

Misterton Neighbourhood Development Plan Review 2022-2038

**A report to Bassetlaw District Council on the Review
of the Misterton Neighbourhood Development Plan**

**Andrew Ashcroft
Independent Examiner
BA (Hons) MA, DMS, MRTPI**

Director – Andrew Ashcroft Planning Limited

Executive Summary

- 1 I was appointed by Bassetlaw District Council in October 2023 to carry out the independent examination of the review of the Bassetlaw Neighbourhood Plan.
- 2 The examination was undertaken by way of written representations. I visited the neighbourhood area on 8 November 2023.
- 3 The Plan includes a variety of policies and seeks to bring forward positive and sustainable development in the neighbourhood area. It has a focus on safeguarding its built and natural environment and refining the approach in the made Plan for the development of the allocated sites.
- 4 The Plan has been underpinned by community support and engagement. All sections of the community have been engaged in its preparation.
- 5 Subject to a series of recommended modifications set out in this report, I have concluded that the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan Review meets all the necessary legal requirements and should proceed to referendum.
- 6 I recommend that the referendum should be held within the neighbourhood area.

Andrew Ashcroft
Independent Examiner
8 January 2024

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This report sets out the findings of the independent examination of the review of the Misterton Neighbourhood Development Plan Review 2022-2038 (the Plan).
- 1.2 The Plan has been submitted to Bassetlaw District Council (BDC) by Misterton Parish Council (MPC) in its capacity as the qualifying body responsible for preparing the neighbourhood plan.
- 1.3 Neighbourhood plans were introduced into the planning process by the Localism Act 2011. They aim to allow local communities to take responsibility for guiding development in their area. This approach was subsequently embedded in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF continues to be the principal element of national planning policy. It was most recently updated in December 2023.
- 1.4 The role of an independent examiner is clearly defined in the legislation. I have been appointed to examine whether the submitted Plan meets the basic conditions and Convention Rights and other statutory requirements. It is not within my remit to examine or to propose an alternative plan, or a potentially more sustainable plan except where this arises as a result of my recommended modifications to ensure that the plan meets the basic conditions and the other relevant requirements.
- 1.5 A neighbourhood plan can be narrow or broad in scope. It can include whatever range of policies it sees as appropriate to its designated neighbourhood area. In this case, the Plan is a review of the 'made' Plan. It has been designed to be distinctive in general terms, and to be complementary to the development plan. The Plan has a focus on safeguarding its built and natural environment and refining the approach towards the development of the allocated sites identified in the made Plan
- 1.6 Within the context set out above this report assesses whether the Plan is legally compliant and meets the basic conditions that apply to neighbourhood plans. It also considers the content of the Plan and, where necessary, recommends changes to its policies and supporting text.
- 1.7 This report also provides a recommendation as to whether the Plan should proceed to referendum. If this is the case and that referendum results in a positive outcome the Plan would then form a part of the wider development plan and be used to determine planning applications in the neighbourhood area.

2 The Role of the Independent Examiner

- 2.1 The examiner's role is to ensure that any submitted neighbourhood plan meets the relevant legislative and procedural requirements.
- 2.2 I was appointed by BDC, with the consent of MPC, to conduct the examination of the Plan and to prepare this report. I am independent of both the BDC and MPC. I do not have any interest in any land that may be affected by the Plan.
- 2.3 I possess the appropriate qualifications and experience to undertake this role. I am a Director of Andrew Ashcroft Planning Limited. In previous roles, I have 40 years' experience in various local authorities at either Head of Planning or Service Director level and more recently as an independent examiner. I am a chartered town planner and have significant experience of undertaking neighbourhood plan examinations and health checks. I am a member of the Royal Town Planning Institute and the Neighbourhood Planning Independent Examiner Referral System.

Examination Outcomes

- 2.4 There are a variety of ways in which a review of a neighbourhood plan can be examined. They are described in Section 3 of this report. In this case I have concluded that the Plan needs both examination and a referendum.
- 2.5 In this context, as the independent examiner I am required to recommend one of the following outcomes of the examination:
- (a) that the Plan as submitted should proceed to a referendum; or
 - (b) that the Plan should proceed to referendum as modified (based on my recommendations); or
 - (c) that the Plan does not proceed to referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.

Other examination matters

- 2.6 In examining the Plan I am also required to check whether:
- the policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood plan area; and
 - the Plan meets the requirements of Section 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (the Plan must specify the period to which it has effect, must not include provision about development that is excluded development, and must not relate to more than one neighbourhood area); and
 - the Plan has been prepared for an area that has been designated under Section 61G of the Localism Act and has been developed and submitted for examination by a qualifying body.
- 2.7 Having addressed the matters identified in paragraph 2.6 of this report, I am satisfied that each of the points have been met subject to the contents of this report.

3 Procedural Matters

3.1 In undertaking this examination I have considered the following documents:

- the submitted Plan.
- the Basic Conditions Statement.
- the Consultation Statement.
- the Design Guidelines and Site Design Codes.
- the Statement of the Extent and Nature of the Review.
- the BDC SEA/HRA Screening report.
- the representations made to the Plan.
- MPC's responses to the clarification note.
- the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy (December 2011).
- the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020 to 2038.
- the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023).
- Planning Practice Guidance.
- relevant Ministerial Statements.

3.2 The various documents are helpfully available on the BDC's website. Wherever possible, I will refer to the document concerned for the purposes of keeping this report as concise as possible.

3.3 I visited the neighbourhood area on 8 November 2023. I looked at its overall character and appearance and at those areas affected by policies in the Plan in particular. The visit is covered in more detail in paragraphs 5.9 to 5.15 of this report.

The examination process for the review of a neighbourhood plan

3.4 The Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017 identifies the circumstances that might arise as and when qualifying bodies seek to review 'made' neighbourhood plans and introduces a proportionate process to do so based on the changes proposed.

