

# Consultation Statement



## **MISTERTON** NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN **Review 2022 - 2038**



*Prepared by Planning With People on behalf of the Neighbourhood Planning Group and Misterton Parish Council*

13 September 2023

## **Table of Contents**

Introduction.....	3
Pre Regulation 14 Consultation.....	3
Regulation 14 Consultation.....	4
Residents' Responses.....	6
Statutory Consultees and other organisations.....	10

## **Introduction**

1. This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations in accordance with the Localism Act 2011 for Dordon Neighbourhood Plan. 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:
  - a) Contain details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Plan;
  - b) Explain how they were consulted;
  - c) Summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
  - d) Describe how those issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan
2. A sub-group of Misterton Parish Council (the Neighbourhood Plan Group or NPG) was set up in 2016 to produce the Misterton Parish Neighbourhood Plan which was made in 2019. The Parish Council decided to do an early Review to provide more clarity on the brownfield site and windfall policy which led on to undertaking additional analysis on landscape sensitivity and design. Consequently, the NPG was made up of people who had already recently completed the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan. The parish Council were clear that this the extent of the Review given that that Neighbourhood Plan had been so recently made.
3. The Neighbourhood Plan Review has been an agenda item on most Parish Council meetings. The Neighbourhood Plan Review Group consisted of Parish Councillors and residents keen to be involved in the project. The NPG wanted continued involvement from residents and additional NPG members were added for the Review.

## **Pre-Regulation 14 Consultation**

4. The Misterton Neighbourhood Plan was made in September 2019. A decision to do an early Review was made in 2020 due to the made Neighbourhood Plan being unable to guide development effectively to the sites that were allocated for growth and an awareness that the brownfield site and windfall policy in the made Neighbourhood Plan was unclear and could have unintended consequences. Covid restrictions meant that face to face discussion was not permitted for some time and the Parish Council were of the view that the community had been fully engaged in commenting on the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan that involved site allocation. Work on the Review Neighbourhood Plan involved active residents on the NPG and feedback was provided via parish council meetings and articles in the local newsletter updating residents on the Review progress. The substantive consultation for the Review was undertaken at Regulation 14.

## Regulation 14 Consultation

5. The Regulation 14 consultation ran from 31<sup>st</sup> October to 16<sup>th</sup> December 2022. The leaflet below was distributed to all households encouraging everyone to comment. It directed people to look at the Misterton Review Neighbourhood Plan on line and advertised a drop-in session at the Misterton Centre on Saturday 12 November from 9.30am – 4.00pm.
6. Paper copies of the MRNP were available at the Misterton Centre (which is the community hub and includes the library).



Dear Resident

Please take the time to read this leaflet as it's important in how our village continues to develop.

### REVIEW OF THE MISTERTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

The Misterton Neighbourhood Plan was developed over a three-year period with extensive consultation with the community and went to a village referendum in September 2019. It was approved by a majority of those voting so was 'made' – in other words, it has legal weight when Bassetlaw District Council (BDC) is determining planning applications.

Since our Plan was made, it has become clear to the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group that there are areas in the Plan that need improvement. These changes have been due, in part, to developments in neighbourhood planning, changes in legislation and guidance, learning from other villages that completed their plans after Misterton, and seeing how our plan has worked in practice.

Many of the Neighbourhood Plan policies remain unchanged but there are some key updates in the Misterton Review Neighbourhood Plan and these are listed below:

- we now have **Design Codes** produced by Urban Designers from AECOM (a national planning consultancy), which gives a much clearer picture of how we want future developments to look
  - a section on **key views** and **significant green gaps** provides more detail about those wide green gaps between built-up areas that we want to preserve in the belief that not every bit of land has to be built on
- there is a new section on the **Newell's site**, which, in the 2019 consultation, many residents wanted developed – but because it falls into the Environment Agency's classification as an area with the highest risk of flooding, we were advised to exclude it as a site for housing. But there are other possible uses of the site, and these are considered
- in this review, the definition of '**infill**' has been clarified and allows for a small number of dwellings
  - **housing density** has been re-examined.

The changes outlined mean that the Misterton Review Neighbourhood Plan must go out to public consultation again. In addition to residents, statutory agencies, such as Bassetlaw District Council and Nottinghamshire County Council, the Environment Agency, Notts Police, etc will also be consulted. This is arranged by Bassetlaw District Council.

The consultation period will last for just over 6 weeks from Monday 31 October to Friday 16 December.

