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## Overview

This document compiles all of the responses received during the Regulation 16 consultation. Original copies of the responses have been supplied to the Independent Examiner, so as to inform the assessment of the Plan. Please contact the Neighbourhood Planning Team with any queries, including reference to any supplementary documents not included here.

## 1: Bassetlaw District Council: Conservation

The changes recommended at Reg 14 stage have been carried out as requested. Therefore,

Conservation has no additional comments to make.

## 2: Bassetlaw District Council: Neighbourhood Planning

**General**

**Supporting / body text:** It would be useful to add a comprehensive numbering system for all sub-sections and paragraphs, to assist referencing of content.

**Policy Format and Numbering:** As above, it would be useful for all policies to be re-formatted to include clause and sub-section numbering (or lettering, where relevant), to make them easier to reference. It is also noted that the policy numbering order has gaps in places (e.g. ENV9 and ENV10 are missing from the sequence), assumingly due to earlier policies being removed. It would be a good idea to take the opportunity to re-number the policies in-full to rectify this.

**References to the Bassetlaw Local Plan:** Many of the references to the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan, particularly policy numbers, need updating, as more recent updates have not been factored-in.

**Specific**

**Page 6, paragraph 4:** First mention of NPPF is incorrectly shown as ‘NPFF’.

**Page 15, A. Housing and the Built Environment, paragraphs 3 and 4:** The housing requirement figures quoted from the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan are incorrect. The District-wide requirement is a minimum of 9,720 dwellings for the 18 years from 2020-2038, and it is expected that about 1,715 dwellings of this will be delivered in Small Rural Settlements during the plan period (see paras 5.1.36 and 5.1.58 of the [Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038 Main Modifications](https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/8099/local-plan-mm.pdf), published August 2023).

**Page 19, Housing Mix, paragraph 9:** The reference to emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan Policy 32 is incorrect; this should be Policy ST30

**Page 20, Affordable Housing, paragraph 8:** In the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan, affordable housing is mentioned in Policy ST29, not Policy ST31, and it requires 20% (not 10%) Affordable Housing provision on brownfield sites (for affordable home ownership) and 25% (not 20%) on greenfield sites.

**Page 22, Design, paragraph 4:** Promoting high quality design and design quality is addressed in Policy ST35 of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan, not Policy ST37.

**Page 22, Design, paragraph 4:** The reference to Policy HBE6 should be amended to address Policy HBE5.

**Page 24, Figures 4.1 and 4.2**: The two maps would benefit from being increased in size, as the information is not legible at present.

**Page 27, Important Open Spaces, paragraph 3:** The plan period for the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan period is from 2020 to 2038 (not 2021 – 2037), and it would be appropriate to refer to Policies ST46 and 47 (Open Space and Sports & Recreation sites), as opposed to Policy ST48.

**Page 44, 1. Community facilities, paragraph 6:** The reference to emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan Policy ST47 is incorrect; this should be Policy ST45 (Protection and Enhancement of Community Facilities).

**Pages 45 – 46:** It may be helpful for the location of the identified community facilities to be detailed on a map.

**Page 53, Broadband, paragraph 3:** Policy ST57 of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan promotes enhanced digital infrastructure, not Policy ST59.

**Page 56, Electric car charging, paragraph 3:** The reference to emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan Policy ST52 needs amending; this is now Policy ST50, and the specific reference to the provision of electric vehicle charging capability is proposed to be deleted as part of the Main Modifications.

**Font:** minor differences in font colour / format have been identified, as follows:

* Page 5: The caption of Figure 2 should not be bold, following the format of other figures.

## 3: Bassetlaw District Council: Planning Policy

The plan has been put together in a professional manner and is laid out in a concise and logical way. The following comments are designed to support the Neighbourhood Plan’s progression through its forthcoming examination.

**Specific Planning Policy Comments:**

**POLICY HBE1: DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY**

For clarity, it might be of benefit to provide a key for Figure 2.

Page 18 – Housing Allocations. Unclear here as to whether the Plan is or isn’t identifying sites for development?