3.5 There are three types of modification which can be made to a neighbourhood plan or order. The process will depend on the degree of change which the modification involves and as follows:

- minor (non-material) modifications to a neighbourhood plan or order which would not materially affect the policies in the plan or permission granted by the order. These may include correcting errors, such as a reference to a supporting document, and would not require examination or a referendum; or
- material modifications which do not change the nature of the plan or order and which would require examination but not a referendum. This might, for example, entail the addition of a design code that builds on a pre-existing design policy, or the addition of a site or sites which, subject to the decision of the independent examiner, are not so significant or substantial as to change the nature of the plan; or

- material modifications which do change the nature of the plan or order would require examination and a referendum. This might, for example, involve allocating significant new sites for development.
- 3.6 The submitted statement by MPC and BDC comments that the modifications to the policies are so substantial and significant to warrant consideration as a change to the nature of the Plan.
- 3.7 Having considered the conclusions made by BDC and MPC very carefully, I also agree with the approach taken and will examine the Plan on this basis.
- 3.8 It is a general rule that neighbourhood plan examinations should be held by written representations only. Having considered all the information before me, including the representations made to the submitted Plan, I was satisfied that the Plan could be examined without the need for a public hearing.
- 3.9 The NPPF was updated in both September and December 2023 after the Plan had been submitted. I have assessed the Plan against the December 2023 version of the NPPF.

4 Consultation

Consultation Process

- 4.1 Policies in made neighbourhood plans become the basis for local planning and development control decisions. As such the regulations require neighbourhood plans to be supported and underpinned by public consultation.
- 4.2 In accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, MPC has prepared a Consultation Statement. The Statement is proportionate to the neighbourhood area and the review of the policies in the made Plan. It reflects the specific circumstances that have generated the community's desire to review the Plan.
- 4.3 The Statement sets out the various activities that were held to engage the local community during the initial stages of the plan-preparation process. They also provide details about the consultation process that took place on the pre-submission version of the Plan (October to December 2022).
- 4.4 The Statement sets out details of the community engagement that took place as the Plan was being prepared.
- 4.5 The Statement set out how the submitted Plan took account of consultation feedback at the pre-submission phase. This is a helpful way to set out the information. It helps to describe how the Plan was refined based on consultation and feedback.

Consultation Feedback

- 4.6 Consultation on the Plan was undertaken by BDC and ended on 27 October 2023. This generated representations from the following organisations:
 - GPS Planning
 - Historic England
 - Isle of Axholme and North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board
 - National Gas Transmission
 - National Grid
 - National Highways
 - Nottinghamshire County Council
 - Planning With People
 - Sport England
 - West Lindsey District Council
 - British Horse Society
 - Canal and River Trust
 - Environment Agency
 - Bassetlaw District Council
 - Natural England

- 4.7 The Plan also attracted several representations from residents (in some cases submitted by professional agents).
- 4.8 I have taken all the comments into account in preparing this report. Where appropriate, I refer to specific representations in my commentary on the various policies in the Plan.

5 The Neighbourhood Area and the Development Plan Context

The Neighbourhood Area

- 5.1 The neighbourhood area is the parish of Misterton. In 2011 the population of the parish was 2140 persons living in 948 households. It was designated as a neighbourhood area on 7 July 2016.
- 5.2 The neighbourhood area is six miles northwest of Gainsborough on the A161. The village is bordered by the River Idle and the River Trent. The Chesterfield Canal running through the village. The Gainsborough to Doncaster railway line runs through the parish in a north-south direction.
- 5.3 The village has a distinctive character with built development based around its road network. This results in a concentration of development in the north of the village based around the Church and the Co-op store around the A161 (High Street) and with largely free-standing areas to the south based around Fox Covert Lane and Grovewood Road. The school is in this part of the village.

Development Plan Context

- 5.4 The development plan covering the neighbourhood plan area is the Bassetlaw District Core Strategy and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2010 - 2028 ('the Core Strategy'). It sets out a vision, objectives, a spatial strategy, and overarching planning policies that guide new development in the Plan period.
- 5.5 Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy provides a focus for new development based around the existing principal settlements in Bassetlaw. Misterton is identified as one of three Local Service Centres. They are settlements with smaller regeneration opportunities and the services, facilities, and development opportunities available to support moderate levels of growth (Policies CS5; CS6; CS7).
- 5.6 Policy CS7 sets out a specific approach for Misterton. It advises that development will be limited to that which will support its role as a Local Service Centre for the rural communities of northeast Bassetlaw. It also comments that any new development will be expected to deliver community benefits or to provide enhancements to existing facilities. It advises that new development will be of a high quality of design, making strong connections with the existing settlement and surrounding communities, as well as providing the facilities necessary to support a new community including open space and play facilities, community facilities and transport improvements. The policy also sets out specific guidance on housing, economic development, the Misterton Local Centre, Community Infrastructure and Regeneration Opportunities.
- 5.7 The submitted Plan has been prepared within its wider adopted development plan context. In doing so it has relied on up-to-date information and research that has underpinned existing planning policy documents in the District. This is good practice and reflects key elements in Planning Practice Guidance on this matter. The submitted

Plan seeks to add value to the Core Strategy and to give a local dimension to the delivery of its policies. This is captured in the Basic Conditions Statement.

- 5.8 BDC is now well-advanced on the production of a new Local Plan. It submitted the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038 for independent examination in July 2022. Main modifications have now been published. Misterton is identified as one of a series of Large Rural Settlements in the emerging Local Plan. I make further reference to the emerging Local Plan in the section on Monitoring and Review of the Plan later in this report.

Visit to the Neighbourhood Area

- 5.9 I visited the neighbourhood area on 8 November 2023. I approached it from Haxey to the north. This helped me to understand its connection to the strategic road network and its setting in the wider countryside.
- 5.10 I looked initially at the village centre. I saw the prominence of All Saint's Church at the heart of the village, and the importance of the Co-op store to the wider community.
- 5.11 I took the opportunity to look at the various proposed housing allocations in the Plan. I saw the progress that had been achieved on sites NP02 (Policy 15R) and NP06 (Policy 16R) since the Plan was made.
- 5.12 I took the opportunity to look at the proposed additional local green space.
- 5.13 I also looked at the former Newell's site at the eastern end of Fox Covert Lane. I saw the way in which its condition and appearance had influenced the contents of Policy 8R of the Plan.
- 5.14 Throughout the visit I sought to understand the way in which the Design Guidelines and Site Design Codes had influenced the revised and new policies in the Plan.
- 5.15 I left the neighbourhood area by driving to Walkeringham to the south along the A161 and then to Gainsborough on the A631. This helped me to understand the relationship of the parish with surrounding larger settlements and the strategic road network.

