



Response to the examiners queries Misterton Neighbourhood Plan Review on behalf of Misterton Neighbourhood Plan Group

The examiners questions are set out below with the neighbourhood plan group's response in italics

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?

Density and sensitive infill development was an important reason why the NP was reviewed so soon after being made. The NPG support the merging of the two policies so long as the significance of both is not lost. Suggested merging could be as follows;

Policy 1R¹ Sustainable Development, Infill, Density and the Development Boundary

- 1. Away from identified housing allocations, proposals for new residential development will only be supported if it is filling a gap within the existing Development Boundary as defined on Map 2 and where it meets all the following criteria;***
 - a) it is in keeping with the character of the area (as defined in the Misterton Design Code 2022) particularly in relation to historic development patterns, density and building plot size.***
 - b) it is on a small site within the built-up area of the village where the site is closely surrounded by buildings,***
 - a) it does not result in the loss of designated areas of nature conservation as identified on Map 5,***
 - b) do not significantly reduce the privacy or amenity of adjoining properties.***
 - c) it does not result in the loss of the sense of openness created by the Significant Green Gaps that are important to the character of the settlement as identified on Map 7,***
 - d) it incorporates any natural or built features on the site that have heritage or nature conservation value into the scheme where possible,***
 - e) it protects and enhances* the biodiversity of the site,***
 - f) it promotes walking, cycling and the use of public transport, and***
 - g) it is water efficient in design and, where applicable, it includes Sustainable Drainage Schemes (SuDS) that improve biodiversity as well as mitigating surface water flood risk, in accordance with the Drainage Hierarchy (Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 80)², and***

¹ The review policies have been numbered consecutively and with a 'R' for Review added to help distinguish them from the made neighbourhood plan policies.

² In Severn Trent Water's Regulation 14 consultation response, they sought to emphasise the importance of drainage hierarchy (Planning Practice Guidance, paragraph 80 (see <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change#para55>) and highlight the need to discharge surface water to the natural watercourse system instead of sewers.



h) it provides a mix and type of housing in accordance with Policy 12R.

2. Outside the Development Boundary, proposals will be limited to development which is necessary to support the rural economy or the provision of utilities infrastructure in accordance with the National, District and other policies in this Neighbourhood Plan reflecting the Parish's intrinsic open, rural character.

**** in accordance with biodiversity net gain requirements as set out in national legislation³.***

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?

It is acknowledged that for the Bassetlaw Plan the calculation of housing in the pipeline has been redefined such that the indicative number for NP11 is not included – however there are pre application discussions on going and the NPG believe that an application will be submitted in the near future. NP12 has also obtained planning permission in September 2023 for 46 dwellings.

The NPG are also proposing (in the amended policy 1R above) to remove the requirement that infill is for up to 3 dwellings. This provides more flexibility to deliver the apparent shortfall in housing numbers within the development boundary.

Policy 6R

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?

Yes it is

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?

Yes it is intended to reflect the community's strong and sustained support for some form of development on the site as identified in the consultation on the site assessment process for the made NP.

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

³ See <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/understanding-biodiversity-net-gain>



It is feasible that the railway station could reopen. A study done some time ago (2005) identified the value of having a 'rail halt' for the economic development of surrounding villages linking communities to Doncaster and Worksop and there is an active Misterton Area Partnership Limited that continue to raise the profile of the potential of this service. There is also a sustained campaign by Doncaster Borough Council, amongst others, to reopen Robin Hood Airport.

There will also be an increase in population and economic activity with the investment in STEP (Spherical Tokamak for Energy Production – utilising fusion nuclear power) investment on the site of the nearby West Burton Power Station. A concept plan is expected in 2024 and completion anticipated in 2040. Responses are being sought to ensure transport infrastructure can meet the requirements of this major initiative and a consideration of having a train stopping at Misterton may be considered.

Policy 12R

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

Yes, but it is also intended to apply on windfall sites which is why it is presented as a separate policy.

