

# **Babworth Neighbourhood Plan 2020-38**

## **Submission Plan**

### **Report to Bassetlaw District Council of the Examination into the Babworth Neighbourhood Plan**

by Independent Examiner, Peter Biggers BSc Hons MRTPI

August 2025

*Argyle Planning Consultancy LTD*

## Contents

<b>Summary and overall recommendation</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	<b>6</b>
Background context.....	6
Appointment of the independent examiner .....	7
Role of the independent examiner .....	7
<b>2. The Examination Process</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>3. Public Consultation</b> .....	<b>10</b>
Background.....	10
Babworth Neighbourhood Plan Consultation .....	10
<b>4. Preparation of the Plan and Legislative Requirements</b> .....	<b>12</b>
Qualifying body .....	12
Plan area.....	12
Plan period.....	12
Excluded development .....	12
Development and use of land.....	13
Plan publication following submission.....	13
<b>5. The Basic Conditions</b> .....	<b>13</b>
National policy and advice .....	13
Sustainable development .....	14
General conformity with the development plan.....	14
European Union (EU) obligations .....	15
<b>6. The Neighbourhood Plan – Assessment</b> .....	<b>17</b>
- The General Form of the Plan .....	17
- Section 1 - About this Neighbourhood Plan.....	19
- Section 2 - The Consultation Process .....	20
- Section 3 - A Plan for Babworth Parish .....	21
- Section 4 - Neighbourhood Plan Policies and Proposals.....	23
• Housing and Built Environment.....	23
Policy HBE1 - Development Boundary .....	23
Policy HBE2 - Housing Allocation .....	25
Policy HBE3 - Housing Mix .....	27
Policy HBE4 - Affordable Housing .....	28
Policy HBE5 - Windfall Development.....	29
Policy HBE6 - Design .....	29
• Natural, Historic and Social Environment .....	30
Policy ENV1 - Local Green Space .....	31
Policy ENV2 - Important Open Spaces.....	31
Policy ENV3 - Sites and Features of Natural Environmental Significance.....	33
Policy ENV4 - Biodiversity and Connectivity.....	33

Policy ENV5 - Sites of Historic Environmental Significance.....	34
Policy ENV6 - Footpaths and Other Walking Routes .....	36
Policy ENV7 - Floodrisk Resilience and Climate Change .....	37
Policy ENV8 - Renewable Energy Generation Infrastructure.....	39
• Sustainability .....	41
Policy CF1 - Retention of Community Facilities and Amenities .....	41
• Employment.....	43
Policy E1 - Employment Development.....	43
Policy E2 - Reuse of Agricultural Buildings.....	44
Policy E3 - Tourism .....	45
Policy E4 - Broadband Infrastructure .....	46
• Traffic .....	47
• Policy T1 - Traffic Management .....	47
- Section 5 - Monitoring and Review .....	49
<b>7. Other Matters .....</b>	<b>50</b>
- Parish History .....	50
- Typographical and Formatting Corrections .....	50
<b>8. Referendum.....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Appendix 1 - Examiner’s Clarifying Questions and Information Requests put to Babworth Parish Council and Bassetlaw District Council .....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Appendix 2 - Recommendation 25 - Typographical and Formatting Corrections .....</b>	<b>63</b>

## Summary and overall recommendation

Following my examination of the Babworth Neighbourhood Plan (BNP), including a site visit to the neighbourhood area on 4 June 2025, it is my view that, subject to modifications, the BNP reflects the views of the community and will set out a clear vision and suite of policies for the neighbourhood area.

My report highlights a number of areas where I consider the wording of the Plan as submitted is not in accordance with one or more of the Basic Conditions.

The more significant of these include policy HBE1 where the proposed development boundary directly undermines a strategic policy in the Bassetlaw Local Plan (BLP). In addition there are a number of areas where the proposed policy repeats policy content already covered in national and local policy which itself is unnecessary but in some cases the policy also makes slightly different requirements which puts it into conflict with either the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) or the BLP resulting in the need for modification e.g. Policies HBE 4, ENV2 and ENV7.

There are also a number of circumstances where the requirement in the PPG for policies to be supported by sufficient justification and evidence has not been observed, for example in policies HBE2, E3 and T1. This needs to be corrected.

I have also recommended other less significant modifications that should be made to a number of policies before the Plan can proceed to referendum. For the most part, the reason for these is that the policies do not wholly meet the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 16 where it states that policies should be: *“clearly written and unambiguous so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals”*. The advice in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) is also relevant to this where it states that: *“A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence”*.

In addition, there are a number of typographical and formatting errors and mapping amendments which need to be corrected.

All these modifications are intended to ensure that, first and foremost, the Plan can meet the Basic Conditions.

In proposing the modifications, I have tried to ensure that the integrity and value of the BNP and its vision is retained and that the intention of neighbourhood planning, where the community’s wishes should be central to the Plan, is honoured.

By its nature, the examination has to be rigorous. Any criticism is not at all to undermine the significant community effort that has gone into the Plan over a long period of time. Rather, the purpose of the examination is to ensure that the Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions and is as robust as possible and that it can better play its part in

planning decisions and managing change in Babworth Parish in the future in an effective way.

In addition to the recommended modifications, it should also be noted that there may be a number of consequential changes, for example to referencing and numbering that will inevitably be needed as a result of making the modifications. I have identified a number of these consequential changes, but not necessarily highlighted all of them and these amendments need to be made in finalising the Plan for referendum.

Subject to the recommended modifications in the report being completed, I am satisfied that:

- having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood plan;
- the making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;
- the making of the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority;
- the making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations;
- prescribed conditions are met in relation to the neighbourhood plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the plan.

The BNP also complies with the legal requirements set out in paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

With the modifications in place, the BNP will meet the Basic Conditions and can proceed to a referendum.

When that referendum takes place, I also recommend that the Babworth Neighbourhood Area, which covers the administrative area of the Parish Council, is taken as the area for the referendum.

Peter Biggers BSc Hons MRTPI  
Independent Examiner  
7 August 2025

# 1. Introduction

## Background context

- 1.1. This report provides the findings of the examination into the Babworth Neighbourhood Plan (referred to as the BNP throughout this report).
- 1.2. The BNP was produced by Babworth Parish Council (BPC) as Qualifying Body and in consultation with the local planning authority for the neighbourhood area – Bassetlaw District Council (BDC). The local community, statutory consultees, interested parties and local stakeholders were also consulted as set out in Section 3 below.
- 1.3. Babworth is a rural Parish in the Bassetlaw district of Nottinghamshire, England, about 1½ miles west of Retford. The Neighbourhood Plan covers the whole of the Parish including Ranby (the main village), Babworth and the hamlets of Great Morton, Little Morton and Morton Grange. In addition, HM Ranby Prison is a large category C working and resettlement prison on an extensive site on the east side of Ranby that holds over 1,000 adult men.
- 1.4. The Parish is located on a gently sloping lobe of modestly elevated land connected on its west with the historical Sherwood Forest and Dukeries and bounded on its south and east by the valleys of the rivers Poulter and Idle. The Chesterfield Canal, runs across the northern part of the Area, and the old Great North Road defines the parish's western edge. Babworth stands on a promontory overlooking the low ground around Retford and the locations of both Ranby and Babworth provide picturesque views across open countryside.
- 1.5. The underlying geology gives rise to light but fertile soils (mostly Grade 3 meaning that some of it is of, or close to, best and most versatile quality); most is under intensive and productive arable cultivation but there are areas of also quite intensive livestock production, and a long-established tree nursery. Amongst the farmland there are a number of scattered woodlands, a small area of parkland around Ranby church and the site of Ranby Hall and a larger area of plantations and historical woodlands associated with Clumber Park in the southwest corner. The Plan Area, despite the presence of the busy A1 and Ranby Prison is very much a rural, farming community.
- 1.6. The Neighbourhood Area equates to an area of approximately 2589 hectares and has a population of 1488 living in 257 households (Census 2021).
- 1.7. This examiner's report provides a recommendation as to whether or not the BNP should go forward to a referendum. Were it to go to referendum and achieve more than 50% of votes cast in favour of it, then the BNP would be 'made' by Bassetlaw District Council. In the event of a successful referendum result, the BNP would immediately carry full weight in the determination of planning applications in the

neighbourhood area.

## Appointment of the independent examiner

1.8. I was appointed as an independent examiner by BDC, with the consent of BPC as the Qualifying Body, (following a competitive procurement process), to conduct the examination and provide this report as an independent examiner. I am independent of the qualifying body and the Local Planning Authority and I do not have any interest in any land that may be affected by the BNP, nor do I have any professional commissions in the area currently. I hold appropriate qualifications and experience and have planning and development experience, gained over 44 years across the public and private planning sectors. I am a Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute.

## Role of the independent examiner

1.9. It is the role of the independent examiner to consider whether a neighbourhood plan meets the 'Basic Conditions'. The Basic Conditions are set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (TCPA) as applied to neighbourhood plans by section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (PCPA). They are that \*:

- a) Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood plan;
- d) The making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;
- e) The making of the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority;
- f) The making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations;
- g) Prescribed conditions are met in relation to the neighbourhood plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the plan.

\* NB Basic Conditions b) and c), relating to listed buildings and conservation areas, are also included in the Basic Conditions but as these only concern neighbourhood development orders they are not included in this report.

1.10. Pursuant to Basic Condition g) above, Regulation 32 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended by the Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018, effective from 28 December 2018, prescribes the following additional Basic Condition for the purpose of paragraph 8(2)(g) of Schedule 4B to the TCPA 1990:

*“The making of the neighbourhood development plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017”.*

Regulation 106(1) of Chapter 8 states that: *“a qualifying body which submits a proposal for a neighbourhood development plan must provide such information as the competent authority may reasonably require for the purposes of the assessment under Regulation 105 (that assessment is necessary where the neighbourhood plan is likely to have a significant effect on a European site or a European offshore marine site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects) or to enable it to determine whether that assessment is required”.*

1.11. In examining the Plan, I have also considered whether the legislative requirements are met, namely:

- The Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body as defined in section 61F of the TCPA as applied to neighbourhood plans by section 38A of the PCPA.
- The Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared for an area that has been designated under section 61G of the TCPA as applied to neighbourhood plans by section 38A of the PCPA.
- The Neighbourhood Plan meets the requirements of section 38B of the PCPA (the Plan must specify the period to which it has effect, must not include provisions relating to ‘excluded development’, and must not relate to more than one neighbourhood area) and
- The policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area in line with the requirements of the PCPA section 38A.

1.12. I have examined the BNP against the Basic Conditions and legislative requirements above and, as independent examiner, I must make one of the following recommendations:

- a) that the Plan should proceed to referendum, on the basis that it meets all legal requirements;
- b) that the Plan, once modified to meet all relevant legal requirements, should proceed to referendum;
- c) that the Plan does not proceed to referendum, on the basis that it does not meet the relevant legal requirements.

1.13. If recommending that the Plan should go forward to referendum, I am also then required to consider whether or not the Referendum Area should extend beyond the Neighbourhood Area to which the Plan relates. I make my recommendation on the Referendum Area at the end of this report (See Section 8).

- 1.14. The role of the independent examiner is not to comment on whether the Plan is sound or how the Plan could be improved, but rather to focus on compliance with the Basic Conditions.

## 2. The Examination Process

- 2.1. It is a general rule that neighbourhood plan examinations should be held without a public hearing; that is by written representations only. However, according to the legislation, when the examiner considers it necessary to ensure adequate examination of an issue or to ensure a person has a fair chance to put a case, a public hearing may be held.
- 2.2. I have considered the representations received at the Regulation 16 publicity stage and I am satisfied that there is no need for a public hearing in respect of the BNP and the matters are considered below. I confirm that all Regulation 16 representations on the Plan have been taken into account in undertaking this examination. Where appropriate, I have made specific reference to the person's or organisation's comments in Section 6 of this report.
- 2.3. I undertook an unaccompanied site visit around the neighbourhood area on 4 June 2025, during which I looked at its overall nature, form, character and appearance and at those areas affected by policies and proposals in the Plan in particular.
- 2.4. Subsequent to my reading for the examination and the site visit, I asked a number of factual clarifying questions of BPC as qualifying body, and BDC relating to the context and intent of policies and proposals of the Plan. This exchange was carried out by email and the questions and the responses received from the Councils are set out in Appendix 1 to this report and have been uploaded to the Neighbourhood Plan website. I am grateful to the Councils for responding on these matters.
- 2.5. In undertaking this examination, I have considered each of the following documents in addition to the Submission Version of the BNP:
- National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)
  - National Planning Practice Guidance 2014 (as amended)
  - Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
  - The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)
  - The Localism Act 2011
  - The Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017
  - The Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023
  - The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations (2012) (as amended)
  - Babworth NP Basic Conditions Statement (February 2025)
  - Babworth NP Consultation Statement and Appendices (February 2025)
  - Babworth NP Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations

Assessment Screening Report (25 June 2024)

- Representations received during the Regulation 16 publicity period post submission – (6 February 2025 to 19 March 2025).

### 3. Public Consultation

#### Background

- 3.1. An accessible and comprehensive approach to public consultation is the best way to ensure that a neighbourhood plan reflects the needs, views and priorities of the local community.
- 3.2. BPC submitted a Consultation Statement, as required by Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations, to BDC on 6 February 2025.
- 3.3. Public consultation on the BNP commenced with early discussions about a neighbourhood plan in 2020. This early consultation was followed by various consultation stages, including the formal stages required by the Regulations:
  - The pre-submission consultation under Regulation 14 from 15 July to 2 September 2024 and again from 14 October to 25 November 2024 when it was discovered that not all the consultees had received notification of the plan's publication.
  - The publicity stage, as required by Regulation 16, (the consultation period post final submission of the Plan) ran from 6 February 2025 to 19 March 2025.
- 3.4. The Regulation 16 stage resulted in consultation responses from 10 respondents some raising multiple points. The representations raised are considered as necessary within my assessment of the Plan in Section 6 below.

#### Babworth Neighbourhood Plan Consultation

- 3.5. The decision to prepare the BNP was taken in 2020 although it was not until 2022, due to the pandemic, that a Neighbourhood Planning Advisory Committee was set up to develop the plan. The group has carried out the consultation with the community and stakeholders throughout the process of plan preparation. The communication methods used included leaflet/flyer drops, email drops, adverts in Retford Life and posters on notice boards as well as open meetings and drop-ins. Printed copies of the Pre-Submission Draft Plans and Submission Plans together with supporting documents were provided locally as well as copies being uploaded to the websites and links provided via email.
- 3.6. Early stage engagement commenced in 2022 with an open meeting at the village hall on 16 July 2022. 42 people attended and a scoping questionnaire issued at the

event helped identify issues, concerns and priorities.