6 The Neighbourhood Plan as a whole

6.1 This section of the report deals with the submitted neighbourhood plan as a whole and the extent to which it meets the basic conditions. The Basic Conditions Statement has helped considerably in the preparation of this section of the report. It is a well-presented and informative document. It is also proportionate to the Plan itself.

6.2 As part of this process I must consider whether the submitted Plan meets the basic conditions as set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. To comply with the basic conditions, the Plan must:

- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
- be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan in the area;
- be compatible with European Union (EU) obligations and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR); and
- not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

6.3 I assess the Plan against the basic conditions under the following headings.

National Planning Policies and Guidance

6.4 For the purposes of this examination the key elements of national policy relating to planning matters are set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) issued in December 2023.

6.5 The NPPF sets out a range of core land-use planning issues to underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. The following are particularly relevant to the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan Review:

- a plan-led system – in this case the relationship between the neighbourhood plan and the adopted Bassetlaw Core Strategy;
- delivering a sufficient supply of homes;
- building a strong, competitive economy;
- recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving local communities;
- taking account of the different roles and characters of different areas;
- highlighting the importance of high-quality design and good standards of amenity for all future occupants of land and buildings; and
- conserving heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

6.6 Neighbourhood plans sit within this wider context both generally, and within the more specific presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 13 of the NPPF indicates that neighbourhoods should both develop plans that support the strategic

needs set out in local plans and plan positively to support local development that is outside the strategic elements of the development plan.

- 6.7 In addition to the NPPF, I have also taken account of other elements of national planning policy including Planning Practice Guidance and ministerial statements.
- 6.8 Having considered all the evidence and representations available as part of the examination, I am satisfied that the submitted Plan has had regard to national planning policies and guidance in general terms. It sets out a positive vision for the future of the neighbourhood area. It proposes revision to the policies in the made Plan and introduces a sharper focus on design matters. It also refines the policies for the allocated housing sites. The Basic Conditions Statement maps the policies in the Plan against the appropriate sections of the NPPF.
- 6.9 At a more practical level, the NPPF indicates that plans should provide a clear framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made and that they should give a clear indication of how a decision-maker should react to a development proposal (paragraph 16d). This is reinforced in Planning Practice Guidance. Paragraph ID:41-041-20140306 indicates that policies in neighbourhood plans should be drafted with sufficient clarity so that a decision-maker can apply them consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. Policies should also be concise, precise, and supported by appropriate evidence.
- 6.10 As submitted, the Plan does not fully accord with this range of practical issues. Many of my recommended modifications in Section 7 relate to matters of clarity and precision. They are designed to ensure that the Plan fully accords with national policy.

Contributing to sustainable development

- 6.11 There are clear overlaps between national policy and the contribution that the submitted Plan makes to achieving sustainable development. Sustainable development has three principal dimensions – economic, social, and environmental. The submitted Plan has set out to achieve sustainable development in the neighbourhood area. In the economic dimension, the Plan includes policies for new residential development (Policies 14R to 18R) and for commercial development (Policy 10R). In the social role, it includes policies on housing types (Policy 12R) and community facilities (Policy 13R). In the environmental dimension, the Plan positively seeks to protect its natural, built, and historic environment. It has specific policies on design (Policy 6R), landscape (Policy 4R), and local green spaces (Policy 5R). This assessment overlaps with MPC's comments on this matter in the submitted Basic Conditions Statement.

General conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan

- 6.12 I have already commented in detail on the development plan context in Bassetlaw District in paragraphs 5.4 to 5.8 of this report.
- 6.13 I consider that the submitted Plan delivers a local dimension to this strategic context. The Basic Conditions Statement helpfully relates the Plan's policies to the policies in

the development plan. Subject to the recommended modification in this report, I am satisfied that the submitted Plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan.

Strategic Environmental Assessment

- 6.14 The Neighbourhood Plan (General) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 require a qualifying body either to submit an environmental report prepared in accordance with the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 or a statement of reasons why an environmental report is not required.
- 6.15 In order to comply with this requirement BDC published a screening report in June 2023 on the need or otherwise for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) to be prepared for the Plan. The report is thorough and well-constructed. It includes the responses from the consultation bodies. As a result of this process, it concluded that the Plan is not likely to have any significant effects on the environment and accordingly would not require SEA.

Habitat Regulations

- 6.16 BDC prepared a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the Plan at the same time. It concludes that the submitted Plan is unlikely to have significant effects on a European site. The report is very thorough and comprehensive. It assesses the impact of the Plan on the following protected sites:
- the Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA;
 - the Hatfield Moor SAC; and
 - the Humber Estuary SAC.

It concludes that the Plan will not give rise to likely significant effects on this European site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, and Appropriate Assessment is not required.

- 6.17 Having reviewed the information provided to me as part of the examination, I am satisfied that a proportionate process has been undertaken in accordance with the various regulations. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, I am entirely satisfied that the submitted Plan is compatible with this aspect of neighbourhood plan regulations.

Human Rights

- 6.18 In a similar fashion I am satisfied that the submitted Plan has had regard to the fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed under the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and that it complies with the Human Rights Act. There is no evidence that has been submitted to me to suggest otherwise. In addition, there has been full and adequate opportunity for all interested parties to take part in the preparation of the Plan and to make their comments known. Based on all the evidence available to me, I conclude that the submitted Plan does not breach, nor is in any way incompatible with the ECHR.

Summary

- 6.19 On the basis of my assessment of the Plan in this section of my report I am satisfied that it meets the basic conditions subject to the incorporation of the recommended modifications contained in this report.

7 The Neighbourhood Plan Policies

- 7.1 This section of the report comments on the policies in the Plan. It makes a series of recommended modifications to ensure that the various policies have the necessary precision to meet the basic conditions.
- 7.2 My recommendations focus on the policies themselves given that the basic conditions relate primarily to this aspect of neighbourhood plans. In some cases, I have also recommended changes to the associated supporting text.
- 7.3 I am satisfied that the content and the form of the Plan is fit for purpose. It is distinctive and proportionate to the neighbourhood area. The wider community and MPC have spent time and energy in identifying the issues and objectives that they wish to be included in the review of the 'made' Plan. The community has successfully marshalled the capacity to prepare the Plan to reflect changing circumstances including updated national planning policies and an emerging Local Plan. This sits at the heart of the localism agenda.
- 7.4 The Plan has been designed to reflect Planning Practice Guidance (ID:41-004-20190509) which indicates that neighbourhood plans must address the development and use of land. It includes a series of Community Aspirations in Section 20.
- 7.5 I have addressed the policies in the order that they appear in the submitted Plan. Thereafter I comment on the Aspirations.
- 7.6 For clarity this section of the report comments on all the policies in the Plan.
- 7.7 Where modifications are recommended to policies they are highlighted in bold print. Any associated or free-standing changes to the text of the Plan are set out in italic print.

