several cases they had an attractive arrangement in sitting at right-angles to the Street. I saw the village green and the open area around the war memorial.
- 5.11 At the northern end of Town Street I walked to the north and east up to the wooded area to the immediate west of the lakes. I saw the various proposed strategic green gaps in this part of the neighbourhood area.
- 5.12 I then walked back to Town Street and then Little Top Lane. I saw that it had a very different character from that of Town Street and was defined by its bungalows on the east side and open countryside/paddocks to the west.

- 5.13 I then walked along the southern part of Town Street to look at the three proposed housing allocations. In doing so I saw the Village Hall opened in 1934 in memory of H.F. Huntsman of Lound Hall.
- 5.14 I then drove along Chainbridge Lane to the east. I saw that its character eventually becomes more commercial.
- 5.15 Thereafter I drove to the west along Daneshill Road. I saw the various commercial uses and then the more recreational areas around Daneshill Lakes.
- 5.16 I then drove to Torwoth to the west. This helped me to understand the landscape setting of the neighbourhood area more fully and its relationship to the strategic road network (A638).

## 6 The Neighbourhood Plan and the Basic Conditions

- 6.1 This section of the report deals with the submitted neighbourhood plan as a whole and the extent to which it meets the basic conditions. The submitted Basic Conditions Statement has helped considerably in the preparation of this section of the report. It is a well-presented, informative and professional document.
- 6.2 As part of this process I must consider whether the submitted Plan meets the Basic Conditions as set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. To comply with the basic conditions, the Plan must:
- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
  - contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
  - be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan in the area;
  - be compatible with European Union (EU) obligations and the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR); and
  - not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (7).

I assess the Plan against the basic conditions under the following headings.

### *National Planning Policies and Guidance*

- 6.3 For the purposes of this examination the key elements of national policy relating to planning matters are set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) issued in July 2021.
- 6.4 The NPPF sets out a range of core land-use planning principles to underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. The following are of particular relevance to the Lound Neighbourhood Development Plan:
- a plan led system– in this case the relationship between the neighbourhood plan and the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy;
  - delivering a sufficient supply of homes;
  - building a strong, competitive economy;
  - recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving local communities;
  - taking account of the different roles and characters of different areas;
  - highlighting the importance of high-quality design and good standards of amenity for all future occupants of land and buildings; and
  - conserving heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.
- 6.5 Neighbourhood plans sit within this wider context both generally, and within the more specific presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 13 of the NPPF indicates that neighbourhoods should both develop plans that support the strategic

needs set out in local plans and plan positively to support local development that is outside the strategic elements of the development plan.

- 6.6 In addition to the NPPF I have also taken account of other elements of national planning policy including Planning Practice Guidance and the recent ministerial statements.
- 6.7 Having considered all the evidence and representations available as part of the examination I am satisfied that the submitted Plan has had regard to national planning policies and guidance in general terms. It sets out a positive vision for the future of the neighbourhood area. It includes a series of policies that address a range of housing development and environmental matters. The Basic Conditions Statement maps the policies in the Plan against the appropriate sections of the NPPF.
- 6.8 At a more practical level the NPPF indicates that plans should provide a clear framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made and that they should give a clear indication of how a decision-maker should react to a development proposal (paragraph 16d). This was reinforced with the publication of Planning Practice Guidance in March 2014. Paragraph ID:41-041-20140306 indicates that policies in neighbourhood plans should be drafted with sufficient clarity so that a decision-maker can apply them consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. Policies should also be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.
- 6.9 As submitted the Plan does not fully accord with this range of practical issues. The majority of my recommended modifications in Section 7 relate to matters of clarity and precision. They are designed to ensure that the Plan fully accords with national policy.

*Contributing to sustainable development*

- 6.10 There are clear overlaps between national policy and the contribution that the submitted Plan makes to achieving sustainable development. Sustainable development has three principal dimensions – economic, social and environmental. It is clear to me that the submitted Plan has set out to achieve sustainable development in the neighbourhood area. In the economic dimension the Plan includes a policy on infill development (Policy 2) and three policies which propose residential allocations (Policies 12-14). In the social role, it includes policies on community facilities (Policy 11) and on local green spaces (Policy 5). In the environmental dimension the Plan positively seeks to protect its natural, built and historic environment. It includes specific policies on landscape character (Policy 4), flood risk (Policy 6), design (Policy 7) and heritage assets (Policy 9). This assessment overlaps with the Parish Council's comments on this matter in the submitted Basic Conditions Statement.

*General conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan*

- 6.11 I have already commented in detail on the development plan context in the wider Bassetlaw District in paragraphs 5.4 to 5.8 of this report.

- 6.12 I consider that the submitted Plan delivers a local dimension to this strategic context and supplements the detail already included in the adopted Core Strategy. The Basic Conditions Statement helpfully relates the Plan's policies to policies in the Core Strategy. Subject to the recommended modifications in this report I am satisfied that the submitted Plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan.

