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## Overview

This document compiles all of the responses received during the Regulation 16 consultation. Original copies of the responses have been supplied to the Independent Examiner, so as to inform the assessment of the Plan. Please contact the [Neighbourhood Planning Team](mailto:neighbourhoodplanning@bassetlaw.gov.uk?subject=Hayton%20Neighbourhood%20Plan) with any queries, including reference to any supplementary documents not included here.

## 1: Bassetlaw District Council: Conservation

Conservation is concerned that the changes suggested in our previous comments (24th October

2022) have not been included in the final document. Therefore, I have repeated these below:

**Page 50, Paragraph 7.11.4**

Hayton Parish is rich in heritage assets, ranging from significant areas of archaeological interest to a Scheduled Ancient Monument (Hayton Castle Farm), a range of Listed Buildings and a number of non-designated heritage assets. The following maps (Figures 11a, 11b, 12, 13) highlight these assets.

**Page 88 – Policy 11b, Church Farm (bullet point 4)**

* The mixture of house types, their siting and design, and the overall layout, should reflect the agricultural nature of the site and surroundings, and the variety and informality that characterises the village e.g. avoiding standard suburban cul-des-sac development

**Appendix 14**

The layout shown on this is totally unacceptable. Presumably this is included for reference (a past consultation?) only? Pages 84-87 of the main document should have a sentence about the nature of Appendix 14 being illustrative only/for consultation only, otherwise, why is it included at all?

**Appendix 18**

Church Farm assessment. I would disagree completely with the results of page 8. This just refers to the church and ignores Church Farm, which is also designated. For impact on designated heritage asset, I would say “Some impact. Potential to enhance the setting of Church Farm, subject to suitable design, layout, scale and materials”. Should it not be possible to amend this document, then as above, I would suggest adding something into pages 84-87 of the main document which clarifies this issue.

I trust the above amendments will be made.

## 2: Bassetlaw District Council: Neighbourhood Planning

**General**

**Formatting and presentation:**

The formatting of the document would benefit from a thorough review, to ensure consistency in section numbering, font style and colour, updating of the header, and clearer naming on the front cover.

The format of all policies would benefit from refinement, so as to include clear section / clause numbers for ease of reference.

The policies are now clearly distinguishable, thanks to their inclusion in boxes. However, they are included as images, rather than being integral to the body of the text, meaning that they do not meet accessibility standards, such as compatibility with screen readers.

**Referencing:**

Previous comments on the Neighbourhood Plan drew attention to references to the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan, and suggested that this was not appropriate in all cases, given that the Bassetlaw Local Plan is still progressing towards adoption, and that these should be changed to the Core Strategy. It is noted that changes have been made to the Neighbourhood Plan in response, but this appears to have been done rather crudely – using ‘find and replace’, but without adjusting any of the associated text. The result is particularly confusing, with references to the Core Strategy and the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan both now labelled as “Core Strategy”, but then with some sections of the Plan, such as section 1.2.6, referenced correctly.

Relatedly, some of the references to specific policies in the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan have now changed, hence a comprehensive update would be beneficial.

**Maps:**

The consistent map format is a welcome addition over earlier versions of the Plan. However, some of the maps use a base that is lacking in detail, making it difficult to identify the location of the features illustrated. In these cases it would be beneficial to change the base map to include more detail, allowing features / designations to be better understood in context.

A number of the maps included in the Plan do not include clear attribution / a licence number – figures 27 to 29, for example.

**Appendices:**

It may be advisable to rationalise the appendices, where possible incorporating items into the Plan itself, and considering co-location of any of the single page items that remain into one document for ease of reference / to ensure none get mislaid.

**Specific**

**Section 1.3:**

This section is accurate at present, but will need to be amended once the Plan progresses.

**Policy 2:**

The final section of the Policy, addressing water efficiency, is a duplication of the first section of Policy 1b – it is likely that the content is more appropriately retained as part of the latter.

**Page 38**:

Further to the above, the included note on water efficiency also appears to be in the wrong location, and may be more appropriately positioned ahead of Policy 1b. This section is also out-of-step with the section numbering used in the wider document.

**Policy 3**:

The criteria regarding adequate capacity in infrastructure is vague, and may be difficult to apply in practice.

**Policy 5:**

It is noted that modifications have been made to this Policy in accordance with our previous comments regarding Assets of Community Value, although it still appears overly complex, and lacking in clarity. This includes the final section, concerning the Community Infrastructure Levy, which although modified, is not consistent with general practice. Overall, a simpler format, as employed in other neighbourhood plans in the District, may be more effective.

**Page 59:**

The paragraph immediately preceding Policy 7 is not currently numbered.

**Figure 15a & 15b**:

It may be beneficial to include a more detailed map of each LGS, individually, so as to more clearly identify the boundaries.

**Policy 8**:

It would be helpful to include the LGS numbering, as employed in Figures 15a and 15b, within the Policy, for ease of reference.

**7.17.3**:

The reference to Policy ST43 (NB - of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan, not the Core Strategy) is now outdated, with this topic now addressed in Policy ST50.

**8.2.3**:

In the interests of clarity, it would potentially be clearer to only list the sites that are specifically allocated in the Plan (i.e. not the infill sites). In theory, other infill sites could come forward during the lifespan of the Plan.

**Policy 11c:**

On reflection, it may be that this policy is unnecessary, with some functions already covered by other policies, and the potential to relocate outstanding elements elsewhere in the Plan. Firstly, the stipulations as to what constitutes an infill site is addressed in Policy 3. Secondly, the criteria currently listed in Policy 11c may sit better as part of an expanded design policy (Policy 2), thus widening their applicability beyond just infill sites.

**8.2.15 to 8.2.17**:

Related to the above, it may be that the content addressing the three infill sites (Windrush, Farm Cottage, and Ridgely Wood Farm) is not necessary. The form of development being proposed on these sites is managed by other policies in the Plan, including 3, 11c and 9, hence they could come forward alongside other, as-yet unidentified infill development proposals. The main reason for making specific reference to one or other development sites (as per Church Farm and Corner Farm) is to add stipulations not covered by other policies in the Plan.

**8.6.1 and 8.6.2**:

The references to the Core Strategy are, again, incorrect – this should be the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan.