The initial sections of the Plan (Sections 1-7)

- 7.8 The Plan is well-organised and includes effective maps and photographs that give real depth and purpose to the Plan. The photographs are particularly effective. The Plan makes an appropriate distinction between the policies and their supporting text. Its design will ensure that it will comfortably be able to take its place as part of the development plan if it is eventually made. The initial elements of the Plan set the scene for the policies. They are proportionate to the neighbourhood area and the subsequent policies.
- 7.9 Section 2 comments about the review of the Plan. It identifies the neighbourhood area (Map 1) and the Plan period. It helpfully sets out the reasons for the review of the Plan.
- 7.10 Section 3 sets out the nature of the parish and its current circumstances. It comments on key issues in the parish. Key elements of this section have underpinned the policies in the Plan.

- 7.11 Sections 4 and 5 set out a comprehensive vision and objectives for the Plan. They are very distinctive to the neighbourhood area and provide an overall context for the resulting policies. The Vision is as follows:

'Misterton will be a thriving, diverse, sustainable community which is an attractive place for people to visit, live and work. The rural and historic character of the village will be protected and preserved for current and future generations.'

- 7.12 Section 6 sets out a key principle for community engagement in the planning process.
- 7.13 Section 7 highlights the importance of non-land use Local Projects. They are listed separately in Appendix C of the Plan. I comment on them in more detail later in this report.
- 7.14 In the round the Plan is a very good example of a review of a neighbourhood plan both in terms of its format and content.
- 7.15 The remainder of this section of the report addresses each policy in turn in the context set out in paragraphs 7.5 to 7.7 of this report.

General comments on policies

- 7.16 The Plan helpfully consolidates the review process within the structure of the 'made' Plan. This results in a series of new policies and the retention of existing policies in the 'made' Plan. For the purposes of this report, I do not comment in any detail on the retained policies other than where they may have been affected by updates in national planning policy since the Plan was 'made' in 2019. In some cases, I have recommended modifications to the wording of policies in the made Plan to reflect the approach and language now taken in neighbourhood plans (which has matured since the Plan was made).

Policy 1R Sustainable Development, and the Development Boundary

- 7.17 This policy is replacement of Policy 5 of the made Plan. It sets out detailed guidance for development proposals within and outside the development boundary.
- 7.18 The approach taken in the policy is entirely appropriate. It will concentrate new development within the development boundary close to the range of commercial and community facilities in the village.
- 7.19 As submitted, there are considerable overlaps between this policy and the contents of Policy 2R. This made was raised by BDC in its representations on the Plan. In its response to the clarification note MPC proposed a combination of Policies 1R and 2R (as submitted). I recommend the suggested policy with a modified opening section which simplifies its format and removes the unnecessary reference to the allocated housing sites. I also recommend that the criteria apply in the plural so that they marry up to the initial part of the policy. Otherwise, the policy meets the basic conditions. It will contribute to the delivery of each of the three dimensions of sustainable development.

Replace the policy with:

‘Within the Development Boundary (as defined on Map 2) proposals for new residential development will be supported where they meet all the following criteria:’

- a) they are 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) they are on a small site within the built-up area of the village where the site is closely surrounded by buildings,**
- c) they do not result in the loss of designated areas of nature conservation as identified on Map 5,**
- d) they do not unacceptably reduce the privacy or amenity of adjoining properties.**
- e) they do 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,**
- f) they incorporate any natural or built features on the site that have heritage or nature conservation value into the scheme where possible,**
- g) they protect and enhance* the biodiversity of the site,**
- h) they promote walking, cycling and the use of public transport**
- i) they are 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), and**
- j) they provide 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 legislation**

Policy 2R Infill Development and Density

- 7.20 This policy replaces Policies 2 and 3 of the made Plan with a more detailed set of design considerations.

- 7.21 As set out in my commentary on Policy 1R, I have recommended that Policies 1R and 2R are combined. The revised policy is set out in the section of this report on Policy 1R. In this context I recommend the deletion of Policy 2R.
- 7.22 The supporting text associated with Policy 2R follows on seamlessly from the text associated with Policy 1R. On this basis it would be appropriate for the two sets of supporting text to support the combined policy.

Delete the policy

Policy 3R Improving Green and Blue Infrastructure and Biodiversity

- 7.23 This policy replaces Policy 14 of the made Plan. It updates the policy to refer to the national agenda on biodiversity net gain.
- 7.24 The policy takes a positive approach to these matters. I am satisfied that it has regard to Section 15 of the NPPF.
- 7.25 I recommend that the fourth and fifth parts of the policy are recast to allow the policy to be applied clearly through the development management process and have the clarity required by the NPPF. I also recommend consequential modification to the supporting text. Otherwise, the policy meets the basic conditions. It will contribute to the delivery of the social and the environmental dimensions of sustainable development.

Replace the fourth part of the policy with: ‘As appropriate to their scale, nature and location, development proposals should incorporate tree planting. Where on site provision is not practicable, off-site provision planting elsewhere within the parish will be supported.’

Replace the fifth part of the policy with: ‘Wherever practicable, development proposals should create or enhance blue-green corridors to protect watercourses and their associated habitats.’

At the end of paragraph 56 add: ‘The fourth part of Policy 3R addresses this matter. Its underpinning ambition is that there is no net loss of tree canopy and where practicable a net gain is achieved.’

