

Consultation statement Cuckney, Norton, Holbeck and Welbeck Review Neighbourhood Plan

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	2
<u>REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION RESPONSES</u>	3
COMMENTS FROM RESIDENTS	3
REGULATION 14 COMMENTS FROM OTHER CONSULTED BODIES AND STATUTORY CONSULTEES	14
<u>APPENDIX 1 – LEAFLET CIRCULATED MAY 2021 TO EXPLAIN THE PURPOSE OF THE NP REVIEW</u>	30
<u>APPENDIX 2 REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION SURVEY OFFERED ON LINE AND DELIVERED TO ALL HOUSEHOLDS MAY 2021</u>	36
<u>APPENDIX 3 LIST OF ALL THE BODIES SENT NOTIFICATIONS AT THE START OF THE REG 14 CONSULTATION:</u>	42

Introduction

This consultation statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations in accordance with the Localism Act 2011 for Cuckney, Norton, Holbeck and Welbeck's Review Neighbourhood Plan (hereafter the Review NP). The legal basis of the statement is provided by Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations which states that a consultation statement should:

- Contain details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Plan;
- Explain how they were consulted;
- Summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
- Describe how those issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.

Pre-Regulation 14 consultation

Throughout the Review process, a progress report was given to Norton and Cuckney Parish Council monthly and was made publicly available on the web site. All the reports can still be seen on www.nortonandcuckneypc.co.uk

A progress report was published from time to time in the Norton and Cuckney Parish Newsletter that is circulated around the NP area, which includes Holbeck and Welbeck.

At the beginning of May 2021, prior to the Reg 14 consultation period, an explanatory leaflet was delivered to every household in the NP area (see Appendix 1). This explained the reasons for the Neighbourhood Plan Review and identified the proposed changes made to the original Neighbourhood Plan of 2017. It highlighted the policies that had been amended in the Review NP (serving to provide clarity that the site allocations in the made NP remained the same).

The Regulation 14 consultation process

The consultation ran from 7th May to 18th June 2021. The full Review document 2021 was available on the Norton and Cuckney Parish Council web site. People were offered the opportunity to read a paper copy of the draft NP Review, but no-one took this up.

There was an online survey (see Appendix 2) on the same Neighbourhood Plan tab on the web site and everyone was invited to complete it. Members of the Neighbourhood Plan Monitoring Group were available to answer any queries. Their contact details were on the hand delivered leaflet.

As this was during the Covid19 lockdown period, the brochure also identified how to respond on-line, and invited people to attend the zoom meetings that we had arranged.

After two weeks, the uptake for the online survey was 9 responses. So, the Neighbourhood Plan Monitoring Group put a notice in the June edition of the Parish newsletter, and delivered paper questionnaires, (copies of the on-line survey) to every household. There was an increase in the responses (a total of 33) with the findings set out below.

As we were unable to consult residents face to face, we held 3 zoom meetings during the consultation period but had no response from residents. The first zoom consultation was on May 11th at 6.30pm.

On Wednesday June 16th, we were able to hold an open meeting in the village hall, where four residents came to discuss the NP Review.



Drop-In Session June 16th

Regulation 14 consultation responses


This section contains detailed responses and comments received on the draft Neighbourhood Plan throughout the Regulation 14 consultation period (between 7th May and 18th June 2021) from residents, statutory consultees and other consulted bodies.

Comments from residents

All the policies were put forward as part of the Regulation 14 consultation. Respondents were asked to say if they agreed or disagreed with the policy and there was the option to provide further comment. A total of 33 residents commented. A few residents provided additional commentary as part of their responses and this has been considered in the round when updating the Review Neighbourhood Plan for Submission. More substantive comments have been addressed as well (see below). All the policies were supported by a majority of residents as the charts show.

Cuckney, Norton, Holbeck and Welbeck
Neighbourhood Plan (Summary)


1. Community objectives p20. Objective 6 has been added – promote a low carbon approach to new buildings and conversion of old properties.



Comments:

- Pollution levels will still be too high in the village especially with a new community hall and extra car parking spaces for that. Noise levels will also be increased in a quiet village.
- 100% Support
- Agree with the community objectives, number 1,5,6 & 7 most important.
- We are surrounded by biogas, solar and wind but still our home in this area are coal powered and poorly insulated.
- In an estate drawing, there seems no evidence of the use of solar panels in the proposed new village hall and housing.
- All efforts must be made to renovate existing buildings to minimise the use of new materials and the impact on the local and wider environment and cost must be secondary consideration.
- Future energy schemes should be adopted where possible and if financially affordable.


2. Policy 1- sustainable development and development boundaries P26



Comments:

- shrinking the size of the park/playing field does not satisfy these recommendations!
- Agree with infill development and repair of existing empty properties and property to enable the expansion of the village community.
- What criteria or methodology be used to define "local need" for sites adjacent to boundaries?
- What is the size of the small sites outside the village boundaries?
- Previous development within Cuckney have eroded the character of the village further future development need careful consideration so not to detract from the character of the village further still.
- Would like to see Norton and Cuckney villages to retain their rural aspect.


3. Policy 2 – infill policy P27



Comments:

- building in cuckney will spoil the character of this village especially with the addition of a village hall which should not be sited in the centre of a quiet village.
- Cloning development design is overprotective. Our villages are an eclectic mix of style over several centuries and I feel it adds not detracts from the area
- While the policy as stated is all very well, recent developments "on the ground" do not seem to coincide with the stated aims.
- Very important to retain the character of the villages.
- Agree is development does not affect privacy or amenity of joining properties or effect the landscape.
- If the houses are in the settlement boundary, build them. Whether in keeping or not, this is the 21st Century.
- Will the parish council or the NP group have the final say in what materials are used in the construction of the new housing or will that be in the hands of the landowner or the construction firm?
- I would support the rural scale of infill development with the above stated requirements but these requirements seem to be overlooked by planning officers in our locality.