*European Legislation and Habitat Regulations*

- 6.13 The Neighbourhood Plan General Regulations 2015 require a qualifying body either to submit an environmental report prepared in accordance with the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 or a statement of reasons why an environmental report is not required. In order to comply with this requirement, BDC prepared a Screening Determination on the need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for the Plan in February 2021. The report is thorough and well-constructed. As a result of this process BDC concluded that the Plan is not likely to have any significant effects on the environment and accordingly would not require SEA.
- 6.14 The screening report includes the responses from the three consultation bodies. This is best practice.
- 6.15 BDC also prepared a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the Plan at the same time. The report is very thorough and comprehensive. It assesses the likely effects of the implementation of the policies in the Plan on the potential Sherwood Forest SPA. For completeness it also assesses the impact of the Plan on two SSSI (Sutton and Lound Gravel Pits and the Mattersey Hill Marsh). It concludes that the neighbourhood plan will not give rise to likely significant effects on European sites, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, and Appropriate Assessment is not required.
- 6.16 Having reviewed the information provided to me as part of the examination I am satisfied that a proportionate process has been undertaken in accordance with the various regulations. None of the statutory consultees have raised any concerns with regard to either neighbourhood plan or to European obligations. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, I am entirely satisfied that the submitted Plan is compatible with this aspect of European obligations.
- 6.17 In a similar fashion I am satisfied that the submitted Plan has had regard to the fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed under the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and that it complies with the Human Rights Act. There is no evidence that has been submitted to me to suggest otherwise. There has been full and adequate opportunity for all interested parties to take part in the preparation of the Plan and to make their comments known. On this basis, I conclude that the submitted Plan does not breach, nor is in any way incompatible with the ECHR.

*Summary*

- 6.18 On the basis of my assessment of the Plan in this section of my report I am satisfied that it meets the basic conditions subject to the incorporation of the recommended

modifications contained in this report. Section 7 assesses each policy against the basic conditions. Where necessary it recommends modifications on a policy-by-policy basis.

## 7 The Neighbourhood Plan policies

- 7.1 This section of the report comments on the policies in the Plan. In particular, it makes a series of recommended modifications to ensure that the various policies have the necessary precision to meet the basic conditions.
- 7.2 My recommendations focus on the policies themselves given that the basic conditions relate primarily to this aspect of neighbourhood plans. In some cases, I have also recommended changes to the associated supporting text.
- 7.3 I am satisfied that the content and the form of the Plan is fit for purpose. It is distinctive and proportionate to the Plan area. The wider community and LPC have spent time and energy in identifying the issues and objectives that they wish to be included in their Plan. This sits at the heart of the localism agenda.
- 7.4 The Plan has been designed to reflect Planning Practice Guidance (41-004-20170728) which indicates that neighbourhood plans must address the development and use of land. It also includes non-land use Community Projects in Appendix A.
- 7.5 I have addressed the policies in the order that they appear in the submitted plan.
- 7.6 For clarity this section of the report comments on all policies whether or not I have recommended modifications in order to ensure that the Plan meets the basic conditions.
- 7.7 Where modifications are recommended to policies they are highlighted in bold print. Any associated or free-standing changes to the text of the Plan are set out in italic print.

### *The initial sections of the Plan (Sections 1-9)*

- 7.8 The Plan as a whole is well-organised and includes effective maps, tables and photographs. It makes an appropriate distinction between the policies and their supporting text. Its design will ensure that it will comfortably be able to take its place as part of the development plan in the event that it is eventually 'made'. The initial elements of the Plan set the scene for the policies. They are proportionate to the Plan area and the subsequent policies.
- 7.9 Section 1 and 2 comment about the background to neighbourhood planning. They also helpfully describe the local planning context within which the Plan has been prepared. Section 2 includes a map showing the designated neighbourhood area and describes the Plan period. Section 3 sets out the need for the Plan and its connection to the strategic housing requirement in the emerging Local Plan for the wider District.
- 7.10 Section 4 comments about the consultation process which was undertaken on the Plan. It overlaps with the submitted Consultation Statement.
- 7.11 Section 5 comments about the status of the projects and actions as set out in Appendix A

- 7.12 Section 6 comments about the special and distinctive features of the neighbourhood area. It is a particularly successful part of the Plan. It provides detailed information about its location, its people, its history, its built environment and its business base.
- 7.13 Sections 7 and 8 set out the Plan's Community Vision and the supporting Community Objectives respectively. They are both well-developed and distinctive to the neighbourhood area.
- 7.14 Section 9 comments about the importance of developers engaging with the community as they seek to bring forward proposals. It establishes a 'Key Principle on this matter.
- 7.15 The remainder of this section of the report addresses each policy in turn in the context set out in paragraphs 7.5 to 7.7 of this report.