Policy 4R Protecting and Enhancing the Landscape Character

- 7.26 This is a new policy. It is based around the identification of a package of Significant Green Gaps (SGGs). The approach taken is underpinned by the Misterton Design Code and the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Study.
- 7.27 The Plan advises that the main village characteristic is the open space within and around the settlement and that the Plan has identified SGGs. It comments that they are spaces that have an open and undeveloped character and meet at least one of the following criteria:
- form a visual break between settlements – actual and perceived (from physical development or level of activity);

- reinforce the loose grained rural character within the village of Misterton; and
 - their boundaries follow physical features on the ground taking account of the need to accommodate the development requirements of the Plan.
- 7.28 The Plan advises that the proposed SGGs have not been defined based on landscape quality (although gap areas may happen to contain areas of good landscape quality), or because they contain historic buildings, or afford attractive and/ or significant views. It also comments that only land necessary to secure the objectives of gaps on a long-term basis have been included.
- 7.29 Map 7 shows the location of the SGGs. Appendix E provides a description and a photograph of each of the SGGs.
- 7.30 In the round, I am satisfied that the proposed SGGs fulfil a clear role and are evidence-based. They reflect the character and layout of the village. In addition, their designation accords with the delivery of sustainable development and has not prevented the allocation of land for housing development.
- 7.31 The policy also includes a series of key views. They are shown on Map 6 and are based on local research and shows these key views from publicly accessible locations across the built-up area of the Parish. The Plan advises that they provide additional information about the sensitivity of the landscape character to change and should be used alongside the Significant Green Gaps information. The Plan also comments that the open spaces within the character areas and long views from the edge of the settlement provide a sense of openness and a very rural sense of place. Appendix D provides a photo and description of each key view.
- 7.32 In the round I am satisfied that the proposed key views fulfil a clear role and as evidence-based. They reflect the character and layout of the village and its surrounding landscape. In addition, their designation accords with the delivery of sustainable development and has not prevented the allocation of land for housing development.
- 7.33 In this overall context I recommend detailed modifications to the wording used to bring the clarity required by the NPPF and to allow it to be used consistently by BDC through the development management process. The first recommended modification will bring a proportionate element to the policy. In addition, it acknowledges that not all the neighbourhood area is affected by the proposed SGGs. Otherwise, the policy meets the basic conditions. It will contribute to the delivery of the social and the environmental dimensions of sustainable development.

In the second sentence of the first part of the policy replace ‘All proposals are required to demonstrate’ with ‘As appropriate to their scale, nature and location, development proposals should demonstrate’

In part 1a) replace ‘they are’ with ‘they would’

In the second part of the policy replace ‘are supported’ with ‘will be supported’

Policy 5R Local Green Spaces

- 7.34 This policy updates Policy 15 of the made Plan with an additional proposed Local Green Space (LGS).
- 7.35 I looked carefully at the proposed additional LGS on open land to the south of NP06 (land off Meadow Drive) and the north of LGS4. I have also considered the assessment of the proposed LGS in the Plan. I am satisfied that its designation meets the basic conditions.
- 7.36 I am also satisfied that the LGSs which are were designated in the made Plan continue to meet the basic conditions for such designations.
- 7.37 I am satisfied that the policy meets the basic conditions. It will contribute to the delivery of the social and the environmental dimensions of sustainable development.

Policy 6R Achieving High Quality Design

- 7.38 This is a new policy. It replaces Policy 2 of the made Plan. It sets out the revised approach to design in response to the publication of the 2021 version of the NPPF.
- 7.39 The Plan advises that an understanding of the existing built character and examples of local good design help in providing a design framework for Misterton. The Misterton Design Code 2022 was commissioned as part of this review and includes:
- the landscape character studies covering the Parish;
 - an assessment of development constraint;
 - a character analysis of Misterton village;
 - Design guidance and Code covering the whole plan area; and
 - Design guidance and Code covering the allocated sites.
- 7.40 In the round, the policy is an excellent local response to Section 12 of the NPPF and the National Design Guide 2019
- 7.41 Within this wider context, I recommend detailed modifications to the wording used to bring the clarity required by the NPPF and to allow it to be used consistently by BDC through the development management process. The modification will allow the policy to be applied in a proportionate way. Otherwise, the policy meets the basic conditions. It will contribute to the delivery of the social and the environmental dimensions of sustainable development.

Replace ‘Development proposals should’ with ‘As appropriate to their scale, nature and location, development proposals should’

In 3d delete ‘to the satisfaction of BDC’

Replace the opening element of the fourth part of the policy with: ‘Boundary treatments should:’

Delete 3c

Replace 3d with ‘avoid long stretches of wooden fencing which have a consistent height and/or appearance.’

Replace 3e with ‘be of a size and scale that responds to its position in the street scene or the local environment.’

Replace 5 with ‘Wherever practicable, decorative brick, stone and wood detailing should provide references to the history of the parish.’

At the beginning of part 6 of the policy add: ‘Development proposals should:’

Policy 7R Renewable Energy, Energy Efficiency and Low Carbon Technologies

- 7.42 This is a new policy. It seeks to provide a local response to Section 14 of the NPPF and to the national and local declarations of a climate emergency.
- 7.43 The policy is both wide-ranging and non-prescriptive. In the round, I am satisfied that it addresses these matters in a positive way. I am also satisfied that the approach taken does not conflict with the Written Ministerial Statement: Planning - Local Energy Efficient Standards Update (December 2023). It replaced the long-standing Written Ministerial Statement of March 2015 on this matter. Nevertheless, I recommend a series of modifications to the wording used in the different elements of the policy to bring the clarity required by the NPPF and to allow them to be used consistently by BDC through the development management process. There is an underpinning approach about the practicability of the implementation of the various proposals, their applicability on a proportionate way and the removal of repetitive elements.
- 7.44 I recommend the deletion of the fifth element of the policy as it effectively repeats the third element.
- 7.45 The sixth part of the policy comments generally about proposals for the development of renewable and low carbon sources of energy. I recommend that the supporting text comments about the applicability of the policy throughout the parish.
- 7.46 Otherwise, the policy meets the basic conditions. It will contribute to the delivery of the social and the environmental dimensions of sustainable development.

Replace the first part of the policy with: ‘Where it is practicable to do so, and as appropriate to their scale and nature, development proposals should incorporate sustainable design features to reduce carbon emissions, minimise the use of scarce resources and mitigate against and adapt to climate change.’

Replace the third part of the policy with: ‘Proposals for the retrofitting of energy efficiency measures into existing buildings (including listed buildings) will be supported where the works involved safeguards the character, integrity and historic importance of the building concerned.’

Replace the fourth element of the policy with: ‘As appropriate to their scale, nature and location, development proposals should demonstrate that they are water-efficient, and incorporate innovative water efficiency and water re-use measures.’

Delete the fifth part of the policy.