4. Policy 3 – Protecting the landscape (significant green gaps) P36



Comments:

- Therefore building on the park and allotments which were given to the village by the late Lady Anne Bentink should not proceed.
- These should be time limited, subject to review (say every 5 years)
- Again, the character, tradition and natural beauty of the area needs protecting.
- Any development should not represent an unacceptable view of the landscape and should fit into the village setting.
- The walls that surround us are not our home, what is outside that is our home. If we are not able to take ownership of our home, people will not care.
- The proposed buildings on the allotment site appear to mask the view of Bakers Row.
- Essential to the rural aspects to our rural village.


5. Policy 5a – Expanding employment in Welbeck P44



Comments:

- what you are intending to build will not improve employment opportunities.
- Welbeck Estates needs to think laterally and get Active
- Provided and development is in keeping with its surroundings
- Absolutely; employment and especially long-term sustainable employment are vital in rural areas.
- Fully agree that old character buildings in Welbeck village should be developed for new usage whilst still retaining the old building character.
- Knock them down, rebuild new sustainable projects fit for the 21st Century.
- Great idea, will start up businesses for example: benefit from initial lower rental/signposted to grants from local government.
- This policy could also be applied to a plea for Norton. Cuckney village hall to be refurbished or replaced on its present site which is more equidistant to both communities.
- Albeit ensuring such changed and recommissioning is completed in a sensitive and sympathetic approach.
- Local employment is desirable to cut carbon footprint and helpful in sustaining family life.


6. Policy 7 – Low carbon development and renewable energy P53



Comments:

- This will not reduce the pollution from all the vehicles using the carpark and the village hall.
- Where possible new development should incorporate feature to reduce carbon emissions and adapt to climate change.
- If a building does not support new carbon or renewable strategies, knock it down.
- New properties and the conversion of new properties would help to retain young people in the community.


7. Policy 8a 8b 8c Housing mix and affordable housing P59



Comments:

- There is no such thing as affordable housing especially for first time buyers and there are many houses still empty on the estate
- this was the driving force for the original plan and remains my key priority
- I believe in the last couple of years quite a few families have moved into the area.
- There is a real risk that local people will be driven out by the lack of available and affordable housing. Air B&Bs should be discouraged and Welbeck should keep rent affordable.
- The rural, quiet, sleepy village with the attraction for us. younger people are traditionally drawn to more livelier areas, (with mobile signal).
- Items A and C
- B and D. D, currently unaffordable or unmaintained.
- What about the infrastructure to service the additional housing?
- Did the specialist company approach residents and ask their opinion? if so what was their response and is it listed in any of the documents?
- How are you intending to make affordable housing available? Recent houses made available for rent by Welbeck have been in the region of £1000 calendar months (NOT AFFORDABLE TO LOCAL PEOPLE).
- Pressure may be needed re building contractors.

8. Policy 10b Lady Margaret Hall/ Community sports hub P65



Comments:

- This hall and surrounding area should be more than a sports hub but a major community hub. At present Lady Margaret Hall and Cuckney Village hall are time expired a community spaces not fit for purpose. Welbeck club is closed. We have nothing
- I think the emphasis should be on developing a multi sports facility
- Lady M Hall is ideally placed to host a range of activities which would support the local area.
- Anyone now can't get about very well, there is nothing for Norton, nowhere to meet up, not everyone drives a car, not a good bus time to get to Cuckney.
- Don't believe that his development is a priority at the present time but should be considered at a later date.
- Three tennis courts may be grants from LTA to support plans for indoor courts any plans to allow cyclists through the deer park to link up with existing bridleways.
- Will the LM sports hub available to local residents as in the past membership of the aforementioned tennis club, for example was over subscribed by outsiders and local folk found membership was not always available?
- Entertainment facilities may also be considered.

Note there were also two questions in the survey that related to future uses of the Norton and Cuckney Village Hall (which was a site secured as part of the made NP) rather than a question about the content of the Review NP so they have not been included in this summary.

There was a question 9 about a proposed Local Green Space – this was included in error in the pre submission draft Review NP as it had already been assessed and removed as part of the examination of the made NP. The community did not wish this LGS to be reconsidered again and the site was removed from the submission NP. The findings of this question are also not included in this summary.

The more substantive resident comments are set out below.

Comments from the Residents Community – Summary¹

Policy	% Agree or Strongly Agree	Comment	Response
Policy 1 Sustainable development and the development boundaries	90.6	shrinking the size of the park/playing field does not satisfy these recommendations what criteria defines local need	The development boundary does not alter the size of the playing field The NPSG commissioned a Housing Needs Assessment this is a supporting document this is combined with BDCs data on housing need in the area.
Policy 2 Infill	84.4	Will the parish council or the NP group have the final say in what materials are used in the construction of the new housing or will that be in the hands of the landowner or the construction firm? Cloning development design is overprotective. Our villages are an eclectic mix of style over several centuries and I feel it adds not detracts from the area While the policy as stated is all very well, recent developments "on the ground" do not seem to coincide with the stated aims.	The NP is supported by a design code that provides detail of the materials that would be appropriate. The design policy requires development to be in accordance with this. Ultimately BDC decide what materials will be acceptable as part of granting planning permission. The NP policy provides some flexibility to reflect existing character which in places is eclectic whilst not harming the existing character so should address both points.
Policy 3 Protecting the landscape	100	These should be time limited, subject to review (say every 5 years)	It is a statutory requirement that the NP is reviewed every 5 years.
Policy 5a Expanding employment in Welbeck	97	What you are intending to build will not improve employment opportunities	The conversion of underused or empty buildings to work units will attract new business and allow existing busines to expand

¹ Note residents were only asked to comment on those policies that were new to the review NP

Policy	% Agree or Strongly Agree	Comment	Response
Policy 7 Low carbon development and renewable energy	97	This will not reduce the pollution from all the vehicles using the carpark and the village hall	Agreed but other policies encourage more cycling and walking
Policy 8a,8b,8c Housing mix and affordable housing	78	How to make housing affordable	No - Affordable housing is a planning definition and does not mean cheaper market housing the definition is in para 15.22 and the glossary
Policy 10b Lady Margaret Hall and community sports hub	97	Will the LM sports hub available to local residents as in the past membership of the aforementioned tennis club, for example was oversubscribed by outsiders and local folk found membership was not always available? This hall and surrounding area should be more than a sports hub but a major community hub. Anyone now can't get about very well, there is nothing for Norton, nowhere to meet up, not everyone drives a car, not a good bus time to get to Cuckney.	<p>This will be a matter for discussion with the PC and the LM tennis club</p> <p>Agreed although there will be development limits given the sensitive rural and historic location.</p> <p>Agree that the rural nature of the NA means that public transport is difficult – it maybe that a dial a ride type service may be appropriate.</p>

Regulation 14 Comments from other consulted bodies and statutory consultees

This section contains the responses and comments received on the draft CNHW Review from the Regulation 14 consultation which ran from 7th May to the 18th June 2021. The responses are from both local residents, other consulted bodies and statutory consultees.