**8.7:**

This section feels confusing as it reads more as a policy than supporting text. It may be more appropriate to integrate elements of it into preceding Section 8.6

## 3: Bassetlaw District Council: Planning Policy

**General:**

* Paragraph numbering format is difficult to navigate. Could these be separated from the text?
* Policies need to have numbered paragraphs – not all do.
* Check the references to the paragraphs for the NPPF, not all correlate to the right sections.
* Some references to the Core Strategy and Bassetlaw Local Plan conflict with one another.
* Avoid referring to Local Plan Policies as these could change through its examination.
* Check figure references are correct.
* Some maps are unclear in terms of what they’re trying to present.

**Specific:**

Paragraph 1.2.5 – two further references to the Core Strategy at the end of the paragraph need to be removed.

Paragraph 1.2.6 – suggest rewording this paragraph to:

*In July 2022, Bassetlaw District Council formally submitted the Bassetlaw Local Plan to the Planning Inspectorate for its independent examination. Once adopted in Autumn 2023, it will replace the Core Strategy and be used, along with the Neighbourhood Plan, to determine future planning applications within Hayton.*

Section 1.3 is partly out of date as it refers to the Regulation 14 public consultation as part of the next steps. This section needs rewording.

Section 5.0 – Guiding principles and objectives seems obsolete when you read this in conjunction with the SWOT and the Vision and list of Objectives in 5.1-5.3. These need to provide a clear link so that all sections flow, make sense and correlate with one another.

**Policy 1**

Policy 1a refers to sustainable development. Tiln is mentioned within this Policy. Is this considered a sustainable place for new development? If so, this is not reflected within the Core Strategy or the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan.

The Policy in general is vague and rather generic in its intention. The National Planning Policy Framework has a list of sustainable development principles so do these need to be identified within the Plan?

**Policy 2**

Policy 2 is relying heavily on Appendix 5. Would it not be sensible to include the general design principles and/ or character areas within the Policy? Otherwise the Policy is rather vague. Part (B) should refer to Nottinghamshire County Council Parking Standards. Does B(i) and (ii) refer to all development or should it state ‘where practicable’?

The last paragraph is largely repeating the requirements identified within Policy 1b.

Paragraphs 7.5.15 – 7.5.16 – Any change to a development boundary should conform to the District Council’s methodology for development boundaries.

Paragraph 7.5.17 seems obsolete in this section?

**Policy 3**

This Policy is unclear and not easy to follow. It is focusing development within the development boundary, but in the second part ‘in all cases’ it again mentions the development boundary. As the development boundary is already mentioned in the opening paragraph, it doesn’t need to be referred to again later on.

The second paragraph refers to conversions needing to follow the Design Guidance, but why does this not apply to all other development?

The third paragraph mentions ‘infilling’ wouldn’t any site within the development boundary constitute as infilling?

The last paragraph isn’t needed as the Policy already accepts forms of development within the development boundary. Ancillary buildings are no different and are a form of development.

**Policy 4**

This Policy is contrary to National Planning Policy and Local Policy which limits general employment development within the rural area. The development of employment within this area needs to be carefully managed to make sure employment uses are located within sustainable locations. Some employment within the rural area will be supported where there is a need and it requires a rural location such as farm diversification. As the Policy refers to ‘employment development’ this is open-ended and isn’t clear on what types of employment are appropriate.

The second paragraph refers to Policy ST11 which is in the Bassetlaw Local Plan and not the Core Strategy.

**Policy 5**

Paragraph 7.9.5 – do the Book Exchange and the Playing Field constitute community facilities? Their inclusion doesn’t correlate to the requirements of Policy 5. Policy 5 requires facilities to be marketed for a period of, at least, 2 years – where is the justification for this. It conflicts with the Core Strategy.

**Policy 6**

This Policy is written as a statement rather than a Policy. What do development proposals need to do if they are likely to impact a heritage asset?

**Policy 7**

The last few paragraphs of the Policy are unclear in their intentions. The first part of the Policy already states that development should protect and enhance local green infrastructure?

**Policy 8**

Could the names of spaces in Figure 14 match the names within the supporting text and the Policy. Could the references for each space be inserted into the Policy so it is easier to cross-reference.

**Policy 9**

Paragraph 7.17.3 refers to the Core Strategy and ST43. This is incorrect and ST43 is within the Bassetlaw Local Plan. This paragraph should be removed as it is referring to a draft policy and intention which is not in place as of yet.

Some of the areas of trees the Plan is seeking to protect are within Local Green Spaces, and therefore are unlikely to be at risk of redevelopment.

**Policy 10**

Figure 19 seems lost within this section, would it not be better placed within the Green Infrastructure section?

Policy 10 is a statement rather than a Policy. As this refers back to the Design work, would it not sit better within the Design Policy?

**Policy 11a – 11b**

These policies are written as statements rather than Policy. In addition, there is some repetitiveness between these policies and other policies within the Plan. How many homes are these sites likely to provide? The boundary of Church Farm site is confusing. Some of the land to the southwest is intended to remain undeveloped, so why is this still within the developable area of the site?

**Policy 11c**

This Policy is closely linked to Policy 1 and Policy 3. Would it be better to include this ‘development principles’ within one of these policies rather than having a standalone policy for infilling? Also do the areas identified for infilling need to be provided within the Plan? Other sites may come forward throughout the Plan period so it might be simpler to remove these potential sites for consistency.

**Policy 12**

This policy is confusing. Although it is trying to meet local need, it seems as if Corner Farm will largely meet the identified needs within the Housing Needs Assessment.

Apart from Corner Farm, would the size of other developments trigger the requirements within this Policy?

Where is the justification for the percentage splits stated within paragraph 1?

Paragraph 2 seems to introduce ‘additional development’ to support the delivery of the allocated sites. If this is correct, then it is open-ended and would conflict with some other policies within this Plan.

Paragraph 8.61 onwards refers to ST32 and the Core Strategy. ST32 is within the Bassetlaw Local Plan and not the Core Strategy. More generally, this section appears to be a statement, but also identifies some policy requirements. What is the intention of the Plan in terms of the Gypsy and Traveller site?

## 4: Brown & Co., on behalf of West View Farm

I write in response to the Hayton Parish Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan, of which the consultation commenced in January 2023. Specifically, this response relates to the Hayton and Clarborough Development Boundary as proposed within the Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan and West View Farm, Hayton. The Hayton Neighbourhood Plan has formally submitted to Bassetlaw District Council in accordance with Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 and Bassetlaw are now consulting statutory bodies and interested parties on the submission.