In the sixth part of the policy:

- **Delete b)**
- **Replace d) with: ‘the development results in a biodiversity net gain and is supported by a management plan to ensure that the net gain remains for the lifetime of the development;’**
- **In e) replace ‘is not harmed’ with ‘is not unacceptably harmed’**

Combine paragraph 93 into paragraph 92.

Replace paragraph 93 with: ‘Policy 7R of the Plan addresses these matters. Its sixth part comments about the development of renewable and low carbon sources of energy applies throughout the parish. It has been designed to ensure that the character of the landscape is safeguarded together with the amenities of any residential properties close to the site concerned.’

Policy 8R Redevelopment of Newell’s Site

- 7.47 This is a new policy. It sets out the community’s approach to the development of this important site. I saw its overgrown condition during the visit.
- 7.48 The Plan advises that the former Newell’s factory site has been a major eyesore for many years. It concludes that the redevelopment of the site, subject to overcoming the issues in respect of flood risk, would constitute sustainable development as it would reuse a large well located brownfield site close to some Misterton’s services.
- 7.49 The Plan also advises that the site is located adjacent to the railway line and MPC is aware of the work being done by the Lincs and North Notts Community Rail Partnership to consider providing a stopping service for the train at Misterton. If this outcome could be achieved, the Plan comments that the site would be well placed to provide a car park and mixed used (e.g. residential development and small retail unit and/or small business units).
- 7.50 The policy comments that subject to the flood risk issues being mitigated, proposals for a mixed-use scheme will be supported. Subject to a train stopping service being provided, the Plan also advises that the redevelopment of part or all the site for a car park and public open space to provide appropriate parking provision will be supported.
- 7.51 The Plan takes a very positive approach to the development of this important site. It responds to its prominent location in the village coupled with its condition
- 7.52 As submitted the policy includes policy elements and supporting text. I recommend modifications to the wording of the policy to address these matters.
- 7.53 The site is adjacent to the railway line and the policy includes an ambitious element about the development of a railway station. I have taken account of MPC’s response to the question in the clarification note about the deliverability of this element of the policy. On the balance of the evidence, I am satisfied that it is appropriate to include a supportive policy on this matter in the Plan. The ongoing potential delivery of such a

project can be assessed in any future review of the Plan. Otherwise, it meets the basic conditions. It will contribute to the delivery of each of the three dimensions of sustainable development.

Replace the policy with:

‘Proposals for the redevelopment of Newell’s site for a mixed-use scheme will be supported where the flood risk issues are adequately mitigated.

The use of part or all the site for a railway station and associated car park and public open space will also be supported.’

Policy 9R Protecting and Enhancing Heritage Assets

- 7.54 This is a new policy. It comments about both designated and non-designated heritage assets.
- 7.55 BDC make a series of detailed comments about the supporting text. I recommend modifications to reflect the suggested changes.
- 7.56 The policy proposes that the Chesterfield Canal should be identified as a non-designated heritage asset. However, BDC has already done so. This is reflected in the recommended modification to the wording of paragraph 104 of the supporting text. On this basis I recommend the deletion of the third part of the policy. I also recommend that Map 11a (showing the Chesterfield Canal) is deleted from the Plan and that the Canal is included on Maps 11b and 11c.
- 7.57 The first part of the policy comments about listed buildings. However, it brings no added value beyond the designation of the buildings themselves and local policies applied by BDC. On this basis I recommend its deletion.
- 7.58 The fourth part of the policy comments about the effects of development proposals on heritage assets. I recommend that it is reconfigured so that it applies only to the identified non-designated heritage assets and has regard to paragraph 203 of the NPPF. Otherwise, it meets the basic conditions. It will contribute to the delivery of each of the three dimensions of sustainable development.

Replace the policy with:

‘Development proposals which would retain, restore, or sensitively reconfigure locally important heritage assets will be supported.

The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset (as shown on Maps 11 b and 11c) should be considered in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.’

Replace paragraphs 102 to 105 of the Plan with:

'The historic core of Misterton village is not designated as a conservation area. The analysis in the Misterton Design Guidelines and Design Code, along with historic mapping, shows that the Church of All Saints, Church Street, High Street, Station Street and Haxey Road can be seen as the historic core, but with historic farm buildings scattered amongst the other character areas. The analysis in the Misterton Design Guidelines and Design Code helps set out the historic significance of the area.'

The maps below show the heritage assets in the village. These include listed buildings (as identified by Historic England) and non-designated heritage assets (identified by Bassetlaw District Council and Nottinghamshire County Council, being buildings that have a local level of historic and/or architectural significance).

In addition, the Chesterfield Canal is regarded as one of the most important heritage assets in Nottinghamshire and has been identified by Bassetlaw District Council as a non-designated heritage asset. The Canal and Rivers Trust support this stance, describing the canal as a valuable reminder of the industrial heritage of the area.

There are more isolated listed buildings and non-designated heritage assets in the rural parts of the parish, which include Haxey Gate Bridge, Cornley Carr Farm, Gringley Road Farmhouse and Fountain Hill Farmhouse.'

Delete Map 11a and shown the Chesterfield Canal on Maps 11b and 11c

Policy 10R Supporting Local Businesses

- 7.59 The policy replaces Policy 11 of the made Plan.
- 7.60 It has two main parts. The first offers support to proposals that enable the sustainable growth of existing or new businesses either through the conversion of existing buildings or well-designed new buildings. The second offers support to proposals which will allow business to operate from integrated home/work locations. In the round I am satisfied that the policy takes an appropriate approach to this matter and has regard to Section 6 of the NPPF. It will contribute to the delivery of the economic dimension of sustainable development.

Policy 11R Improving Broadband and Mobile Connectivity

- 7.61 The policy replaces Policy 12 of the made Plan. It has two elements. The first is on broadband connections. The second is on 4G and 5G masts.
- 7.62 Broadband connection to new buildings is now addressed in the Building Regulations. On this basis I recommend the deletion of the first part of the policy. However, I recommend that the supporting text is revised to explain the position on this important matter.
- 7.63 I am satisfied that the second part of the policy meets the basic conditions. Nevertheless, I recommend that paragraph 119 is revised so that it more fully describes

the ambitions of the policy. Otherwise, it meets the basic conditions. It will contribute to the delivery of each of the three dimensions of sustainable development.

Delete the first part of the policy

At the end of paragraph 118 add: ‘Broadband connection to new properties is now addressed in the Building Regulations.’