Comments from Statutory Consultees

BDC Policy Team

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
General	Bassetlaw Local Plan not adopted so carries no weight ref to policies may change. But 5% HRF is a NPPF requirement. Need to clarify if NP is delivering. HRF Status of development boundary policy is incorrect it is part of the adopted Local Plan	This is a review of the made NP. The Made NP had allocated sites for housing – there is no intention to amend these allocations This is explained at section 4 but has been expanded including ref to HRF. References to emerging Bassetlaw Plan have been clarified and status of development boundary corrected.	Y
Policy 1	Intention unclear – is there a need for policy 1 ?	Policy 1 was in the made NP. This review has tried to minimize the changes to the made NP. However, revisions based on the comments and the merging with policy 2 (see below) should address the matters raised.	Y
Policy 2	Would be better titled residential development and what is considered small development in relation to Holbeck ?	Policy 2 has been merged with policy 1 and criteria that referred to small development has been amended to relate to scale and density.	Y
Policy 3 (now renumbered policy 2)	How have the significant green gaps and important views been defined and what are their positive attributes for their designation?.i.e. are the views towards a particular landscape or heritage feature?	The criteria for assessing the SGGs has been added at Appendix E. The reasoning for the key views is provided in the text. The SGGs and key views are shown on maps. This is considered sufficient information to support the policy approach. The wording of policy 2 has been amended based on recent examination feedback on making the most of this approach in the policy wording.	Y
Policy 5a (now	No reference to the significant heritage constraints on site	Policy criteria 4a criteria added at 1a	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
renumbered policy 4a)			
Policy 5b (now renumbered policy 4b)	Hasn't this site already got outline planning permission? If so, the principle of development has already been set. It maybe that the Policy focuses more on the design of the development which could help influence a detailed planning application in the future?	Yes this site was allocated in the made NP for employment. However, the amendment to Use classes and the changed situation WRT development on the nearby former colliery site means that the policy needs rewording. There was some repetition in the previous wording of the policy and this has been removed.	Y
Policy 6 (now renumbered policy 5)	Making more of the design code work and conservation area appraisal information here would further emphasis the need for high-quality and sensitive design. Further integration of the recommendations in the design code work in to the supporting text and policy would help provide more local distinctiveness to this policy compared to others	More of the design code text has been added to the justification text and the policy wording has been amended to make fuller reference to it	Y
Policy 7 (now renumbered policy 6)	Some of these policy requirements are not yet in place as they are part of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan or through national guidance. We feel that any Policy for Renewable development should be encouraged but it will be the type and scale of renewable energy that is likely to need further control.	The ref to tree planting has been moved to policy 2 on landscape character and linked to the NPPF. References to emerging policies in the Local Plan have been removed. New criteria on small scale community energy schemes added.	Y
Policy 8a (now renumbered policy 7a)	reference to the local connection criteria needs to be checked as it may no longer apply or has since been superseded.	Response from Terry Roe is that it needs to be BDCs local connection criteria Appendix B amended	Y
Policy 8b (now	References to 20% for greenfield land and 10% for	Noted and removed	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
renumbered policy 7b)	brownfield land is from the emerging Local plan and is not yet Policy and therefore should be removed.		
Policy 8c (now renumbered policy 7c)	Make sure that this Policy conforms to that of the NPPF and exception sites	Noted and amended to remove requirement to meet adjoining development boundary	Y
Policy 9 (now renumbered policy 8)	Shouldn't parking standards be applied to all residential development and not just those on the A60 and A616	This policy is from the made NP. Work was done to justify this approach for the made plan – there is a local issue relating to the danger of on street parking on this part of the A60 which this policy seeks to address.	N
Policy 10a (now renumbered policy 9a)	Could policies 10a and 10b be merged as they are intrinsically linked and some of the criteria in part b would apply to those other facilities in part a?	Agreed policy merged	Y
Policy 11 (now renumbered policy 10)	As this policy only seems to be focusing on Welbeck, the criteria could be closely linked to the existing facilities on site and the enhancement of the local employment and visitor offer. In addition, the promotion of this area is likely to have an impact on its heritage assets and their setting should this needs to be considered.	Agreed policy relates to Welbeck Village – this area has been defined. References to the need to reflect design code, heritage and build on local enterprises added	Y
Policy 12	The area proposed was excluded from the CNHW NP at examination – it was included here in error and has been removed	Policy removed	Y
Policy 13 (now renumbered policy 11) And policy 14 (now	The principle of the allocation was made in the original Neighbourhood Plan and has therefore been supported in principle. Has there been any	Yes the principle is already established background text on site moved to appendix A (20 with extant policy. Link to requirement of design code and HNA added to revised policy)	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
renumbered policy 12)	movement on its delivery since the last plan?		
Policy 15 (now renumbered policy 13)	The principle of this site allocation is questionable.	Principle of development already established in the made NP the text clarifies community support remains revised policy link to Design Code added. Policy contains constraint requirement re heritage that means development of site will have to address sensitivity of the site.	Y
Policy 16 (now renumbered policy 14)	Would 9 dwellings be consistent with the existing character of the area in terms of scale and density of the surrounding streetscape? The area appears to have a low density and a linear form and therefore may conflict with part d of the policy criteria? The level of development being proposed for the site should factor in these issues.	Principle of development on the site established in made NP. Increase of 5 is due mainly to conversion of farm buildings that are now available adjoining the site this has been clarified and the site plan amended. Link to design code requirements added Site area extended to include whole development site.	Y