**POLICY HBE 2: HOUSING MIX**

Although the Housing Needs Assessment identifies a need for smaller homes, it does not prohibit larger properties from being developed. In line within local and national planning policy, new development should provide a suitable mix of homes to meet local needs. It is likely that sites over 10 units will provide some smaller homes.

Those smaller sites may not necessarily provide smaller homes- especially if it is responding to a specific need such as self-build.

Housing Need Assessment is a separate Appendix so this could be referenced in the Policy for clarity.

**Policy HBE 3: AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

Check with BDC Housing Team over the local connection criteria.

The Housing Need Assessment recommends a 40% discount for First Homes. This could be strengthened in the Policy.

As the Local Plan is at an advanced stage, and we are currently producing a Supplementary Planning Document on Affordable Housing, it means the Affordable Housing percentage in Nether Langwith could change in the future rendering the policy as being redundant. We would recommend keeping up-to-date with the Local Plan or reviewing this policy in six months time.

**POLICY HBE 4: WINDFALL SITES**

This is similar to Policy HBE 1. Would it be beneficial to merge these policies together for consistency.

**POLICY HBE 5: DESIGN**

Whilst the design code work is very informative, more could be taken from it and put into the Policy. As currently written, the Policy is generic and key principles could be taken and strengthened through the Policy.

The Design Code is part of the Plan (Appendix 4) so this should be referenced to within the Policy.

**POLICY ENV 1: LOCAL GREEN SPACE**

No comments.

**POLICY ENV 2: IMPORTANT OPEN SPACES**

Do these spaces qualify to be Local Green Spaces?

**POLICY ENV 3: SITES AND FEATURES OF NATURAL ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE**

Although this is a good example of identifying local natural assets, what risk is there of these being impacted by development. Most are within open countryside and already protected by specific designations.

**POLICY ENV 4: BIODIVERSITY AND HABITAT CONNECTIVITY**

It is great to see biodiversity net gain being referenced here. However, until the Local Plan is adopted any reference to net gain should come direct via National Planning Policy. BDC is in the process of producing a Supplementary Planning Document to help manage net gain within the District.

**POLICY ENV 5: SITES OF HISTORICAL ENVIRONMENT SIGNIFICANCE**

See comments from BDC Conservation Team

**POLICY ENV 6: RIDGE AND FURROW**

See comments from BDC Conservation Team

**POLICY ENV 7: IMPORTANT VIEWS**

The policy could be strengthened and refer to development not blocking these important views. The short or long-distance sightlines are just as important as the end view/vista. It is unlikely that a development could mitigate the loss of a particular view as prescribed in the Policy.

The Policy could refer to the importance of the views in relation to their proposed layout.

**POLICY ENV8: FOOTPATHS AND OTHER WALKING ROUTES**

No comments.

**POLICY ENV11: FLOOD RISK RESILIENCE**

Flood Risk is generally well covered by National Planning Policy. For consistency, it is important that any flood related Policy in a Neighbourhood Plan reflects the Policy requirements in the National Planning Policy Framework.

**POLICY CF1: THE RETENTION OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND AMENITIES**

The list of community facilities covers green spaces and heritage assets that are already covered by designation policies. Community facilities should be those that provide a local service or facility to residents.

A Map identifying the community facilities and amenities would help support this Policy.

**POLICY E1: EMPLOYMENT AND COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT**

As currently written, this Policy would conflict with current and emerging planning policy for employment in the rural area. Employment in locations like Nether Langwith should be appropriate to its rural context. Commercial development and/ or general employment development would not likely be supported here through the Local Plan/Core Strategy. Any localised employment policy should specify the type of employment uses that would be supported in the Neighbourhood (in line with those in the emerging Local Plan).

**POLICY E2: WORKING FROM HOME**

Not all of these uses need planning permission. You would not require planning permission to change an existing room in a residential dwelling to a home office. Some of the outdoor offices fall under permitted development rights. ‘’where permission is required’’ could be included in the introduction to the Policy.