It should be remembered that the Neighbourhood Plan is not to stop development – this is made clear in the legislation that permits Neighbourhood Plans - but to support it, subject to development proposals meeting relevant criteria.

We have been guided in this review process by experienced neighbourhood planning consultants, funded from Locality (a government organisation) and BDC's neighbourhood planning officers.

Below, there is information on how to find out more about Misterton Review Neighbourhood Plan and how to make your views on it known.

### **TIME TO HAVE YOUR SAY**

We want to hear your views on the revised Neighbourhood Plan.  
Your views matter. The statutory consultation is from Monday 31 October to Friday 16 December 2022.  
Every household in Misterton will receive this leaflet and request to participate.

Information will be on posters around the village and sent to local media, including newspapers.

Copies of the Misterton Review Neighbourhood Plan and Design Codes are available at The Misterton Centre where there is also a comment form for you to complete. The Misterton Centre is open Tuesday to Thursday 10.00am -5.00pm and Friday 10.00am-2.00pm. The Library is open on the second and fourth Saturday of every month from 9.30am to 12.30pm.

You will find an electronic copy of the Misterton Review Neighbourhood Plan and the Design Codes on the Misterton Parish Council website ([www.misterton-notts-pc.gov.uk](http://www.misterton-notts-pc.gov.uk))

All Library members can log onto a computer in the Library to access this information online. Information will also be posted on Misterton Parish Council's Facebook page.

### **COME AND HAVE YOUR SAY IN PERSON**

The Misterton Centre will be open on Saturday 12 November between 9.30am and 4.00pm. Copies of the Misterton Review Neighbourhood Plan and Design Codes will be available to view with extracts highlighted.

Members of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group will be there to answer questions.

If you have any queries or questions, please contact the Parish Clerk on (01427) 890780 or by e-mail at: [theclerk@misterton-notts-pc.gov.uk](mailto:theclerk@misterton-notts-pc.gov.uk)

**We look forward to hearing from you**  
**Members of Misterton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group**

7. Some comments were posted to the Parish Council others were provided at the drop-in session. Where these comments are relevant to planning, they have been set out below with a response provided.
8. BDC provided a comprehensive list of statutory consultees, and these were emailed seeking a response to the Pre-Submission MRNP.

Note: A consequence of the revisions to the MRNP based on these comments is that Policy numbering from Policy 8R onwards is amended. Therefore, consultee references to policy number after 7R Renewable Energy, Energy Efficiency and Low Carbon Technologies have been amended as follows.

Pre-Submission NP Policy Numbers	Submission NP Policy Numbers
Policies numbers the same 1R to 7R then	
Aspiration policy 1 <u>Redevelopment of Newell's Factory site</u>	<u>Policy 8R Redevelopment of Newell's Factory Site</u>
Policy 8R Protecting and Enhancing Heritage Assets	<u>Policy 9R Protecting and Enhancing Heritage Assets</u>
Policy 9R (1) Supporting Local Businesses.	<u>Policy 10R Supporting Local Businesses</u>
Policy 9R(2) Communication Connectivity	<u>Policy 11R Improving Broadband and Mobile Connectivity</u>
Policy 10R A Mix of Housing Types	Policy 12R A Mix of Housing Types
Policy 11R Enhancing the Provision of Community Facilities	<u>Policy 13R Enhancing the Provision of Community Facilities</u>
Policy 12R NP01 Land off Haxey Road	<u>Policy 14R Land off Haxey Road</u>
Policy 13R NP02 Land off Church Street	Policy 15R NP02 Land off Church Street
Policy 14R NP06 Land off Meadow Drive	Policy 16R NP06 Land off Meadow Drive
Policy 15R NP11 Land off Grange Walk	Policy 17R NP11 Land off Grange Walk
Policy 16R NP12 Land off Fox Covert Lane	Policy 18R NP12 Land off Fox Covert Lane

### Residents' Responses

Ref	Section of Plan	Comments	Amendments Made
1	General	In general we agree with all aspects of the Plan and thank you for all the hard work that has gone into it	supportive
2	General	Still feel great concern about the old "Newells corner" site. At present an utter disgrace.  Still great worry about parking at the end of Grovewood Road. No parking near and around the corner needed – double yellow lines. Do we have to wait until someone is killed before the County Council act?	Agree and the NP identifies possible redevelopment opportunities.  Noted and PC aware – this is a NCC highways matter
3	Policy 1R	Very well explained and I am pleased to see that the plans for development are in	Supportive