BDC Development Management

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
Policy 1	criterion a) how do we define development needs and what happens if you have a site within the development boundary but there is no identified need, would you be expecting it to be refused even though it is in the boundary?	In the context of this Plan the only development that would be acceptable within the development boundary is where it is for local need – development for holiday lets or build to rent (unless it is AH) would not be acceptable.	N
Policy 1 part 3	is it clear where we can identify local need?	The AECOM HNA identified local need a footnote has been added and in the supporting text this clarified further.	Y
Infill policy	not sure I fully understand 'unless a greater number would not lead to the	Matters addressed as infill policy wording has been amended and included in policy 1	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
	site being overdeveloped. A greater number than what? Infill policy part 2 – refers to redevelopment sites, I think infill and redevelopment are different?		
Policy 3	<p>Policy 3 1b – is it correct to make reference to ‘valued by local people’ in a policy? How would you determine this?</p> <p>Part 3 I would class a low brick wall as a soft boundary</p> <p>Part 4 – looking at key views I understand the sense of openness but not sure about a sense of place, is this the correct wording?</p> <p>Policy 3 Part 5 – I understand this but there is a wider issue here about how we are going to assess net gain from a practical point of view. Should we simply be saying that we would expect proposals to achieve net gain rather than it being negatively worded?</p>	<p>Wording has been amended and definition of SGG provided</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>This wording has been amended</p> <p>Agreed and wording of criteria 5 amended</p>	Y
Policy 5	NPPF ref needs updating and principals needs changing	Minor word changes and ref to NPPF para updated	Y
Policy 7	<p>can building regs legislation be used in policy? Wouldn't it be better to ask for planning apps to be accompanied by a statement demonstrating low carbon and renewable technologies?</p> <p>Criteria 5 is emerging LP policy</p>	<p>Criteria 2 amended to include this requirement</p> <p>Criteria 5 has been removed</p>	Y
Policy 8	<p>the housing needs assessment, is this readily available? Is it a local one?</p> <p>M(4) 2 needs ‘or equivalent’</p> <p>Criteria 4 it doesn't exclude a different number of bedrooms coming forward. Eg if a development of 4 beds came forward this point wouldn't necessarily prevent this.</p>	<p>Yes it is local and it is a supporting document on BDCs web site.</p> <p>The policy does not seek to exclude 4 bed houses but seeks to encourage 2/3 bed houses that are accessible</p>	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
	<p>Policy 8b, does this follow the local plan policy? Has it been assessed how this would be controlled if provision was made on an alternative site? How you ensure that the AH is delivered if its subject to a separate planning application? Plus I'm not convinced that this would lead to mixed communities where AH is integrated and to some degree this conflicts with criterion 3? How is the identified need demonstrated and by whom? 8C d) for the lifetime of the development as opposed to in perpetuity?</p>	<p>Policy has been amended to align with Core Strategy policy not emerging LP policy. The landowner Welbeck estates has agreed to sign a legal agreement if the AH was delivered across two sites.</p> <p>The need is in accordance with the HNA In perpetuity</p>	
Policy 10a	<p>Policy 10a2 – does this need to reference that the relocated facilities should be of similar provision and wouldn't we want a statement that justifies the need to relocate? Policy 10a3 – I'm not sure why the ref to a bus stop is there. If they are existing facilities this can't be controlled.</p>	<p>Agreed ref added</p> <p>Noted and ref removed</p>	Y
Policy 10b	<p>Policy 10b f – should this also reference use? It doesn't have to be a building to generate the need for parking? Policy 10b h – I don't know this site but is there a need to reference water quality and would we expect this detail to be submitted with any application?</p>	<p>Noted building changed to facility</p> <p>This criterion was part of the policy for the made NP for this site – the sensitivity of the SSSI means the community prefer it to remain</p>	Y
Policy 10c	<p>Policy 10 C c – I'm not sure about this criterion it doesn't have to be for biodiversity?</p>	<p>Agreed it has been removed</p>	Y
Policy 14 Policy 15	<p>not sure why the applicant is referenced? NPPF paras need amending</p>	<p>Amended</p>	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
Policy 16	is this all bungalows? If they provided 1 bungalow this would satisfy it?	Wording amended to say at least 4 bungalows and more detail provided on the indicative scheme proposed. Minor amendment to the site allocation is necessary to accommodate the indicative proposal.	Y