- 3.7. This led into a phase of evidence gathering and plan drafting during 2022 and 2023 and in order to inform the consideration of the draft policies and proposals of the emerging plan a further open event was held on 23 September 2023. This included two drop-in sessions, consultation with landowners and a policy options newsletter to all addresses in the neighbourhood area. A total of 30 people attended the event and there was strong support for the policies and proposals with the exception of the development boundary and the renewable energy policy which were amended as a result. The views were used to finalise the pre-submission draft plan.
- 3.8. The pre-submission draft of the Plan was signed off by the Parish Council and as required by Regulation 14, the pre-submission consultation stage ran for 6 weeks from 15 July to 2 September 2024. The BNP was made available online on the Parish and District Council websites, and links to the Plan were provided via email to statutory consultees and local stakeholders and hard copies of the plan and supporting documents made available locally. It came to light following the consultation that not all consultees had received the notifications of the plans publication and a second six week pre-submission consultation period was arranged running from the 14 October to 25 November 2024. Despite this the consultation resulted in only 6 representations being made.
- 3.9. Following the pre-submission stage and the analysis of results, the Plan was revised, approved for submission and submitted by the Parish Council to Bassetlaw District Council with the regulation 16 publicity stage then taking place between 6 February 2025 and 19 March 2025. A total of 10 representations were received raising multiple points.
- 3.10. The Neighbourhood Planning Regulations are part and parcel of Basic Condition a), and Regulation 15 (2) sets out clearly what the Consultation Statement should include. The BNP Consultation Statement and its appendices, as provided to me, explains the early consultation, sets out the results of the Regulation 14 consultations and comments on the representations made and what it was proposed to do about them and provides a full list of those consulted which is a requirement of Regulation 15. Having reviewed the Consultation Statement, as well as the appendices to the statement, I am satisfied that of itself it is compliant with Regulation 15.
- 3.11. What is not clear however from the statement is what other opportunities were provided at the pre-submission draft stage for the community to engage in the plan's preparation. This is intended to be the main consultation stage and other than publishing the plan and notifying the consultees there does not appear to have been any additional opportunities to engage the community, a point confirmed by BPC in its responses to the Examiner's clarifying questions at Appendix 1. This is disappointing to say the least and may explain why there was an unusually low number of responses at the pre-submission stage.

- 3.12. Notwithstanding this, given the fact that there were no significant issues raised by the resident and stakeholder community at the later Regulation 16 publicity stage it can be assumed that the community is broadly satisfied with the content of the plan as was the case when the draft policies were considered in 2023. The local referendum stage will prove whether this is in fact the case.

## 4. Preparation of the Plan and legislative requirements

- 4.1. In terms of the procedural tests set out above my findings are:

### Qualifying body

- 4.2. Babworth Parish Council (BPC), as the duly elected lower-tier council is the qualifying body for preparation of the Plan.
- 4.3. I am satisfied that the requirements set out in the Localism Act (2011) and in section 61F(1) and (2) of the TCPA (as applied to neighbourhood plans by section 38A of the PCPA) have been met.

### Plan area

- 4.4. An application was made by BPC on 8 September 2020 to designate the Neighbourhood Area. The area applied for covered the whole administrative area of Babworth Parish. This neighbourhood area was approved by Bassetlaw District Council on 24 September 2020.
- 4.5. This satisfies the requirement under section 61G (1) (2) and (3) of the TCPA (as applied to neighbourhood plans by section 38A of the PCPA) and Regulations 5, 6 and 7 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations as amended.

### Plan period

- 4.6. A neighbourhood plan must specify the period during which it is to have effect. The BNP clearly states on the title page and in the introductory sections that it covers the period up to 2038 synonymous with the period of the Bassetlaw Local Plan.
- 4.7. The intended time period satisfies the requirements of section 38B of the PCPA as amended.

### Excluded development

- 4.8. The Plan does not include policies or proposals that directly relate to any of the categories of excluded development: County matters (mineral extraction and waste development), nationally significant infrastructure, or any matters set out in Section

61K of the TCPA 1990. The BNP, as proposed to be modified in Section 6 below, relates solely to the neighbourhood area and no other neighbourhood area, and there are no other neighbourhood development plans in place within the neighbourhood area. This satisfies the requirements of section 38B of the PCPA, as amended.

## Development and use of land

- 4.9. The Neighbourhood Plan should only contain policies relating to the development and use of land. Subject to modifications proposed below in Section 6, the BNP policies would be compliant with this requirement of section 38A of the PCPA, as amended.

## Plan publication following submission

- 4.10. BDC undertook a validation check of the BNP following its submission on 6 February 2025. The Council was satisfied that the Plan could proceed to be publicised under Regulation 16 and proceed to this independent examination.

## 5. The Basic Conditions

### National policy and advice

- 5.1. The main document that sets out national policy is the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the NPPF). A revised version of the NPPF was published in December 2024. Paragraph 239 of the revised NPPF sets out transitional arrangements for Neighbourhood Plans in preparation, and makes clear that if a neighbourhood plan proposal has been submitted to the local planning authority under Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) on or before 12 March 2025 the policies of the revised NPPF need not apply. However although the Babworth plan was submitted before this date the plan has been updated prior to submission to reflect the revised NPPF December 2024.
- 5.2. The NPPF explains that neighbourhood plans should support the delivery of strategic policies and set out non-strategic policies and plan positively to shape, direct and help to deliver sustainable development that is outside the strategic elements of the Local Plan.
- 5.3. The NPPF also makes it clear that neighbourhood plans should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area. In other words, neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan. They should not promote less development than that set out in the strategic policies of the development plan or undermine those strategic policies.

- 5.4. The NPPF indicates that plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals. They should serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in the NPPF).
- 5.5. National advice on planning is set out in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), which includes specific advice regarding neighbourhood plans. I have considered the advice of the PPG as part of assessing the Plan against Basic Condition a).

## Sustainable development

- 5.6. A qualifying body must demonstrate how a neighbourhood plan would contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The NPPF as a whole constitutes the Government's view of what sustainable development means in practice for planning. The NPPF explains that there are three overarching objectives to sustainable development - economic, social and environmental which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways.
- 5.7. There is no legal requirement for a formal Sustainability Appraisal (SA) to be carried out in respect of neighbourhood plans. However, SA is an established method of demonstrating how a neighbourhood plan will contribute to achieving sustainable development.
- 5.8. In this case, no Sustainability Appraisal was carried out assessing the plan policies against a suite of sustainability objectives (environmental, social and economic). Instead, a very high-level assessment was carried out as part of the Basic Conditions Statement which asserts that the effect of the policies of the Plan would be generally positive in terms of sustainability. To confirm whether this is in fact the case I consider the contribution of specific policies to sustainable development below in Section 6.

## General conformity with the development plan

- 5.9 The BNP has been prepared in the context of the *Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-38* (BLP). The BNP must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the local plan.
- 5.10 The PPG provides the following definition of general conformity:

“When considering whether a policy is in general conformity a qualifying body, independent examiner, or local planning authority, should consider the following:

- whether the neighbourhood plan policy or development proposal supports and upholds the general principle that the strategic policy is concerned with;

- the degree, if any, of conflict between the draft neighbourhood plan policy or development proposal and the strategic policy;
- whether the draft neighbourhood plan policy or development proposal provides an additional level of detail and/or a distinct local approach to that set out in the strategic policy without undermining that policy;
- the rationale for the approach taken in the draft neighbourhood plan or order and the evidence to justify that approach.”

5.11 I consider the extent to which the policies and proposals of the BNP are in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Bassetlaw Local Plan in detail in Section 6 below.

## European Union (EU) obligations

5.12 A neighbourhood plan must be compatible with EU obligations, as incorporated into UK law, in order to be legally compliant. Notwithstanding the United Kingdom’s departure from the EU, these obligations continue to apply unless and until repealed or replaced in an Act of the UK Parliament.

## Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitat Regulations Assessment

5.13 Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment has a bearing on neighbourhood plans. This Directive is often referred to as the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive. Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora and Directive 2009/147/EC on the conservation of wild birds (often referred to as the Habitats and Wild Birds Directives respectively) aim to protect and improve Europe’s most important habitats and species and can have a bearing on neighbourhood plans.

5.14 Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, as amended in 2015, requires either that a SEA is submitted with a neighbourhood plan proposal or a determination obtained from the responsible authority (BDC) that the Plan is not likely to have ‘significant effects.’

5.15 SEA screening carried out in June 2024 concluded that SEA was not required. This was largely due to the very small scale of planned development and the generally beneficial effects of the policies within the Neighbourhood Plan seeking to achieve more sustainable development. The overall conclusion therefore was that the Plan is not likely to have ‘significant effects’.

5.16 Regarding Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), the test in the additional Basic Condition under Regulation 32 now essentially mirrors that in respect of SEA. It requires an Appropriate Assessment to be carried out where a plan is likely to have

a significant effect on a European site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects) or a determination obtained from the responsible authority that the plan is not likely to have a 'significant effect'. A screening opinion was similarly carried out by BDC in 2024 and a determination prepared.

- 5.17 The Screening Opinion confirmed there were no European sites located within the Neighbourhood Area although part of the Potential Prospective Sherwood Forest Special Protection Area which would include habitats of ornithological interest for breeding nightjars and woodlarks would, if designated, extend into the SW corner of the Neighbourhood Area. The Birklands and Bilhaugh Special Area for Conservation is within 10kms of the Neighbourhood Area lying 7.8 kms to the SW. Notwithstanding this, as with the screening for SEA, the scale of development planned within the BNP and the limited opportunities for windfall were anticipated to have only very local impacts and were not likely to have adverse effects and could therefore be screened out. The BNP policies and proposals, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, were unlikely to have a significant effect on any European sites. Consequently, the plan is not considered to require Appropriate Assessment under Article 6 or 7 of the Habitats Directive.
- 5.18 Both the SEA and HRA screening conclusions have been confirmed by Natural England, the Environment Agency and Historic England as statutory consultees. I have no reason to reach a different view to the statutory consultees.

#### European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)

- 5.19 The Human Rights Act 1998 encapsulates the Convention and its articles into UK law.
- 5.20 An Equalities and Human Rights Impact Assessment has not been specifically carried out for the BNP. Instead, the Basic Conditions Statement asserts that the plan will not have any adverse effects on issues relating to human rights and equality.
- 5.21 It is important however to examine the plan against the 3 main relevant Articles of the Convention.
- 5.22 In respect of Article 1 of the first protocol - the right of everyone to the peaceful enjoyment of possessions - although the BNP includes policies that would restrict development rights, this does not have a greater impact than the general restrictions on development rights provided for in national law. The restriction of development rights inherent in the UK's statutory planning system is demonstrably in the public interest by ensuring that land is used in the most sustainable way, avoiding or mitigating adverse impacts on the environment, community and economy.
- 5.23 In respect of Article 6 of the Convention's Rights and Freedoms - the right to a fair hearing in determination of an individual's rights and obligations - the process for preparing the BNP is fully compatible with this Article. The consultation statement makes clear that there was consultation on the proposals at various stages and the

Parish Council has confirmed how traditionally hard to reach sections of the community were engaged. This independent examination process and a final local referendum ensures Article 6 is observed.

- 5.24 In respect of Article 14 of the Convention's Rights and Freedoms - the enjoyment of rights and freedoms without discrimination on any ground - the policies and proposals of the BNP have been developed in consultation with the community and wider stakeholders to produce as inclusive a document as possible.
- 5.25 I conclude that, given the nature of the plan policies and proposals, it is unlikely there would be any detrimental impact on the 'protected characteristics' set out in the Equality Act and, generally, the Plan would bring positive benefits. Whilst the Plan does not directly address needs in respect of particular 'protected characteristics' within the plan area, the BNP is not prejudicial to any group in its policies.
- 5.26 No concerns or objections on the grounds of human rights or equalities have been raised during the consultation stages of the Plan. I am satisfied on the basis of the above that, across the Plan as a whole, no sectors of the community are likely to be discriminated against. The policies together would generally have public benefits and encourage the social sustainability of the neighbourhood.
- 5.27 I am satisfied therefore that the Plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, the ECHR.
- 5.28 I am not aware of any other European Directives which apply to this particular neighbourhood plan and no representations at pre- or post-submission stage have drawn any others to my attention. Taking all of the above into account, I am satisfied that the BNP is compatible with EU obligations and therefore with Basic Conditions f) and g).

## **6 The Neighbourhood Plan – Assessment**

- 6.1 The Neighbourhood Plan is considered against the Basic Conditions in this section, following the structure and headings in the Plan. Given the findings in Section 5 above that the Plan as a whole is compliant with Basic Conditions f) (EU obligations) and g) (Other prescribed conditions including that under Regulation 32), this section largely focusses on Basic Conditions a) (Having regard to national policy), d) (Contributing to the achievement of sustainable development) and e) (General conformity with strategic policies of the development plan).
- 6.2 Where modifications are recommended, they are clearly marked as such and set out in boxes in bold print.

### **The general form of the Plan**

- 6.3 The structure of the BNP is generally logical with early sections setting the context in

respect of the background to the neighbourhood plan, before setting out the vision and objectives and the policy sections.

- 6.4 The Plan distinguishes between the policies themselves and their supporting text by colouring the policies blue. Each policy is accompanied by supporting text setting out the context, justification and intent. Some of this is weak - a point I will return to in the policy sections below and will need to be strengthened.
- 6.5 The NPPF at paragraph 16 requires the Plan to be “*clearly written and unambiguous so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals*” and to “*serve a clear purpose avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area*”. This is reflected in the Planning Practice Guidance which states that “*A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence*”.
- 6.6 While this is directly related to policy wording, the general intent is that the whole plan should be clear and unambiguous and in a number of respects there are matters that need to be resolved to ensure the general form of the BNP assists in making the policies and whole plan as clear as possible.
- 6.7 - Firstly, the Neighbourhood Plan is referred to differently throughout the plan – on the title page as Babworth Neighbourhood Plan, but in Section 3 as the Babworth Parish Neighbourhood Plan for example. The Parish were asked about this in the Examiner’s clarifying questions and have confirmed that it wishes the Plan to be referred to as the Babworth Neighbourhood Plan. This is appropriate but all references need to be changed to BNP.
- Secondly, the paragraphs should be numbered throughout to allow users to easily reference the different sections.
- Thirdly, the policies should be more clearly differentiated from the supporting text in case the plan is being viewed in black and white and I suggest the policies are printed in bold and inserted within a text box to achieve this.
- Finally, in order to provide a clear and unambiguous plan this also requires the mapping to be clear. In the printed and digital versions, the plans that are not full page and do not have keys need to be enlarged to be full page plans and have keys and sources inserted to be as clear as possible. BDC in their Regulation 16 representations also propose that a single integrated Policies Map is prepared so that the interaction of different policies can be understood. This would resolve a problem that exists currently where the separate maps are all referred to as ‘Figures’ throughout. Those ‘figures’ that are displaying the spatial boundaries of policies or proposals have a different function to the other mapping which is just displaying spatial data. (eg figs 4.1 and 4.2).

At the very least, even if an integrated Policies Map is not possible, those ‘figures’ displaying policy boundaries should be retitled ‘Policy Map HBE1’ for example and the references to ‘Figures’ in the policies changed.

<b>Recommendation 1</b>	
<b>1A</b>	<b>Standardise the references to the Neighbourhood Plan throughout the document to the <i>Babworth Neighbourhood Plan (BNP)</i></b>
<b>1B</b>	<b>Number all text paragraphs in the plan with the section number first then the text paragraph e.g 1.1, 1.2 etc.</b>
<b>1C</b>	<b>Further differentiate the policies by using bold print and enclosing in a bounded text box.</b>
<b>1D</b>	<b>Enlarge the mapping used within the plan so that it occupies a whole page and is as large as possible within the constraints of the A4 format.</b>
<b>1E</b>	<b>Either provide an integrated Policies Map showing all policies but at least ensure the ‘Figures’ that are displaying the spatial boundaries of policies and proposals are entitled ‘Policy Map’ with the relevant policy number to distinguish their status from the spatial data ‘Figures’ e.g. “<i>Policy Map HBE1</i>”. Change the wording in the policy accordingly to refer to ‘<i>Policy Map ....</i>’ rather than ‘Figure...’</b>

6.8 With these modifications the general structure of the plan will meet the Basic conditions and in particular Basic Condition a).