**POLICY E3: REUSE OF AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS**

Not all now require planning permission. ‘’where permission is required’’ could be included in the introduction to the Policy.

**POLICY E4: TOURISM**

It would be helpful to identify what land uses would qualify as ‘’tourism’’ developments.

**POLICY E5: BROADBAND INFRASTRUCTURE**

No comments.

**POLICY T1: TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT**

Not all development would be required to provide such infrastructure**. ‘**’Where appropriate’’ could be included in the introduction of the Policy**.** Parking Standards are provided by Nottinghamshire County Council.

**POLICY T2: CAR PARKING**

This Policy is unlikely to be effective. Off-street parking is generally privately owned and would not normally require planning permission to modify or altar – especially if it is an existing property.

**POLICY T4: ELECTRIC VEHICLES**

No comments.

## 4: Environment Agency

Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the above submission draft of the Nether Langwith Neighbourhood Plan.

The Environment Agency provided a response to the pre submission draft on the 29th July 2023. In this response we suggested a few minor changes but having reviewed the latest submission draft document and supporting documents we notice that these have not been implemented. We therefore reiterate the points raised in that July 2023 response which are detailed below.

**Environment Agency position**

**Flood Risk**

The settlement of Nether Langwith lies predominantly within flood zone 1 although the River Poulter does intersect the southern section of the settlement. The EA flood map for planning indicates that sections of flood zones 2 and 3 are present particularly along Queen’s Walk.

It should be mentioned that the River Poulter is not classified as a ‘Main River’ and therefore the Environment Agency do not hold hydraulically modelled data. Therefore, any proposed new development located within flood zone 3 may require additional modelling to ensure it is able to meet the requirements of the NPPF. The requirements of the NPPF are to ensure that not only the development can be made safe for its perceived lifetime but also does not increase risk to third parties as a result of development.

We welcome the addition of Policy ENV11 however this is predominantly targeted towards the mitigating the impact of surface water flood risk. While we do support this, we do feel that the fluvial flood risk emanating from the River Poulter should have a greater level of scrutiny.

The above is evident within section 2.6 of the design guide and codes document but this should be emphasised within the neighbourhood plan document.

**Biodiversity and Habitat Connectivity**

We welcome that there are policies which seek to enhance or provide biodiversity and habitat connectivity improvements as part of new development.

However, we feel that Policy ENV 4 should also include mention of both ‘green infrastructure’ and ‘blue infrastructure’ as it would be beneficial to clearly link both within the policy wording. 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.

While Policy ENV 4 makes mention of Biodiversity Net Gain we would encourage specific mention of the requirements now mandated through the Environment Bill.

The Environment Bill has now been approved through parliament requiring development to provide a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain. 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/feesible.

Should the above changes be implemented then this will add further linkage between the Neighbourhood Plan and section 4.6 – Green and Blue Infrastructure of the accompanying design guide and codes document.

**Water efficiency of new build development**

We also wished to point out that while the design guide and codes document is extremely thorough, we would recommend that the inclusion of water efficiency targets are incorporated. This would appear to fit most naturally within Design Code D3.

We would encourage inclusion of the requirement for all new residential development to meet the tighter water efficiency measures of 110 litres per person per day unless it can be demonstrated that this is not feasible.

Producing mains water, treating waste water and in-home water heating has significant embedded energy and requires chemical inputs, 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.

## 5. Historic England

Thank you for consulting us on the Regulation 16 Consultation of the Nether Langwith Neighbourhood Plan.

We have no further comments to make in addition to those we made at Regulation 14 stage - a copy of which I have attached for your information.

## 6: National Highways

Thank you for providing National Highways with the opportunity to consult on the draft Neighbourhood Plan for Nether Langwith.

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

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

The SRN closest to the NDP area is the M1 trunk road, which is outside the boundary of the plan area.

We have considered the contents of the Neighbourhood Plan and as the plan does not introduce any new development sites or transport related policies that are likely to impact the safety and operation of the SRN, we have no other comments to make.