#### Housing Delivery

- 7.16 The Plan has sought to deliver the housing growth for the neighbourhood area as anticipated in the emerging Local Plan. Policy ST1 of the emerging Local Plan sets out a requirement for 10013 dwellings in the District between 2020 to 2037. This overall figure includes about 1500 dwellings in small rural settlements on appropriate sites within development boundaries or on-site allocations in neighbourhood plans by up to 5% of the existing number of homes in the parish concerned.
- 7.17 In this context the Plan comments about the close collaboration between LPC and BDC's policy team since 2016, both as part of the work on the Neighbourhood Plan and as part of the consultation on the Local Plan. The submitted Plan delivers the local growth anticipated in the emerging Plan. This limited growth reflects the extent of local facilities and the availability of suitable sites.
- 7.18 Policies 12 to 14 of the Plan allocate sites for development. I address them later in this report. Part of the context for their development has been weaved in to Policies 1 and 2 which set a broader spatial strategy for development and identify a development boundary. In the round I am satisfied that this approach meets the basic conditions. The Plan has responded positively to the national and local growth agenda. In particular I am satisfied that the modest amount of growth promoted in the plan does not conflict with the broader approach to housing delivery as set out in the adopted Core Strategy.

#### Policy 1: Sustainable Development and the Development Boundary

- 7.19 This policy comments about sustainable development. It seeks to ensure that new development is concentrated within the identified development boundary. The policy sets a wider spatial strategy for the Plan.
- 7.20 BDC make general comments about the relationship between Policy 1 and Policy 2 of the Plan and question whether Policy 1 is necessary. I have considered this matter very carefully. Whilst the policies could have been expressed in a more streamlined fashion with a degree of modifications their combined effect meets the basic conditions. In particular Policy 1 provides a helpful and broader context for the wider Plan which



will assist in the delivery of the strategic allocation for the parish in the emerging Local Plan.

- 7.21 As submitted the first part of the policy would apply to all development in the development boundary. Many such proposals will be of a domestic or minor nature and will not directly affect the criteria listed in the policy. I recommend modifications so that the policy can be applied in a proportionate fashion. I also recommend detailed modifications to the wording of the criteria so that they have the clarity required by the NPPF.
- 7.22 The second part of the policy applies the principles of national and local planning policies to the remainder of the parish outside the development boundary. Whilst the approach is entirely appropriate, I recommend a modification to its wording so that it has the clarity required by the NPPF.

**Replace the opening element of the first part of the policy with: ‘Development proposals within the development boundary as defined on Map 16 will be supported where, as appropriate to their scale, nature and location, they meet the principles of sustainable development by:’**

**In e) replace ‘where possible’ with ‘where practicable’**

**Replace h) with: ‘not intensifying existing land drainage and sewerage issues in the immediate locality’**

**In the second part of the policy replace: ‘Outside the Development Boundary proposals will be limited to development that’ with: ‘Proposals outside the settlement boundary will only be supported where they promote development that’**

Policy 2: Infill Development and Density

- 7.23 This policy comments about infill development within the defined development boundary and offers support to such developments subject to a series of criteria. It provides commentary about development densities based on the work undertaken in assessment of different character areas in the Design Guide.
- 7.24 There is a degree of conflict between the policy and paragraph 177 of the Plan which comments that ‘where the 5% housing requirement for Lound has been achieved, additional housing development will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that it has the support of the community and the District Council through the review of the neighbourhood plan’. In its response to the clarification note LPC commented:

*‘The Lound Neighbourhood Plan is now able to allocate sites in order to provide the 5% development which is currently required. This has been done based on the aspirations of landowners and the preferences of local residents. It is the best plan that can be made today, but it cannot be guaranteed that all, or indeed any, of these proposed dwellings will actually be built. Hence it is important that Policy 2 stands in*

*readiness to fulfil any shortfall in housing that evolves, probably on new sites. This will only be needed if the full BDC requirement cannot be achieved on the allocated sites. Additionally, the new Local Plan is not yet adopted. Until it is, Policy 2 provides an important policy framework for planning applications'*

- 7.25 In all the circumstances I am satisfied that LPC has taken an appropriate approach to this matter. Irrespective of policy considerations it is likely that proposals for infill development will naturally arise within the Plan period. In addition, it is likely that they will be of a limited scale given the layout of the built fabric of the village. In any event, such proposals will not undermine the wider strategic objectives of the emerging Local Plan. In these circumstances I recommend modifications both to the policy, the supporting text and to paragraph 177 to ensure that the Plan is internally consistent. In particular I recommend that the second and third parts of the policy are reconfigured so that they become additional criteria associated with the first part of the policy. Such modifications will achieve the clarity required by the NPPF.

**In the initial section of the first part of the policy delete 'only'**

**In the first part of the policy replace 'where development is' with 'where the resulting development is'**

**In a) delete 'therefore'**

**Replace the second and third parts of the policy with:**

**'c) designed not to cause an unacceptable impact on the privacy or amenity of adjoining properties; and**

**d) designed to ensure that the density of development reflects the patterns of local distinctiveness as identified on Map 3'**

*Replace paragraph 177 of the Plan with: 'The Plan has been designed to deliver the 5% housing requirement for Lound as identified in the emerging Local Plan. Additional housing development within the development boundary will be carefully controlled in the context of Policy 2 of this Plan'*

Policy 3: Biodiversity

- 7.26 This policy comments that proposals should consider how they will respond, conserve and enhance biodiversity and are required to demonstrate that they have regard to a series of criteria. It has a separate element relating to the protection of mature trees, hedges and grass verges.
- 7.27 As submitted the first part of the policy would apply to all development in the development boundary. Many such proposals will be of a domestic or minor nature and will not directly affect the criteria listed in the policy. I recommend modifications so that it can be applied in a proportionate fashion.