## **Section 1 – About This Neighbourhood Plan**

- 6.9 This section provides a factual introduction to the Neighbourhood Plan and the history of the Parish. There are however factual corrections to make to the references to the Basic Conditions, to update the references to the stage reached in the process and to update references to census information.
- 6.10 On Page 4 - paragraph 4 the text paraphrases some of the Basic Conditions. To avoid confusion this paragraph should use the wording in the legislation.
- 6.11 As well as updating the stage reached as the plan is prepared for the referendum stage this section needs to acknowledge that the plan if supported at the referendum will become a statutory part of the Development Plan.
- 6.12 As census 2021 data is now available the section should be updated accordingly.

<b>Recommendation 2</b>	
<b>2A</b>	<p><b>Reword Page 4 Para 4 Line 3 as follows:</b></p> <p><i>“In particular the policies must have regard to national policy and advice and be in general conformity with the strategic planning policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (i.e. the Bassetlaw Local Plan)</i></p>
<b>2B</b>	<p><b>Page 4 Para 5 - Stop text at Bassetlaw District Council</b></p> <p><b>Page 4 Para 6 - Reword as follows:</b></p> <p><i>“ A further round of consultation was carried out following submission before the plan was independently examined to ensure it meets all the basic conditions tests. Recommended modifications proposed during the examination have now all been accepted and the plan modified. It will now be put forward to a local referendum.”</i></p> <p><b>Page 5 top - line 2 replace with the following wording:</b></p> <p><i>“...to become ‘Made’ and a statutory part of the Development Plan for the area”.</i></p>
<b>2C</b>	<p><b>Page 6 Babworth Parish History Para 1 Line 3 – Instead of 2001 and 2011 census can we have the figures for 2001 and 2021 or all three to show the up to date population trend.</b></p> <p><b>Page 8 Census Information – para 1 line 2 – Insert “257” after the words ‘living in’ in order that it is clear that the 596 relates to the total number of occupants living in private households.</b></p>

6.13 With these modifications the introductory section will meet the Basic Conditions.

## **Section 2 – The Consultation Process**

6.14 Section 2 of the BNP sets out the consultation that has taken place in preparing the plan. This is a largely factual section and raises no matters in relation to the Basic Conditions. However, there is again a need for a small update at the end of the text on page 10 now that the plan has moved on a stage.

<b>Recommendation 3</b>	
<b>3A</b>	<p><b>Insert additional text at the end of the text on page 10 after the word ‘amended’ to read:</b></p>

***“...prior to the plan being published for pre-submission consultation between 15 July and 2 September 2024 as required under Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning regulations. The responses received at the pre submission stage were then taken into consideration in preparing the plan for submission to Bassetlaw District Council in February 2025”***

### **Section 3 – A Plan for Babworth Parish**

- 6.15 This section of the plan introduces the vision for the plan, sets out the planning context and the plan’s commitment to achieving sustainable development.
- 6.16 Most neighbourhood plans have a clear thread that runs from identified key issues to vision and objectives and then to policies and proposals in response. The BNP doesn’t identify early on what the key issues are before introducing the vision and objectives, thus the rationale for these is not clear. As both the NPPF and PPG require plans to be clear and unambiguous the lack of a statement regarding the issues is contrary to Basic Condition a). Accordingly, as part of the Examiner’s clarifying questions at Appendix 1, BPC were requested to provide a short section of text for section 3 ahead of the vision that sets out what the key issues for the parish are that have emerged out of the preparation and consultation process and which can then lead into the vision and objectives. The response from the Parish is set out at Appendix 1. However, whilst it is clear from this what the issues might be the response is expressed in a manner similar to objectives rather than presenting issues. In my recommendation below I have therefore proposed slightly different text which is expressed as a presenting issue. This has been confirmed with BPC as representing the key issues.
- 6.17 In terms of the vision itself the Plan has regard to the PPG advice that it *“provides the opportunity for communities to set out a positive vision for how they want their community to develop over the next 10, 15, 20 years in ways that meet identified local need and make sense for local people”*.
- 6.18 The vision and objectives also encapsulate and generally reflect the vision and strategic objectives set out in the BLP at Section 4 (Bassetlaw Vision and Objectives) particularly strategic objective No 5 relating to rural areas.
- 6.19 The section of text relating to the Planning Context in the first paragraph is factually correct but if the basic conditions are going to be referred to they should all be referenced as set out in the legislation not paraphrased or only partially quoted.
- 6.20 The impact of pursuing the vision and objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan would contribute to the achievement of sustainable development in the neighbourhood area in the manner explained in the text and therefore there is no conflict with Basic Condition d). However, please note there are also some grammatical changes

recommended in Appendix 2 to help clarify the text.

<b>Recommendation 4</b>	
<b>4A</b>	<p><b>Revise the text on Page 11 Para 2 to read:</b></p> <p><b><i>“In preparing the Plan the following key issues have been identified in consultation with the community and stakeholders which the plan seeks to address:</i></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b><i>1. The choice of housing currently available in the Parish does not necessarily reflect local housing need, particularly in respect of size, tenure, and affordability.</i></b></li><li><b><i>2. The Parish is home to a range of valued open spaces and environmentally sensitive areas, which may be vulnerable to the effects of development if not appropriately managed.</i></b></li><li><b><i>3. The distinctive rural character and heritage assets are defining features of the Parish, but are at risk of being eroded due to a lack of understanding of the key characteristics.</i></b></li><li><b><i>4. The range of community facilities, employment opportunities, and infrastructure needs maintaining and enhancing to sustain the Parish as an attractive place to live, work and visit.</i></b></li></ol> <p><b><i>In order to manage these issues, the following vision and objectives have been identified for the plan:</i></b></p> <p><b>A Vision for 2038.....”</b></p>
<b>4B</b>	<p><b>Page 12 Planning Context Para 1 Line 3 – after the words Babworth Neighbourhood Plan delete the words ‘in particular....Plan:’ and replace with the words “so that:”</b></p> <p><b>Replace the current bullet points with the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>• Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood plan;</b></li><li><b>• The making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;</b></li><li><b>• The making of the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (i.e. the Bassetlaw Local Plan);</b></li><li><b>• The making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations;</b></li><li><b>• Prescribed conditions are met in relation to the neighbourhood plan and prescribed matters have been complied with.</b></li></ul>

## Section 4 – Neighbourhood Plan Policies and Proposals

6.21 Section 4 sets out the policies of the neighbourhood plan.

### Housing and the Built Environment

#### Policy HBE1 – Development Boundary

- 6.22 The first policy section of the plan sets out the background to development in the neighbourhood area and the context of the strategic spatial development policy in the BLP (Policy ST1) where Ranby is identified as a small rural settlement and the rest of the neighbourhood Area as open countryside. Note the supporting text to Policy HBE1 does not name the strategic policy of the BLP but for clarity should.
- 6.23 BDC in its Regulation 16 representation considers that paragraph 5 on page 14 could be clarified further with the addition of text to explain that the figure of 13 homes would be a minimum and how development beyond that would be considered. I accept that in the interests of a clear and unambiguous plan as required in national policy and guidance there would be benefit in including the suggested text. (See recommended addition below at Recommendation 5B).
- 6.24 For the purpose of clarity to developers and as permitted in the BLP, BPC decided to designate a development boundary for Ranby in the neighbourhood plan (Policy HBE1). The rationale for the boundary is set out in the supporting text to the policy on pages 15 and 16 of the plan and the resultant proposed boundary in most respects is a logical one.
- 6.25 However, the proposed boundary at Figure 2 includes a long northwards extension along Blyth Road. BDC has raised concerns in its Regulation16 representation regarding the absence of any supporting justification in the text for this. In view of the representation, I considered this proposal carefully on site and gave the opportunity to the Parish Council to explain the rationale for this northern section. The Parish's response is set out at Appendix 1 and they briefly explain that in large part this was a response to the views of residents of that part of Ranby wishing to feel that Blyth Road was being treated as part of the village. Notwithstanding this, for a number of reasons, I am not satisfied that the proposed boundary is justified and at worst could be argued to undermine the strategic intent of the Local Plan spatial strategy.
- 6.26 Firstly, heading north along Blyth Road out of Ranby there is a material change in character around the village hall and the southbound slip road back onto the A1. Up until this point the character is very much discernibly part of the village. Beyond it the character changes to a well wooded country lane with no discernible frontage development until a point about 400 metres further north from the village hall where there is a group of houses on the east side of the lane with 2 further groups spaced well apart beyond that. Secondly, as development within this area is discontinuous with long gaps between each cluster, inclusion of this part of the lane within the

development boundary would simply result in the development of these gaps and establishment of a ribbon of development which would be alien to the form and nature of development in Ranby. Contrary to the view of the Parish Council I am not persuaded that development here would be a sustainable response to development needs within Ranby. Thirdly, designating this as part of the settlement directly contradicts the stated intent on Page 16 of the plan in the last bullet where it states that non-residential land which relates better to the countryside including agricultural land, paddock, meadow, woodland and/or other greenfield land has been excluded. I therefore find no justification for the proposed northward extension of the development boundary along Blyth Road.

- 6.27 Clause 2 of BLP Policy ST2 sets out the basis on which development within development boundaries would be capable of being supported. These criteria could not be met by development within the development boundary as proposed along Blyth Road. If the intention is to include land to meet possible future needs of Ranby village then arguably there are better alternative sites than encouraging a ribbon of development in this location.
- 6.28 Although the Parish Council in their response refer to the fact that permission for housing has been granted on Blyth Road, this actually is on site LAA0566 south of the village hall and this does not justify the extension of the settlement boundary north of the hall.
- 6.29 There is therefore direct conflict with a strategic policy of the Local Plan and the neighbourhood plan with this northward extension to the development boundary included therefore conflicts with Basic Condition e). As ribbon development along Blyth Road would also not contribute to achieving sustainable development there is also therefore conflict with Basic Condition d).
- 6.30 My recommendation to resolve this is to redraw the northern limit of the development boundary around the village hall and delete the section north along Blyth Road beyond the hall.

<b>Recommendation 5</b>	
<b>5A</b>	<b>Page 14 para 5 Line 2 Insert after the word ‘development’ add in brackets the words “(Policy ST1)”</b>
<b>5B</b>	<b>Add the following text to paragraph 5 on Page 14 in place of the last sentence to the paragraph:</b>  <b><i>“The minimum housing requirement for Ranby is 13, minus existing commitments and completions which stand at 4 currently leaving a net requirement of 9. Where settlements have met their minimum requirement, additional residential development will be considered appropriate if it meets the criteria in Policy ST2 of the Local Plan and Policy HBE1 of this</i></b>

	<i>Plan.”</i>
<b>5C</b>	<b>Revise the development boundary to exclude the northern ribbon along Blyth Road terminating it instead on the northern boundary to the Village Hall.</b>

6.31 With these modifications in place the Policy and preamble will meet the Basic Conditions.

## Policy HBE2 - Housing Allocation

6.32 The BNP takes the opportunity to allocate a site for housing to ensure that housing need will be met and proposes a site at the south end of Ranby south of The Conifers. In introducing this the plan seeks to explain one of the benefits of allocating sites set out in the NPPF but does so in a way that is potentially unclear and confusing. In the interests of providing a clear and unambiguous plan as required by the NPPF and PPG I recommend an alternative wording in Recommendation 6 below.

6.33 The evidence base for selection of the site to be allocated and the summary of it on Page 17 do not entirely coincide. Appendix 2 to the BNP – the assessment of alternative sites - identifies a preferred site but this is not the site ultimately allocated which itself is one of 4 potential sites. The plan does not make clear why the land south of the Conifers was ultimately chosen. BPC were asked about this as part of the Examiner’s clarifying questions and its response is at Appendix 1 below. The Parish Council suggest perhaps this explanation should be included in an appendix. However, using the BPC wording I recommend that a shorter summary is added to the supporting text on Page 17 and I recommend as such below.

6.34 Still on the subject of evidence, whilst it is clear that a Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) has been carried out (Appendix 1 to the plan) and that this concludes that the majority of new development should be 2 bedroom accommodation this is not referred to at all in the supporting text to the policy. The result is that clause d) of Policy HBE2 specifying the housing mix is completely unsupported by a reasoned justification. This needs to be added to the supporting text.

6.35 The inclusion of Clause d) also raises the matter of flexibility. It is conceivable that, when the site comes forward for development, the housing mix specified in the policy may no longer be appropriate. There should therefore be an addition to this clause in the policy making clear that in the event of a more up-to-date HNA concluding that a different mix is required that this can be accommodated.

6.36 Finally, the map of the allocated housing site at Page 18 should be enlarged to zoom in on the site rather than showing the whole village of Ranby so that the detail of the

site context is clear. As above it should also be clearly referenced as a 'Policy Map' rather than a 'Figure'.

<b>Recommendation 6</b>	
<b>6A</b>	<p><b>Housing Allocation – para 1 - 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence - delete and replace with the following:</b></p> <p><b><i>“Plans which choose to do this and are less than 5 years old receive additional powers. In particular the plan policies will remain active even where Bassetlaw District cannot provide a 5 year housing land supply and the local plan housing policies are thereby deemed to be out of date.”</i></b></p>
<b>6B</b>	<p><b>Housing Allocation – para 2 – line 6 – Insert a new section of text after the words ‘Appendix 2’ explaining why the land south of The Conifers was selected as the most appropriate site as follows:</b></p> <p><b><i>“The Site Options report concluded that, of all the sites, the site on Blyth Road south of the village hall was the preferred (LA0556) but this site now has permission and forms part of the committed supply. From the AECOM report 4 potential sites were shortlisted for consideration by the BNP Steering Group, however, BAB03 off The Conifers provided the best fit as a potential site for allocation. The site does not have any physical or topographical issues, the site is self-contained with hedging and trees offering some shielding on all sides and it has good potential access from The Conifers Road. The site size matches the number of dwellings allocated for the next planning period when taken in consideration with dwellings that have already been granted with planning permission. BAB03 sits next to the last previous development within Ranby Village (The Conifers built in around 2007), which was a development of 5 large houses. This development was next to Beechwood Crescent which was a self-contained mixed development when it was built, meaning Ranby is continuing to grow in a similar way to how the village has developed in the recent past. BAB03 is also located very close to a bus route which passes through part of the village allowing access to Retford, Worksop and beyond.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>After discussion the BNP Steering Group decided that the only site that could be recommended for the Babworth Neighbourhood Plan was BAB03.”</i></b></p> <p><b>Add text immediately after this insert explaining why the mix at clause d) of the policy has been arrived at and referring to the Housing Needs Assessment at Appendix 1 of the Plan as follows:</b></p> <p><b><i>“It is important that the allocated site meets identified local housing needs. To that end a Housing Needs Assessment has been carried out, attached at Appendix 1 to the plan, which identifies the need for smaller housing units and single storey accommodation. Accordingly, Policy HBE2 requires at section d) a mix of housing specifically to meet these</i></b></p>

	<p><b><i>identified needs. However, it is possible that by the time development takes place slightly different needs may apply and therefore section d) acknowledges that a different housing mix may be justified by more up-to-date needs evidence.</i></b></p> <p><b>Delete the last 2 sentences of para 2 and replace with the following :  <i>“The site is allocated subject to the requirements set out in Policy HBE2 and together with a modest assumption of 3 windfall housing units over the Plan period will more than meet the District Council’s minimum housing requirement for the neighbourhood area”</i></b></p>
<b>6C</b>	<p><b>Add to the end of clause d) of Policy HBE2 the following:  <i>“Exceptionally, a different mix of size and type may be supported where it is justified by more up-to-date housing needs evidence”.</i></b></p>
<b>6D</b>	<p><b>Enlarge the plan of the Housing Allocation on Page 18 by zooming in. Retitle it to make clear it is Policy Map HBE2.</b></p>

6.37 With these modifications in place the Policy and preamble will meet the Basic Conditions having regard to national policy, in conformity with the BLP and the development of the site is capable of being achieved sustainably.