BDC Neighbourhood Planning Team

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
General	Policies in boxes would be easier to read Maps 19 and 20 are wrongly numbered Extracts from design guide and pattern book add to appendices Policy wording use of permission more appropriate may be support Welbeck Pattern Book: Some of the content in this document doesn't match the Design Codes document – key views are a case in point.	Amended Community facilities and tourism policies amended The Welbeck pattern book was not commissioned by the NPSG. The group reviewed the key views in the pattern book but disagreed with some of them and/or felt some were missing. The key views in the pattern book were used as a starting point only. This has been clarified in the text.	Y
Para 4.2	The summary of changes is useful, and it may be useful to identify which policies are impacted.	Agreed policies amended due to these new themes from the Review NP listed.	Y
Para 2.9 and 4.9	Wording not clear	Amended	Y
Key principle community engagement	Should this address all potential development, reflecting that there are a small number of sites in the Neighbourhood Area not in the ownership of Welbeck Estates?	Yes amended	Y
Section 9.2	The text references the origins of the Cuckney development boundary, but doesn't clarify how the Norton boundary has	Text explaining rational for development boundaries has been expanded	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
	been identified (i.e. it is newly identified in this Plan). It may also be worth noting that the Cuckney boundary is a modified version of the CS boundary, incorporating the NP allocations.		
Policy 1, Part 3:	The reference to “small sites” and a “small number” could be open to interpretation. The reference to “local need” may benefit from reference to a source of such data.	Agree one or two dwellings has been added to the policy and the local need has been defined in the footnote and linked to the HNA	Y
Policy 3, Part 4	Reference is made to map 9, but there are now maps 9 a, b, and c.	Amended policy 3 now policy 2	Y
Policy 4 part 3	Wording needs amending	Amended	Y
Policy 5a, Part 1,	Potential to refine wording to link to previous section of the policy	Amended	Y
Policy 5b, Part 2:	Potential to amend wording from “Permission will be granted” to “Development will be supported” or similar	Amended	Y
Page 45:	Potential to make the section heading concerning the redevelopment of Hatfield Plantation more clearly defined – it’s easy to miss at present.	Amended	Y
Policy 6:	The policy mentions the Design Guide 2020, but the supporting text refers to the Design Code 2021	All refs to Design Code amended to 2021	Y
Housing section:	Potential to mention First Homes	Amended	Y
Policy 8c (now policy 7c)	Rural exceptions policy – is this contrary to notions of having exceptions?	Unclear on the reference but policy wording amended and text added to reinforce need for community support	Y
Section 20 Policy 12:	It may be sensible to continue to list and map all of the LGS designations in the area, not just the new one. Also, it has been noted that the proposed	There was some confusion about the status of the riverside LGS from the previous NP examination. The NPSG are not seeking to	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
	LGS at Cuckney was included in the original NP but removed by the examiner. Is it considered that it now stands a better chance of designation? (Check reasons).	designate this area and it has been removed from the submission NP. All the LGS in the made NP remain and are listed at appendix A.	
Policy 16 Norton Farm and Lady Margaret Crescent	Refine wording?	Policy and justification text has been amended with more explanation of the proposed scheme. The site area has been amended slightly to include access to an additional dwelling and the indicative layout included and explained.	Y

BDC Conservation Team

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
General	Provided comments on the wording of the heritage policy and the site allocations policies where heritage impact is a factor (Lady Margaret Hall and Norton Grange farm)	Amendments made in accordance with the suggestions made accepting the expertise of the conservation team in this matter.	Y

Natural England

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
General	No specific comments to make	NA	N

National Grid

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
General	No national grid assets within the Neighbourhood Area	NA	N

Historic England

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
General	Since our original consultation on the plan in 2015 we have been involved in extensive discussions regarding the merits of the proposals and its overall soundness. The ambition of the plan is considerable, and the status of the local plan presented certain challenges and opportunities in terms of delivery. Further to our letter of the 11th January 2016 and subsequent email correspondence, we managed to achieve consensus on most areas of the plan, but the remaining outstanding issue was the allocation of the land to the north of Budby Road for housing. We therefore welcome its omission from the submission draft.	Yes, HE was an active participant in the drafting of the heritage elements of the made NP. The aspiration has not changed. HE are mistaken Budby Road has not been removed as it was part of the made NP the Budby Road site remains allocated. The NPSG consider that the extensive discussion undertaken last time that resulted in the examiner supporting the Budby Site remaining in the NP means that this site was not part of the review.	N

Highways England

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
General	Due to the minimal growth currently being proposed, we do not consider that there will be any material impacts on the operation of the SRN .	NA	N

Nottinghamshire County Council

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
General	No specific comments to make	NA	N

Coal Authority

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
General	Our records indicate that within the identified Neighbourhood Plan area there are recorded risks at surface and shallow	Noted	N

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
	<p>depth arising from past coal mining activity, including 2 mine entries and fissures. These features are recorded, in the main, to the southern (mine entries) and eastern (fissures) parts of the plan area. It appears that the plan proposes to allocate sites for future development, although these appear to fall outside of the areas where past coal mining activity is recorded. It would be prudent however to assess any sites proposed for future development against the downloadable GIS data (Development Risk plans) which are provided to the Local Planning Authority by the Coal Authority in order that any risks arising from past coal mining activity are identified at an early stage in the process.</p>	Noted and agree this should be part of the planning application process	

Severn Trent Water

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
Infill development	<p>Not all infill development is appropriate and that breaks within the building line in some cases provide flow routes for flows routes for water through the urban environment either as a result of surface water or exceedance flows from sewer or rivers. It is important that when infill sites are proposed an understanding of how the flow of water will be impacted such that the flood risk to existing or new properties is not increase / created. We would therefore recommend that a statement is included within policy 2</p>	Agreed and wording at para 8.10 and criteria added Policy 1(f)	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
	continuity of surface water through development. Water efficiency – suggested on encouraging less water use are already in policy on low carbon development.		
Land south of Creswell Road	The site is located within close proximity of a watercourse therefore we would anticipate that a surface water discharge to the watercourse is pursued as a primary outfall for over a connection to the foul sewerage network.	Criteria 12 (1) g added	Y
Woodhouse Hall Barns	We would however recommend that a development at this location is developed in accordance with the principles of the drainage hierarchy such that all opportunities to discharge of surface water sustainably are utilised prior to a connection of surface water to the foul sewers being pursued.	Text added prior to policy. The policy refers to policy 5 which now has reference to drainage hierarchy	Y
Lady Margaret crescent and Norton Grange Farm	The site is indicated to have limited surface water outfalls but there may be potential for infiltration drainage to be effective in the area and that this option is considered prior to any connection to the sewerage system being pursued.	Text added prior to policy. The policy refers to policy 5 which now has reference to drainage hierarchy	Y

Welbeck Estates

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
Development Boundaries	Consider that development boundaries are unnecessary and does not allow sufficient flexibility to increase development.	The made NP allocated sites in Norton and Cuckney. BDCs Core Strategy includes a development boundary for Cuckney but not for Norton. The NP adjusts the DB for Cuckney to include the sites	N