This response will not exhaust all policies within the plan, but relates to West View Farm, Hayton and the proposed modification of Hayton Village Development Boundary. It is acknowledged that the Neighbourhood Plan incorporates a ‘Development Boundary’, however, this proposed development boundary excludes West View Farm which is located in the north section of the village.

The landowner of West View Farm is requesting that the Development Boundary be amended to include the property within.

**West View Farm**

West View Farm is located immediately to the west of Main Street and north of Scotter Lane Road. The property is approximately an area of 2.18 hectares (5.4 acres) and comprises former farm buildings, some of which are used as a DIY Livery business, manage and yard. The property has road frontage onto Main Street and is well located and connected to the village.

The buildings on site comprise two modern sheds and a traditional brick built building. The presence of development has been apparent at West View Farm since at least 1953, in accordance with historic mapping, and West View Farm has been part of the village for over 70 years.

Due to changes in the farming practice, changes in residence and succession, West View Farm is no longer in full agricultural operation and has partly been used as equestrian and as a DIY Livery, albeit the use of the site is infrequent and diminishing.



**Figure 1: Location of West View Farm in context with Development Boundary**

Currently, West View Farm sits immediately outside of the proposed Development Boundary within the Hayton Neighbourhood Plan, as depicted on Figure 1.

**Development Boundary Context**

It is understood that since 2011 Hayton has had a ‘village development boundary’ within the Local Plan. This boundary was intended to demarcate land that is available and acceptable for development and land that is not available for development.

It is also understood that a Steering Group performed a review of the boundary in August 2022, where the following changes were made to amend various anomalies where the boundary line:

1. Intersected buildings
2. Did not account for extensions built since 2011
3. Did not align with logical boundary lines

The Draft Neighbourhood Plan, now under consultation, also has proposed a Development Boundary within its plan. Currently, as shown on Figure 1, West View Farm sits outside but immediately adjacent the boundary. However, Paragraph 7.5.14 of the Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan does state that it is recognised over time that circumstances may change which may require modification of the development boundary subject to meeting the required criteria defined below. In circumstances:

1. Where changes to land or buildings adversely affects the character and spaces within the village
2. **Or** where redundant land/or property puts village spaces and buildings at risk of vandalism, trespass or occupation, or deterioration that may cause health and safety issues
3. **And** where there are alternative use proposals that meet the relevant policies of this Neighbourhood Plan.

As will be explained in the following section, it is considered that the merits of the site meet all three criteria above and trigger the circumstances for modification.

Where it is applicable, the text within the Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan states that in these circumstances, the Development Boundary will be reviewed and may be modified. In the case of West View Farm, this is welcomed as the landowner now wishes to alert Hayton Parish and Bassetlaw that the site is now available, acceptable and its inclusion would following the logical boundary lines.

It is noted that the Development Boundary has been modified already to include Church Farm to the south of the village. From reviewing Appendix 18 (Assessment of Land offered for future development) within the submission documents, it is understood that the owners of Church Farm had demonstrated that the site will become redundant to agricultural needs within 5 years and the site meets the criteria of the Neighbourhood Plan’s Sustainable Development Strategy in that it would constitute previously developed land that may otherwise fall into decay, and when/if farming ceases, the site will most likely meet the plan definition of “land and sites of buildings that have become redundant” becoming a potential development site.

It is therefore clear that the plan actively encourages the reuse of redundant buildings and previously developed land, and to help facilitate this, will actively review the Development Boundary to appropriately promote suitable development. The situation at West View Farm is considered to be materially similar to that of Church Farm, albeit, the equestrian status and large amounts of hardstanding are considered to present the site as more ‘harmonious’ with the definition of ‘previously developed land’ with the agricultural use already ceased.

**Proposal to Amend Development Boundary to include West View Farm**

This response requests that the Development Boundary is amended at this early stage in the plan preparation to include West View Farm. The reasons for inclusion include:

* The farm is no longer fully operational, and the landowner is no longer in connection to the village and parish. The buildings and yard are at threat of becoming disused and the appropriate strategy to futureproof the site and village is controlled, planned and appropriate redevelopment.
* Inclusion of the site inside the Development Boundary, allowing for potential redevelopment, would provide an enhancement to the village, both in visual impact and setting.
* The NPPF supports ways ‘that makes as much use as possible of previously developed or ‘brownfield’ land’.
* The farm has been a key part of the village for decades and its utilisation into another appropriate use is considered beneficial for the village as a whole. Farm conversion and redevelopment of Previously Developed Land is supported in principle by the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.
* The location of the farm is central to the village, with road frontage directly onto Main Street and adjacent residential dwellings, therefore, spatially the site is well connected, well located and forms part of the main pattern and form of development. Historic maps suggest that development has been located on site over at least 70 years and therefore is an integral developed part of the village.

Below depicts how the Proposed Development Boundary could look with the inclusion of West View Farm.

Figure 2: Indicative Alteration to the Development Boundary

**Figure 2: Indicative Alteration to the Development Boundary**

It is understood that the Development Plan may be reviewed if the circumstances within Paragraph 7.5.14 of the Draft Plan can be met. These circumstances are discussed below:-

**Circumstance A** - Where changes to land or buildings adversely affects the character and spaces within the village

West View Farm has previously been used as an active farm with the owner living in the opposing property. The owner has now relocated, the farm is no longer an active farm and yard, and the equestrian use is limited and infrequent. The farm is divided into multiple elements; the modern sheds, brick-built building, manage and yard. Whilst of modest size, there are multiple elements to consider, each with different planning considerations.

The landowner is currently looking at options for the farm and is keen to make the site available for future development, however it is considered that the omission of the site from the development boundary would have a significant adverse impact on the ability to sensitively ‘revitalise’ the farm and bring it back into a suitable use to benefit the village and provide an enhancement to the setting and visual appearance. As the site is not an active working farm, and the equestrian use is infrequent, the change in the function of the farm is considered to have a potential adverse effect on character of the village as the site is open onto the frontage of Main Street. Inclusion into the development boundary is encouraged to help the landowner work with the Council to diversify and/or develop appropriately. Policy 3 of the Draft Plan states that residential development is an appropriate way of redeveloping disused sites. Over time there is threat that the site will further deteriorate and increase in adverse impact.