### Policy HBE3 - Housing Mix

- 6.38 Policy HBE3 seeks to ensure that housing provision meets the local housing needs requirements including specialist accommodation for the mobility impaired and the ageing population (particularly bungalows), and the availability of smaller housing units. As such the principle of the policy has regard to the policy objectives in Section 5 of the NPPF at paragraphs 61 and 63 to provide for a range of housing to meet community needs.
- 6.39 Policy ST28 of the BLP sets out in strategic terms what it seeks to achieve in regard to housing mix but, as regards size and type of housing, the policy is expressed in a flexible way with the emphasis on balance and the efficient use of housing land. Policy HBE3 of the BNP is complementary to and in general conformity with Policy ST28 but the Policy goes further in specifically giving priority to the provision of 2 and 3 bedroom units and to accessible housing.
- 6.40 The plan makes it clear that these need aspects were identified through the Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) at Appendix 1 of the BNP and that therefore there is evidence to support this position. However, as with Policy HBE2, to fully reflect the flexibility inherent in the NPPF statements on housing mix, there needs to be additional specific reference to the possibility that a more up-to-date HNA may show up a different type of priority need particularly as this clause of the policy is worded negatively in terms of a presumption against larger homes.

6.41 In terms of the supporting text to the policy, there is rather odd phrasing in the last paragraph of page 19 where it states “*Population growth can be expected to be driven by the oldest households....*”. In the interests of a clear and unambiguous plan the Parish Council were asked to confirm in the Examiner’s clarifying questions whether what was in fact meant by this was that demand for housing is driven by the older 65+ age group which is the fastest growing age group in the Neighbourhood Area . BPC has confirmed this is what was meant; in which case I recommend the paragraph is clarified.

<b>Recommendation 7</b>	
<b>7A</b>	<b>Policy HBE3 – para 3 - line 2 add at the end of the policy the words : “...evidenced by an up-to-date Local Housing Needs Assessment.”</b>
<b>7B</b>	<b>Reword the 1<sup>st</sup> sentence of the last paragraph on page 19 to read: “Demand for housing is driven by the older 65+ age group which is the fastest growing age group in the Neighbourhood Area. There is expected to be a 67% increase in the number of households with a reference person aged 65 or over between 2011 and 2038. This would mean....”</b>

6.42 With these minor amendments the Policy would meet the Basic Conditions a), d) & e).

### Policy HBE4 - Affordable Housing

6.43 Policy HBE4 sets out the basis for affordable housing in the village even though the allocated site would not be required to provide affordable housing due to its size. The plan also supports the development of rural exception sites. In these respects it has regard to the NPPF at Section 5 paragraph 82.

6.44 The Policy supports and is complementary to the BLP strategic policy - Policy ST27. However, particularly in respect of the section of the policy on exception sites the criteria simply reiterate the BLP policy and to an extent the NPPF in respect of the section about subsidisation by market housing. The advice in the PPG is very clear that it is not the intention that neighbourhood plan policies should simply reiterate policy already in place, through for example the Local Plan, as this can just lead to confusion. Accordingly, the criteria a) to d) in Policy HBE4 is superfluous and should be deleted.

6.45 There is a second issue with the Policy in respect of the tenure mix. This is slightly different to the mix set out in BLP Policy ST27. Whilst this is supported by evidence from the 2023 Housing Needs Assessment appended to the plan, again, as with Policies HBE2 and HBE3, there is a need to provide for flexibility in the policy where a later HNA may identify the need for a different mix of tenures. Accordingly, I will recommend a modification in Recommendation 8B below.

6.46 Generally, the Policy will contribute to achieving sustainability in the Parish by helping to ensure that local housing needs are met and therefore basic Condition d)

would be met.

<b>Recommendation 8</b>	
<b>8A</b>	<b>Delete criteria a) to d) in the second part of Policy HBE4 and amend the sentence preceding the criteria to read:</b>  <b><i>“To meet identified needs.....through an exception site will be supported where it complies with the criteria set out in Bassetlaw Local Plan Policy ST27 or any successor policy on rural exception sites.”</i></b>
<b>8B</b>	<b>Add the following text in a new line under criteria 1 and 2 of Policy HBE4:</b>  <b><i>“unless the housing proposal is supported by evidence from an up to date housing needs assessment suggesting that an alternative tenure mix is required.”</i></b>

6.47 With these modifications in place the Policy and preamble will meet the Basic Conditions.

### Policy HBE5 - Windfall development

6.48 Policy HBE 5 sets out criteria to ensure that windfall development where it occurs is appropriate. It has regard to the NPPF and whilst the BLP does not have a specific policy regarding windfall development this BNP policy is in general conformity with the BLP spatial and housing policies. In seeking to ensure windfall development is respectful of local character, provides for safe access and meets housing need, the Policy is likely to achieve sustainable windfall development. Accordingly, the Policy meets the Basic Conditions and no modifications are necessary.

### Policy HBE6 - Design

6.49 Policy HBE6 of the BNP looks to secure a high standard of design and, to support this, BPC appointed AECOM consultants to produce a Design Guidance and Coding for the Neighbourhood Plan. In that respect it has regard to the NPPF.

6.50 Policy ST33 of the BLP sets out a number of criteria that development should comply with to deliver a high standard of design. The BNP Policy HBE6 does not seek to replicate this and instead principally requires that development has regard to and applies the Design Guide and Coding requirements.

6.51 The BDC Planning Policy Team in its Regulation 16 representation suggested that more detail should be included in Policy HBE6 itself from the Design Guide and Coding. However, the content of the guide is very specific and highly detailed. It is already included in full in Appendix 3 to the plan and using policy HBE6 as an ‘umbrella’ policy on design to reference the Design Guide and requiring developers

to apply the guidance is an appropriate approach. However, the Design Guide should be referenced in full earlier in the policy in Paragraph 1 as recommended below.

- 6.52 BDC’s Conservation Team has also raised specific issues about the content of the Guide in its Regulation 16 representation. But as the guide is not formally a part of the BNP itself I do not propose to recommend any modification to the Guidance but would invite BDC and BPC to consider whether the changes requested are necessary.
- 6.53 The Conservation Team also requested two minor changes to clarify the text. The first relates to the terminology at paragraph 2 on Page 24 where it is suggested that the bracketed wording at the end of the paragraph should be changed to designated and non-designated. The second asks that the materials palette typical of the area is referenced in the supporting text. Inasmuch as these are straightforward changes in the interests of a clear and unambiguous plan I have no problem with recommending their inclusion below.

<b>Recommendation 9</b>	
<b>9A</b>	<b>Add at the end of Paragraph 1 to Policy HBE6 the words:</b>  <b><i>“...as set out in the Babworth Design Guidance and Codes at Appendix 3 to the Plan.”</i></b>
<b>9B</b>	<b>In the bracketed section at the end of Paragraph 2 on P24 change the wording to read <i>“(both designated and non-designated)”</i>.</b>
<b>9C</b>	<b>In Paragraph 5 before the Policy on P 24 Line 4 after the word ‘detail’ add the words:</b>  <b><i>“...that reflects the established materials palette and roof form of the area.”</i></b>

6.54 With these modifications Policy HBE6 will meet the Basic Conditions b), d) and e).

## The Natural, Historical and Social Environment

6.55 This section of the plan looks to protect environmental assets of the plan area and starts with a general descriptive introduction. The BDC Conservation Team in their representation at the Regulation 16 stage suggest that the number of non-designated heritage assets should be identified in the plan. They were asked in the Examiner’s clarifying questions to provide information for this and in response at Appendix 1 to this report have provided a spreadsheet of these assets of which there

are 29 in total. The total should be referred to and the detail of the assets included in an additional appendix to the plan.

<b>Recommendation 10</b>	
<b>10A</b>	<p><b>Add at the end of the first sentence in Paragraph 2 on Page 28 a new sentence as follows:</b></p> <p><b><i>“There are also 29 non-designated heritage assets which have been identified in the Neighbourhood Area details of which are in Appendix x to the plan.”</i></b></p> <p><b>Insert the word “also” before the word ‘includes’ in line 3 of the same paragraph.</b></p>

## Policy ENV1 - Local Green Spaces

- 6.56 The Neighbourhood Plan at Policy ENV1 takes up the opportunity offered in the NPPF to identify and designate Local Green Space (LGS) in accordance with NPPF paragraphs 106-108. Such spaces can only be designated at the time the neighbourhood plan is being prepared and development within them will be treated in the same way as development within the Green Belt i.e. only permitted where very special circumstances apply.
- 6.57. A number of sites were considered but only one (Ranby Fun Field) is proposed to be designated. The assessment of the site against the NPPF criteria is at Appendix 4 of the plan and is mapped at Figure 5 in the plan. The NPPF tests are:
- Is the green space in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves?
  - Is the green space demonstrably special to the local community and of local significance?
  - Is the green space local in character and not an extensive tract of land?
- 6.58 Having reviewed the proposed LGS on site I agree that it meets all the tests and the plan is in accordance with Basic Condition a). The BLP does not contain policies directly relevant to LGS. However, Policy ENV1 is in general conformity with the overall objectives of the local plan. The Policy is likely to make a strongly positive contribution to achieving sustainability. Accordingly, the designation and policy also meet Basic Conditions d) & e) and no modification is necessary.

## Policy ENV2 - Important Open Spaces

- 6.59 Policy ENV2 seeks to protect important open spaces both those identified in the BLP and those identified separately in the neighbourhood plan as important. Whilst this general principle has regard to national policy, the tests that the policy seeks to

apply are not the same as paragraph 104 of the NPPF and therefore the policy is in conflict with Basic Condition a). Whilst Sport England in its Regulation 16 representation would be happy to see the policy tests reworded to align with the NPPF this would simply be unnecessary duplication.

- 6.60 Policy ST45 of the BLP also covers the point about protection of land and buildings used for sport and recreation setting out the same tests as the NPPF again meaning that repeating the same tests in Policy ENV2 would be unnecessary repetition.
- 6.61 However, Policy ST45 is less clear than the NPPF as to whether this would protect amenity open spaces so I understand why the Neighbourhood Plan would wish to ensure open spaces with community value for their more general amenity are protected alongside sport and recreation sites.
- 6.62 That being the case I recommend that the Policy is amended to avoid repetition of the tests and instead just cross refers to the BLP.
- 6.63 The BDC Conservation Team also raised a point regarding the supporting text to the policy that the text on Page 29 should acknowledge that open space can also have heritage value for example the churchyards. As this is factually correct and acknowledges the varied importance of open spaces I agree that a reference should be added to the supporting text in the interests of clarity.
- 6.64 Finally, BDC in its Regulation 16 representation also indicates that it would be helpful to identify in the policy any spaces that would benefit from improvement as this would help evidence the need for developer contributions if relevant in the future from new development. BPC were asked in the Examiner’s clarifying questions if there were any sites in need of improvement and the Parish has concluded that there are not. (See responses at Appendix 1 below). Accordingly, I make no recommendation in this respect.

### Recommendation 11

<b>Recommendation 11</b>	
<b>11A</b>	<p><b>Delete the second sentence of Policy ENV2.</b></p> <p><b>Reinstate the following wording after the list of sites:</b></p> <p><b><i>“Development proposals that result in the loss of these sites or any significant impact on them will not be supported unless the tests in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Policy ST45 (or any successor policy protecting open spaces) are met.”</i></b></p>
<b>11B</b>	<p><b>Insert after the first sentence of Paragraph 1 on Page 29 the following words:</b></p> <p><b><i>“ Some of these sites also have heritage value.”</i></b></p>

6.65 With these modifications in place the Policy and preamble will meet the Basic Conditions.

### Policy ENV3 - Sites and features of natural environment significance

6.66 The neighbourhood area has a valued natural environment which Policy ENV3 is intended to protect.

6.67 The NPPF at Section 15, encourages plans to promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats. As such the policy has regard to the NPPF. Policy ST38 of the BLP also shadows the NPPF in seeking to protect biodiversity and geodiversity. Much of Policy ENV3 simply reiterates word for word the content of the NPPF and to some extent Policy ST38. BDC in its Reg 16 representations raises this matter and that the Policy is not entirely compliant with either the NPPF or the BLP and that the policy should be deleted and concentrate instead on Policy ENV4.

6.68 Inasmuch as the BNP identifies sites in Figure 7 to which Policy ENV3 applies the Policy could be retained with the duplicated sections removed and a slight rewording to the first paragraph to delete the reference to the 10% biodiversity net gain which is now required by law anyway save for a small number of exceptions. There would then have to be a consequent amendment to the supporting text on Page 31 which suggests the Policy refers to the biodiversity metric approach which it then would not do. Accordingly, I recommend the necessary modifications below.

<b>Recommendation 12</b>	
<b>12A</b>	<p><b>Reword policy ENV3 to delete the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraphs in their entirety and to revise the wording of the 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence of paragraph 1 to read as follows:</b></p> <p><i>“The impact of development on the significance of the species, habitats or features present should be weighed against the benefit of the development in determining whether to grant planning permission”.</i></p> <p><b>Then delete the last sentence of paragraph 1.</b></p>
<b>12B</b>	<b>Delete the last sentence of the supporting text on Page 31</b>

6.69 Although this modification involves some reworking to Policy ENV3 I am satisfied that the essential purpose and objective of the Policy remains the same and as modified it will meet Basic Conditions a) and e). Inasmuch as the policy will promote environmental sustainability in particular, the policy will contribute to sustainable development and Basic Condition d) would also be met.

### Policy ENV4 - Biodiversity and Connectivity

6.70 Policy ENV4 stresses the importance of connectivity between wildlife corridors to

species movement and thus the importance of their protection and on that matter the policy has regard to national policy. However, as already referred to above the PPG makes it clear that policies do not have to cover matters already fully covered in higher order policy. In this respect a large part of the first paragraph of Policy ENV4 simply reiterates national policy without adding anything. It needs to be deleted.

- 6.71 The matter of connectivity does not appear to be directly addressed in the BLP but the intentions of Policy ENV4 are in general conformity with the objectives of the BLP in this regard.
- 6.72 The removal of a part of the policy wording means again there is a need for an in consequence adjustment to the supporting text to remove references to some of the legislation as this is no longer required.

<b>Recommendation 13</b>	
<b>13A</b>	<b>Delete second sentence of the first paragraph of Policy ENV4 in its entirety.</b>
<b>13B</b>	<p><b>Reword the first sentence of the supporting text leading into Policy ENV4 on page 35 as follows:</b></p> <p><b><i>“While Policy ENV3 delivers site-specific compliance in the plan area with the relevant BDC policies, national policy and legislation this policy ENV4 does the same for planning future development proposals across the Plan area to control their potential impacts on wildlife connectivity”.</i></b></p> <p><b>Delete the second sentence in its entirety but retain the third sentence.</b></p>

- 6.73 With these modifications in place the Policy and preamble will meet the Basic Conditions.