- 7.28 I also recommend detailed modifications to the wording of other parts of the wider policy. I also recommend that the final sentence of the third part of the policy is repositioned into the supporting text. It is a process matter rather than a policy.

**In the first part of the policy insert the following at the beginning of the second sentence: ‘As appropriate to their scale, nature and location’**

**In a) replace ‘adverse’ with ‘unacceptable’**

**In c) replace ‘wherever possible’ with ‘where practicable’**

**In the third part of the policy replace ‘not possible’ with ‘not practicable’**

**Delete the final sentence of the third part of the policy**

*At the end of paragraph 83 add: ‘The third part of the policy addresses mature trees. Where replacement trees are required as part of a development proposal their planting will be controlled either by way of a planning condition or a legal agreement based on the circumstances of the particular development.’*

Policy 4: Enhancing Landscape Character

- 7.29 This policy celebrates the landscape character of the parish. It identifies a series of key views which development proposals need to respect. It also identifies four Significant Green Gaps (SGGs).
- 7.30 The identified views are a good reflection of the character of the neighbourhood area. Their identification meets the basic conditions
- 7.31 The SGGs are parcels of land on the edge of the defined development boundary. I looked at them carefully during the visit both in their own right and to establish the extent to which they would bring added value to the second part of Policy 1 of the Plan which effectively addresses development in the countryside. I sought LPC’s views on this issue in the clarification note. It commented as follows:

*‘Neighbourhood Plans provide the opportunity to provide locally distinct policies. Significant Green Gaps are very important and are highly valued by the people of Lound. Public consultation shows concern to ensure that inappropriate housing development does not damage these places. The Steering Group’s intention was to make sure that such highly sensitive areas adjoining the Development Boundary are protected. It is acknowledged that Significant Green Gaps are referenced in Policy 1, but this is an overarching policy setting the standard for development across the Parish. Policy 4 was intended to provide more specific reasoning for the inclusion of Significant Green Gaps and Key Views. It is contended that it provides a clear policy framework for the consideration of development that may impact on the landscape character of the Parish’*

- 7.32 On the balance of the evidence I am satisfied that the SGGs have been carefully defined. They are distinctive parcels of land which immediately adjoin the defined development boundary.

- 7.33 The policy requires that new development takes account of the identified views and the SGGs. Its format is complicated and merges supporting text and policy. I recommend modifications to its structure to remedy this matter. However, the effect of the policy remains unchanged. The elements of supporting text recommended to be deleted from the policy are already addressed in detail in the text preceding the policy (and specifically in paragraphs 84-91 on general matters, paragraphs 92-95 on key views and paragraphs 96-97 on the SGGs).

**Replace the first part of the policy with:**

**‘As appropriate to their scale, nature and location development proposals should respond positively to, and conserve and enhance the character of the local landscape. In particular proposals should demonstrate how they would either conserve or enhance the openness of the identified key views (as shown on Map 8) and how they would maintain or strengthen the identified qualities of the significant green gaps (as shown on Map 9)’**

**In the second part of the policy delete the first sentence. Thereafter replace ‘are supported’ with ‘will be supported’**

Policy 5: Local Green Spaces

- 7.34 This policy proposes the designation of five local green spaces (LGSs). It seeks to apply the principles in the NPPF on this matter to sites in the parish. The proposed LGSs are described in the Plan and assessed against the three criteria in paragraph 102 the NPPF. I looked at the proposed LGS during my visit to the parish.
- 7.35 Based on my own observations and the information in the Plan I am satisfied that the following proposed LGSs meet the basic conditions:
- LGS1 Village Green;
  - LGS2 Playing Fields;
  - LGS3 Poplar Walk; and
  - LGS5 War Memorial.

In several cases they are precisely the types of green spaces which the authors of the NPPF would have had in mind in preparing national policy. The Village Green (LGS1) and the Playing Fields (LGS2) are particularly good examples of informal and formal LGSs respectively.

- 7.36 In addition, I am satisfied that their proposed designation would accord with the more general elements of paragraph 101 of the NPPF. Firstly, I am satisfied that their designation is consistent with the local planning of sustainable development. They do not otherwise prevent sustainable development coming forward in the neighbourhood area and no such development has been promoted or suggested. Secondly, I am satisfied that the LGSs are capable of enduring beyond the end of the Plan period. Indeed, they are an established element of the local environment and, in most cases, have existed in their current format for many years. In addition, no evidence was

brought forward during the examination that would suggest that the proposed local green spaces would not endure beyond the end of the Plan period.