**OR**

**Circumstance B** - Where redundant land/or property puts village spaces and buildings at risk of vandalism, trespass or occupation, or deterioration that may cause health and safety issues

The majority of the farm is now infrequently used, and the use of the buildings has decreased. This is the case especially with the brick-built building, which is the most prominent, and is in a deteriorating condition. As the landowner is no longer local, whilst the site has locked gates and CCTV, it is not inconceivable for the buildings to be at risk. Given the location within the village, it is considered important that policy can help the landowner reuse the buildings appropriately.

**AND**

**Circumstance C** - Where there are alternative use proposals that meet the relevant policies of the Neighbourhood Plan

Policy 3 (Land for Residential Development) is clear that proposals for development that consist of one or more additional dwellings within the development boundary of Hayton village will be supported where the development consists of the use/conversion of an existing building or development of an infill site or the development of land and sites of buildings that have become redundant or a previously developed brownfield site, and:

* In the case of farm building conversion, proposals follow the Design Guidance and Code proposals and where appropriate e.g. where original building materials permit, maintain the style and features of the original building;
* In the case of an infill site, the development consists of an individual housing plot on a small gap within an otherwise developed frontage within the existing development boundary of the village;
* In the case of a brownfield site or land and sites of buildings that have become redundant, residential development is the most appropriate way of preventing deterioration, dereliction, vandalism and the potential hazard associated with redundant land and buildings

Therefore it is clear that alternative use proposals on a site such as this can be considered suitable when within the Development Boundary.

Review of Circumstances

In review of the circumstances, a property requires to meet Circumstance A or B, and C, to be able to potentially be reviewed to be included within the Development Boundary. As discussed above, the current status and future status of West View Farm is considered to meet the parameters of all three circumstances and therefore, is considered suitable for potential review and inclusion within the Development Boundary.

West View Farm is no longer an active farm and the equestrian, livery and school use on the site is not frequently used. Therefore, the buildings and the yard have the potential to rapidly lessen in use and have the potential to significantly deteriorate if aren’t used and maintained. The lack of use, due to the change of in function of the site, is considered to adversely impact upon setting and character of the village. As Policy 3 states, ‘in the case of a brownfield site or land and sites of buildings that have become redundant, residential development is the most appropriate way of preventing deterioration, dereliction, vandalism and the potential hazards associated with redundant land and buildings’.

Either meeting Circumstance A or B would be required to trigger a potential Boundary review, however it is considered West View Farm would meet the requirement of both.

Circumstance C also requires to be met to trigger review. Policy 3 allows for such proposals to be converted and for previously developed land to the redeveloped. It is clear from the preparation of the plan already, especially drawing upon Church Farm and Appendix 18, that development of such underused previously developed farms should not be excluded from the Development Boundary where redevelopment can be achieved.

Therefore, in line with paragraph 7.5.14, it is considered that the Development Boundary can be reviewed to include available sites, such as West View Farm and West View farm presents itself as a suitable site for redevelopment.

Positive Enhancement to the Setting and Character

The site is currently partly used as a livery business; however, the use is infrequent, and the site could be available for suitable and appropriate redevelopment. There is risk of the buildings to deteriorate further which would have an adverse impact on the site as a whole. Given the surroundings being predominantly residential and agricultural, it is considered that the inclusion into the Development Boundary, to enable a suitable development opportunity, would positively enhance the setting and character of the area.

The buildings currently are not of significant architectural or historical merit and if left to decay, would adversely impact upon the character of the area.

It is considered that there is a real opportunity, especially within this Neighbourhood Planning process, to include the site within the Development Boundary and help to achieve a possible redevelopment which would enhance the setting and character of Hayton and be in line with the Hayton Design Guidance and Codes.

Use of ‘Previously Developed Land’

Chapter 11, Paragraph 119 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodatingly objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously-developed or ‘brownfield’ land.

Albeit a Green Belt policy, Paragraph 149(g) of the NPPF also supports the construction of new buildings where limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land would occur. It is considered in areas outside of the Green Belt, proposals such as this would be further supported given the lessening of the restriction in area such as this, compared to the Green Belt. The NPPF also supports, in regard to business and economic development, the use of previously developed land where the sites are physically well-related to existing settlements and where this occurs, sites should be encouraged where suitable opportunities exist.

West View Farm presents itself as a parcel of previously developed land, which is available and is well-located and situated to the village. Appendix 18 of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, in regard to Church Farm, has already stated “The proposed residential development of previously developed land at Church Farm will be supported, provided its design is consistent with the Design Guidance & Codes for Hayton”.

It is therefore considered that under the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan and under the NPPF, that the Development Boundary can be amended to include West View Farm.

**Example of Change to Development Boundary**

Figure 3: Existing and Proposed Development BoundaryFigure 3: Existing and Proposed Development Boundary

**Figure 3: Existing and Proposed Development Boundary**

Figure 3 above depicts the existing Development Boundary proposed in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan (left) and the proposed amendment to include West View Farm by the landowner (right).

As shown on the Figure, the change makes a minor and negligible change to the boundary and spatially does not make a material difference to the composition of the village. What the amendment does do, is incorporate further previously developed land into the Development Boundary, allowing further control over the redevelopment of the village. The inclusion would help revitalise this part of the village, preventing the former farm and yard from ceasing use, deteriorating and adversely impacting upon the character and setting of the area.

**Material Considerations**

The site is considered to be suitable of inclusion and redevelopment within the Development Boundary. This is further compounded due to the absence of material considerations that would preclude development.

Flood Risk

The site is located within Flood Zone 1 which is the lowest probability of flooding from rivers and the sea. Therefore, sequentially in regards to Flood Risk, the site is a preferred location.

Heritage

According to Historic England and Nottinghamshire HER, the site is absent of any heritage records or designations. The closest listing to the site is the Chesterfield Canal, Lecture Room Bridge, approximately 210m to the south-west. Redevelopment of the site would not impose harm to the setting of this asset or inflict any visual harm. Therefore, in regard to heritage, the site is considered suitable for conversion without any harm to the historic environment.

Residential Amenity

Whilst spatially well-connected to the village the site benefits from suitable distances away from the residential dwellings to the north, east and west, meaning that redevelopment of the site could be achieved without considerations such as loss of light, overlooking and overshadowing. Any development of the site would take account of the Design Guidance for Hayton and the site is capable of conforming to a suitable land use, layout and density to compliment the surrounding vernacular.