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

## 7: Natural England

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 17 November 2023.

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

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

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

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

Natural England does not hold information on the location of significant populations of protected species, so is unable to advise whether this plan is likely to affect protected species to such an extent as to require a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Further information on protected species and development is included in [Natural England's Standing Advice on protected species](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/protected-species-how-to-review-planning-applications) .

Furthermore, Natural England does not routinely maintain locally specific data on all environmental assets. The plan may have environmental impacts on priority species and/or habitats, local wildlife sites, soils and best and most versatile agricultural land, or on local landscape character that may be sufficient to warrant a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Information on ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees is set out in Natural England/Forestry Commission [standing advice](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-and-veteran-trees-protection-surveys-licences).

We therefore recommend that advice is sought from your ecological, landscape and soils advisers, local record centre, recording society or wildlife body on the local soils, best and most versatile agricultural land, landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity receptors that may be affected by the plan before determining whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment is necessary.

Natural England reserves the right to provide further advice on the environmental assessment of the plan. This includes any third party appeal against any screening decision you may make. If an Strategic Environmental Assessment is required, Natural England must be consulted at the scoping and environmental report stages.

For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk .

## 8: Derbyshire County Council

Thank you for giving Derbyshire County Council (DCC) the opportunity to comment on the Nether Langwith Neighbourhood Plan (NLNP) (Regulation 16) Submission Draft. The comments below are DCC’s Member and Officers’ technical comments with regard to the climate change, footpaths, and transport aspects of the Plan.

**Local Member Comments**

Councillor Joan Dixon, the County Council Member for Bolsover South Electoral Division, has been consulted. She has not commented so far, but if I receive any comments, I will forward them to you.

**Officer Comments**

**Neighbourhood Plan Policies**

**General**

**Climate change**

From a climate change perspective there is very little reference to energy use or energy conservation. There is no reference to renewable energy generation, decarbonisation of heat, insulation or adapting buildings to the impacts of climate change. Beyond a few references to climate change there are no specific details about how climate considerations have influenced the Plan or how climate change should be considered in future decision-making.

Therefore, DCC would reiterate the comments it made on climate change in relation to the Pre-submission version of the NLNP (attached), and recommend that the document should be strengthened in these areas.

**B. The Natural, Historical and Social Environment**

**Footpaths and other walking routes**

In general, DCC’s comments on the Pre-submission version of the NLNP (attached) still stand as there has not been a substantial change in relation to Public Rights of Way.

**POLICY ENV8: FOOTPATHS AND OTHER WALKING ROUTES** - Development proposals that result in the loss of, or have a significant adverse effect on, the existing network of footpaths which are also public rights of way (figure 13) will not be supported without appropriate mitigation.

The extension of the footpath network to key Parish facilities and to adjoining Parishes is supported.

The last sentence ‘The extension of the footpath network to key Parish facilities and to adjoining Parishes is supported’ has since been added to the Pre-submission draft, and this addition is welcomed. However, DCC would suggest that the addition of the words ‘the existing paths’ to adjoining parishes would more directly acknowledge the existing links and paths along the County boundary.

The policy would therefore read:

The extension of the footpath network to key Parish facilities and the existing paths to adjoining Parishes is supported.

**C. Sustainability**

**3. Traffic**

**Traffic management**

While there is a comment on page 54 (see quotation below) about the public transport (bus and rail) services in the area there is nothing in the documents about what could be done to encourage more use of them or that they could help to alleviate some of the problems that are raised e.g., volumes of traffic, and lack of parking, etc. DCC would suggest, therefore, that further consideration should be given to these aspects of the Plan and, if appropriate, a policy should be added accordingly.

“There is a two-hourly train service running from Worksop to Nottingham (but not on a Sunday). There is a regular bus service connecting Nether Langwith to Bolsover, Chesterfield, Mansfield, Worksop and Warsop.”

Please contact me if you wish to discuss the comments further.

## 9: Sport England

Thank you for consulting Sport England on the Nether Langwith Neighbourhood Plan.