- 7.37 Proposed LGS4 (Linghurst Lakes) is a lakeland-environment and provides a diverse area of "parkland" containing walks and seating areas. It provides a tranquil setting. I am satisfied that it is within reasonably close proximity to Lound and is demonstrably special to the local community and holds a particular significance. However, at 29ha the proposed area is significantly larger than the other proposed LGSs. On this matter I sought LPC's comments on the extent to which it considered the parcel of land to be local in character. It commented as follows:

*'The Steering Group's intention was to highlight the importance of Linghurst Lakes (LGS 4) in the Plan. It is only a short walk from the centre of the village and is certainly "local in character", even at 29 hectares. The Examiner is respectfully reminded that there is no definition of what an extensive tract of land is in the NPPF. The Parish Council does own Linghurst Lakes and the area is protected by a covenant; it is also part of a Local Wildlife Site. However, its importance for both recreational and wildlife purposes to the village is such that it is almost inconceivable that it would not be mentioned prominently in the Lound Neighbourhood Plan. The Steering Group and the community strongly support its designation as a Local Green Space.'*

- 7.38 I have considered this matter very carefully. I have concluded that Linghurst Lakes is an extensive tract of land rather than one which is local in character as required by the NPPF. In these circumstances I recommend that LGS4 is deleted from the policy. Nevertheless, I recommend that the significance of Linghurst Lakes is reflected in the supporting text and an indication provided about its existing protection by covenant, its designation as a Local Wildlife Site and its ownership by LPC.
- 7.39 The second part of the policy sets out the implications for LGS designation. It seeks to follow the approach as set out in paragraph 103 of the NPPF. However, it goes beyond that approach in indicating that developments will only be supported where it 'clearly enhances the Local Green Space for the purpose for which it was designated'.
- 7.40 Given the diversity of proposed LGSs I can understand the circumstances which have caused the Parish Council to design the policy in this way. Nevertheless, I recommend a modification so that the policy takes the matter-of-fact approach in the NPPF. The recommended modification also takes account of the recent case in the Court of Appeal on the designation of local green spaces and the policy relationship with areas designated as Green Belts (2020 EWCA Civ 1259).
- 7.41 In the event that development proposals affecting designated LGSs come forward within the Plan period, they can be assessed on a case-by-case basis by BDC. In particular BDC will be able to make an informed judgement on the extent to which the proposal concerned demonstrates the 'very special circumstances' required by the policy. I recommend that the supporting text clarifies this matter.

**Replace the second part of the policy with:**

**'Development proposals within the designated local green spaces will only be supported in very special circumstances'**

*At the end of paragraph 101 add: 'Policy 5 follows the matter-of-fact approach in the NPPF. In the event that development proposals come forward on the local green spaces within the Plan period, they can be assessed on a case-by-case basis by the District Council. In particular it will be able to make an informed judgement on the extent to which the proposal concerned demonstrates the 'very special circumstances' required by the policy'. The parish Council considered the designation of Lingham Lakes as a LGS. It is within reasonably close proximity to Lound and is demonstrably special to the local community and holds a particular significance. However, at 29 ha it is an extensive tract of land rather than a parcel of land which is local in character. Nevertheless, its protection within the Plan period is safeguarded by an existing covenant, its designation as a Local Wildlife Site and its ownership by Lound Parish Council'*

*Delete LGS4 from the details in the Plan and from Map 10*

#### Policy 6: Flood Risk and Drainage

- 7.42 This policy addresses flood risk issues and drainage. It has two related parts. The first is that developments should result in a net reduction of surface water run-off. The second is that all developments other than minor extensions should incorporate sustainable urban drainage techniques (SUDs)
- 7.43 The policy is underpinned by extensive supporting text. Some elements have been informed by community consultation during the preparation of the Plan.
- 7.44 The policy takes an ambitious approach to the use of SUDs systems. In addition, the second part of the policy recognises that any such drainage schemes should be proportionate to the development concerned. I sought LPC's comment on the extent to which there is evidence to support the requirement for the use of SUDs to all developments other than minor proposals. It responded as follows:
- 'The problems in Lound with sewage and surface water flooding are not the ones that are typically found on low lying land close to water courses. Rather, local evidence shows these are problems caused by the village's poor drains, which are old, prone to blockages and apparently near their flow capacity limit. The comments from Severn Trent Water for the Regulation 14 Consultation formed the basis of significant amendments to the Neighbourhood Plan in this regard. Understandably, residents who have experienced such "sewage on the lawn" episodes are concerned that the development of additional houses can only worsen a problem, which anyway will increase over time with climate change. Paragraphs 104 to 109 cover this, but it is suggested that paragraph 104 might be reinforced with new words after the second sentence along the lines of "A number of properties have suffered from overflows of the foul sewer and the surface water drains, resulting in effluent in their garages and on their gardens. Although this is not something that happens every year, such events cannot be acceptable'*
- 7.45 I have considered this matter very carefully. In doing so I am not satisfied that the policy has regard to national policy (as set out in the NPPF). In doing so it takes an unduly onerous approach.