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
		allocated in the made NP. A DB was put around Norton because the community have accepted some growth (this principle was accepted in the made NP) but also want to provide some certainty that the growth will be limited. The identification of a DB provides this certainty for the community. It is considered that there is sufficient flexibility provided in the policy wording as it does allow limited infill. In the context of the limited growth considered suitable in accordance with district policy the NPSG believes that the DB does not make planning policy more inflexible but provides clarity for the community and Welbeck.	
Hatfield Plantation	This policy should remain as it was in the made NP	The NPSG agree with Welbeck and the policy on the development of Hatfield plantation remains – it has been amended to reflect the changes in the use class order	N
Renewable Energy Policy	Suggest a reference is added that energy efficient design 'would not be compatible with or creates harm to the significance and setting of heritage assets'	The NP policies are intended to be read together and not taken in isolation. The need to protect the significance of heritage assets in any development is applies to renewable energy schemes wording of Criteria 1 amended to reflect this .	Y
Rural Exceptions Site policy	Needs to reflect national policy that rural exceptions site can be in the open countryside Also suggested amendments included allowing rural	Agreed rural exception sites can be a mix of Affordable Housing	Y Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
	exceptions site for affordable housing in full or in association with market housing	and market housing but this is at the discretion of BDC.	
Walking and cycling routes policy (now policy 9)	Requested amendment Development <u>of visitor facilities and infrastructure</u> that are directly related to the improvement or extension of walking and cycling routes will be permitted where the proposals:	The NPSG considered that this was beyond what the community was prepared to support and would not provide sufficient protection. Visitor facilities at Welbeck village and at Lady Margaret Hall is supported in the NP	N
Tourism Development	It is our view that Policy 11, worded as a general policy across the whole Neighbourhood Plan area, then proceeds to read with a focus on tourism development in the Welbeck Village. This may not be the intention of the policy, but we suggest this that it must be clearer and more prescriptive to cover elements of the Neighbourhood Plan area that fall outside of the Welbeck Village but that are intrinsic to the policies of the plan.	This policy has been amended and now focus on promoting tourism in Welbeck village – that is where the community want tourism development to be as it provides economic and social benefits but does not harm the wider rural environment	Y
Policy 13 Former Depot Budby and 14 Land South of Creswell Road	Both sites continue to be available, deliverable and achievable. It is our view that as this is a review of the existing Neighbourhood Plan, a policy must remain in place and for the benefit of the reader that covers each of the sites. We disagree with Bassetlaw District Council's response that appears to not take into account of the earlier plan.	Agree principle of development was secured in the made NP. The policies as presented in the Review NP (now policies 11 and 12) merely update the details based on the new evidence base from the AECOM studies (design code and housing needs assessment).	Y
Policy 15 redevelopment of land and buildings	We do not understand the Council's questions related to the policy allocation, which are unfounded. This is a site	The NPSG agree – the wording has been updated to reflect the new evidence base (design codes) and	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	Amendments Proposed	Amendments Made
Woodhouse Hall Barns (now policy 13)	and policy that has been tested and made through a previous allocation. In making this response there appears to have been no correlation made with the significance of the previous Neighbourhood Plan. As a proposed review of that plan, the policy, which remains valid in its entirety, should remain visible for the reader of the plan. At ground level added to criteria 13 (3)	comments from BDCs conservation team. Added	
Policy 16 Norton Grange Farm (now policy 14)	We suggest that the map supporting this policy requires amendment to reflect all of the buildings to the north of the farm site as displayed by Ordnance Survey to provide a true interpretation of the site.	Agreed and site boundary amended and policy updated to reflect proposal that includes farm buildings.	Y

Appendix 1 – Leaflet circulated May 2021 to explain the purpose of the NP review

THE 2021 REVIEW OF
CUCKNEY NORTON HOLBECK AND WELBECK
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN



A GUIDE TO THE PROPOSED
IMPROVEMENTS OF THE
CNHW NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
ADOPTED IN 2017

See CNHW Neighbourhood Plan 2017 on

www.nortonandcuckneypc.co.uk

INTRODUCTION

In 2017 the Cuckney Norton Holbeck and Welbeck Neighbourhood plan was adopted by a referendum by the residents of the four villages.

This document was the result of four year's work by a group of residents representing all four villages in cooperation with Bassetlaw District Council. It was one of the first wave of Neighbourhood plans to be adopted by Bassetlaw DC.

The essence of the NP is to inform Bassetlaw District Council's planning department of the communities' wishes with regard to the sites of new houses/improvements to community facilities/economic development and enhancement and protection of the environment.

Planning regulations and new laws on environmental issues do not stand still, and Bassetlaw District Council are in the process of developing a district wide Local Plan. Whilst our Neighbourhood Plan is still valid, it was advised that we should review the plan to incorporate new legislation, and ensure that it would continue to hold weight in planning decisions up to 2037.

The review process has taken almost two years, blighted by Covid 19, and more pressing demands on some of the group. The draft review is now available on-line at www.nortonandcuckneypc.co.uk and paper copies will also be available on request.

We are required to hold a consultation period of six weeks, commencing on **MAY 7th 2021** and during that time you will be invited to complete a survey. Your views on the draft review NP are important. The group who are working on the review will respond to your comments and suggestions.

This booklet will guide you to identify the changes to the existing Cuckney Norton Holbeck and Welbeck Neighbourhood plan.

Page 20 Community objectives

Objective 6 has been added to declare our intention to adapt to the latest national aims to reduce carbon emissions.

"To promote a low carbon approach by encouraging community renewable energy schemes, the use of green materials and designs and in the renovation of existing buildings."

Page 21 Engaging with the community

This is an important principle, emphasising the wishes of the communities to be consulted about development proposals made by Welbeck Estates Co. Ltd. Whilst this is not a legal requirement The NP encourages Welbeck estates to consult with the community before a planning application is submitted

Page 26 Policy 1 Sustainable development and development boundaries

Development boundaries have been drawn around Norton and Cuckney. Boundaries drawn around settlements is not a new idea, but it has recently been advised to protect communities from excessive development. It does not prevent small sites adjacent to the boundaries from being developed where it is identified as meeting local need.

Page 27 Policy 2- Infill development

This policy limits the building of houses in gaps inside the settlement boundary by requiring that the buildings are in keeping with the surrounding properties.