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

This would be acceptable so long as the approach is also reflected in any windfall sites as well.

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?

NP11 there are pre application discussions on going and the NPG believe that an application will be submitted in the near future. NP12 has secured planning permission in September 2023 for 46 dwellings.

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

Yes, the NPG will monitor the effectiveness of the NP against the policies in the Bassetlaw Plan (when adopted), including the amendment suggested above (to relax the number of dwellings permissible within the development boundary, subject to the scale and design being in accordance with the character of the area as identified in the Misterton Design Code.) It may be necessary to review the site allocations as part of a review of this Neighbourhood Plan in due course.



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?

Yes, given the timing, this would be a sensible addition, so as to ensure the Neighbourhood Plan is clearly aligned with the Misterton-specific elements of the Local Plan once it has been adopted. It is also noted that the additional work done by the NPG to understand the landscape sensitivity will assist decision makers in assessing future applications that may come forward once the Local Plan is adopted.

Reg 16 Representations

The NPG make the following comments on the Reg 16 representations.

BDC note that '**Figure 8:** This diagram, from the Design Code, depicts the development boundary incorrectly (it matches the site boundaries, as per Map 14a). This figure should either be corrected, if possible, or removed, to avoid confusion'.

The NPG think it is important to keep figure 8 in as it shows the two sites working together. Can AECOM be asked to amend the DB – it should line up with the site boundary?

BDC note that 'in **Policy 3R** It is unclear how part 4 of the Policy would be effective or implemented. The National Tree Planting Programme is not a national Planning Policy and therefore where is the evidence for this part of the policy? Does it apply to all applications residential/ non-residential?'

The NPG think that ensuring there is no loss of tree canopy is an important way to minimise the impact of development on the rurality of the parish and protects biodiversity. It should apply to those sites where trees are part of the character – it will assist in the need to achieve 10% biodiversity net gain on development. The NPG would like to keep this in if possible.

BDC note that '**Policy 6R** Part 3 c How/where should they show? In their design and access statement?'

The NPG agree that this additional wording would be helpful.

BDC note that 'Part 3 e Is this too prescriptive? Not all properties are red-brick or rendered?'

The NPG accept the point and suggest that part of the wording is retained, and part amended – retain the start 'use materials that reflect those dominant in the adjoining area' and amend rest of text to 'for example red brick, pale render and red pantiles and grey slate tiles are common'

BDC note that '**Policy 7R** Does part 6 of the Policy include larger scale development inside and outside the development boundary? If so, it may benefit the policy to provide clearer



introductory text to outline what type(s) of development this part of the Policy is seeking to manage.'

The NPG accept that point, part 6 is a reference to renewable energy outside the development boundary (suitably scaled and located solar farms or wind farms may be an example) whilst part 2 relates to alterations to individual dwellings.

BDC note that '**Policy 10R** This Policy needs to be clearer in the type of uses it is promoting. Not all economic/business development would be supported or appropriate in Misterton. This Policy should refer to the uses appropriate for the location in both National and Local Planning Policy. These uses are more likely to be those that are small in scale and support the rural economy or existing businesses.'

The policy requires the development to be of a 'scale layout and design that respects the character of the area' – this means that per sey this would be small in scale and appropriate to a rural area but in the interest of clarity this could be made explicit.

BDCs comments on 12R and the site allocations

Policy 12R and 14-18R. It was intended that policy 12R acted as the housing policy element for all development. As such it would apply to the site allocations and any other sites that come forward on windfall or infill sites. It is accepted that a housing mix including the 2/3 bed homes and bungalows is more likely to be achieved on larger sites.

The NPG also note the response from Nottinghamshire County Council Transport and Travel who provided additional information about the bus services and demand responsive travel that was not provided at Regulation 14 and could be usefully referenced.

Helen Metcalfe, Planning with People, acting for Misterton Neighbourhood Plan Group 6.12.23.