Ref	Section of Plan	Comments	Amendments Made
		keeping with the lovely rural character of Misterton	
4	Policy 1R	Fully supported	
5		<p>We support the idea if the plot is big enough for a garden and off-street parking.</p> <p>The Council also needs to recognise that the doctors and school will struggle with the expanded village and needs to make provisions. I know the doctors have several surgeries but remember a lot cannot travel to Retford or Gringley and Harworth.</p> <p>No dentist again needs to be addressed. What do our teenagers have? ...More houses [means] more children and they need some[where to play].</p>	<p>Supportive</p> <p>The PC recognise the constraints and continue to seek to engage with health services – but this is a national problem</p>
6		Happy to see the policy plans	Supportive
7	Policy 3R	Fully supported	Supportive
8	Policy 3R	We support this idea	Supportive
9	Policy 3R	As a walker I am keen to see current walking routes around green areas of Misterton maintained. Perhaps some cycling routes (off road) would interest visitors and benefit local residents who enjoy these activities?	The NP supports walking and cycling across the Parish and the Public Rights of Way are protected
10	Policy 4R	Fully supported	Supportive
11	Policy 4R	Green gaps do create an open border between villages boundaries. Development may enhance these areas and allow more people to appreciate them.	Supportive
12	Policy 4R	I agree with the policies	Supportive
13	Policy 5R	Fully supported	Supportive
14	Policy 5R	Even the sports field needs development for people to continue to use. One idea is an outside gym equipment to aid mental health and wellbeing which has been put into other parishes and has had a positive response for young and old who can't afford to go to the gym. <a href="http://www.freshairfitness.co.uk">www.freshairfitness.co.uk</a>	The PC note this suggestion

Ref	Section of Plan	Comments	Amendments Made
15	Policy 5R	Rural views are important to all residents and need to be protected.	Agreed and the NP policy identifies where these views are.
16	Policy 6R	Whilst we support design that references existing building materials (para 3e) we think that exceptional quality contemporary architecture should be encouraged even if it departs from these guidelines with regard to use of materials.	Policy 6R (7) allows the flexibility for innovative design
17	Policy 6R	Sounds positive	Supportive
18	Policy 6R	These are certainly to be considered in developments. Some energy efficient houses can have different "looks" to older houses in the area and spoil the overall visual pleasure of the area.	The flexibility in criteria 7 reflects national policy
19	Policy 7R	Fully supported where the proposals are relevant and the technology is suitably advanced If every home could generate a small amount of power via solar or wind going into the national grid it would solve a lot of problems. Electric cars are the future but rechargeable battery cars are a likely stop gap to cars with a hydrogen tank. People should not be forced to install electric points when electric and copper is a precious resource.	The NP supports the move the low carbon development
20	Policy 7R	The above [Policy 7R] are good policies. Also to include the materials used on the exterior of the homes to ensure they do not clash with other homes in the area.	It is hoped that policy 6R and 7R will be used together to ensure good design and low carbon development.
21	Policy 8R	Fully supported. There are some non-designated assets in the village which are at risk such as the bridge over the mother drain adjacent to the river idle, by the Haxey Gate pub	This was not identified as a non designated heritage asset by the NPG
22	Policy 8R	We would prefer to see a building put up to use rather than it go to ruin.	Agreed
23	Policy 9R (1)	Fully supported	Supportive



Ref	Section of Plan	Comments	Amendments Made
24	Policy 9R (1)	We should support new commercial/live work dwellings so businesses can continue to provide local services and employment bringing much needed growth to existing businesses. The buildings should reflect the environment around it and also provide a nice space to work helping mental health & wellbeing. I believe councils should look to see what they can do to help and encourage businesses to grow in the area and utilise the space they have in the parish. Encouraging businesses in the sport leisure and tourism helps young people. From a personal view our son used to play at Misterton Golf club where he ended up getting a scholarship to play in the USA which he took & played golf for 2 years there and just shows where positive results happen.	Supportive
25	Policy 9R (1)	The village does need to encourage appropriate businesses to re-locate to start up here to develop and thrive.	Supportive
26	Policy 9R (2)	Yes please, anything that will support a better phone signal would be welcomed	Supportive
27	Policy 9R (2)	I agree with this [Policy 9R(2)] I know an awful lot of residents in Misterton that struggle with slow internet. This does need to be addressed if you are building extra houses. Young people need good internet access due to Netflix etc and to work from home.	Supportive
28	Policy 10R	Fully supported	Supportive
29	Policy 10R	A mix of housing is good and I think we need to take into consideration helping young people get onto the property	Supportive
30	Policy 10R	Agree	Supportive
31	Policy 11R	Support for more retail would be welcomed. The butcher and Co-op are very valuable to the village. For example, good retail use of the old Co-op.	Supportive
32	Policy 11R	Improving these facilities is a must and expanding would be a benefit	Supportive