### Policy ENV5 - Sites of Historical Environment Significance

- 6.74 Policy ENV5 of the plan seeks to protect heritage sites (including archaeological sites) of at least local significance.
- 6.75 The NPPF and the BLP at Policy ST41 deal extensively with statutorily protected assets which is recognised by the fact that the Neighbourhood Plan does not seek to duplicate this in its policy coverage. Both the NPPF and the BLP in Policy ST41 recognise the importance of the sites of more local significance and it is these that Policy ENV5 focusses on. In that respect the Policy has regard to national policy and is in general conformity with the BLP.
- 6.76 With regard to the wording of the Policy itself, Notts County Council in its Regulation 16 representations, although supporting the policy generally, considers that it

should set out the procedure relating to sites where there is archaeological interest. However, the County’s suggested wording simply reiterates that set out in the NPPF and to include it would simply reiterate policy already adequately set out in higher order policy, contrary to the advice in the PPG. The BDC Conservation Team also consider that the policy should require that heritage assets found locally shall be appreciated and valued for their significant contribution to the distinctive character of Babworth and great weight afforded to the preservation and enhancement of such assets. Inasmuch as this helps to clarify the objective of the policy and allows the policy to better meet Basic Condition a) I recommend that this is included below.

- 6.77 Although the BNP does not include policy about the statutorily protected assets a section of text on page 38 deals with these assets and sits slightly oddly in the flow of the plan, a point picked up by BDC Neighbourhood Planning in its Regulation 16 representation. Presumably, the plan was arranged this way because BPC’s steering Group considered that as policy provisions for the statutorily protected assets were already covered in detail in legislation, the NPPF and the BLP it was unnecessary to repeat it. Nevertheless, I agree that in the interests of a clear plan this section should start off the section on the historic environment on Page 35.
- 6.78 The BDC Conservation Team in its Regulation 16 representation raises a concern that what is said about setting in this section of text is not strictly accurate. It implies Historic England defines ‘setting’ on a case by case basis which is not in fact correct as there are many many proposals affecting the lower graded listings which Historic England do not involve themselves with. Again as there is a clear definition of setting in the NPPF it is only necessary to cross refer to that in the BNP it does not have to be directly quoted. What is missing from the last sentence on Page 38 however is that it is not just setting that must be taken into account but the significance of the asset and this should be reflected in the wording.
- 6.79 The Conservation Team also takes the view that the approach to determining proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings should at least be referred to in the supporting text. However, given the clear policy context provided elsewhere in the NPPF and BLP on this matter I am not persuaded that this is strictly necessary to meet the Basic Conditions and I do not make a formal recommendation in this regard. If BDC and BPC wish to make these additions it is open to them to do so in preparing the referendum version of the Plan.

<b>Recommendation 14</b>	
<b>14A</b>	<p><b>In Policy ENV5 line 3 delete the words ‘and they are locally valued’ and replace with the following:</b></p> <p><b><i>“...and in considering development proposals these features must be appreciated and valued for their significant contribution to the distinctive character of Babworth.”</i></b></p>

	<p><b>Add at the end of the first paragraph to the policy the following words:</b></p> <p><b><i>“...and great weight afforded to their preservation or enhancement.”</i></b></p>
<b>14B</b>	<p><b>Relocate the section of text headed Statutorily Protected Heritage Assets and the map on Page 38 to the start of the section on Sites and Features of Historical Environment Significance on Page 35.</b></p> <p><b><i>Reword the second sentence of that portion of text to read :</i></b></p> <p><b><i>“All new development proposals will be required to take into account the significance of the building or structure , inclusive of their setting, following the requirements of Planning and Listed Building legislation and the NPPF.”</i></b></p>

6.80 With this modification the policy will meet Basic Conditions a) d) and e).

### Policy ENV 6 - Footpaths and other walking routes

- 6.81 This policy of the plan seeks to protect the network of public footpaths and rights of way in the parish. The NPPF acknowledges the role of footpaths in its section 9 at paragraph 111 and in that respect the policy has regard to national policy. Policy ST53 of the BLP seeks to encourage and promote active travel by sustainable modes. The BNP policy is complementary to the Local Plan policy and in general conformity with its objectives. Inasmuch as promoting and facilitating active travel is important to achieving sustainability the plan is also in accordance with Basic Condition d).
- 6.82 However, although the policy in principle meets the basic conditions there is a minor matter in the wording that detracts from the requirement that policies are clear and unambiguous. There are statutory duties regarding public rights of ways and footpaths and the policy wording suggests that loss and adverse effects can be accepted if they are mitigated this is misleading. The BPC as part of the Examiner’s clarifying questions were asked to confirm that loss of a public footpath or PROW would require replacement provision. BPC in its response at Appendix 1 acknowledge that would be the case and I recommend that this is spelt out in a modification to the policy.
- 6.83 Finally, BDC in its Regulation 16 representation also indicates that it would be helpful to identify in the policy any footpaths that would benefit from improvement as this would help evidence the need for developer contributions if relevant in the future from new development. BPC were asked in the Examiner’s clarifying questions if there were any footpaths in need of improvement and the Parish has concluded that there are not. (See responses at Appendix 1 below). Accordingly, I make no recommendation in this respect.

## Recommendation 15

15A	<b>Add after the word ‘appropriate’ in line 3 of Policy ENV6 the words “<i>replacement routes or other mitigation</i>”.</b>
-----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### Policy ENV7 - Flood Risk Resilience and Climate Change

- 6.84 Policy ENV7 looks to ensure that new development is resilient to flood risk and does not exacerbate the impact of flooding in the plan area. However this is an area of planning that is already covered by both national policy and local policy in the BLP at Policy ST50 and there is a need to ensure that Policy ENV7 is both compatible with these higher order policies and not unduly repetitive ie that it is complementary to the policies rather than just overlapping with them in a potentially confusing way.
- 6.85 BDC Planning Policy Team in its Regulation 16 representation and response to the Examiner’s clarifying questions are concerned that the policy as drafted conflicts with both national and local policy and is not a clear and unambiguous policy statement. The team’s response at Appendix 1 sets out the concerns in detail but essentially they are as follows:
- That part 1 of the policy should relate to all development not just that in flood zones 2 and 3 which is largely what Figure 11 shows. The NPPF requires of all development that it does not increase flood risk.
  - That Part 1 is also not clear in what is meant by the benefit of development outweighing the harm. This overlooks the sequential and exceptions testing procedure set out in the NPPF and implies that ‘benefit’ can ‘trump’ the national policy tests.
- The suggested modification to part 1 put forward by the BDC Policy Team is acceptable except that the use of the words ‘where appropriate’ simply contribute to a policy that is not clear and unambiguous as it is never clear to a developer where the policy is meant to apply with this wording included. It is best if these qualifying terms can be avoided and if necessary wording added in the supporting text to explain where the policy will apply.
- 6.86 Regarding paragraph 2 of the Policy the Policy Team also have concerns. These relate mainly to the fact that floodwater management proposals are not straightforward. They must meet operational standards, have the support of the relevant agency and above all need to be maintained over their lifetime. The suggested modification by the Policy Team covers these points, would meet the Basic Conditions and is acceptable.
- 6.87 Regarding paragraph 3 of the policy again the Planning Policy team raise a number of issues but in essence the concerns are as follows:

- That the section should cover all development rather than only applying to certain developments.
- That clause a) simply replicates other policy regarding the sequential test approach and, if it is to be included, to be helpful it should refer to the National Flood Mapping so that developers can identify the areas susceptible to flooding and consequently where sequentially preferable locations might be.
- That the section on surface water flooding would be better to be more clearly separated from the section on fluvial flooding and references to SuDS clarified.
- That parts f and g) are removed as they repeat earlier sections of the policy as proposed to be modified.

6.88 In the interests of achieving a clear and unambiguous and more effective policy having reviewed the team’s proposed wording I am satisfied that the proposed rewording would be acceptable.

6.89 Finally, the Environment Agency in its Regulation 16 representation point to the fact that there is now revised spatial data on flood risk and that Figure 11 should be based on the latest data. This is a factual update in the evidence and should be incorporated in preparing the referendum version of the plan.

<b>Recommendation 16</b>	
<b>16A</b>	<b>Revise para 1 of Policy ENV7 to read:</b> <i>“Development proposals within the Plan Area will be required to demonstrate that the long term implications for flood risk have been appropriately considered and that the proposal contributes to climate change objectives and aligns with locally applicable flood mitigation strategies to avoid increased vulnerability to residents, properties and land from climate change.”</i>
<b>16B</b>	<b>Revise Para 2 of Policy ENV7 to read:</b> <i>“Proposals to construct new (or modify existing) floodwater management infrastructure (ditches, roadside gullies, retention pools, etc.), including within or close to the built-up area, will be supported, provided they are designed to minimum operational standards, have the support of the relevant agency(s), do not adversely affect sites and features of natural or historical environment significance, and have maintenance arrangements in place to ensure effective operation over its lifetime.’</i>

16C	<p><b>Revise Para 3 of Policy ENV7 to read:</b>  <b><i>‘Development proposals should demonstrate that:</i></b></p> <p><b><i>a) if in a location susceptible to flood risk as defined by the National Flood Risk Map, no alternative site is available in a sequentially preferable location to meet the development need;</i></b></p> <p><b><i>b) its location and design respect the geology, flood risk and natural drainage characteristics of the immediate area and is accompanied by a hydrological study whose findings must be complied with in respect of design, groundworks and construction;</i></b></p> <p><b><i>c) All major development proposals should include sustainable drainage systems, unless it can be demonstrated that this is not feasible.</i></b>  <b><i>Proposals will be expected to:</i></b></p> <p><b><i>i) include a Surface Water Drainage Strategy which demonstrates that the proposed drainage scheme, and site layout and design, will not lead to an increase in surface water flood risk on site or elsewhere and that the development will not threaten other natural habitats and water systems;</i></b></p> <p><b><i>ii) be designed to an appropriate technical specification, with an appropriate climate change allowance, supported by ongoing maintenance acceptable for the development’s lifetime.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>iii) where practicable, include habitat creation comprising e.g. landscaping, access and egress for aquatic and terrestrial animals, and native species planting.</i></b></p>
16D	<p><b>Revise Figure 11 to be based on the latest flood mapping information available as requested by the Environment Agency.</b></p>

6.90 These recommended modifications represent a substantial rewording of the policy but in the interests of ensuring it would meet the Basic Conditions, in particular that it has regard to national policy and is in conformity with the BLP, it is important these changes are made. The policy given its subject and coverage will contribute to achieving sustainable development and therefore, as modified, Basic Condition d) would also be met.

## Policy ENV8 - Renewable Energy Generation Infrastructure

6.91 This policy of the plan looks to support renewable energy installations at the smaller scale up to a maximum of 5 turbines of maximum 50 metres to blade tip and solar arrays up to 40 hectares.

6.92 A supportive approach to renewable energy is endorsed in the NPPF which requires

plans to provide a positive strategy for renewable energy and in that respect the policy has regard to national policy. However, the PPG is clear that neighbourhood plan policies should be evidence based and there does not appear to be any evidence to support the thresholds referred to in the Policy. Accordingly, the BPC was asked about this in the Examiner’s clarifying questions but their response does not take the matter any further. It refers to the proximity of the area to the potential prospective Sherwood Forest SPA and the area being within the Sherwood Forest Landscape Character Area but the LCA does not place any specific limits on turbine height for example. The Policy can be successfully modified to depend on criteria rather than inflexible thresholds and given the focus on the National Landscape Character Area Profile it is appropriate that landscape character should be specifically added to Policy ENV8.

- 6.93 The BDC Planning Policy Team raise the same point and reach the same conclusion in its Regulation 16 representation and detailed response to the Examiner’s clarifying questions. They also note that the Babworth Design Code highlights the importance of site-specific renewable energy measures helping to mitigate the impacts of climate change and highlights the importance of considering the impacts, (including visual), of roof mounted technologies. Given this local evidence the team recommend an additional slight change to policy ENV8 to address this locally important matter. I agree that the addition would be acceptable as there is at least some local evidence to justify it.
- 6.94 BDC also raise matters of accuracy regarding the supporting text and particularly that the text incorrectly states that identifying areas suitable for renewable energy would be beyond the scope of the BNP. Although this needs to be corrected in the text there is no opportunity to identify locations at this late stage in the plan preparation process nor is there any obligation on the BPC to do so to meet Basic Conditions.
- 6.95 The suggested modifications to the text are acceptable clarifications and I recommend them below.

**Recommendation 17**

**17A**

**Revise Policy ENV8 to read:**

**“Proposals for wind, solar and other renewable energy generation infrastructure will be supported, subject to the satisfactory resolution of site-specific and cumulative impacts on landscape character, environment and amenity, including views, footpaths, biodiversity, historic environment and noise. Proposals for commercially available renewable energy systems for individual properties including roof mounted renewable technologies will be supported subject to visual and other planning matters being capable of satisfactory resolution.”**

<b>17B</b>	<p><b>Amend the supporting text on page 43 paras 2 - 4 as follows:</b></p> <p><b>Delete Para 2 in its entirety</b></p> <p><b>Amend para 3 line 3 onwards as follows:</b></p> <p><b><i>“Residents of Babworth Parish ..... has been recognised by the government in the NPPF where it states that plans should consider identifying suitable areas for wind energy development and that any such proposals in those areas have the support of local communities. The Bassetlaw Local Plan (2020-2038) does not refer ....in Babworth Parish but supports neighbourhood plans who wish to identify suitable areas.”</i></b></p> <p><b>Amend para 4</b></p> <p><b><i>“In the absence of up-to-date development plan landscape sensitivity or renewables suitability assessments, the Neighbourhood Plan’s Policy ENV 8 takes its guidance on landscape sensitivity/suitability .....Profile 49 Sherwood. Given the emphasis on the National Character Area Profile, the neighbourhood plan proposes that landscape character is added as a consideration in Policy ENV8.”</i></b></p>
------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

6.96 With these recommended modifications the policy would meet the Basic Conditions in particular that it has regard to national policy and is in conformity with the BLP. The policy given its subject and coverage will also contribute to achieving sustainable development and therefore Basic Condition d) would also be met.

## Sustainability

6.97 This section of the plan has a wide ranging remit covering community facilities, Traffic and Business and Employment.

### Policy CF1 - Retention of Community Facilities and Amenities

6.98 The first section deals with community facilities and their protection and enhancement. In that respect the policies have regard to Section 8 of the NPPF which seeks to protect and encourage development of community services.

6.99 The BLP at Policy ST43 already sets out the circumstances in which the loss of a community facility might be acceptable and in that respect the repetition of this in Policy CF1 is contrary to national advice (that policies should not be repeated in

plans at different levels in the hierarchy) and therefore the first part of Policy CF1 is redundant other than its role in identifying the community facilities in Babworth Parish. Although the BLP at Policy ST43 also sets out the requirements of new community facilities, in this case the second section in the BNP Policy CF1 is complementary and additional to ST43 adding local requirements and this would be acceptable. However, the policy would be clearer in this second part if the requirements were set out as bullets. Also the reference to ‘where appropriate’ in respect of residential amenity is unnecessary and simply results in uncertainty in the policy. It should be removed. I make these recommendations below.