Replace paragraph 119 with: ‘The review of the Plan supports the roll-out of these technologies including the erection of 4G and 5G masts. However, the installation of telecommunications masts to support such technologies must be done sensitively and not result in the erection of permanent structures in areas of high landscape sensitivity (for example, on the Local Green Spaces identified in the Plan, or where they obstruct the key views).’

Policy 12R A Mix of Housing Types

- 7.64 This policy replaces Policy 4 of the made Plan. It has two parts. The first requires that development proposals for new housing respond to local needs and deliver 2- and 3-bedroom homes. The second supports the development of accessible and adaptable homes.
- 7.65 The policy takes a very positive approach to this matter. I recommend that the first part of the policy is modified so that it sets out its requirements in a clearer way and which can be better implemented through the development management system. I am satisfied that the second part of the policy meets the basic conditions. Otherwise, the policy meets the basic conditions. It will contribute to the delivery of the social and the environmental dimensions of sustainable development.

Replace the first part of the policy with: ‘As appropriate to their scale, nature and location, proposals for new housing development should deliver housing sizes and types that reflect housing needs and delivers 2- and 3-bedroom homes including some bungalows.’

Policy 13R Enhancing the Provision of Community Facilities

- 7.66 The policy replaces Policy 13 of the made Plan.
- 7.67 I am satisfied that the additional community facilities are appropriate to be included in the policy. In the round I am satisfied that the policy meets the basic conditions. It will contribute to the delivery of the social and the environmental dimensions of sustainable development.

The Housing Allocations

- 7.68 The review of the Plan takes the opportunity to update the policies for the allocation of housing sites from the made Plan. In each case the revised policies set out a revised approach to the design of the site in response to the contents of the revisions to Policy 6R.

- 7.69 The Design Code provides detailed analysis of the density and character in the area around the site allocations. In some cases, this results in an adjustment to the housing numbers allocated on the site concerned.
- 7.70 I comment on the policies in turn. However, in each case I recommend that an additional element is included into the policy to ensure that their development responds positively to the requirements of Policy 6R on the mix of house types. MPC advised that this was its intention for the various allocated sites in its response to the clarification note.

Policy 14R Land off Haxey Road

- 7.71 The policy replaces Policy 6 of the made Plan. It sets out the revised approach to the design of the site in response to the contents of the revisions to Policy 6R.
- 7.72 This has resulted in an adjustment to the housing numbers allocated on the site. The policy comments that the development of the site should demonstrate how it is in accordance with the guidelines in the Design Code 2022 (section 5.2.4).
- 7.73 I am satisfied that the policy takes a very positive approach towards the development of the site. The site analysis work undertaken in the Design Code is sensitively incorporated into the revised approach. This is helpfully shown in Figure 5.
- 7.74 I recommend a modification to the wording used in both the second and third parts of the policy to bring the clarity required by the NPPF. I recommend that an additional element is included into the policy to ensure that their development responds positively to the requirements of Policy 12R on the mix of house types. Otherwise, it meets the basic conditions. It will contribute to the delivery of each of the three dimensions of sustainable development.

In parts 2 and 3 of the policy replace ‘will be required to’ with ‘should’

Incorporate an additional section to the policy to read:

‘4. Development proposals should include a mix of house types which respond positively to the requirements of Policy 12R of this Plan.’

Policy 15R Land off Church Street

- 7.75 The policy replaces Policy 7 of the made Plan. It sets out the revised approach to the design of the site in response to the contents of the revisions to Policy 6R.
- 7.76 The previous site allocation was for twelve dwellings. However, the Plan advises that the character analysis and planning applications have demonstrated that this would harm the character of the area. The number proposed in the revised policy reflects the acceptable density levels on the site. During the visit I saw that some initial site layout works had been undertaken on the site.
- 7.77 The policy comments that the development of the site should demonstrate how it is in accordance with the guidelines in the Design Code 2022 (section 5.3.4).

- 7.78 I am satisfied that the policy takes a very positive approach towards the development of the site. The site analysis work undertaken in the Design Code is sensitively incorporated into the revised approach. This is helpfully shown in Figure 6.
- 7.79 I recommend a modification to the wording used in the third parts of the policy to bring the clarity required by the NPPF. I recommend that an additional element is included into the policy to ensure that their development responds positively to the requirements of Policy 12R on the mix of house types. Otherwise, it meets the basic conditions. It will contribute to the delivery of each of the three dimensions of sustainable development.

In part 3 of the policy replace ‘will be required to’ with ‘should’

Incorporate an additional section to the policy to read:

‘4. Development proposals should include a mix of house types which respond positively to the requirements of Policy 12R of this Plan.’

Policy 16R Land off Meadow Drive

- 7.80 The policy replaces Policy 8 of the made Plan. It sets out the revised approach to the design of the site in response to the contents of the revisions to Policy 6R.
- 7.81 Paragraph 151 advises that planning permission has been approved for nine dwellings for this site, but the location of the site and the character of the adjoining area would support a higher density. During the visit I saw that the development of the site is now underway.
- 7.82 The policy comments that the development of the site should demonstrate how it is in accordance with the guidelines in the Design Code 2022 (section 5.4.4).
- 7.83 I am satisfied that the policy takes a very positive approach towards the development of the site. The site analysis work undertaken in the Design Code is sensitively incorporated into the revised approach. This is helpfully shown in Figure 7.
- 7.84 I recommend the inclusion of an additional element is included into the policy to ensure that their development responds positively to the requirements of Policy 12R on the mix of house types. Otherwise, it meets the basic conditions. It will contribute to the delivery of each of the three dimensions of sustainable development.

Indicate the submitted policy as part 1. Thereafter incorporate an additional section to the policy to read:

‘2. Development proposals should include a mix of house types which respond positively to the requirements of Policy 12R of this Plan.’

Policy 17R Land off Grange Walk

- 7.85 The policy replaces Policy 9 of the made Plan. It sets out the revised approach to the design of the site in response to the contents of the revisions to Policy 6R.

- 7.86 The policy comments that the development of the site should demonstrate how it is in accordance with the guidelines in the Design Code 2022 (section 5.5.4).
- 7.88 I am satisfied that the policy takes a very positive approach towards the development of the site. The site analysis work undertaken in the Design Code is sensitively incorporated into the revised approach. This is helpfully shown in Figure 8.
- 7.89 I recommend a modification to the wording used in the second part of the policy to bring the clarity required by the NPPF. I recommend that an additional element is included into the policy to ensure that their development responds positively to the requirements of Policy 6R on the mix of house types. Otherwise, it meets the basic conditions. It will contribute to the delivery of each of the three dimensions of sustainable development.