7.46 Paragraphs 159 to 161 of the NPPF set out national policy as follows: ‘Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Strategic policies should be informed by a strategic flood risk assessment, and should manage flood risk from all sources. They should consider cumulative impacts in, or affecting, local areas susceptible to flooding, and take account of advice from the Environment Agency and other relevant flood risk management authorities, such as lead local flood authorities and internal drainage boards. All plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development – taking into account all sources of flood risk and the current and future impacts of climate change – so as to avoid, where possible, flood risk to people and property’

7.47 In general terms the Plan has followed this approach. In particular it has:

- identified allocated sites for housing development;
- included criteria for their drainage in the site-specific policies;
- set out a policy approach which concentrates new development in an identified development boundary; and
- the identified development boundary is well away from Flood Zones 2 and 3 (as shown on Map 11a in the Plan)

7.48 In this context the second part of the policy seeks to apply elements of both the sequential test (NPPF 161 to 162) and the exceptions tests (NPPF 163 to 165) in national policy where such an approach may not be required. In all the circumstances I recommend that the second part of the policy is recast to ensure that it has regard to national policy. In particular the modifications result in a policy which is more general in nature and responds to the nature of the proposal concerned and its specific effects on the local water environment. The modifications also include a new part of the policy which offers particular support to proposals which include sustainable urban drainage approaches.

**Replace the first part of the policy with:**

**‘Development proposals should not increase the risk of flooding and, where practicable, should achieve a net decrease in surface water run-off rates, including through green infrastructure provision such as the planting of native trees and bushes’**

**Replace the second part of the policy with:**

**‘2. Development proposals should incorporate drainage systems commensurate with their scale and impact. In addition, where it is appropriate and practicable to do so proposals should provide multifunctional benefits by providing natural flood management and mitigation through the improvement or creation of green infrastructure.’**

**3. Development proposals that incorporate sustainable urban drainage systems which respond sensitively to the water and drainage in the neighbourhood area will be particularly supported'**

*Replace paragraph 107 with: 'Paragraph 159 of the NPPF comments that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. The Plan has achieved this approach in a variety of ways.'*

*At the beginning of paragraph 108 add: 'The third part of Policy 6 offers specific support for developments which include sustainable urban drainage schemes'*

**Policy 7: Achieving high-quality design**

7.49 This policy provides a very positive and well considered approach to the design agenda. It is based on the character work undertaken for the Design Guide and as summarised in Table 4 of the Plan. The policy has five related parts as follows:

- proposals should demonstrate a high design quality that accords with National Design Guide standards, 'Building for a Healthy Life' or equivalent and contributes to the character of the village;
- particular attention should be given to landscaping schemes and boundary treatment;
- materials, scale and massing should also reinforce the existing character area.
- proposals should demonstrate how they comply with a series of design and layout criteria; and
- new developments should be appropriate to their location and context.

7.50 The policy has been very well-developed. In particular it takes account of the National Design Guide and the assessment of character areas in its own Design Code. This ensures that it is very distinctive to the parish. I recommend that the fourth part of the policy is modified so that it would be applied on a proportionate basis. This will acknowledge that most of the proposals which come forward in the Plan period will be in the development boundary and will be minor in nature. Whilst the Plan was prepared and submitted before the 2021 version of the NPPF was published it is underpinned by a range of assessments and detailed studies as highlighted in paragraph 129 of that version of the NPPF. In this context I am satisfied that the policy meets the basic conditions. It will assist significantly in delivering the environmental dimension of sustainable development.

**At the beginning of the fourth element of the policy add: 'As appropriate to their scale, nature and location development'**

**Policy 8: Energy efficiency in design**

7.51 This policy addresses a series of energy efficiency issues. It includes elements on:



- support for the construction of low carbon homes;
- support for the sensitive retrofitting of energy efficiency measures in historic properties; and
- the application of water efficiency standards.

7.52 In general terms the policy has been well-developed and meets the basic conditions. However, to bring the clarity required by the NPPF I recommend detailed modifications to the wording of the three parts of the policy. I also recommend that the examples in the second part of the policy are relocated into the supporting text.

**In the first part of the policy replace ‘are supported’ with ‘will be supported’**

**In the second part of the policy replace ‘is supported’ with ‘will be supported’**

**In the second part of the policy delete ‘This could be achieved through: (and the two examples)’**

**In the third part of the policy replace ‘will be required to’ with ‘should’**

*At the end of paragraph 130 add: ‘The second part of Policy 8 addresses this important matter. Retrofitting can be achieved through a range of measures including [at this point add a) and b) from the policy]’*

#### Policy 9: Heritage Assets

- 7.53 This policy comments about heritage assets. It identifies the various assets in tables/maps and then applies the approach in national policy to the assets.
- 7.54 The policy takes a positive approach to this important matter. It also takes account of the significance of historic buildings to the character and appearance of the village.
- 7.55 I recommend a series of detailed modifications to the policy to ensure that it has the clarity required by the NPPF. In particular I recommend the deletion of the third part of the policy. The policy element with regard to non-designated assets is addressed in the fourth part of the policy and its format follows the equivalent element of national policy. Otherwise, the policy meets the basic conditions. It will assist significantly in the delivery of the environmental dimension of sustainable development.