- 6.100 As the provision of improved or new facilities would also assist in a more sustainable quality of life for residents of the plan area the policy proposals would also meet Basic Condition d).
- 6.101 The supporting text to this policy also raises a couple of issues. Firstly, in the interests of conciseness in the plan, whilst the information about the two churches is interesting it probably goes further than is necessary. The text would be better concentrating on the role the buildings play both as worship space and as community facilities within the parish rather than the historical detail. However, as this does not affect the Basic Conditions I make no recommendation to modify.
- 6.102 Secondly, the BDC Neighbourhood Planning and Conservation Teams point out in their Regulation 16 representations that the entry regarding the Chequers Inn is both repetitious and unnecessarily detailed and the second paragraph could be removed. I agree that the second paragraph repeats the first and adds nothing to the plan and should be removed.
- 6.103 Finally, the BDC Planning Policy and Neighbourhood planning Teams in their Regulation 16 representations suggest that it would improve the clarity of the plan if there were a map identifying and referencing the community facilities. Inasmuch as this would be consistent with the rest of the plan and aid clarity I recommend the modification is made.

<b>Recommendation 18</b>	
<b>18A</b>	<p><b>In policy CF1 1st paragraph line 4 amend as follows:</b></p> <p><b>“...it can be demonstrated that <i>the tests set out in the Bassetlaw Local Plan Policy ST43 (or any successor policy) are met.</i>”</b></p> <p><b>Delete clauses a), b) and c)</b></p> <p><b>Restructure part 2 of the policy as follows:</b></p> <p><b>“ Small scale proposals .....subject to the proposals demonstrating that <i>they will:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>• <i>Not generate unacceptable disturbance...traffic;</i></b></li> <li><b>• <i>Have appropriate off road parking;</i></b></li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>Respect and be compatible with the local character and surrounding uses; and</i></b></li> <li>• <b><i>Protect residential amenity.</i></b></li> </ul>
<b>18B</b>	<b>In the section on page 45 on the Chequers Inn - delete the words ‘an extensive quarter of a million pound’ and delete the second paragraph in its entirety.</b>
<b>18C</b>	<b>Add a plan indicating the location of the community facilities to the preamble to Policy CF1.</b>

## Employment

### Policy E1 - Employment Development

- 6.104 Policy E1 seeks to support and encourage economic and employment development in the plan area and protect existing employment uses from proposals leading to their loss. The Policy has regard to Section 6 of the NPPF seeking to build a strong competitive economy and encouraging sustainable economic growth.
- 6.105 Policy BLP ST8 deals with encouraging rural enterprise and in that respect Policy E1 is in part in general conformity with the BLP. However, the first section regarding loss of employment land refers to BLP Policy ST7 which the Council states, in its response to the Examiner’s clarifying questions, is not intended to relate to the type of more sporadic employment sites occurring in Babworth Parish and instead relates to the sites listed in the BLP. BDC’s Planning Policy Team’s suggested rewording of this part of the Policy changes it to be expressed positively and to refer to Policy ST8 instead. However, this will not work to meet the ends the Parish are trying to achieve as the subject matter of the first part of Policy E1 is to counter the threat of loss of business premises to other uses e.g. residential. If the Council are taking the view that Policy ST7 and particularly clause 4 would not relate to business premises in the Parish then it is open to the neighbourhood plan to propose its own local policy. I recommend that the text of the first part of Policy E1 is changed to remove the reference to the BLP altogether and to set out the basis on which loss of business premises would be accepted ie where the premises or land is no longer needed, viable or suitable for employment use. This would not undermine the strategic intent of the BLP as the cases involved will be small.
- 6.106 The BDC Planning Policy Team also raise concern with the second part of the policy and in particular that as Policy ST8 requires there to be a clear need for commercial development to be located in the rural areas this must be referred to in Policy E1 along with the other tests the Policy refers to. I am not persuaded that this is necessary, firstly as the NPPF does not specifically require evidence of need for

rural economic development and, secondly, because as it is already stated in the strategic policy of the BLP it is unnecessary to repeat it in Policy E1.

6.107 Again as with Policy CF1 however this second part of Policy E1 would be much clearer set out as bulleted requirements rather than as written and I recommend a modification to this effect below.

6.108 Regarding the supporting text this should draw on updated evidence from the Census 2021 rather than using data from 2011. BPC was invited to comment on this in the Examiner’s clarifying questions and in response they have provided the statistics from Census 2021. These should be inserted in preparing the Plan for Referendum.

6.109 The Policy, in encouraging local employment opportunities that allow people to live and work locally, is likely to contribute to sustainable living. The Policy as proposed to be modified therefore meets Basic Conditions a), d) and e).

<b>Recommendation 19</b>	
<b>19A</b>	<p><b>Revise the wording of Policy E1 to read:</b></p> <p><b>“Development that results in the loss of, .... will only be supported where it can be demonstrated <i>that the site or building is no longer needed, viable or suitable for continued employment use.</i></b></p> <p><b>Proposals for rural employment development will be supported where it can be demonstrated that the development:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><i>will not generate unacceptable disturbance, noise, fumes, smell, or traffic;</i></b></li> <li>• <b><i>has appropriate off-road parking;</i></b></li> <li>• <b><i>will respect and be compatible with the local character and surrounding uses; and</i></b></li> <li>• <b><i>will protect residential amenity.”</i></b></li> </ul>
<b>19B</b>	<p><b>Replace data references in paragraphs 1 and 2 on page 49 with data from the Census 2021 as provided by BPC in Appendix 1 to this report i.e.:</b></p> <p><b>The 2021 Census identifies 35.2% of people in Babworth who work from home. Economic inactivity has reduced to 39%.</b></p>

## Policy E2 - Reuse of Agricultural Buildings

6.110 Policy E2 supports the reuse of agricultural buildings for business, recreation or tourism uses. The expansion of the rural economy through the reuse of buildings, as well as new buildings, is supported by the NPPF and in that respect the Policy has regard to national policy. BLP Policy ST8 provides encouragement to the reuse

of buildings but does not provide detail regarding the reuse so the proposed Policy E2 would be in general conformity with and complementary to Policy ST8.

- 6.111 The BDC Conservation Team in its Regulation 16 representation proposes that the supporting text should acknowledge that this type of development can help secure a future use for and prevent heritage buildings falling into disrepair and that this should be added. As this would lead into and support the Policy wording at clause c) it would be a sensible addition to the supporting text.
- 6.112 Although the section is headed up farm diversification and it is true the reuse of buildings can facilitate farm diversification, it would appear from the section and the Policy that in fact the intention is for Policy E2 to apply to rural buildings generally and not just farm buildings. That being the case the plan would be clearer and less ambiguous if the section and policy was retitled accordingly.

<b>Recommendation 20</b>	
<b>20A</b>	<p><b>In the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph on Farm Diversification on Page 50 line 7 insert a comma after the word parish and delete the word ‘and’.</b></p> <p><b>At the end of line 8 add the following text:</b></p> <p><b><i>“and secure a future use and prevent heritage buildings falling into disrepair”.</i></b></p>
<b>20B</b>	<p><b>Retitle the section and the policy to read :</b></p> <p><b><i>“Reuse of Agricultural and Other Rural Buildings.”</i></b></p>

6.113 Policy E2 as amended would meet Basic Conditions b), d) and e).

### Policy E3 - Tourism

- 6.114 Policy E3 seeks to support proposals that promote and enhance tourism in the rural area. The NPPF similarly supports tourism development but as presently worded the Policy appears to restrict tourism development to those schemes that reuse rural buildings and form part of farm diversification. This is contrary to the NPPF which encourages both the reuse of existing buildings and the development of well-designed new buildings. The BPC was asked to clarify this in an Examiner’s clarifying questions at Appendix 1 below and it proposes in response that the Policy is reworded to resolve this as it was not the intention to restrict tourism development in this way.
- 6.115 Policy ST10 of the BLP supports tourism development in the rural areas subject to tests being met. The wording of Policy E3 is in general conformity with the BLP and complementary to it as, although the wording is somewhat overlapping, it does

introduce additional matters of local concern.

6.116 The content of the policy is also likely to help secure a more sustainable form of tourism development in the rural area and in that respect Basic Condition d) is also met.

6.117 However, one of the requirements of advice in the PPG is that proportionate, robust evidence should support the choices made and the approach taken and that evidence should be drawn upon to explain succinctly the intention and rationale of the policies. It is not clear from the supporting text to policy E3 what the intention is in what is a very brief introduction. Basic Condition a) is not therefore fully met without modification. The Examiner’s clarifying questions at Appendix 1 request BPC to provide additional supporting text in this respect and to explain what additionally it seeks to provide in addition to the BLP strategic policy. Despite the BPC being invited to offer additional justification no such justification has been provided. The recommendation below is open ended but to satisfy the requirement of the PPG additional justification must be provided in preparing the referendum version of the plan.

<b>Recommendation 21</b>	
<b>21A</b>	<p><b>Amend Policy E3 as follows:</b></p> <p><b>Indent clauses a) to d) following the first line.</b></p> <p><b>Delete colon and insert full stop at the end of clause d)</b></p> <p><b>Delete clauses e) and f) and after Clause d) insert:</b></p> <p><b><i>“Tourism activities which involve the reuse of existing buildings or facilitate farm diversification will be particularly supported”.</i></b></p>
<b>21B</b>	<p><b>Expand on the supporting text and justification to Policy E3 explaining why the Policy is required and what it seeks to achieve.</b></p>

## Broadband Infrastructure – Policy E4

6.118 Policy E4 seeks to secure improved broadband and telecoms services for the Parish although both the section title and the policy only refer to broadband. The NPPF at Section 10 states that planning policies should support the expansion of broadband and mobile telecommunications and in that respect the policy has regard to national policy and advice. The BLP at Policy ST55 sets out a detailed policy regarding the provision of broadband and telecoms and whilst Policy E4 is in general conformity there is a degree of overlap between the two policies in particular the issue of effective use of equipment and mast sharing is covered in both policies and it is not necessary to reiterate it in Policy E4. Also telecoms

infrastructure enjoys significant permitted development rights under the General Permitted Development Order and for clarity the last clause of the Policy regarding infrastructure improvements should make it clear that this will only apply where planning permission is required.

- 6.119 With regard to the supporting text, the BNP refers to the fact that broadband and mobile tech is particularly important for homeworking as outlined in policy E2. However, whilst it is true homeworking relies heavily on good tech, Policy E2 has nothing to say about homeworking. The reference to the policy should either be deleted or changed to refer to its importance to business growth and Policy E1.

<b>Recommendation 22</b>	
<b>22A</b>	<p><b>Change the title of Policy E4 to :</b>  <b><i>“Broadband and Mobile Telecommunication Infrastructure”</i></b>  <b>In Para 2 of Policy E4 delete the second sentence.</b>  <b>In para 3 of Policy E4 Amend the start of the sentence to read:</b>  <b><i>“Any infrastructure improvements requiring <i>planning permission</i> for above ground network installations....”</i></b></p>
<b>22B</b>	<p><b>In the supporting text on Broadband - change title to:</b>  <b><i>“Broadband and Mobile Telecommunication Infrastructure”</i></b>  <b>and in Line 5 of Para 1 delete the words ‘as outlined in Policy E2’</b></p>

## Traffic

### Policy T1 – Traffic Management

- 6.120 The principle of Policy T1 of the Neighbourhood Plan in seeking to manage the traffic impacts of development has regard to the NPPF at section 9, which encourages plans to promote active travel.
- 6.121 The strategic context in respect of sustainable transport and active travel is set out in Policy ST53 of the BLP. Whilst there is some overlap between the Local Plan Policy and Policy T1, the BNP Policy does add local context and does not merely replicate the Local Plan policy. Policy T1 is arguably therefore complementary to the BLP policy and in general conformity and Basic Condition e) is met.
- 6.122 However, what is not clear is how additional traffic generation and movement will be minimised at Clause a). Presumably this would be by ensuring that there was provision in developments for active travel by foot and cycle. Including this clarification in clause a) would better reflect National and Local Plan policy and given that the Policy would then provide for active travel, Policy T1 would also have a more positive effect in achieving sustainable development. Thus Basic Condition d) would also be met.

6.123 The BDC Planning Policy Team in its Regulation 16 representation raise a number of detailed points about the Policy as set out in the responses to the Examiner's clarifying questions at Appendix 1. In essence these are that :

- For Policy T1 to be consistent with the BLP and NPPF the policy should apply to all new development not just housing and commercial development.

- At Policy T1 clause b), Policy ST33 of the Local Plan requires new parking to be informed by the most up to date Nottinghamshire Parking Standards unless it can be demonstrated that it is not feasible or viable to do so. It does not require that all proposals comply with the standards as implied in Policy T1 because it is recognised that there will be many circumstances particularly in a rural area, where this may not be practicable. This allows locally distinctive parking solutions to be promoted through design codes, such as the Babworth Design Code – GF.03 which provides detailed locally specific car parking solutions. The team suggests that this evidences the approach to parking at a local level and should be referenced in a revised clause c) to Policy T1.

- In terms of providing off-site parking in an alternative location in clause c), it is important that the policy is clear about where the off-site provision should go. To ensure there is a link between the provision and the development, the team suggests any alternative needs to be in the locality of the development.

- For the policy to be effective, parts d) and e) need further clarification about what is considered a necessary improvement and when traffic calming is appropriate. The team suggests that this needs to be as assessed by the development's transport statement/assessment. Reference to communal parking in part d) duplicates the parking criteria in the policy and should be deleted.

These clarifications are appropriate to make in the interests of a clearer and less ambiguous policy and, accordingly, I recommend the modifications below.

6.124 One of the requirements of advice in the PPG is that proportionate, robust evidence should support the choices made and the approach taken and that evidence should be drawn upon to explain succinctly the intention and rationale of the policies. It is not clear from the supporting text to policy T1 what the intention is in what is a very brief introduction. Basic Condition a) is not therefore fully met without modification. The Examiner's clarifying questions at Appendix 1 request BPC to provide additional supporting text in this respect. However, the response from the parish does not take the justification much further other than to say it is to resolve excess speeding through Ranby and resolve congestion around the school neither of which are directly referred to in the policy and indeed, certainly in respect of speeding, is not a matter that the BNP can control. I recommend below that in preparing the referendum version of the plan that suitable justifying text is added to the preamble to Policy T1.

<b>Recommendation 23</b>	
<b>23A</b>	<p><b>Revise Policy T1 as follows:</b></p> <p><b>“With particular regard to the rural highway network of the parish and the need to minimise any increase in vehicular traffic, all <i>new development</i> must:</b></p> <p><b>a) Be designed to minimise additional traffic generation and movement through the village and on single-track roads <i>by providing safe and convenient access for all including provision for active travel by foot and cycle;</i></b></p> <p><b>b) <i>Provide for an appropriate level of well-integrated, convenient parking for motor vehicles and cycles informed by the Nottinghamshire Parking Standards unless it can be demonstrated that it is not viable or feasible to do so;</i></b></p> <p><b>c) <i>provide on-plot parking consistent with the Babworth Design Code and to maintain existing off-road parking areas unless a suitable equivalent alternative is provided in an off-road location within the locality;</i></b></p> <p><b>d) <i>provide any necessary improvements as evidenced by the proposal’s transport assessment/statement to provide safe, convenient site access, and the safe, effective functioning of the highway network;</i> and</b></p> <p><b>e) <i>Provide for traffic calming measures where evidenced by the proposal’s transport assessment/statement to be appropriate.</i>”</b></p>
<b>23B</b>	<p><b>Expand on the supporting text and justification to Policy T1 explaining why the Policy is required and what it seeks to achieve.</b></p>

6.125 These recommended modifications represent a substantial rewording of the policy but in the interests of ensuring it would meet the Basic Conditions in particular that it has regard to national policy and is in conformity with the BLP it is important these changes are made.