Views

It is noted that there is an important north-westerly view from the canal to the south of the site, as depicted on the Hayton Design Guidance. Redevelopment of the site would not have an impact on this view being located to the east of the line of sight, however it is considered that subject to design, the site has potential to enhance views through the site given a visual permeable design.

**Summary**

In summary, the landowner requests that the Development Boundary should be amended to include West View Farm. It is considered that the amendment should occur based on the following:-

* The site is infrequently used, previously developed, and is in danger or deteriorating
* The site is well connected to the village, and developed has been present on the site for over 70 years
* The site is now available to be developed and included within the Development Boundary of the Neighbourhood Plan
* Spatially, the site relates well to the village and the amendment, as shown on Figure 3, would have a negligible impact on the composition of the village
* Materially, this amendment is the same as Church Farm which was also been amended through this process
* The inclusion would not inflict any harm on the village or the setting and character. It is considered that exclusion of the site may give rise to increased harm as the exclusion of the site would limit redevelopment options

It is therefore considered that West View Farm should be included within the Development Boundary and the landowner encourages dialogue from Bassetlaw and Hayton Parish Council in order to help achieve this.

## 5: Canal & River Trust

Thank you for consulting the Canal & River Trust on the draft Hayton Neighbourhood Plan.

We are the charity who look after and bring to life 2000 miles of canals & rivers. Our waterways contribute to the health and wellbeing of local communities and economies, creating attractive and connected places to live, work, volunteer and spend leisure time. These historic, natural and cultural assets form part of the strategic and local green-blue infrastructure network, linking urban and rural communities as well as habitats. By caring for our waterways and promoting their use we believe we can improve the wellbeing of our nation. The Trust is also a statutory consultee in the Development Management process.

We are owner, operator and Navigation Authority for some 2.25km of the Chesterfield Canal within the Plan area. The canal is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) because of its rare aquatic plant life, including linton's pondweed, short-leaved water starwort, and brackish water crowfoot; it is also a County Wildlife Site (Chesterfield Canal- Welham to Misterton).

Given both the importance of the canal as a wildlife habitat and its very rural character (much valued by walkers and boaters for its peace and tranquility) we consider that the draft Plan takes an appropriate approach by looking to preserve this character and protect the canal from inappropriate development. Policy 7 of the draft Plan adds further support and protection for the role of the canal as a valuable green infrastructure and biodiversity asset. We also note that a number of views of the canal are identified as important views and vistas in Policy 10 and are to be further safeguarded from development proposals likely to harm these views.

Overall, the Trust therefore considers that the draft Plan is appropriate and seeks to ensure that the Chesterfield Canal continues to be protected from inappropriate development which could harm its value as a wildlife habitat or as a recreational resource enjoyed by the local community.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any queries you may have.

## 6: Coal Authority

Thank you for your notification received on the 26th January 2023 in respect of the above consultation.

The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body sponsored by the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero. As a statutory consultee, The Coal Authority has a duty to respond to planning applications and development plans in order to protect the public and the environment in mining areas.

Our records indicate that within the identified Neighbourhood Plan area there are no recorded coal mining features present at surface or shallow depth which may pose a risk to surface stability and public safety. On this basis the Planning team at the Coal Authority have no specific comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.

## 7: Environment Agency

Thank you for giving the Environment Agency (EA) the opportunity to reply to the above Regulation 16 consultation.

We provided comments to the pre submission draft plan (Regulation 14) consultation. As such we have provided updated comments in line with the latest submission.

**Environment Agency position**

There have been no changes to the proposed sites for possible housing development. As mentioned in our previous response we are pleased that these sites are located within flood zone 1 and therefore we have no fluvial flood risk concerns to raise.

The previous comments relating to available hydraulic modelling are still valid however and have been included again below for completeness.

It should be noted that the EA only give feedback on fluvial flood risks. The Chesterfield Canal runs close to the settlement of Hayton and we do not hold modelling data for this waterbody. You may wish to contact the Canal and Rivers Trust (CRT) to see if they hold modelled data.

Please note that surface water and ordinary watercourses fall within the remit of the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) who in this case are Nottinghamshire County Council. They may hold modelled data relating to these elements.

**Biodiversity Net Gain**

We are pleased to note that substantial changes have been incorporated within the neighbourhood plan which reflect our previous comments.

Notably in sections 7.13 – Green and Blue Infrastructure and 8.1 – Land for Future Housing Development.

Significant changes have been made to section 7.13.1 (d) which notes the requirement for providing biodiversity net gains (BNG) in line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The requirement for at least 10% BNG has also now been incorporated into Policy 7: Green and Blue Infrastructure and Biodiversity which is a positive amendment.

Section 8.1.11 has now been added which highlights the requirement for a BNG of at least 10% for all new development.

**Green Infrastructure**

We note that positive changes have been made to section 7.13 – Green and Blue Infrastructure which relate directly to our previous comments.

We are of the opinion that the neighbourhood plan now adequately addresses the linkage between blue/green infrastructure and the benefits this linkage provides. We are pleased to see that Policy 7: Green and Blue Infrastructure and Biodiversity has been significantly expanded to reflect this.

**Sustainable design**

We previously noted that the Neighbourhood Plan should include the requirement for all new development to meet tighter water efficiency targets of 100 litres per person per day.

We are pleased to note that Policy 2: Delivering Good Design has now been updated to include specific reference to these requirements.

## 8: Historic England

Thank you for consulting Historic England on the Regulation 16 stage of the Hayton

Neighbourhood Plan.

I attach our comments from the Regulation 14 stage of the plan, which we sent back in October last year. At this point we have no further comments to make beyond our previous advice.

## 9: National Highways

Thank you for consulting National Highways on the Hayton Neighbourhood Plan which covers the period 2020 to 2038. The plan is to be in conformity with the Bassetlaw DC Local Plan and this is acknowledged within the document.

National Highways has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as a strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is our role to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth.

In responding to Local Plan consultations, we have regard to DfT Circular 01/2022: The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development (‘the Circular’). This sets out how interactions with the Strategic Road Network should be considered in the making of local plans. In addition to the Circular, the response is also in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and other relevant policies.

National Highways principal interest is in safeguarding the safe operation of the SRN in the area, namely the A1 which routes approximately 7 miles to the east of the Plan area.