Sport England is a statutory consultee on planning applications affecting playing field land. We assess planning consultations against the five exceptions in our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance Document <https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport> which reflects the wording in paragraph 103 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Protecting Sports Facilities**

Paragraph 103 of the NPPF offers clear advice on how sport facilities and playing fields should be considered in the planning system.

Policy ENV2, which seeks to protect open spaces including OS02 Cockshut Lane Playing Field and OS05 Hardwick Street/ Devonshire recreation ground/ playing field, is welcomed. However, the exception within the policy which relates to the development no longer being required by the community does not reflect the requirements of Part a) of paragraph 103 which requires that ‘an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements’. For the Policy to be consistent with the NPPF the wording of the Policy should be amended to reflect the requirements of paragraph 103 of the NPPF.

Policy CF1, which seeks to protect community facilities and amenities, is welcomed. However, the Hardwick Street Recreation Ground and Cockshut Lane Recreation Ground are playing field. For this policy to be consistent with paragraph 103 of the NPPF and Sport England’s Playing Fields Policy for playing fields and sports facilities, it is recommended that a separate criterion is added which applies to the playing fields as the exceptions listed in the policy are contrary to the wording in paragraph 103 of the NPPF. The new criterion should read:

*Development proposals which would reduce the quality or quantity of sports facilities or playing field land will only be supported if:*

*• An assessment has been undertaken which demonstrates the sports facility or playing field is surplus to requirements; or*

*• Existing facilities are replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quality and quantity and in a suitable location; or*

*• The development is for alternative sports and recreation provisions, the benefits of which outweigh the loss.*

This would also ensure that these policies are in conformity with Policy DM9 of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD and Policy ST47 of the Publication version of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038.

**Active Design**

Policy ENV8, which seeks to protect the footpath network and Policy T1, which requires development to consider improvement and creation of footpaths and cycleways and to enhance pedestrian facilities, are welcomed. Sport England, in conjunction with Active Travel England and the Office for Health Improvement and Disparities, has produced ‘Active Design’ (2023), a guide to planning new developments that create the right environment to help people get more active, more often in the interests of health and wellbeing. The guidance sets out ten key principles for ensuring new developments incorporate opportunities for people to take part in sport and physical activity. The Active Design principles are aimed at contributing towards the Government’s desire for the planning system to promote healthy communities through good urban design. The document can be downloaded via the following link: <http://www.sportengland.org/activedesign> .

If you require any further information or clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me.

## 10: Coal Authority

Thank you for your notification of 22 November 2023 seeking the views of the Coal Authority on the above.

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

Our records indicate that within the identified Neighbourhood Plan area there are limited coal mining features present at surface and shallow depth. In this case our records indicate that fissures/breaklines and reported surface hazards are present within the northern part of the area identified.

Following a review of the Neighbourhood Plan it is noted that it does not propose to allocate any new sites for future development. On this basis the Planning team at the Coal Authority have no specific comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.

## 11: P&DG obo Welbeck Estates

I write on behalf of my client Welbeck Estates Company Limited (Welbeck) to make representations to the current Draft Nether Langwith Neighbourhood Plan consultation.

As the Council will not doubt be aware, Welbeck is a working estate with land interests in the local and wider and is a significant contributor to the local economy by providing employment opportunities and acting as a considerable draw for local tourism.

As such, it takes a keen interesting in local planning issues.

Having read the Draft Nether Langwith Neighbourhood Plan, Welbeck is largely supportive of its policies and proposals and the aspirations of the local community.

Welbeck is pleased to note that under the Plan’s ‘Vision and Objectives’ it states:

*“We aren’t against all new housing development. Smaller, incremental housing schemes, designed to be sympathetic to the visual amenity of our village, will be considered.” (the Vision p8).*

Under ‘Objectives’ it states that:

*“The objectives of our Neighbourhood Plan are:*

***a)*** *To provide a balanced range of housing choices which meet the diverse needs of all**generations, particularly by increasing the supply of smaller homes for ‘down-sizers’;”*

Welbeck is pleased to see that an objective of the Plan is to provide a balanced range of housing choices, but would suggest that focusing too much on the supply of smaller homes for ‘down-sizers’ is not within the spirit of ‘a balanced range of house choices’ and couldlead to a skewed demographic for the village which doesn’t include an appropriate level of young families which would help secure its future.