(A Design Code has been produced that reflects this and can be viewed on

www.nortonandcuckneypc.co.uk

Page 36 Policy 3 - Protecting the landscape character

The Review group have drawn maps showing areas and views that we believe should be protected. These are called Significant Green gaps. This policy also states that the boundaries of any new development should also be sympathetic to the surrounding natural countryside.

Page 44 Policy 5a - expanding employment opportunities in Welbeck village

There have at times been difficulties in getting permission to change the use of the historic old buildings in the centre of Welbeck village. We have already seen the benefits that have been gained in the creation of local employment opportunities, and this policy supports the need to bring old buildings back into use for 21st century purposes.

Page 53 Policy 7 Low carbon and renewable energy

This policy informs planners of new buildings and conversion of old properties that designs should incorporate features to reduce carbon emissions. It doesn't state what should be used as the advances in technology are being made at such a pace that we cannot imagine what will be available by 2037.

Page 59 - Policy 8 -Housing mix and affordable housing

The review group used a specialist company to carry out a housing needs assessment for the Neighbourhood Plan area, and this can be viewed on the Norton and Cuckney parish council website.

The existing NP has a policy on housing mix, but this has now been extended. We were keen to impress on planners that there is a need for

a) more houses suitable for older members of the community b) more houses to be privately owned

c) starter homes for young families

d) more affordable houses to rent.

Our aim is to encourage young people to stay in the community to redress the imbalance that currently exists of an

increasingly ageing population.

Page 65 Policy 10b - Lady Margaret Hall Community Sports hub

Lady Margaret Hall and the surrounding land already hosts the tennis club, and recently the archery club, and in the past a badminton club. There are various options to increase the sports facilities on this site for existing clubs on the estate.

This policy supports the development of a sports hub that will be in keeping with the surrounding countryside.

Page 73 Policy 12 Local green space

In the existing Neighbourhood Plan there are already several green spaces allocated across the communities. We propose to add one more, namely Church Meadow in Cuckney.

Norton Cuckney Village Hall and Car Park

This proposal was put forward in the previous neighbourhood plan and shows what can be achieved.

Planning permission has been granted to put a car park on part of the allotment site and edge of the playing field, and build a village hall at the edge of the playing field on Creswell Road in Cuckney.

The village hall will accommodate about 50 people, an additional small meeting room with internet connection, kitchen and toilets. There will be use of the playing field out of school hours and good safe parking.

Our aim is to complement not compete with the sports activities held at Lady Margaret Hall. This is an exciting opportunity for us to start up new community groups.

As part of the survey, we will be asking you what kind of groups you might be interested in getting involved in.

The Neighbourhood Plan is a community plan that will significantly affect the quality and quantity of any proposed changes to our communities. For many of us, we may not see

many changes, but the plan will secure a positive future for our children and grandchildren.

The Consultation Survey

The Government restrictions on face-to-face consultations obviously limit how you can tell us your views. We are advised that we should use on-line methods wherever possible.

The draft Review Neighbourhood Plan and the existing Neighbourhood Plan, together with additional reports can be seen on www.nortonandcuckneypc.co.uk

The survey is there for you to complete on-line.

If you use Facebook, you can go to the Norton and Cuckney Community News Page and it will direct you to the survey.

If this doesn't work for you, you can email and request a survey be sent to you.

If all else fails, you can ring a member of the Review group who will do their best to advise and receive your comments.

A hard copy of the draft review can be sent to you on request.

There will also be two consultation events by Zoom on Wednesday May 12th at 6.30pm
Wednesday June 9th at 6.30pm

Contact leeannm.ncpc@gmail.com for invitation details

An open meeting will be held at Norton Cuckney Village Hall on Wednesday June 16th at 6.30pm to 8pm

(this will be subject to COVID regulations)

Contact details for the Neighbourhood Plan Monitoring Group

Georgina Smith 01623 842502 georgina.ncpc@gmail.com

LeeAnn Morton 07943208565 leeannm.ncpc@gmail.com

Kevin Dukes 07887657936 kevin.dukes@cllr.bassetlaw.gov.uk

Judith Reynolds 01623 842217 judith.ncpc@gmail.com

Sheila Brailsford 07792017387 sheila.ncpc@gmail.com

David Wall walld3@hotmail.com

Data Protection

Under the General Data Protection Regulation 2016 (GDPR) and Data Protection Act (2018), Norton Cuckney Parish Council is a Data Controller for the information it holds about you. The Council will hold the personal information provided by you for the purpose of the review of CNHW Neighbourhood Plan consultation and your data may be published at the end of the consultation and/or shared with third parties such as Bassetlaw District Council. The lawful basis under which the Parish Council uses personal data for this purpose is consent. By responding to this consultation, you are confirming your consent for Norton Cuckney Parish Council to share your comments regarding the review of the CNHW Neighbourhood Plan.

Appendix 2 Regulation 14 Consultation Survey offered on line and delivered to all households May 2021

Survey for Review of CNHW Neighbourhood Plan

We really need your views about the review of the Neighbourhood plan. You can hand in your completed survey to Jac's shop in Cuckney or to Sheila Brailsford or LeeAnn Morton in Norton, or to the Post office in Holbeck. A member of the group is willing to collect the survey from your home if you are unable to get to a drop off place.

We also plan to hold a public meeting on Wednesday June 16th 6.30 to 8pm in Norton Cuckney Village Hall where you can also hand in your survey

You are invited to indicate your views on the proposed improvements to our Neighbourhood Plan. The questions refer to the review document that can be viewed on www.nortonandcuckney.pc.co.uk . If you would like to see a paper copy of the review document, please contact one of the group.

A brief explanation of each policy can also be seen in the leaflet that was delivered along with the April parish newsletter. Please circle the number you favour on each question

Q1. Page 20 Community objectives

Objective 6 has been added to declare our intention to adapt to the latest national aims to reduce carbon emissions.

"To promote a low carbon approach by encouraging community renewable energy schemes, the use of green materials and designs and in the renovation of existing buildings."