We responded to the draft submission version of the Hayton Neighbourhood Plan (Reg 14 consultation) in September 2022. At that time, we acknowledged that due to the scale and anticipated distribution of the additional development growth being proposed through the Neighbourhood Plan, it is unlikely that there will be any significant impacts on the

operation of the SRN in the area.

Our latest response with regard to this Reg 16 consultation is consistent with the above and as such we have no further comments to make.

If I can be of any further assistance on this matter, please do not hesitate in contacting

me.

## 10: Natural England.

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 25 January 2023

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.

**Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.**

However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.

## 11: Nottinghamshire County Council – Highways

Dear Sir

As previously reported:

**Policy 11c – Infill Development Sites, Frontage Developments (Garages, Extensions and Outbuildings)**

Windrush

The footway will require widening across the site frontage.

Farm Cottage (no.42 Main Street)

The footway will require widening across the site frontage. It is likely that access would need to be shared with Farm Cottage to achieve adequate visibility splays onto Main Street.

Ridgely Wood Farm (no.14 Main Street)

The footway will require widening across the site frontage. It is likely that access would need to be shared with Ridgely Wood Farm to achieve adequate visibility splays onto Main Street.

**Appendix 5: Hayton Design Guidance and Codes**

The Hayton Design Guidance and Codes should refer to the Nottinghamshire Highway Design Guide. It is unlikely that Nottinghamshire County Council as the local highway authority would be able to support a development proposal that is not in general compliance with the Highway Design Guide.

## 12: S. Ashton, on behalf of P. A. Harrison and Family

These comments are submitted on behalf of Mr P A Harrison and family who are the owners of Church Farm, Main Street, Hayton. Representations have previously been submitted to the Bassetlaw Local Plan Consultation in 2020 and 2021.

Many of the farm buildings at Church Farm are no longer suitable for modern farming practices and the owner and his family now farms in partnership with another farmer away from Church Farm. The buildings are now mainly used for storage purposes and therefore a new economically viable use for this brownfield site is required.

The Harrison family live in Hayton and are fully aware of the pressures, concerns and aspirations facing Hayton over the next 15 years. Mr Harrison has appointed representatives to advise the family on redevelopment opportunities for the Church Farm site. The representatives are experienced professionals working in property market and they have met the Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan Group several times over the last few years to promote the site and discuss different development ideas. The discussions have been open and constructive.

The overall vision for Hayton in the Neighbourhood Plan is supported, the draft document is comprehensive and we congratulate the Neighbourhood Plan Group on a thorough document which has clearly taken a considerable time and effort to produce. Policy 11b-Church Farm Development Policy sets out that the site should provide for a mixture of house types and sizes and this is supported. The Policy sets out a number of requirements on issues such as design, drainage, landscaping and respect for the adjacent Listed Building all of which can be addressed through the submission of a planning application. Figure 26 is an example of an indicative layout for the Church Farm site. We have commissioned an experienced architect who will prepare a new layout for the site and we are happy to share this with the Parish Council at the appropriate time as part of pre-application discussions. I think it is important not to be too prescriptive within the Neighbourhood Plan in terms of the housing mix, footprint location and the size of proposed dwellings as the site needs to be viable and attractive to a small quality housebuilder otherwise the site will remain vacant.

The intention is to enter into pre-application discussions with the Parish Council in 2023 prior to marketing the site. The submission of a planning application will follow the pre-application discussions.

Farming will continue on the remaining land under the ownership of the Harrison family.

The family will continue to live adjacent to Church Farm and they wish to ensure the scheme is high quality and therefore requests that flexibility is allowed within the Policy as the proposals evolve next year.

## 13: Severn Trent Water

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your consultation, we have some specific comments to make on your plan. Please keep us informed when your plans are further developed when we will be able to offer more detailed comments and advice.

**Position Statement**

As a water company we have an obligation to provide water supplies and sewage treatment capacity for future development. It is important for us to work collaboratively with Local Planning Authorities to provide relevant assessments on the impacts of future developments and to provide advice regarding policy wording on other relevant areas such as water efficiency, Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), biodiversity, and blue green infrastructure. Where more detail is provided on site allocations, we will provide specific comments on the suitability of the site with respect to the water and sewerage network. In the instances where there may be a concern over the capacity of the network, we may look to undertake modelling to better understand the potential risk. For most developments there is unlikely to be an issue connecting. However, where an issue is identified, we will look to discuss in further detail with the Local Planning Authority. Where there is sufficient confidence that a development will go ahead, we will look to complete any necessary improvements to provide additional capacity.

**Paragraph 7.1.14**

Severn Trent are supportive of the inclusion of the Drainage hierarchy within the Hayton Local Plan, the sustainable discharge of surface water is essentialto ensure drainage systems remain resilient to the impacts of climate change by directing flows back into the natural water system at a controlled rate as early as possible.

**Policy 1b: Sustainable Water Management systems**

Severn Trent are supportive of the principles within Policy 1b, in particular Water efficiency, SuDS and the Drainage Hierarchy. Our general Guidelines at the bottom of this response provide further

information on why we support the need to incorporate these aspects into Local Planning Policy.

**Policy 2: Delivering Good Design**

Severn Trent note that Policy 2 also incorporates a reference to water efficiency and support this as water efficiency should be a key consideration that is included in a well-designed development. We would also highlight that the use of SuDS inline with current best practice and the drainage hierarchy as essential for delivering a well-designed site and would recommend that they are also mentioned under Policy 2, to ensure that they are considered from the outset of the design process, as recommended by the SuDS Manual(CIRIA C753).

**Policy 9: Trees**

Severn Trent recognise the benefits provided by ensuring trees are retained on development sites or Planted within the urban landscape, for biodiversity and place setting. We would recommend that where trees are proposed to be planted in new developments that the use of Tree-Pits are considered to support the development of the tree and provide a source of sustainable surface water management. By including a recommendation for the consideration of Tree-pits within Policy 9 will further support the promotion of SuDS alongside biodiversity.

**Policy 11a: Corner Farm**

The proposed development at Corner Farm is not anticipated to have a significant impact on the sewerage system, the development would be anticipated to connect into the Foul Sewer in Smeath Lane, However as this is a foul sewer surface water should not be connected into this system. There is a surface water sewer located south of the development in Main Street, if a sustainable discharge to ground or watercourse cannot be achieved this surface water sewer would be more suitable than any of the Foul sewers in the network.