**In the first part of the policy replace ‘permitted’ with ‘supported’ and ‘shall not harm’ with ‘does not have an unacceptable impact on’**

**Delete the third part of the policy.**

#### Policy 10: Mix of Housing Types

- 7.56 This policy seeks to achieve a mix of housing types to meet local housing needs. It has two related parts. The first requires that the mix of house types should reflect the most recent evidence on this matter. The second requires that houses with 1-3 bedrooms should be constructed to Building Regulations Part M4(2).
- 7.57 The first part of the policy meets the basic conditions with a modification to the wording used.

- 7.58 In the clarification note I sought LPC's comments on the evidence which underpinned the approach taken in the second part of the policy. It advised that:

*'The evidence relates to the needs of the local ageing population, supporting older people wanting to stay in their houses in the village, and the importance of creating homes that are sustainable. Both themes are referenced throughout the Neighbourhood Plan.'*

- 7.59 On balance I am satisfied that the Plan has made a strong case for such an approach. Nevertheless, I recommend that its format is simplified. In particular there is no need for the policy to describe the details of the Building Regulations Part M4(2).

**In the first part of the policy replace 'will be required to' with 'should'**

**Replace the second part of the policy with: 'Proposals for 1-3 bed dwellings should be accessible and adaptable to the standards set out in Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations'**

Policy 11: Community Facilities

- 7.60 This policy celebrates the importance of community facilities in the parish. It has three related parts as follows:

- the identification of key community facilities and their safeguarding;
- the identification of a limited number of circumstances where proposals for the loss of an identified facility would be supported; and
- offering support for the development of new community facilities.

- 7.61 The policy is well-developed. In particular it acknowledges the importance of community facilities to the well-being of the parish. In addition, I am satisfied that the three identified facilities are appropriate to the neighbourhood area.

- 7.62 The second part of the policy takes a flexible approach to proposals which may affect the identified facilities. It takes account of changing circumstances and commercial viability.

- 7.63 The third part of the policy comments about proposals for new community facilities. It intends to concentrate them within the development boundary unless there is a need for a specific proposal and it cannot be more centrally-located. However, as BDC comments the Playing Fields are located outside the development boundary and a rigid interpretation of the policy could prevent additional facilities coming forward on that site. To remedy this issue, I recommend that the policy provides support to new facilities within or immediately adjacent to the development boundary. I also recommend that the policy builds in appropriate safeguards in respect of the amenities of any residential properties in the immediate vicinity of any site concerned.

**Replace the third part of the policy with:**

**'Proposals for new community facilities will be supported where they:**

- **are located within the Development Boundary or immediately adjacent to the development boundary; and**

- **do not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of residential properties in the immediate locality'**

#### *Housing Allocations*

- 7.64 Policies 12 to 14 of the Plan bring forward a package of housing sites in the village. They have been developed locally as the plan has progressed. They have been designed to deliver the local element of growth proposed for small villages as set out in the emerging Local Plan. This is a very positive approach.
- 7.65 Elements of the various policies and the supporting map details refer to the site numbers used as the Plan was being developed (and as other sites were considered). This is understandable. However, within the context of the Plan becoming part of the wider development plan this approach is no longer necessary. As such I recommend the removal of the references concerned. I do not repeat this explanation on a policy-by-policy basis.
- 7.66 In each policy I recommend modifications to the drainage-related criterion to ensure that the eventual solution for the individual site reflects the wider approach taken in Policy 6 of the Plan. I also recommend consequential modifications to the supporting text associated with each policy. I do not repeat this explanation on a policy-by-policy basis.

#### *Policy 12: Development of Yew Tree Farm site and outbuildings*

- 7.67 As the Plan comments the site contains large farm storage buildings and hard standing. The site is outside, but immediately adjoining, the Conservation Area and is in the setting of the listed Yew Tree farmhouse. As such, any development would need to have regard to this historic setting, the most appropriate types of buildings being of a traditional agricultural style which relate well to the listed Yew Tree farmhouse in terms of their layout, design and materials.
- 7.68 I am satisfied that the allocation of this site is appropriate and reflects its location in the village. Similarly, I am satisfied that it is accompanied by a carefully-selected range of distinctive criteria.

**In part 1 g) replace 'the use of.... Paragraph 80)' with 'the application of the principles set out in Policy 6 of this Plan'**

*Remove reference to NP number (NP19) in policy title and Map 17*

*In paragraph 184 delete the penultimate sentence.*

#### *Policy 13: Development of Land east of Town Street*

- 7.69 As the Plan comments the site is a field (of 0.15-hectare in size). It is proposed for one dwelling and will be deliverable in the medium term (10-15 years). The site adjoins, but is outside, the accepted development boundary (as defined for the work on the Core Strategy).

- 7.70 I am satisfied that the allocation of this site is appropriate and reflects its location in the village. Similarly, I am satisfied that it is accompanied by a carefully-selected range of distinctive criteria.