Welbeck is supportive of the proposed ‘Development Boundary’ as shown on ‘Figure 2 –

Development boundary for Nether Langwith – main area’. It is reflective of the built-up area

of the village whilst still leaving some areas open for modest future development.

Welbeck is concerned however that under ‘Housing Allocations’ the Plan states:

*“Neighbourhood plans can allocate residential development sites to help meet a local need and to contribute to a housing requirement. Plans which choose to do this receive additional powers – the Plan will remain active if it allocates a site for residential development in circumstances where Bassetlaw falls below its required land supply over a 5-year period.*

*Although there is no specific housing target for the Neighbourhood Area, this Neighbourhood Plan has undertaken a comprehensive assessment of potential residential development sites and taken a positive approach to securing sustainable development and to help meet a local need. The Housing Needs Assessment is attached at Appendix 2. The process undertaken, together with the report, revealed that there are no suitable sites for residential development in the Neighbourhood Area.”*

Welbeck believes that the Plan should be more flexible in its approach to housing delivery and allocation. Future housing need and national and local planning policy on housing delivery can change. The Plan therefore should be ‘future proofed’ to ensure that if there is a change in circumstances, the Plan (as made) could rise to meet those challenges and not be held back by short-sighted or limiting planning policies.

Welbeck is supportive of policy ‘HBE 4: WINDFALL SITES’ where it states:

*“Development proposals for infill (individual dwellings or small groups of dwellings) will be supported where appropriate, and:*

*- The site is within the development boundary for Nether Langwith;…”*

Welbeck hopes these comments are helpful and looks forward to a continued positive working relationship with the Parish Council in this new chapter of its history.

If you have any questions about this representation, please do not hesitate to contact me.

## 12: Heatons obo Tarmac

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Submission Draft version of the Nether Langwith Neighbourhood Plan. The comments in this letter are provided by Heatons on behalf of Tarmac Trading Limited (‘Tarmac’). Tarmac operates Nether Langwith (Cuckney Hay Wood) Quarry, which is located within the Neighbourhood Area.

The Quarry is the sole dedicated aggregate limestone quarry in Nottinghamshire. It is accessed via a purpose-built haul road that meets the public highway at Wood Lane.

Also present at the Quarry is a Tarmac-operated Skills and Safety Park which acts as the national training facility for Tarmac staff, providing a unique service for the Company’s employees. The operation of the Skills and Safety Park is tied to the lifespan of the Quarry under condition number one of the Skills and Safety Park’s extant planning permission (Nottinghamshire County Council reference 1/18/01499/CDM).

The purpose of this letter is twofold:

• To secure the long-term retention of part of the Quarry for small-scale employment uses;

 and

• To emphasise the importance of the mineral operations permitted at the quarry, which are likely to continue to operate throughout the plan period of the Nether Langwith Neighbourhood Plan.

The above points are discussed in greater detail overleaf.

Promotion of Long-Term Small-Scale Employment within Nether Langwith Quarry

The approved restoration for Nether Langwith Quarry, required to be implemented upon the cessation of limestone extraction, commits the Quarry to be restored predominantly to grassland and agricultural pastureland. At present, it is acknowledged that there is no established planning permission for the retention of buildings at the Quarry post-mineral operations.

However, Tarmac considers that it would be beneficial to retain the Skills and Safety Park beyond the life of mineral operations. The Skills and Safety Park is located as shown on Figure 1 below:

The Skills and Safety Park was opened by HRH Prince William in 2020. It is the only such site of its kind across Tarmac’s nationwide portfolio. Approximately 3,500 people will have attended training courses at the Park in 2023. At the time of writing, the Park also supports apprenticeships for 104 people.