Ref	Section of Plan	Comments	Amendments Made
33	Policy 11R	We are fortunate to live in a village which has retained its community spirit & all above support & develop this for	Supportive
34	Aspiration Policy 1	We would love the development of a train stop on this site. If the final solution to this site is likely to take years in the planning we think a short term "tidy up" programme should be implements such as replace the fencing with a more sightly boundary.	Supportive
35	Aspiration Policy 1	I hope Newells site will be "tidied up". At least planting of trees and shrubs for wildlife would help. Not just an abandoned area.	Supportive

## Statutory Consultees and other organisations

### Bassetlaw District Council

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
Overall	To improve clarity to add an indent in the policies for sub points a,b,c and the end of each sub point should be the same throughout	Style amended	Y
Overall	Presentation: Providing a coloured background for the policies would help them to stand out in the plan.	Style amended	Y
Overall	Ref should be to Submission Version Local Plan	Updated	Y
Overall	It may be beneficial to note all of the changes between the existing version of the Plan and the review version in a standalone section at the start of the Plan	This is provided in summary at para 9	N
Overall	Figures and images in the Plan to have unique ref numbers	Amended	Y
Page 5	wording should be 'Flood risk' not 'flooding'	Amended	Y
Policy 1R	Has there been a Housing Needs Assessment, how do you know what local requirements for housing are?	The consultation feedback in 2018 for the MNP and a Housing Needs Survey in 2012 identified the need for	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
		2-3 bed dwellings but that recent new developments have been for larger 4 bed homes see section 17 of the MRNP – text added to 1R (a)	
Policy 1R	Provide link to biodiversity net gain legislation	Added link	Y
Para 35	Amenity circulation space what does this mean?	Wording amended to 'provides a plot to building ratio that is comparable to adjoining properties	Y
Para 36	Define small sites	Wording amended to ref the design guide and infill sites being 1-3 dwellings (now para 39)	Y
Para 37	Ref to housing need studies	Added para 40	Y
Policy 1R and 2R	Combine these policies?	Infill development is what triggered the PC to review the NP – the community are keen to see a specific policy on it	N
Section 11 policy 5R and Appendix F	Advised to bring LGSs from MNP into main body of review NP	Amended as requested	Y
Map 9	Map update now using the one from the latest design code	Amended	Y
Policy 6R 3d	Ref to native trees but flexibility to ensure right tree for the space	Amended	Y
Aspiration policy	The redevelopment of Newell's is a community aspiration accepting the difficulty of the site due to flood risk, however comments from EA have enabled the NPG to reword the aspiration policy in such a way as it has now been reinstated as a policy.	Amended	Y
Map 11a and Map 11b	Map 11b added – it was missed out in error	Amended	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
Para 103	Wording of para amended to be more positive and to reflect the issue of concern about large scale development and its harm on the landscape rather than a list of types of business	(now para 105) amended	Y
Query way policy 9R1 and 9R2 were separate	Policy 9R2 was from the MNP and unchanged however this has now been revised and updated and is renumbered. This is now Policy 11R	Amended	Y
Policy 10R housing (now Policy 12R)	Ref to housing needs assessment is to two studies done in 2012 and 2018 and used to support the MNP. This is explained at para 129 and 130. Wording in policy criteria 1 amended to refer to local studies	Amended	Y
Para 124	Was the viability of the sites re-checked?	It was not considered necessary to re- check the viability and 4 out of the 5 sites are at varying stages in the process of being progressed. The made NP is only 3 years old and the assessment made at the time was considered up to date given the developer interest in the sites	N
Para 124	What is meant by Policy 12R to 16R do not seek approval for the allocation?	The sites already have approval via the made NP wording amended to sites already allocated	Y
	Have the site owners been contacted to confirm their sites are still available	4 out of the 5 sites either have planning permission or are at pre application, the site assessment was done in 2018 and the site owners are aware of the review	N