## **Section 5 – Monitoring and Review**

6.126 Section 5 of the plan sets out the Parish Councils’ intentions in respect to monitoring the BNP and its review. Although this is a largely factual statement of how monitoring and review will operate there are a couple of aspects where clarification is required.

6.127 The section refers to the fact that the plan will be ‘regularly monitored’ which is good practice but the statement itself is ambiguous as regular monitoring could be every 5 years. The Parish Council needs to indicate if this would be an annual activity (usual practice). BPC were asked to clarify this in one of the Examiner’s clarifying

questions at Appendix 1 and has confirmed that it would monitor annually.

6.128 Making this clarifying modification will ensure this section of the Plan meets Basic Condition a).

<b>Recommendation 22</b>	
<b>24A</b>	<b>Page 54 Para 2 Line 1 – replace the word ‘regularly’ with the word “<i>annually</i>” .</b>

## **7 Other Matters**

### **7.1 Parish History**

7.1.1 Nottinghamshire County Council in its Regulation 16 representation states that, whilst the parish history section (page 6) provides a good review of the recent history, especially the significant connection with the Pilgrim Fathers, the medieval history could be expanded upon to include the deserted medieval village at Babworth which was cleared when the park was created. NCC considers that as the parish also contains evidence for extensive late Iron Age and Roman settlement, which is mentioned later in the document, it might be helpful to include this in the background. NCC states that as few parishes can compete with the level of known archaeological sites of this period and it is a positive heritage story that should be presented here.

7.1.2 Whilst it is helpful for plan users to understand the background, expanding the parish history to include these references is not necessary to meet any of the Basic Conditions. I therefore will not formally recommend a modification but if BDC in consultation with BPC and NCC, in preparing the plan for Referendum, wish to incorporate these points it can do so.

### **7.2 Typographical, Grammatical and Factual Corrections**

7.2.1 There are a number of typographical/grammatical and factual errors in the Plan which ought to be corrected in the interests of a clear and unambiguous plan. In addition to proposing modifications to ensure the Plan meets the Basic Conditions the only other area of amendment that is open to me, as the examiner, is to correct such errors. I have identified these in Appendix 2, and, in modifying the Plan as set out above and finalising it for the referendum, these typographical, grammatical and factual amendments should be made.

<b>Recommendation 25</b>	
<b>25A</b>	<b>Make typographical, grammatical and factual corrections as set out in Appendix 2 at the end of this report.</b>

## 8. Referendum

- 8.1 Subject to the recommended modifications set out above being completed, it is appropriate that the Babworth Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to a referendum.
- 8.2 I am required to consider whether the Referendum Area should be synonymous with the Neighbourhood Area or extended beyond it.
- 8.3 The Neighbourhood Area covers the administrative area of Babworth Parish Council. I am satisfied that the BNP policies and proposals themselves will not affect other adjoining Parishes beyond the Neighbourhood Area to any significant degree. I therefore do not consider that extension of the referendum area beyond the Neighbourhood Area would be warranted.
- 8.4 Accordingly, I consider that it is unnecessary to recommend any other Referendum Area than the Neighbourhood Area and no representations have been submitted seeking an alternative approach.

<b>Recommendation 26</b>	
<b>26A</b>	<b>I recommend to Bassetlaw District Council that the Babworth Neighbourhood Plan, modified as specified above, should proceed to a referendum based on the Neighbourhood Area as approved by the District Council on 24 September 2020.</b>

Peter D Biggers BSc Hons MRTPI - Independent Examiner – 7 August 2025

## Appendix 1 –

### Examiner’s Clarifying Questions and Information Requests put to Babworth Parish Council and Bassetlaw District Council

#### Questions and Information Requests to Parish Council

##### Question PC1:

What is to be the formal name of the neighbourhood plan – Babworth Parish Neighbourhood Plan or the Babworth Neighbourhood Plan? – currently the plan uses both titles.

**Response** - *We would like it to be called ‘Babworth Neighbourhood Plan’*

##### Question PC2

Most neighbourhood plans have a clear thread that runs from identified key issues to vision and objectives and then to policies and proposals in response. The BNP doesn’t identify early on what the key issues are although as the reader progresses through the plan it does become clearer. I will be suggesting that the Parish Council provides a short section of text for section 3 ahead of the vision that sets out what the key issues for the parish are that have emerged out of the preparation and consultation process and which can then lead into the vision and objectives. It would be helpful if this additional text could be provided before the examination completes. A bullet point summary of the key issues will be sufficient.

**Response** - *Please find our preferred text below:*

- *For the Parish to grow in a proportionate manner with housing that meets a local need*
- *For the most important environmental areas to be protected from inappropriate development*
- *To safeguard the character of the Neighbourhood Area and to ensure high quality design*
- *To preserve and enhance the range of community facilities and employment opportunities available to residents*

##### Question PC3

Re the development boundary – what is the rationale for the long extended strip along Blyth Road north of the main part of Ranby? Currently there is no justification set out.

**Response** - *After the consultation event the residents in that area asked for the boundary to be moved so they could feel part of Ranby village. Development has already been approved in that area and it was seen as an opportunity to regularize the area and*

*hopefully improve the road and footpath area. This is a positive response to sustainability filling in gaps between existing developments.*

#### **Question PC4**

Re the alternative sites set out in the AECOM Site Options Assessment Report – what happened to LAA056 Blyth Road which AECOM considered to be the best site? The now allocated site south of the Conifers was one of 4 identified as possible all below LAA056 in terms of preference. Possibly LAA056 has been developed but even so there should be clarity as to why the now allocated site was chosen – is it just a case of the others either being too small to meet the identified need or too large?

**Response** - *Please see the response below and LAA056 already has planning permission on it so has already a number of houses allocated to it.*

*Site Allocation for Babworth Neighbourhood Plan.*

*The site allocation for the Babworth Neighbourhood Plan (BNP) evolved over time after going through several stages and processes both internally by the Babworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (BNPSG) and externally from AECOM Limited (AECOM). The minimum housing requirement for Ranby for the next planning period was dictated by the Bassetlaw Local Plan which has set the target at 13 dwellings.*

*AECOM were employed to provide a Site Options and Assessment Final Report, using information from the Neighbourhood Plan “call for sites” and the Bassetlaw Land Availability Assessment (LAA) as a starting point. Following the work carried out by AECOM the number of sites that were actually potentially suitable and available were assessed and rated. Some sites already had planning permission granted so no further assessment was required. From the AECOM report 3 potential sites were then put forward for discussion by the BNPSG, these were BAB01, BAB02 and BAB03. BAB02 was the first area to be discounted as the site would only yield 1-2 dwellings and the challenging topography of the site was highlighted in the AECOM report. BAB01 also had significant issues, with the site’s close proximity to the A1 to the west generating large amounts of traffic noise, also a communication mast in the corner which would require ongoing access. The site borders the Chesterfield Canal which is a major feature of Ranby village and the building of a significant number of dwellings next to the canal could have a detrimental impact on the local biodiversity. BAB03 provided the best fit for a potential available site for allocation. The site does not have any physical or topography issues, the site is self-contained with hedging and trees offering some shielding on all sides and it has good potential access from The Conifers Road. The site size matches the number of dwellings allocated for the next planning period when taken in consideration with dwellings that have already been granted with planning permission. Barring infill BAB03 sits next to the last previous development within Ranby Village (The Conifers built in around 2007), which was a development of 5 large houses. This development was next to Beechwood Crescent which was a self-contained mixed development when it was built, meaning Ranby is continuing to grow in a similar way to how the village has developed in the past. BAB03 is also located very close to a bus route which passes through part of the village allowing access to Retford, Worksop and beyond.*

*After discussion the BNPSG decided that the only site that could be recommended for the Babworth Neighbourhood Plan was BAB03.*

### Question PC5

What is meant by the last paragraph on P19 – ‘population growth can be expected to be driven by the oldest households’? Does this mean demand for housing is driven by this age group and therefore it is the fastest growing age group?

**Response – Yes**

### Question PC6

Re BDC’s policy comments on policy ENV2 at Regulation 16 stage are there any important OS sites in the policy in need of improvement or enhancement?

**Response - Babworth Neighbourhood Plan Group are unaware of any OS sites in need of improvement.**

### Question PC7

Re BDC’s policy comments on policy ENV6 at Regulation 16 stage are there any particular footpaths to identify for improvement.

Also Re Policy ENV6 ‘appropriate mitigation’ is not clear as to what is intended. Presumably if loss of a footpath was involved it was intended that mitigation would include alternative provision?

**Response - Babworth Neighbourhood Plan are unaware of any footpaths that need improvement but if a footpath was lost mitigation would include appropriate re routing of the footpath and to retain its country side feel.**

### Question PC8

What is the evidence base/justification of the height threshold for wind turbines in policy ENV8 as 50 metres to tip is now very small in industry terms?

**Response - Currently there are a number of smaller wind turbines within the parish and Babworth Neighbourhood Plan would support similar turbines. We also have to be mindful of the proximity of the Sherwood Forest Prospective Potential Special Protection Area which need to be taken into account, and the location of the Parish within the Sherwood Forest Landscape Character Area.**

### Question PC9

Re community facilities and amenities - whilst the historic background to the churches is interesting - perhaps the more relevant point is the extent to which the buildings offer wider community services beyond worship. Please can you clarify?

**Response - The churches are used for worship, Christenings, weddings, funerals but also Ranby Village School have visits to the Churches especially Ranby. Babworth church is also used for historical visits due to its relationship with the pilgrim fathers.**

## Question PC10

On Page 49 in the top two paragraphs - what is the situation with home working and economic activity in the data from the 2021 census as this will be more relevant now than quoting 2011 data?

**Response** - *The 2021 Census identifies 35.2% of people in Babworth who work from home. Economic inactivity has reduced to 39%.*

## Question PC11

The justification in the supporting text to Policy E3 is exceptionally brief – what is the intent of the policy? - is it necessary because you want to develop/expand on the BLP policy on tourism? Please provide additional supporting text for this section.

Also in respect of E3 - is this intended to restrict tourism development to reuse of existing buildings and farm diversification schemes because if so this would put the policy in conflict with NPPF policy which does not restrict business growth in the rural economy in this way?

**Response** - *The purpose of the policy is not to restrict tourism in this way but to acknowledge that further tourism activities can come from farm diversification along with other sources.*

*Maybe the following re wording would work :*

*POLICY E3: TOURISM - Support will be given to facilities that enhance and promote tourism where:*

- a) They are of a scale appropriate to the nature of the Parish and*
- b) They do not have a detrimental effect on the distinctive rural character of the Parish and*
- c) They do not adversely affect the surrounding infrastructure, particularly local road networks, water supply and sewerage and*
- d) They benefit the local community through, for instance, provision of local employment opportunities and improvements to local service provision appropriate in scale to their location and*

*Tourism activities which involve the reuse of existing buildings and involve farm diversification are supported'.*

## Question PC12

Re Policy T1 – the justification / evidence base for the policy is similarly 'light'. Please provide additional supporting text for this section.

**Response** - *The justification for this policy is excess speeding within Ranby village and on country roads. Large traffic problems including irresponsible parking around the village school which causes congestion.*

### Question PC13

Re the section on Monitoring and Review – would the Parish commit to monitoring annually – is that the intent as the phrase ‘regular monitoring’ is unclear and could for example mean every 5 years ?

Also what are the examples of other monitoring that will be included?

**Response** - *The Parish Council will routinely monitor the NP by analysing planning approvals and refusals and considering how successful the NP policies have been. This informal monitoring will take place on at least an annual basis and will help inform the need to formally review the NP itself.*

*Other data will include legislative updates such as the NPPF, Planning Practice Guidance and updated housing requirement figures supplied by the local planning authority.*

### Question PC14

With regard to the consultation statement and the Reg 14 pre submission consultation – were any events held or was it simply a case of making the plan available and notifying consultees and the community that it was published?

In particular how did the Parish ensure that traditionally hard to reach groups were engaged?

Is it right that only 6 consultees responded and only one from a resident at this pre-submission stage?

Also – at the draft policies consultation event in September 2023, of the attendees there, how many actually made comments on the policies?

**Response** - *As referenced in the question, there was an informal consultation event organised for the community which was held in September 2023 and was attended by 30 people. As stated in the analysis of the event, attendees were offered the opportunity to comment but were encouraged to contribute to the Regulation 14 consultation. The analysis notes that three people commented on the policies and a further six people completed a questionnaire on renewable energy.*

*The responses to Regulation 14 consultation are as stated.*

*There were no specific consultation events through Regulation 14. It was advertised on the Parish Council website, through posters and fliers delivered throughout the parish.*

## Questions to Bassetlaw District Council

### Question BDC1:

Two dates are given for the designation of the neighbourhood area in the documentation – 24/9/20 and 25/9/20 which is it?

**Response** - *The neighbourhood area was designated on 24 September 2020*

### Question BDC2

What is the specific concern in respect of policy ENV7? – when asking for a policy to be revisited it would be helpful to have an indication of the concern and the requested change. This helps ensure any recommended modifications actually resolve the point of concern.

**Response** - *Paragraph 1 of the supporting text should refer to National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy for England, 2020 instead of draft 2019. Figure 11 should also be updated to align with the most recent Flood Risk Maps. The Local Plan policy reference should be Policy ST50 not Policy 50.*

*The supporting text says the Neighbourhood Plan is looking to support measures that manage the effects of climate change on flooding for the lifetime of the Plan and beyond. It adds that its important that the location and technical standards of all new development in the Plan Area be judged on their likely contribution to flooding in a climate change world.*

*However, the first paragraph of Policy ENV 7 focuses on proposals in areas identified in Figure 11, which we understand to be the flood zones. To be consistent with the NPPF and the Local Plan the ENV7 should ensure that proposals anywhere in the Plan Area appropriately manage their impact on flood risk, not just in flood zones 2 and 3.*

*The first paragraph of ENV7 says ‘Development proposals within the areas indicated in Figure 11 will be required, where appropriate, to demonstrate that the benefit of development outweighs the harm in relation to its adverse impact on climate change targets, and on the likelihood of it conflicting with locally applicable flood mitigation strategies and infrastructure.’*

*It is not clear how the ‘benefit of development’ will be assessed and when that would be considered to outweigh the harm in relation to climate change and flood risk. This does not align with the national policy requirement to use the sequential test.*

*It is also unclear how a proposal could conflict with locally applicable flood infrastructure.*

*Our understanding of the intention of ENV7 paragraph 1 is that the neighbourhood plan is requiring all relevant development proposals to mitigate their impacts upon flood risk in the Plan Area to ensure they are consistent with climate change objectives. We’d suggest the following to be consistent with national and local policy:*

*‘Development proposals within the Plan Areas indicated in Figure 11 will be required, where appropriate, to demonstrate that the benefit of development outweighs the harm in relation its adverse impact on long term implications for flood risk have been appropriately considered and that the proposal contributes to climate change targets objectives and*

aligns with locally applicable flood mitigation strategies to avoid increased vulnerability to residents, properties and land from climate change and infrastructure.