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Agree

Comments

Q2. Page 26 Policy 1 Sustainable development and development boundaries

Development boundaries have been drawn around Norton and Cuckney. Boundaries drawn around settlements is not a new idea, but it has recently been advised to protect

communities from excessive development. It does not prevent small sites adjacent to the boundaries from being developed where it is identified as meeting local need.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Agree

Comments

Q3. Page 27 Policy 2- Infill development

This policy limits the building of houses in gaps inside the settlement boundary by requiring that the buildings are in keeping with the surrounding properties.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Agree

Comments

Q4. Page 36 Policy 3 - Protecting the landscape character

The Review group have drawn maps showing areas and views that we believe should be protected. These are called Significant Green gaps. This policy also states that the boundaries of any new development should also be sympathetic to the surrounding natural countryside.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Agree

Comments

Q5. Page 44 Policy 5a - expanding employment opportunities in Welbeck village

There have at times been difficulties in getting permission to change the use of the historic old buildings in the centre of Welbeck village. We have already seen the benefits that have been gained in the creation of local employment opportunities, and this policy supports the need to bring old buildings back into use for 21st century purposes.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Agree

Comments

Q6. Page 53 Policy 7 Low carbon and renewable energy

This policy informs planners of new buildings and conversion of old properties that designs should incorporate features to reduce carbon emissions. It doesn't state what should be used as the advances in technology are being made at such a pace that we cannot imagine what will be available by 2037.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Agree

Comments

Q7. Page 59 - Policy 8 -Housing mix and affordable housing

The review group used a specialist company to carry out a housing needs assessment for the Neighbourhood Plan area, and this can be viewed on the Norton and Cuckney parish council website.

The existing NP has a policy on housing mix, but this has now been extended. We were keen to impress on planners that there is a need for

a) more houses suitable for older members of the community b) more houses to be privately owned

c) starter homes for young families

d) more affordable houses to rent.

Our aim is to encourage young people to stay in the community to redress the imbalance that currently exists of an

increasingly ageing population.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Agree

Comments

Q8. Page 65 Policy 10b - Lady Margaret Hall Community Sports hub

Lady Margaret Hall and the surrounding land already hosts the tennis club, and recently the archery club, and in the past a badminton club. There are various options to increase the sports facilities on this site for existing clubs on the estate.

This policy supports the development of a sports hub that will be in keeping with the surrounding countryside.

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Agree

Comments

Q9. Page 73 Policy 12 Local green space

In the existing Neighbourhood Plan there are already several green spaces allocated across the communities. We propose to add one more, namely Church Meadow in Cuckney

Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Agree

Comments

Q10. Norton Cuckney Community facility

The Community Redevelopment Support Group (CRSG) are raising funds for a new car park and community facility on the allotment site and edge of the recreational field on Creswell Road in Cuckney. Planning permission has been granted for this site. The CRSG would like to hear your views about a new village community facility to replace the old hall that is beyond repair. In view of the refurbishment of Lady Margaret Hall we would like to know what community facility you would like to see in Cuckney.

- a) a pavilion type structure that has a small meeting room for up to 30 people and has a kitchen facility and public toilets
- b) a ready-made community building that holds 50 people, with an additional meeting room, kitchen and public toilets
- c) a stone/brick building that holds up to 50 people with kitchen, public toilets, and small meeting room
- d) no community building at all

Please state your preference

a)

b)

c)

d)

Comments

Q11. If there is a desire for a new Norton Cuckney village community facility

Please indicate which of the following groups you would be interested in joining or being involved in

Mums and toddlers' group

Coffee mornings

Afternoon tea group

Fund raising events

Local history club

Villagers group

T'ai chi group

Youth club

Church group

Cards and board games group

Reading group

Business meetings

Garden Club

Reiki group

Zumba class

Film club

Village fun days and fairs

Childrens' parties

Other Ideas welcome

Any other comments

Thank you for your completing this survey

The information you have given will be compiled with other responses to complete the consultation. A member of the review group will respond to any of your comments that need answering.

In order for your comments to be valid, you are required to provide the following contact details.

Name

Address

Telephone number

Email address

Data Protection

Under the General Data Protection Regulation 2016 (GDPR) and Data Protection Act (2018), Norton Cuckney Parish Council is a Data Controller for the information it holds about you. The Council will hold the personal information provided by you for the purpose of the review of CNHW Neighbourhood Plan consultation and your data may be published at the end of the consultation and/or shared with third parties such as Bassetlaw District Council. The lawful basis under which the Parish Council uses personal data for this purpose is consent. By responding to this consultation, you are confirming your consent for Norton Cuckney Parish Council to share your comments regarding the review of the CNHW Neighbourhood Plan.

Neighbourhood plan monitoring group – contact details

Georgina Smith 01623 842502 georgina.ncpc@gmail.com

LeeAnn Morton 07943208565 leeannm.ncpc@gmail.com

Kevin Dukes 07887657936 kevin.dukes@cllr.bassetlaw.gov.uk

Judith Reynolds 01623 842217 judith.ncpc@gmail.com

Sheila Brailsford 07792017387 sheila.ncpc@gmail.com

David Wall walld3@hotmail.com

Appendix 3 List of all the bodies sent notifications at the start of the Reg 14 consultation:

Neighbouring Parishes and Districts

Carburton Parish Meeting
Elmton with Creswell Parish Council
Hodthorpe and Belford Parish Council
Nether Langwith Parish Council
Perlethorpe cum Budby Parish Meeting
Warsop Parish Council

Bolsover District Council
Mansfield District Council

Bassetlaw District Council (BDC)

BDC Conservation
BDC Development Management
BDC Neighbourhood Planning
BDC Planning Policy
BDC Property Services
BDC Strategic Housing

Statutory Bodies / Interested Parties

Anglian Water
Cadent Gas
Canal and River Trust
Coal Authority
Environment Agency
Highways England
Historic England
Internal Drainage Board
Lincolnshire Archaeology (providing services to Nottinghamshire)
National Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Group
National Grid
National Trust
Natural England
NHS Accountable Car Partnership
Nottinghamshire County Council Highways
Nottinghamshire County Council Planning Policy
Nottinghamshire County Council Strategic Health
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
Severn Trent Water
Sport England
Sustrans (Nottinghamshire)
Western Power