**In part 1 e) replace ‘the use of.... Paragraph 80)’ with ‘the application of the principles set out in Policy 6 of this Plan’**

*Remove reference to NP number in policy title (NP21 north) and Map 18*

*In paragraph 192 delete the final sentence.*

Policy 14: Development of Land east of Town Street

- 7.71 As the Plan comments the site is a field (of 0.15-hectare in size). It is located to the immediate south of the site identified in Policy 13. It is proposed for two dwellings. The site adjoins, but is outside, the accepted development boundary (as defined for the work on the Core Strategy).

- 7.72 I am satisfied that the allocation of this site is appropriate and reflects its location in the village. Similarly, I am satisfied that it is accompanied by a carefully-selected range of distinctive criteria.

**In part 1 e) replace ‘the use of.... Paragraph 80)’ with ‘the application of the principles set out in Policy 6 of this Plan’**

*Remove reference to NP number in policy title (NP21 south) and Map 19*

*In paragraph 198 delete the final sentence*

Community Projects

- 7.73 Appendix A identifies four community projects. I am satisfied that they are appropriate to the parish. In some cases, they will complement the land use policies.
- 7.74 The Plan follows best practice in including the projects in a separate section of the Plan.

Other Matters - General

- 7.75 This report has recommended a series of modifications both to the policies and to the supporting text in the submitted Plan. Where consequential changes to the text are required directly as a result of my recommended modification to the policy concerned, I have highlighted them in this report. However other changes to the general text may be required elsewhere in the Plan as a result of the recommended modifications to the policies. It will be appropriate for BDC and LPC to have the flexibility to make any necessary consequential changes to the general text. I recommend accordingly.

*Modification of general text (where necessary) to achieve consistency with the modified policies.*

## Implementation and Review

- 7.76 Section 22 of the Plan properly comments about the need for monitoring of any made neighbourhood plan. It also recognises that a review of the Plan may be required at some point within the Plan period.
- 7.77 The submitted Plan has been prepared within the context of a development plan context that pre-dates the introduction of the current version of the NPPF. BDC is now working towards the preparation of a new Local Plan. It is anticipated that the emerging Local Plan will be adopted in 2023. This process will be an important milestone in the development of planning policy in the District. I have commented elsewhere in this report about the relationship between the allocated sites in the Plan (as recommended to be modified) and the emerging clarity about the requirement for new development in the Plan period.
- 7.78 In these circumstances I recommend that the submitted neighbourhood plan includes a degree of commentary about the relationship between the emerging local plan and any made neighbourhood plan at that time. Plainly the Parish Council will need to consider the potential impact at that time and reach its own view on the need or otherwise for a review of the Plan.
- 7.79 I also recommend that this part of the Plan addresses three potential scenarios and/or outcomes arising from the adoption of the Local Plan. The first would be one where development does not proceed as planned on the three allocated housing sites. The second would be one where the adopted Local Plan required a higher yield of houses in the smaller villages. The third would be one where the balance between windfall development and allocated sites meeting the objectively-assessed housing requirement incorporated in the Local Plan varied from that proposed in Policy ST1 (B) of the emerging Local Plan

*At the end of paragraph 204 add: 'In particular the Parish Council will consider a review of the Plan if any or all of the three housing sites allocated in the Plan do not come forward. In addition, the adoption of the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2037 will be a key milestone in the formulation of the development plan for the District. In this context the Parish Council will consider the need for a review of the neighbourhood plan at that point. This task will be undertaken based on an assessment of developments that have taken place at that time in the neighbourhood area, the objectively-assessed housing requirement incorporated in the Local Plan and the way in which the adopted Plan proposes that the requirement is apportioned within the hierarchy in Policy ST1 (B).'*

## 8 Summary and Conclusions

### *Summary*

- 8.1 The Plan sets out a range of policies to guide and direct development proposals in the period up to 2037. It is distinctive in addressing a specific set of issues that have been identified and refined by the wider community to safeguard the character and setting of the neighbourhood area and its community facilities and to promote sensitive new development.
- 8.2 Following my independent examination of the Plan I have concluded that the Lound Neighbourhood Development Plan meets the basic conditions for the preparation of a neighbourhood plan subject to a series of recommended modifications.

### *Conclusion*

- 8.3 On the basis of the findings in this report I recommend to Bassetlaw District Council that subject to the incorporation of the modifications set out in this report that the Lound Neighbourhood Development Plan should proceed to referendum.

### *Other Matters*

- 8.4 I am required to consider whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the Plan area. In my view, the neighbourhood area is entirely appropriate for this purpose and no evidence has been submitted to suggest that this is not the case. I therefore recommend that the Plan should proceed to referendum based on the neighbourhood area as approved by Bassetlaw District Council on 7 July 2016.
- 8.5 I am grateful to everyone who has helped in any way to ensure that this examination has run in a smooth manner.

**Andrew Ashcroft**  
**Independent Examiner**  
**25 August 2021**