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
Site policies	<p>Would like site maps not maps from AECOM report</p> <p>In the region of or up to what is the difference</p> <p>Clarify LGS is next to NP12</p> <p>Query about extent of boundaries for LGS 8 and 9</p> <p>Typos in design code guidelines at para 144</p>	<p>Site maps requested from BDC</p> <p>Agreed to make all in the region of</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Minor amends made to these LGS boundaries</p> <p>Amended</p>	<p>Y</p> <p>Y</p> <p>Y</p> <p>Y</p> <p>Y</p>
General	Be careful of quoting para numbers in submission Bassetlaw Plan as this may change.	Noted, where possible ref to policy number rather than para number used	Y
1R	Policy 1R would. Be better as a high level policy and leave more detailed aspects to the other policies. Criteria in policy could be more related to scale and siting, other issues in detailed policies	Policy 1R amended agree that the review NP has much more detail on aspects of development than the made Np so can move away from the previous format. Criteria 1a-e removed – ref to housing mix added policy rewarded.	Y
2R	Quite restrictive ref to 1-2 dwellings – could have unintended implications for Newels site	NPG agreed to change ref to 1 -3 but otherwise being specific about what makes an infill site is a major reason why the NPG undertook such an early review. Newels site has its own policy to support redevelopment so don't see how this would affect it	Y
3R	What is a green link?	Green Links are identified in the Design Code and this is described in section 10 and shown on map 4	N
3R (4)	This is likely to be a cost to development and it isn't clear how this has been evidenced or how it will be implemented.	Tree planting policy is in context of BDCs ST 50 in the submission Local Plan (this is explained in section 10 of the MRNP)	N

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
		it would be negotiated as part of the landscape scheme for a development and could contribute to 10% biodiversity net gain targets. The Design Code has evidenced the significance of trees and tree canopy to the character of the parish NPG would like to see this remain	
7R	How does this relate to large scale renewal?	Section added to address renewable energy projects of a larger scale	Y
9R (now 10R)	Does this policy refer to employment inside or outside the development boundary and should it define employment uses?	Policy 10R has been amended	Y
11R	Post Office may not need planning permission and check all listed are classed as community facilities	Wording amended to reflect permitted development issues, and NPPF sited and definition which can include local services added. Pharmacy and post office are important local services. Pub, Co-op and Pavilion added to the list following further discussion with the NPG.	Y
Site allocation policies	Policies are good and detail here is effective but wonder if they should be moved to after policy 1R	Relocation of policies considered but much of the criteria-based policies inform the policy approach in the site allocation policies. However, text added after 1R to direct reader to site allocation policies to assist in navigation.	Y

**Sport England**

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
General	No specific comments to make - Provided general information on the importance of ensuring expanding communities have sufficient sports provision.	Noted Misterton Sports Field is protected as a LGS in the MNP	NA

**Nottinghamshire County Council Highways**

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
General	No objections on highways grounds to the NP	Noted	NA
Design Code	<p>Part H Major development para 4.9.1 movement and connectivity – it is unlikely that a major development in Misterton would be of a scale that would justify the inclusion of a cycle track it is also unlikely that existing streets would be of sufficient width for it to be possible to introduce meaningful cycling infrastructure in Misterton.</p> <p>Fourth bullet point suggests that new streets should include trees set within verges alongside carriageway. This arrangement may not be favoured by the highway authority verges can cause severance for pedestrians and present difficulties for motorists and passengers when alighting from vehicles</p>	Noted – the NPG are not able to amend the AECOM reports at this stage, a cycle track is an aspiration but not a policy requirement	NA

**National Highways**

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
General	Principle interest is in safeguarding the A1 and M180. The allocated sites remain unchanged and any additional development will be restricted to small infill/windfall sites. Given the distribution of the additional development growth being	Noted	NA

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
	proposed through the Neighbourhood Plan it is unlikely that there will be any significant impacts on the operation of the SRN in the area.		