Paragraph 2 of ENV7 considers proposals for new/improved flood infrastructure. Such provision is complex and should be designed to an appropriate technical specification, supported by appropriate technical assessments to ensure that the infrastructure can be effective in managing flood risk and drainage in the long term. To ensure paragraph 2 is effective we'd suggest the following:

'Proposals to construct new (or modify existing) floodwater management infrastructure (ditches, roadside gullies, retention pools, etc.), including within or close to the built-up area, will be supported, provided they are designed to minimum operational standards, have the support of the relevant agency(s), do not adversely affect sites and features of natural or historical environment significance, and have maintenance arrangements in place to ensure effective operation over its lifetime.'

The introduction to ENV7 paragraph 3 is restrictive and does not take into account any development that is not classified as residential, employment or agricultural. To ensure that there are no conflicts with national and local policy we'd suggest changing the first sentence to relate to all new development.

The policy recognises that if a proposal is in a location susceptible to flood risk no other sites in a preferable location are available. We understand this is referring to the sequential test. To aid legibility and effectiveness we suggest clarifying how a susceptible location will be defined (via the Flood Risk Map) and also by being explicit to a sequentially preferable location.

Given the focus on surface water flooding and sustainable drainage in paragraph 3 we'd also suggest for legibility and effectiveness, having a separate part of the policy for surface water, as distinct from fluvial and other forms of flood risk. This would align well with the NPPF/Local Plan. The separation would also help align paragraph 3 with national policy which requires SuDS from all major development.

In paragraph 3, part c) the policy requires surface water strategies to 'prevent' properties from flooding from surface water. This conflicts with national policy which requires that flood risk 'is not increased elsewhere'. This should be changed. F) and g) repeat c) and should be removed. In summary we'd suggest:

'Development proposals of one or more dwellings and/or for employment or agricultural development should demonstrate that:

a) if in a location susceptible to flooding from rivers or surface water risk as defined by the national Flood Risk Map, no alternative site is available in a sequentially preferable location to meet the local residential development need is available;

b) its location and design respect the geology, flood risk and natural drainage characteristics of the immediate area and is accompanied by a hydrological study whose findings must be complied with in respect of design, groundworks and construction;

All major development proposals should include sustainable drainage systems, unless it can be demonstrated that this is not feasible. Proposals will be expected to:

c) it includes a Surface Water Drainage Strategy which demonstrates that the proposed

*drainage scheme, and site layout and design, will not lead to an increase in surface water flood risk on site or prevent properties from flooding from surface water, , that flood risk elsewhere will not be exacerbated by increased levels of surface water runoff, and that the development will not threaten other natural habitats and water systems;*

*d) its be designed to an appropriate technical specification, includes, as appropriate, sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) with an appropriate including allowing for climate change allowance, supported effects with by ongoing maintenance acceptable for the developments lifetime provision for , other surface water management measures and permeable surfaces;*

*e) proposed SuDs infrastructure includes, where practicable, include habitat creation comprising e.g. landscaping, access and egress for aquatic and terrestrial animals, and native species planting;*

*f) it does not increase the risk of flooding to third parties; and*

*g) it takes the effects of climate change into account.'*

### **Question BDC3**

What is the specific concern in respect of policy ENV8? – when asking for a policy to be revisited it would be helpful to have an indication of the concern and the requested change. This helps ensure any recommended modifications actually resolve the point of concern.

**Response** - *The supporting text for ENV8 states that mapping of areas that are technically suitable for renewables is outside the scope of the Plan. But the NPPF says a suitable area for wind energy development can be defined in the development plan, not solely a Local Plan, and Local Plan Policy ST49 supports neighbourhood plans identifying suitable areas for renewable development including wind energy. We'd request that paragraphs 2-4 of the supporting text be amended as:*

*'Mapping of areas that are technically suitable (aspect, exposure, prevailing wind, connection to the grid) for renewables development is beyond the scope of this Plan.*

*Residents of Babworth Parish wish to play their part in reducing emissions, but at a scale appropriate to the landscape sensitivity of the Plan Area. The impact of wind generation infrastructure on communities has been recognised by the government: a Ministerial Statement (18 June 2015) the NPPF says that plans should consider identifying suitable areas for wind energy development must be identified in local plans and that any such proposals in those areas must have the support of local communities. The Bassetlaw Local Plan (2020-2038) intentionally does not refer to any evidence-based documentation identifying and mapping areas suitable for turbine (or solar PV) infrastructure developments across the District or, specifically, in Babworth Parish but supports neighbourhood plans who wish to identify suitable areas. In the absence of up-to-date BDC development plan landscape sensitivity or renewables suitability assessments, the Neighbourhood Plan's Policy ENV 9 & takes its guidance on site-specific wind and solar energy generation infrastructure landscape sensitivity/suitability and therefore on locally acceptable locations from the descriptions and assessments of the adverse effects of drivers of change in the Natural England National Character Area Profile 49 Sherwood. Given the emphasis on the National character Area Profile, we would recommend that*

*landscape character is added as a consideration in Policy ENV8.'*

*By relying on the National Character Area Profile, the supporting text recognises that there is little locally specific evidence to inform the location of renewables proposals. However, Policy ENV8 provides a threshold for wind energy/solar development. It is unclear how that threshold has been reached or where the evidence for the number and scale of wind/solar development has been derived from. The National Character Area Profile does not provide information about the capacity for renewable energy development so should not be relied upon to justify the policy. This conflicts with the NPPF which requires plans to provide a positive strategy for renewable energy.*

*However, the Babworth Design Code highlights the importance of site-specific renewable energy measures helping to mitigate the impacts of climate change. It also highlights the importance of considering the impacts, including visual of roof mounted technologies. Given this local evidence we would recommend a slight change to policy ENV8 to address this locally important matter.*

*We would recommend the following:*

*'Proposals for wind, and solar, and other renewable energy generation infrastructure of up to five turbines, maximum tip height 50m, and/or one solar array up to 40 ha will be supported, subject to the satisfactory resolution avoidance or mitigation of harmful effects site specific and cumulative impacts on landscape character, environment and amenity, including views, footpaths, biodiversity, historic environment and noise.*

*Proposals for commercially available renewable energy generation infrastructure systems for individual properties including roof mounted renewable technologies larger than specified above (number, height or area) will not be supported subject to visual and other planning matters being addressed.'*

#### **Question BDC 4**

What is the specific concern in respect of policy T1? – when asking for a policy to be revisited it would be helpful to have an indication of the concern and the requested change. This helps ensure any recommended modifications actually resolve the point of concern.

**Response** - *We advise that reference in paragraph 3 of the supporting text should be to Local Plan Policy ST53 not ST55.*

*National policy requires development plans to be written positively. The following proposed changes are designed to strengthen the positive approach to traffic management in the neighbourhood plan.*

*For Policy T1 to be consistent with the Local Plan and the NPPF we recommend that the policy applies to all new development not just housing and commercial development.*

*Policy ST33 of the Local Plan requires new parking to be informed by the most up to date Nottinghamshire Parking Standards unless it can be demonstrated that it is not feasible or viable to do so. It does not require all proposals comply with the standards as it is recognised that there will be many circumstances particularly in the rural area, like Babworth where this may not be practicable.*

Further, this allows locally distinctive parking solutions to be promoted through design codes, such as the Babworth Design Code – GF.03 provides detailed locally specific car parking solutions. We would suggest that this appropriately evidences the approach to parking at a local level and should be referenced in Policy T1.

In terms of providing off site parking in an alternative location, it is important that the policy is clear about where the off site provision should go. To ensure there is a link between the provision and the development we would suggest that needs to be in the locality of the development.

For the policy to be effective, part d) and e) need further clarification about what is considered a necessary improvement and when traffic calming is appropriate. We advise this needs to be as assessed by the development's transport statement/assessment.

Reference to communal parking in part d) duplicates the parking criteria in the policy and should be deleted.

'With particular regard to the rural highway network of the parish and the need to minimise any increase in vehicular traffic, all new housing and commercial development must:

a) Be designed to minimize additional traffic generation and movement through the village and on single-track roads by providing safe and convenient access for all including through sustainable travel measures;

b) Avoid additional on-street parking provide for an appropriate level of well-integrated, convenient parking for motor vehicles and to ensure provision is made for cycles storage, development proposals will be assessed against informed by the Nottinghamshire Parking Standards (2016) unless it can be demonstrated that it is not viable or feasible to do so

c) provide on-plot parking consistent with the Babworth Design Code and not remove or compromise the use of any to maintain existing off-road parking areas unless a suitable equivalent alternative is provided in an off road location within the locality;

d) provide any necessary improvements as evidenced by the proposal's transport assessment/statement to provide safe, convenient site access, communal parking and the safe, effective functioning of the highway network; and

e) Provide for traffic calming measures where evidenced by the proposal's transport assessment/statement as appropriate.'

## Question BDC5

Regarding BDC Conservation Team's Reg 16 representations re page 28 of the neighbourhood plan - if the number of Non Designated Heritage Assets is to be added to the text , please provide the actual number of these and whether these are in a 'local list' recognised and maintained by the District Council?

**Response** - In terms of the non-designated heritage assets:

- There are 29 Local Interest Buildings within the Babworth Parish boundary. I have attached an extract of our non-designated heritage asset spreadsheet relating to these. And yes, these are recognised as being on our 'local list' and are identified in

accordance with our approved criteria

(<https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/qfenhzqx/non-designated-heritage-assets-criteria-november-2016-update.pdf>). The same data is also contained on the Nottinghamshire HER.

- There are also 3 Unregistered Parks and Gardens, these being Ranby Hall, Ranby House and Morton Hall. Again, these are identified in line with our approved criteria (<https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/11zbfs15/bassetlaw-upgs-methodology-1st-march-2017.pdf>) and the data is shared on the Nottinghamshire HER.

Four attachments – (The documents have been sent to the Examiner):

- *Babworth Parish – Local Interest Buildings.pdf*
- *UPG39 – Morton Hall.pdf*
- *UPG44 – Ranby Hall.pdf*
- *UPG45 – Ranby House.pdf*

Note – As I continue the examination I may have additional questions of clarification and these will be forwarded on.

P. D. Biggers

Independent Examiner

04 June 2025

<b>Appendix 2 - Recommendation 25 – Typographical, Grammatical &amp; Factual Corrections</b>		
<b>Page</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Correction</b>
3	Foreword Para 1 - Line 4	Change 'a designated area' to " <i>the designated Neighbourhood Area</i> " Reason – to clarify terminology
3	Foreword para 4 Line 2	Change 'the reference point' to " <i>part of the development plan</i> " Reason – to clarify terminology.
5	Figure 1 - Title	Change 'Designated area' to " <i>Designated Neighbourhood Area</i> " Reason – to clarify terminology.
6	Para 1 – Line 1	Change 'delivering' to " <i>preparing</i> " Reason - to clarify the stage the plan is at .
7	Para 2 Line 3	Insert the word " <i>It</i> " before the word 'opened' Reason - to make grammatical sense.
7	Para 3 Line 1	Insert "HMP" before the word 'Ranby' Reason – to clarify this is talking about the prison
9	Section 2 Para 1 – Lines 9-11	Insert full stop after Statement and remove rest of paragraph. Reason – this stage is now past
11	The Vision	Correct the date in the title to 2038 In Line 2 of Vision correct the spelling to " <i>complemented</i> " Reason – to make grammatical sense.
12	2nd Bullet - Top of page Line 1	Change '2023' to " <i>2024</i> " Reason – to ensure correct version of NPPF is referenced.
12	Planning Context Para 1 Line 2	Insert "(as amended)" after 2012 Reason – to ensure correct version of Regs is referenced.
12	An Economic Role - Para 2 Line 2	Add the word " <i>within</i> " after the word 'including' Reason – to make grammatical sense
13	A Social Role – Para 2 Line 2	Delete the plural 's' in the word 'allocations' Reason - to make grammatical sense as there is only one residential allocation.
13	An Environmental Role – Para 1 - 2nd sentence	Reword to read: " <i>Part of this is about helping to improve biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution and mitigating and adapting to climate change....</i> " Reason – to make grammatical sense – as written it was not a sentence.

13	1st Bullet Line 1	Insert the words “( <i>Local Green Spaces</i> )” after the words ‘Neighbourhood Area’ Reason – clarification of what is meant by special open spaces.
16	2nd Bullet Line 1	Capitalise letter ‘p’ in the word ‘plan’ Reason – to make grammatical sense.
17	Policy HBE2 Clauses d),e),f).	Amend text to read: at d) “The housing mix <i>comprising</i> 3x2 bed....” at e) “...landscape statement <i>being</i> provided...” at f) “Design features <i>being</i> in line...” Reason – to make grammatical sense to fit with parent clause - ie ‘development of this site will be supported subject to’
22	1st Paragraph 1 – Line 2	Replace the word ‘in’ with the word “ <i>of</i> ” Reason – to make grammatical sense.
23	Windfall Development – Para 3 Line 1-2	Revise wording after the word ‘allocation’ to read: “... <i>identified in the plan will be restricted....</i> ” Reason – missing words in sentence .
23	Design – Para 1 Line 2	Add the letter “s” to the word ‘enhance’ Reason – to make grammatical sense.
24	Para 4 - Lines 3-4	Replace the word ‘emerging’ with the word “ <i>the</i> ” Reason – The BLP Policy is now adopted.  Move the word ‘design’ to follow after the word ‘housing’ Reason – to make grammatical sense.  In Line 4 replace the word ‘promote’ with the word “ <i>requires</i> ” Reason - Policy ST33 <b>requires</b> high quality design
24	Policy HBE6 Design - Para 2 Line 2	Replace the word ‘has’ with “ <i>have</i> ”. Reason – to make grammatical sense
25	Para 3 – Line 1	Insert the word “ <i>undulating</i> ” or similar adjective after the word ‘gently’. Reason – to make grammatical sense.
29	Para 1 – Line 1	Delete the letter ‘s’ from the end of the word ‘values’. Reason – to make grammatical sense.
31	Para 1 – Line 2	Reword the reference to Sherwood Forest to read: “ <i>a) part of the Potential Prospective Sherwood Forest Special Protection Area,</i> ”  Reason – The Sherwood Forest site is still a potential prospective SPA not yet protected by statute.
35	Policy ENV4 Para 2 Line 2	Add letter “s” to the word ‘corridor’. Reason - There is more than one corridor identified in Figure 8.

40	Policy ENV6 - Line 2	Correct figure reference to " <i>Figure 10</i> ". Reason –Incorrect reference.
40	Flood Resilience Section Para 1 Line 6/7	Amend title of document quoted to read: " <i>National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy for England 2020</i> " Reason – the document named in the Plan has been superseded.
40	Flood Risk Resilience Section Para 3 Line 1	Amend Policy reference to read "ST50" Reason –Incorrect policy reference.
45	The Chequers Inn - Para 2	Delete paragraph Reason – Duplicates 1st paragraph.
48	Policy CF1 -Clause A	Add the word " <i>or</i> " after the semi colon at the end of clause a): Reason – This is an either / or situation.
49	3 <sup>rd</sup> Complete Para - Line 3	Insert the word " <i>an</i> " before the word 'existing' and insert the word " <i>opportunities</i> " after the word 'employment'. Reason – to make grammatical sense and for clarity.
49	4th Complete Para - Lines 2-3	Insert full stop after the word 'overall'. Start new sentence " <i>However, maintaining.....</i> " Replace the word 'mitigates' with the word " <i>militates</i> " Reasons – Sentence as written does not make sense and the word 'mitigates' is used incorrectly in this context.
52	Broadband - Para 1 Line 2	Correct BLP Policy Reference to "ST 55" Reason – Incorrect policy reference
52	Traffic - Para 2 Line 2	Correct BLP Policy Reference to "ST 53" Reason – Incorrect policy reference