We are supportive of the inclusion of statements within Policy 11a, to highlight the need for SuDS to be constructed, and to increase biodiversity through the inclusions of Trees and vegetation as part of the street scene.

**Policy 11b: Church Farm Development**

The proposed development at Church Farm is not anticipated to have a significant impact on the sewerage system, the development would be anticipated to connect to the foul sewer in Main Street, however as this is a foulsewer surface water should not be connected into this system. There is a surface water sewer to the north of the site in Main street, if a sustainable discharge to ground or watercourse cannot be achieved this surface water sewer would be more suitable than any of the Foul sewers in the network.

We are supportive of the inclusion of statements within Policy 11a, to highlight the need for SuDS to be constructed, and to increase biodiversity through the inclusions of Trees and vegetation as part of the street scene.

**Policy 11c: Infill Development Sites, Frontage Developments (Garages, Extensions and Outbuildings)**

Severn Trent are supportive of the need to protect the natural flow of water and the natural environment of water. The retention of watercourses (including ditches) and for surface water flows to enter watercourses is essential for mitigating flood risks, and facilitate sustainable surface water discharges.

For your information we have set out some general guidelines and relevant policy wording that may be useful to you.

**Wastewater Strategy**

We have a duty to provide capacity for new development in the sewerage network and at our Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) and to ensure that we protect the environment. On a company level we are producing a Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan covering the next 25 years, which assesses the future pressures on our catchments including the impacts of climate change, new development growth and impermeable area creep. This plan will support future investment in our wastewater infrastructure and encourages collaborative working with other Risk Management Authorities to best manage current and future risks.

Where site allocations are available, we can provide a high-level assessment of the impact on the existing network. Where issues are identified, we will look to undertake hydraulic sewer modelling to better understand the risk and where there is sufficient confidence that a de velopment will be built, we will look to undertake an improvement scheme to provide capacity.

**Surface Water**

Management of surface water is an important feature of new development as the increased coverage of impermeable area on a site can increase the rainwater flowing off the site. The introduction of these flows to the public sewerage system can increase the risk of flooding for existing residents. It is therefore vital that surface water flows are managed sustainably, avoiding connections into the foul or combined sewerage system and where possible directed back into the natural water systems. We recommend that the following policy wording is included in your plan to ensure that surface water discharges are connected in accordance with the drainage hierarchy:

**Drainage Hierarchy Policy**

New developments shall demonstrate that all surface water discharges have been carried out in accordance with the principles laid out within the drainage hierarchy, whereby a discharge to the public sewerage system is avoided where possible.

Supporting Text:

Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 80 (Reference ID: 7-080-20150323) states:

“Generally the aim should be to discharge surface water run off as high up the following hierarchy of

drainage options as reasonably practicable:

1. into the ground (infiltration);

2. to a surface water body;

3. to a surface water sewer, highway drain, or another drainage system;

4. to a combined sewer.”

**Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)**

Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) represent the most effective way of managing surface water flows whilst being adaptable to the impact of climate change and providing wider benefits around water quality, biodiversity, and amenity. We therefore recommend that the following policy wording is included within your plan regarding SuDS:

Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) Policy

All major developments shall ensure that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) for the management of surface water run-off are included, unless proved to be inappropriate.

All schemes with the inclusion of SuDS should demonstrate they have considered all four areas of good SuDS design: quantity, quality, amenity and biodiversity.

Completed SuDS schemes should be accompanied by a maintenance schedule detailing maintenance boundaries, responsible parties and arrangements to ensure the SuDS are managed in perpetuity.

Supporting Text:

Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be designed in accordance with current industry best practice, The SuDS Manual, CIRIA (C753), to ensure that the systems deliver both the surface water quantity and the wider benefits, without significantly increasing costs. Good SuDS design can be key for creating a strong sense of place and pride in the community for where they live, work and visit, making the surface water management features as much a part of the development as the buildings and roads.

**Blue Green Infrastructure**

We are supportive of the principles of blue green infrastructure and plans that aim to improve biodiversity across our area. Looking after water means looking after nature and the environment too. As a water company we have launched a Great Big Nature Boost Campaign which aims to revive 12,000 acres of land, plant 1.3 million trees and restore 2,000km of rivers across our region by 2027. We also have ambitious plans to revive peat bogs and moorland, to plant wildflower meadows working with the RSPB, National Trust, Moors for the Future Partnership, the Rivers Trust, National Forest and regional Wildlife Trusts and conservation groups.

We want to encourage new development to continue this theme, enhancing biodiversity and ecology links through new development so there is appropriate space for water. To enable planning policy to support the principles of blue green Infrastructure, biodiversity and protecting local green open spaces we recommend the inclusion of the following policies:

Blue and Green Infrastructure Policy

Development should where possible create and enhance blue green corridors to protect watercourses and their associated habitats from harm.

Supporting Text:

The incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) into blue green corridors can help to improve biodiversity, assisting with the wider benefits of utilising SuDS. National Planning Policy Framework (2018) paragraph 170 States:

“Planning policies and Decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

1. protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their Statutory Status or identified quality in the development plan);
2. recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;
3. maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving public access to it where appropriate;
4. minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;”

Green Open Spaces Policy

Development of flood resilience schemes within local green spaces will be supported provided the schemes do not adversely impact the primary function of the green space.

Supporting Text:

We understand the need for protecting Green Spaces, however open spaces can provide suitable locations for schemes such as flood alleviation schemes to be delivered without adversely impacting on the primary function of the open space. If the correct scheme is chosen, the flood alleviation schemes can result in additional benefits to the local green space through biodiversity and amenity benefits.

**Water Quality and Resources**

Good quality watercourses and groundwater is vital for the provision of good quality drinking water. We work closely with the Environment Agency and local farmers to ensure that the water quality of our supplies are not impacted by our operations or those of others. Any new developments need to ensure that the Environment Agency’s Source Protection Zones (SPZ) and Safeguarding Zone policies which have been adopted by Natural Resources Wales are adhered to. Any proposals should take into account the principles of the Water Framework Directive and River Basin Management Plan as prepared by the Environment Agency.

Every five years we produce a Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) which focuses on how we plan to ensure there is sufficient supply of water to meet the needs of our customers whilst protecting our environment over the next 25 years. We use housing target data from Local Planning Authorities to plan according to the projected growth rates. New development results in the need for an increase in the amount of water that needs to be supplied across our region. We are committed to doing the right thing and finding new sustainable sources of water, along with removing unsustainable abstractions, reducing leakage from the network and encouraging the uptake of water meters to promote a change in water usage to reduce demand.