#### Natural England

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
General	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted	NA

#### Historic England

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
General	The area covered by your Neighbourhood Plan includes several important designated heritage assets. If you have not already done so, we would recommend that you speak to the planning and conservation team at your local planning authority together with the staff at the county council archaeological advisory service who look after the Historic Environment Record. If you envisage including new housing allocations in your plan, we refer you to our published advice available on our website, allocations in local plans as this relates equally to neighbourhood planning.	BDC's Conservation Team have been supportive of the MRNP and have commented on the Plan – no additional sites have been added	NA

#### Coal Authority

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
General	Our records indicate that within the identified Neighbourhood Plan area there are no recorded coal mining features present at surface or shallow depth within the Plan area. As such we have no specific comments to make.	Noted	NA



### West Lindsey District Council

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
General	We have no specific comments to make.	Noted	NA

### Severn Trent

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
Policy 1	Supportive of the principles outlined within Policy 1 bullet point f, promoting the use of sustainable drainage system – would like more reference in the policy to water efficiency.	Noted additional wording added to 1 (f)	Y
Policy 2 [Assume this should have been Policy 6R]	Severn Trent are supportive of the approach to promote good design and think water efficiency is an important part of that.	Requirement to be water efficient added to design policy	Y
Policy 17 improving green infrastructure	Severn Trent are supportive of the principles to protect and enhance green infrastructure	No policy 17 exists assume this is ref to another NP?	NA
Policy 18 Local Green Space	(Assume ref is to Policy 5R) LGS can provide suitable locations alleviation to be delivered without adversely impacting on the function of the open space.	LGS4 may be suitable for this purpose and wording of policy 5 has been amended with criteria 3 added	Y
Site allocations	We have also reviewed the proposed allocations within the plan and undertaken a high-level assessment. This has identified a number of sites at high risk to the sewerage network. Please note that this does not mean that they are necessarily unsuitable for development, but, that there may be a requirement for alterations or improvements at work to accommodate them.  High Risk – it is likely that improvements will be required to accommodate development.	Additional text and policy wording amended to reflect issues raised re sewerage capacity	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
	<p>Land off Fox Covert Lane - There are known downstream constraints, as such it is anticipated that development at this location will result in an increased risk of flooding unless capacity improvements are made. Severn Trent would request that they are notified as development proposals for this site come forward to enable more detailed assessments of the risk.</p>		
	<p>Medium risk - capacity improvements may be required to accommodate development.</p> <p>Land off Grange Walk - There are known downstream constraints, as such it is anticipated that development at this location will result in an increased risk of flooding unless capacity improvements are made. Severn Trent would request that they are notified as development proposals for this site come forward to enable more detailed assessments of the risk.</p> <p>Land off Gringley Road (South) There are known downstream constraints however due to the small scale of the development it is not anticipated significant flows will be created and that the need for capacity improvements should be minimal, however we would like to assess this further as additional information about the development comes forward.</p> <p>Land off Haxey Road Based on the scale of development it is anticipated that the surrounding network may need some capacity improvements, however further investigation will be required. network may need some capacity improvements, however further investigation will be required</p>	<p>Additional text and policy wording amended to reflect issues raised re sewerage capacity</p>	<p>Y</p>
	<p>We are supportive of the principles of blue and green infrastructure and plans that aim to improve biodiversity across our area. Development should where possible create and enhance blue green</p>	<p>NPG agree and believe that the MRNP supports this approach . BDCs</p>	<p>Y</p>

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
	<p>corridors to protect watercourses and their associated habitats from harm.</p> <p>We want to encourage new development to continue this theme, enhancing biodiversity and ecology links.</p>	<p>Green Infrastructure Study 2010 includes waterways and the NPG consider the blue and green infrastructure vital but realize this is not explicit, blue infrastructure added to section heading and policy title.</p> <p>Additional criteria 5 added to policy 3R</p>	

#### Canal and Rivers Trust

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
Policy 3R	<p>We consider that Policy 3R- Improving Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity is appropriately worded and we would comment that the support for improving or extending access to green infrastructure such as opportunities for walking and cycling in the Parish could and should encompass looking to secure new or improved access to the Chesterfield Canal towpath, which is a valuable recreational resource. Similarly, the requirement to protect and enhance green infrastructure assets and to provide linkages to and from them where appropriate could also assist in protecting the canal as an important green/blue infrastructure corridor and encouraging improved linkages to it to allow greater access</p>	<p>Agree and the MRNP provides more detail about how the canal weaves through the landscape and the built environment. The community highly value the Canal for its wildlife and walking routes.</p> <p>Reference to blue as well a green infrastructure has been added to policy 3R.</p>	Y
Policy 6R	<p>Achieving High-Quality Design also provides sound general design advice and we consider that criterion 6 is appropriate providing further support for</p>	Noted	N