The Park today directly supports 24 jobs and contributes to the local economy directly through employment and business rates, and indirectly through the use of local contractors and support for the local businesses in the community. The Park uses local suppliers for a variety of services including catering, cleaning, landscaping, and maintenance. The Park also generates significant business for local hotels and B&Bs; annual spend on accommodation for delegates visiting the Park is over £75,000. These direct and indirect benefits associated with the Park would all reduce to nothing upon its closure at the end of the Quarry’s mineral life.

Tarmac considers that the retention of small-scale employment uses at the Quarry post-mineral operations would leave an appropriate legacy for the Quarry. This would avoid a situation where the number of jobs associated with minerals provided by the site is reduced to zero upon implementing the approved restoration plan which returns the site to grassland and agriculture with no job retention. Tarmac is keen to ensure the benefits of Nether Langwith Quarry to the Company and to the local economy are not completely lost upon cessation of mineral operations. Sensitively securing the long-term future of the Skills and Safety Park is an opportunity to provide continued benefits for the Company and the local area.

The retention of small-scale employment uses would represent an appropriate diversification of the Quarry’s restoration scheme and the wider area.

Therefore, our suggested alternative is that the Skills and Safety Park is retained to maintain jobs and the numerous other economic benefits. As the Skills and Safety Park is already (successfully) existing, Tarmac considers that the retention of some element of employment use at the site is an ideal way to secure long-term employment floorspace in a demonstrably acceptable location.

Retention of employment uses at the Quarry could also safeguard from development other greenfield locations within the Neighbourhood Area that are of comparatively greater sensitivity either in terms of their landscape or ecological value, or their proximity to residential properties.

Long-term small-scale employment uses at Nether Langwith Quarry beyond the remaining duration of mineral operations would support sustainable economic development in accordance with the objectives of Section 3 of the Submission Version Neighbourhood Plan. Contribution towards the achievement of sustainable development is also a ‘basic condition’ (Condition D) that Neighbourhood Plans must meet in order to proceed to referendum.

In summary, Tarmac hereby requests that the Neighbourhood Plan be modified to include direct reference to, and support for, the potential long-term small-scale employment uses at the Quarry. Tarmac wishes to promote the portion of Nether Langwith Quarry that is contained within the red line boundary at Figure 1 for retention beyond the life of mineral operations.

It is important to note that, even if support for the Skills and Safety Park’s retention through the Neighbourhood Plan is achieved, planning permission to secure the future of the Park beyond the duration of mineral operations would still be required. The acceptability of the Park’s long term retention against the policy tests as set out in the Bassetlaw development plan and national planning policy and guidance would still need to be demonstrated. In that regard, Tarmac acknowledges that support for the retention of the Park in the Nether Langwith Neighbourhood Plan does not represent a presumption that planning permission will be obtained, but is an important first step to securing the future of the Park with the support of the local community.

Further engagement between Tarmac and the Neighbourhood Plan Group on the subject of securing long-term small-scale employment uses at the Quarry is warmly welcomed.

Recognition of the Importance of Nether Langwith Quarry

As stated, Nether Langwith Quarry is the only dedicated aggregate limestone quarry in Nottinghamshire. It is therefore an important limestone resource for the County.

Tarmac wishes to emphasise the importance of mineral operations, as championed in the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) and the Nottinghamshire County Council Minerals Local Plan (2021). Whilst the primary objective of this letter is to secure the future of small-scale employment uses within the permitted boundary of Nether Langwith Quarry, it is also considered that the Neighbourhood Plan would benefit from greater consistency with national planning policies and guidance relating to minerals development. “Regard to national policies…” is a ‘basic condition’ (Condition A) that all Draft Neighbourhood Plans should meet in order to proceed to referendum. Recognition of the significant mineral operations within the Neighbourhood Area would make the Nether Langwith Neighbourhood Plan more acceptable with regard to its progress towards referendum.

We trust that these comments are helpful. We would welcome opportunity to discuss the contents of this letter.

Should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.