In parts 2 of the policy replace ‘will be required to’ with ‘should’

Renumber part 4 as part 3

Incorporate an additional section to the policy to read:

‘4. Development proposals should include a mix of house types which respond positively to the requirements of Policy 12R of this Plan.’

Policy 18R Land off Fox Covert Lane

- 7.90 The policy replaces Policy 10 of the made Plan. It sets out the revised approach to the design of the site in response to the contents of the revisions to Policy 6R.
- 7.91 This has resulted in an adjustment to the housing numbers allocated on the site. The policy comments that the development of the site should demonstrate how it is in accordance with the guidelines in the Design Code 2022 (section 5.5.4).
- 7.92 I am satisfied that the policy takes a very positive approach towards the development of the site. The site analysis work undertaken in the Design Code is sensitively incorporated into the revised approach. This is helpfully shown in Figure 9.
- 7.93 I recommend a modification to the wording used in both the second part of the policy to bring the clarity required by the NPPF. I recommend that an additional element is included into the policy to ensure that their development responds positively to the requirements of Policy 12R on the mix of house types. Otherwise, it meets the basic conditions. It will contribute to the delivery of each of the three dimensions of sustainable development.

In part 2 of the policy replace ‘will be required to’ with ‘should’

Incorporate an additional section to the policy to read:

‘4. Development proposals should include a mix of house types which respond positively to the requirements of Policy 12R of this Plan.’

Community Aspirations

- 7.94 Section 20 addresses a series of Community Aspirations which have arisen as the Plan was developed. They are detailed in Appendix C. They are non-land use matters which cannot directly be addressed as planning policies. In accordance with national advice, they are included in a separate section of the Plan.
- 7.95 I am satisfied that the various Aspirations are both appropriate and distinctive to the parish. In some cases, their implementation will complement some of the land use policies. The Aspirations for the provision of a Village Hall and the re-establishment of a railway station with the provision of a car park are particularly noteworthy.

Monitoring and Review

- 7.96 Section 21 of the Plan addresses the way in the Plan will be monitored and review. It anticipates a further review will take place five years after the current review of the Plan has been made.
- 7.97 In its response to the clarification note, MPC acknowledged that it would be appropriate to assess the need or otherwise for a further review of the Plan once the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan has been adopted.
- 7.98 The delivery of the housing allocations is a key element of the successful implementation of the Plan. During the visit, I saw the progress that has been made on sites NP02 (Policy 15R) and NP06 (Policy 16R) since the Plan was made in 2019. In its response to the clarification note, MPC advised that there are ongoing pre-application discussions on the site allocated in Policy 17R and that an application will be submitted shortly. It also advised that planning permission had been granted on the site allocated in Policy 18R in September 2023 for 46 dwellings. In its response MPC also agreed that it would be important for the Plan to monitor the delivery of the housing allocations throughout the Plan period.
- 7.99 I also recommend that the effectiveness of Policy 8R (the Newell's site) is monitored carefully. A key component of such monitoring will be the progress made by the Misterton Area Partnership Limited and the Lincs and North Notts Community Rail Partnership in securing the re-establishment of a railway station in the parish.

At the end of paragraph 172 add:

'The delivery of the housing allocations will be a key element of the successful implementation of the Plan. Whilst progress on delivery is promising at this point, the delivery of the various sites will be closely monitored. Where necessary, corrective action will be taken through a review of the Plan focused on the delivery of housing. The Parish Council will also monitor the effectiveness of Policy 8 (the Newell's site). A key component of such monitoring will be progress made by the Misterton Area Partnership Limited and the Lincs and North Notts Community Rail Partnership in securing the re-establishment of a railway station in the parish.'

At the end of paragraph 173 add:

'The Parish Council recognise the importance of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan in setting a wider planning policy for the District, including the overall delivery of new housing. In this context it will assess the need for a further review of the Plan within six months of the adoption of the Local Plan.'

Other Matters - General

- 7.100 This report has recommended a series of modifications both to the policies and to the supporting text in the submitted Plan. Where consequential changes to the text are required directly because of my recommended modification to the policy concerned, I have highlighted them in this report. However other changes to the general text may be required elsewhere in the Plan because of the recommended modifications to the policies. It will be appropriate for BDC and MPC to have the flexibility to make any necessary consequential changes to the general text. I recommend accordingly.

Modification of general text (where necessary) to achieve consistency with the modified policies.

Other Matters - Specific

- 7.101 BDC has made detailed comments on the Plan. They have been very helpful as part of the wider examination process. Where they relate directly to specific policies, I have considered them in my assessment on a policy-by-policy basis. BDC has also made a series of more general comments on the wording used in the Plan. They relate to the way in which the Plan period is identified in the Plan and the way in which it refers to the emerging Local Plan. I recommend modifications to address these matters.

Ensure that the end date for the Plan is shown consistently as 2038.

Update the general and specific references to the Bassetlaw Local Plan based on its current progress.

8 Summary and Conclusions

Summary

- 8.1 The Plan sets out a range of policies to guide and direct development proposals in the period up to 2038. It is distinctive in addressing a specific set of issues that have been identified and refined by the wider community to safeguard the character of the neighbourhood area and to promote sustainable housing development. In the round it is a first-class example of a review of a neighbourhood plan.
- 8.2 Following the independent examination of the Plan, I have concluded that the submitted Misterton Neighbourhood Development Plan Review meets the basic conditions for the preparation of a neighbourhood plan subject to a series of recommended modifications.

Conclusion

- 8.3 Based on the findings in this report I recommend to Bassetlaw District Council that subject to the incorporation of the modifications set out in this report the Misterton Neighbourhood Development Plan Review should proceed to referendum.

Referendum Area

- 8.4 I am required to consider whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the Plan area. In my view, the neighbourhood area is entirely appropriate for this purpose and no evidence has been submitted to suggest that this is not the case. I therefore recommend that the Plan should proceed to referendum based on the neighbourhood area as originally approved by the District Council on 7 July 2016.
- 8.5 I am grateful to everyone who has helped in any way to ensure that this examination has run in a smooth and efficient manner.

Andrew Ashcroft
Independent Examiner
8 January 2024