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
	improving connectivity with the surrounding footpath network, which includes the Chesterfield Canal towpath.		
Policy 8R	We suggest that the Chesterfield Canal could reasonably be a locally important heritage asset (albeit non-designated) and is worthy of protection as a valuable reminder of the industrial heritage of the area (in addition to its value as a wildlife habitat and recreational resource) and would be worthy of explicit mention either in the policy or the supporting text.	Agreed and the Chesterfield Canal has been added with map 11a and new criteria in policy 9R (3)	Y
Design Code	We have also reviewed the Design Code which accompanies the Plan Review & note that this document identifies and acknowledges the importance of the Chesterfield Canal as a landmark feature and the different roles it plays, highlighting in particular its value as a recreational resource and green/blue infrastructure asset. The Design Code should help to provide useful advice to guide new development proposals near to the canal to ensure that the canal is properly considered, and opportunities taken to maintain or enhance its character and appearance and where appropriate to improve access to it and encourage people to make more use of it.	Good and noted	NA

#### Environment Agency

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
Flood Risk	The majority of the Misterton Development Boundary is in flood zone 1. We are pleased to see that the housing allocations are located within flood zone 1 and therefore we	Noted part of NP11 and NP12 are in higher FZs but this is addressed in the policy framework for those sites.	N

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
	have no fluvial flood risk concerns to raise		
Newell's site	<p>Section 14 of the NP highlights the desire to redevelop the former Newell's factory site and correctly, highlights the challenges in placing development in this location due to the flood risk posed to the site. While the majority of the site does lie within Flood Zone 3a this does not automatically mean that development is not possible but it will first need to pass the sequential test which is determined by the local planning authority. If the requirement of the exception test can be met then the developer would need to meet the specific requirements of a site specific flood risk assessment.</p> <p>Section 14 highlights the possibility of this land being utilised as a car park and/or public open space. It should be considered that any land raising above existing ground levels could impact on the function of the floodplain. Therefore, a site specific FRA will still be required to ensure there is no detrimental impact on the function of the floodplain and third parties.</p> <p>Given the previous uses of the former Newell's factory site there is a possibility of land contamination. Any contamination discovered on site will require the appropriate level of remediation before development can be moved forward.</p>	<p>Additional text added to make this point</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Additional text added to make this point.</p>	Y
Biodiversity net gain	We welcome that the document highlights the opportunity to provide biodiversity net gain. Paragraph 91 highlights that the Environment Bill has now been approved through parliament requiring development to provide a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain.	Noted and additional reference added to supporting a 20% net gain where possible	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
	We would encourage the neighbourhood plan to push for developers to provide biodiversity net gain in excess of the required 10% across any development sites which may come forward where possible/feasible.		
Green Infrastructure	This policy should also include mention of 'blue infrastructure' as it would be beneficial to link it with green infrastructure. Development should integrate and increase blue/green infrastructure to build in multi-functional solutions to future impacts such as increased flood risks, water shortages and overheating. Blue and green infrastructure can work together to achieve these aims.	BDC's Green Infrastructure Strategy includes waterways and the NPG consider the blue and green infrastructure vital but realize this is not explicit, blue infrastructure added to section heading and policy title. Additional criteria added to policy 3R (5) and text at para 47	Y
Sustainable design	We are pleased to note the inclusion of point 82 within the NP which highlights a requirement for all new residential development, the tighter water efficiency measures of 110 L per person per day, producing mains water treating waste water and water, heating significant embedded energy, therefore reducing water demand per capita by requiring the tighter standard of 110 l/p/d could lead to significant reductions in the associated carbon emissions.	Noted	N

#### GPS Planning and Design Ltd

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
General	They note that the proposed quantum of housing on the allocated sites in the made NP has been reduced following more detailed analysis for the review NP.	Whilst the representation correctly listed the amended housing figures proposed for the sites the balance of 52 is incorrect the HRF of 194 minus the proposed allocations of 152 = 42. The Rural Monitoring Report August 2023 notes that 41 dwellings have been completed and the NP allocates sites for 131 dwellings. Following the Local Plan examination, the main modifications (out	NA