New developments have a role to play in protecting water resources, we encourage you to include the following policies:

Protection of Water Resources Policy

New developments must demonstrate that they will not result in adverse impacts on the quality of waterbodies, groundwater and surface water, will not prevent waterbodies and groundwater from achieving a good status in the future and contribute positively to the environment and ecology.

Where development has the potential to directly or indirectly pollute groundwater, a groundwater risk assessment will be needed to support a planning application.

Supporting Text:

National Planning Policy Framework (July 2018) Paragraph 163 states:

“Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment… e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as river basin management plans;”

Water Efficiency Policy

We are supportive of the use of water efficient design of new developments fittings and appliances and encourage the optional higher water efficiency target of 110 litres per person per day within part G of building regulations. Delivering against the optional higher target or better provides wider benefits to the water cycle and environment as a whole. This approach is not only the most sustainable but the most appropriate direction to deliver water efficiency. We would therefore recommend that the following wording is included for the optional higher water efficiency standard:

New developments should demonstrate that they are water efficient, incorporating water efficiency and re-use measures and that the estimated consumption of wholesome water per dwelling is calculated in accordance with the methodology in the water efficiency calculator, not exceeding 110 litres/person/day.

Supporting Text:

National Planning Policy Framework (July 2018) Paragraph 149 states:

“Plans should take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change, taking into account the long-term implications for flood risk, costal change, water supply, biodiversity and landscapes, and the risk of overheating from rising temperatures. Policies should support appropriate measures to ensure the future resilience of communities and infrastructure to climate change impacts, such as providing space for physical protection measures, or making provision for the possible future relocation of vulnerable development and infrastructure.”

This need for lower water consumption standards for new developments is supported by Government. In December 2018, the Government stated the need to a reduction in Per Capita Consumption (PCC) and issued a call for evidence on future PCC targets in January 2019, with an intention of setting a long term national target. The National Infrastructure Commission ( NIC) has already presented a report including recommendations for an average PCC of 118 l/p/d. In Wales, the 110 l/p/d design standard was made mandatory in November 2018. In 2021 the Environment Agency classed the Severn Trent region as Seriously Water Stressed – link.

We recommend that all new developments consider:

* Single flush siphon toilet cistern and those with a flush volume of 4 litres.
* Showers designed to operate efficiently and with a maximum flow rate of 8 litres per minute.
* Hand wash basin taps with low flow rates of 4 litres per minute or less.
* Water butts for external use in properties with gardens.

**Water Supply**

For the majority of new developments, we do not anticipate issues connecting new development, particularly within urban areas of our water supply network. When specific detail of planned development location and sizes are available a site-specific assessment of the capacity of our water supply network could be made. Any assessment will involve carrying out a network analysis exercise to investigate any potential impacts. If significant development in rural areas is planned, this is more likely to have an impact and require network reinforcements to accommodate greater demands.

**Developer Enquiries**

When there is more detail available on site-specific developments, we encourage developers to get in contact with Severn Trent at an early stage in planning to ensure that there is sufficient time for a development site to be assessed and if network reinforcements are required that there is time to develop an appropriate scheme to address the issues. We therefore encourage developers to contact us, details of how to submit a Developer Enquiry can be found here - <https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/new-site-developments/developer-enquiries/>

We hope that this information has been useful to you and we look forward to hearing from you in

the near future.

## 14: Sport England

Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above neighbourhood plan.

Government planning policy, within the **National Planning Policy Framework** (NPPF), identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important.

It is essential therefore that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 98 and 99. It is also important to be aware of Sport England’s statutory consultee role in **protecting playing fields** and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England’s playing fields policy is set out in our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document.

[https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-](https://protect-eu.mimecast.com/s/NDa-CZV9Nu5NW86IzNyMI?domain=sportengland.org) [sport#playing\_fields\_policy](https://protect-eu.mimecast.com/s/NDa-CZV9Nu5NW86IzNyMI?domain=sportengland.org)

Sport England provides guidance on **developing planning policy** for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded.

[https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-](https://protect-eu.mimecast.com/s/eIjsC1rvPsMYQB4hGAP2k?domain=sportengland.org) [sport#planning\_applications](https://protect-eu.mimecast.com/s/eIjsC1rvPsMYQB4hGAP2k?domain=sportengland.org)

Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Par 99 of the NPPF, this takes the form of **assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities**. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.

Where such evidence does not already exist then relevant planning policies in a neighbourhood plan should be based on a proportionate assessment of the need for sporting provision in its area. Developed in consultation with the local sporting and wider community any assessment should be used to provide key recommendations and deliverable actions. These should set out what provision is required to ensure the current and future needs of the community for sport can be met and, in turn, be able to support the development and implementation of planning policies. Sport England’s guidance on assessing needs may help with such work. [http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance](https://protect-eu.mimecast.com/s/dVC3C2vwQcpwDZYsBSgkK?domain=sportengland.org)

If **new or improved sports facilities** are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes. <http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/>

Any **new housing** developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place.

In line with the Government’s NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links below, consideration should also be given to how **any new development**, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England’s Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing planning policies and developing or assessing individual proposals.

Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. The guidance, and its accompanying checklist, could also be used at the evidence gathering stage of developing a neighbourhood plan to help undertake an assessment of how the design and layout of the area currently enables people to lead active lifestyles and what could be improved.

NPPF Section 8: [https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-](https://protect-eu.mimecast.com/s/tTT0C4RyPIB1w9VuVKobh?domain=gov.uk) [communities](https://protect-eu.mimecast.com/s/tTT0C4RyPIB1w9VuVKobh?domain=gov.uk)

PPG Health and wellbeing section: [https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing](https://protect-eu.mimecast.com/s/awMXC59zXsZGrpJS8ALHh?domain=gov.uk)

Sport England’s Active Design Guidance: [https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign](https://protect-eu.mimecast.com/s/VA7bC6RA4IrK40NiB-Wo3?domain=sportengland.org)

*(Please note: this response relates to Sport England’s planning function only. It is not associated with our funding role or any grant application/award that may relate to the site.)*

If you need any further advice, please do not hesitate to contact Sport England using the contact details below.