**Misterton Neighbourhood Development Plan Review**

**Examiner’s Clarification Note**

This Note sets out my initial comments on the submitted Plan. It also sets out areas where it would be helpful to have some further clarification. For the avoidance of any doubt matters of clarification are entirely normal at this early stage of the examination process.

***Initial Comments***

The review of the Plan has been carefully considered in the context of recent updates to national planning policy.

The Plan provides a distinctive vision for the neighbourhood area. Its presentation is very good. The difference between the policies and the supporting text is clear.

The Plan is impressively underpinned by the package of supporting information. It is clear that the Design Guidance and Code and Appendices A-F have been very influential in the development of the Plan.

***Points for Clarification***

I have read the submitted documents and the representations made to the Plan. I have also visited the neighbourhood area. I am now able to raise issues for clarification with the Parish Council.

The comments made on the points in this Note will be used to assist in the preparation of my report and in recommending any modifications that may be necessary to the Plan to ensure that it meets the basic conditions.

I set out specific policy clarification points below in the order in which they appear in the submitted Plan.

*Policies 1R and 2R*

In combination the policies set an effective spatial strategy for the Parish.

Nevertheless, there are overlaps between the two policies. Could they usefully be combined into a single policy?

Paragraph 7 of the Plan comments about the strategic housing requirement for the parish and the expectation that the residual amount (beyond the delivery of the allocated sites) will be accommodated through windfall sites. However, is this approach realistic given the way in which the Development Boundary is tightly drawn around the existing settlement?

*Policy 4R*

The additional detail in Appendix E on the Significant Green Gaps is helpful.

*Policy 6R*

This is an excellent policy. It is underpinned by the Design Guidelines and Codes.

In the round it is an excellent local response to Section 12 of the NPPF.

Is the third section of the policy intended to be applied in a proportionate way according to the scale and nature of the development proposed?

*Policy 7R*

In the round it is an excellent local response to Section 14 of the NPPF.

*Policy 8R*

I saw the condition of the site during the visit.

For my clarity does the policy intend to set out a range of potentially-acceptable future uses rather than as an allocation?

Is the development of a railway station on the site (part 2 of the policy) a realistic option within the Plan period?

*Policy 12R*

Is this first part of this policy intended to be applied on each of the proposed allocation sites?

If so, should its approach be weaved into the specific policies for the allocated sites?

*Housing allocations – General*

I saw the progress that has been made on sites NP02 (Policy 15R) and NP06 (Policy 16R) since the Plan was made.

Is the Parish Council aware of the likelihood of development proceeding on the other allocated sites in the Plan period?

Is a potential shortfall in housing delivery a matter which should be built into the Plan review process?

The way in which the findings of the Design Guidelines and Codes are weaved into the various site allocation policies is very effective.

*Policies 17R/18R*

The relationship between the development of the two sites is very well-considered.

*Monitoring and Review (Section 21 of the Plan)*

Does this element of the Plan need to build in an assessment of the implications of the adoption of the emerging Local Plan on the contents of any made neighbourhood plan?

***Representations***

Does the Parish Council wish to comment on any of the representations made to the Plan?

I would find it helpful to receive the Parish Council’s comments on the representations made by:

* Bassetlaw District Council (Representations 1-3);
* GPS Planning (Representation 7);
* Nottinghamshire County Council – Highways (Representation 14);
* Nottinghamshire County Council - Transport and Travel (Representation 16); and
* Shakespeare Martineau (Representation 17)

***Protocol for responses***

I would be grateful for responses and the information requested by 6 December 2023. Please let me know if this timetable may be challenging to achieve. It is intended to maintain the momentum of the examination.

If certain responses are available before others, I am happy to receive the information on a piecemeal basis. Irrespective of how the information is assembled please could it come to me directly from the District Council. In addition, please can all responses make direct reference to the policy or the matter concerned.
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