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
	GPS suggest that these revised numbers would leave a balance of 52 dwellings to be found to meet the housing requirement figure.	<p>for consultation August 2023) have clarified that the HRF is a minimum number, and also increased the HRF for Misterton to 195. The examination of the Local Plan also clarified that, in order to contribute to the HRF, dwellings must have been granted permission during the Local Plan period (1 April 2020 onwards), or have been allocated in a made neighbourhood plan and granted planning permission during the same timeframe.</p> <p>Future housing development in the Neighbourhood Area will be delivered on sites that are allocated in the MRNP and on sites that are unallocated but that are in accordance with the policies in the MRNP. The expectation is that the HRF will be met from the delivery of the allocated sites in the MRNP and smaller sensitively located windfall sites. A 5 year review will enable an assessment of this approach.</p> <p>Accept that the 4 dwellings west of the Old Barn have been double counted.</p>	
Policy 2R	Notes definition of infill sites being 1-2	This has been increased to 'up to 3'	N
Site allocation	Puts forward a site along Grovewood Road between the primary school and Gravelholes Lane as a logical and ideal parcel of land for such an allocation.	<p>This site was considered in 2017 when the first NP was produced and was not supported by the community. – see attached report the site was numbered NP09. The scope of the MRNP was to provide a more detailed landscape and character assessment of the plan area and to establish design codes for the allocated sites. In so doing the quantum suitable on the allocated sites was reassessed. This has provided clarity to the community on the likely role of infill sites in making up the HRF. It was not the remit of the Review to consider additional sites that were ruled out in 2017.</p> <p>There was extensive consultation regarding the sites to be allocated as part of the made neighbourhood plan in 2017/2018. This information was set out in a report to support the made NP. The site assessment consultation report is on the Parish Council</p>	N

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
		<p>web site. The scope of the Review was not to reassess the sites.</p> <p>The recent proposed amendments to the Local Plan (out for consultation until 22 September 2023) means that there will be more flexibility in delivering a higher quantum of housing in Misterton but this needs to be balanced with other proposed amendments to ST2 that requires development to 'positively respond to the design principles as identified in Policy ST35, and any relevant characterisation studies and/or design codes informing a made neighbourhood plan'. The site proposed for development is identified in the MPRNP as significant green gap 6 and is at the end of a green link that runs through the village as shown in the Design Code.</p>	

**Site Assessment from 2018 Report on Sites for Made NP (for full report see Misterton Parish Council web site neighbourhood plan tab)**

MISTERTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - SITE ASSESSMENT RESULTS						
Site No	Responses 167					
	Yes	%	No	%	None	%
NP01	94	56.29	57	34.13	16	9.58
NP02	84	50.30	61	36.53	22	13.17
NP03	116	69.46	34	20.36	17	10.18
NP05	88	52.69	62	37.13	17	10.18
NP06	101	60.48	52	31.14	14	8.38
NP07	68	40.72	92	55.09	7	4.19
NP08	59	35.33	93	55.69	15	8.98
NP09	56	33.53	106	63.47	5	2.99
NP11	105	62.87	53	31.74	9	5.39
NP12	105	62.87	52	31.14	10	5.99

**NP09 Comments**

Refused on consultation before

iii  
iiii iiiii iiiiii iiiiii iiiiii iiiiii iiiiii

Too many houses

iiii ii

Create too much traffic already on busy rd

iiii iiiii iiiii iiiii iiiii ii



Traffic- too close to school (-ve)	iiii iiii iiii iiii iiii iiii iiii iiii	
High quality pasture land	i	
Shouldn't lose green field space	iiii iiii iiii iiii i	
Cause flooding issues elsewhere	iii	
Good area to develop	iiii	
Spoil look	iiii	
Close to school good re traffic	ii	
Won't affect other houses	ii	
Infrastructure issues	iiii iiii iiii iii	
Sewerage issues	iiii iiii i	
Drainage issues in village already	iiii i	
School already full/needs extending	iiii iii	
150 houses max		ii
60 max		i
180 max		i
Good access		ii
Dependant on number of houses	iiii	
Access issues if large house numbers	iii	
50 houses max	i	
No to development near school	iiii iiii iiii	
Too much disruption for village/elderly	i	
30 houses max	i	
Should keep green space around school for kids	iii	
2-3 bed with proper gardens no 3 storey	i	
Amenities should compete with club etc	i	
Good location for surgery etc	i	
Good elevation	i	
Significant impact on school (-ve)	i	
Really against this site	ii	
Severe strain on services	iii	
Could provide amenities	i	
Alter nature of village (-ve)	iiii	
Good if for young families as close to school	ii	
Gov't look for small industry investment not housing	i	
Should offer community and recreation facilities first	i	
If affordable 2/3 bed homes	i	