

# Consultation Statement

## Lound Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2021 - 2037



*Prepared by Planning With People on behalf of Lound Parish Council*

10 March 2021

# **Table of Contents**

Introduction.....	3
Early Stages of the Neighbourhood Plan .....	3
Timeline: Consultation and Engagement up to Regulation 14.....	3
Regulation 14 Consultation .....	6
The Results .....	8
Detailed Responses to the Regulation 14 Consultation.....	10
Appendix 1 (see R45 above).....	46

## Introduction

- 1.1 This consultation statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations in accordance with the Localism Act 2011 for the Lound Neighbourhood Plan (hereafter the LNP). The legal basis of the statement is provided by Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations which states that a consultation statement should:
- Contain details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Plan;
  - Explain how they were consulted;
  - Summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
  - Describe how those issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.

## Early Stages of the Neighbourhood Plan

- 1.2 The table below shows the extensive efforts undertaken to engage with the local community. The decision to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan was taken after consultation with local people in 2015. The contents of the Lound Neighbourhood Plan (LNP) were shared as it was being Drafted (see table below) to ensure that at key stages local people were consulted and able to influence the focus of the LNP.
- 1.3 In June/July 2018 there was consultation on the proposed site allocations.
- 1.4 Consultation on the emerging Bassetlaw District Council (BDC) Local Plan is part of the timeline because feedback from Lound Parish Council on the implications of the 20% growth requirements contributed to a rethink at District level on the scale of growth acceptable in smaller settlements like Lound.

### Timeline: Consultation and Engagement up to Regulation 14

Date	What	Description	Consultation
Autumn 2015	Initial questionnaire	Seeking views on the future of the village	Sent with the Crier to all residents by the Parish Council
22 December 2015	Open meeting	Decision taken to create a Neighbourhood Plan	Organised by the Parish Council and all residents invited
20 January 2016	Meeting	Formation of Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. Scope and mandate determined	Organised by the Steering Group and interested residents
May / June 2016	Residents' Survey	More detailed survey with doorstep delivery and collection. Report published in January 2107, showing 23 suggested sites for potential development	Replies received from 82% of occupied households

<b>Date</b>	<b>What</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Consultation</b>
November 2016	Survey of Businesses, Clubs and Associations	Personal interviews held in nearly all cases. Report published in January 2017	22 organisations contacted
16 February 2017	Open meeting	Presentations and discussions on the results of the surveys and the way forward	All residents invited to attend via Crier, website and notice boards
July 2017	Update	Sharing of the proposed Vision and Objectives	Information disseminated in the August Crier and on the website
June 2018	Invitations to up-coming events for consultation on sites with information	The two events were to share information about potential development sites and to give residents the opportunity to express their views	Published on the village website plus Article in Crier and information sheet delivered to every home
June 2018	Publication of reports	Reports from statutory consultees and from AECOM's site assessment work	Published on the village website
16 June 2018	First public event for consultation on sites	Reduction of sites from 23 to 9 explained. Details of the 9 sites provided. Residents asked to complete a form expressing their views and preferences on the sites	All residents were invited to attend
June 2018	Dissemination of information	Documents, including site details, from the consultation meeting	Published on the village website
July 2018	Follow-up article	Report of the first meeting and a reminder of the second event	Published in the Crier
5 July 2018	Second public consultation event	Format similar to the first event	All residents were invited to attend
July 2018	Results of public consultation on sites	Analysis showed the preferences for and against the 9 sites	Published on the village website
1 August 2018	Results of public consultation on sites	The above numerical results were also publicised in the Crier	Published in the Crier
October 2018	Publication of reports from BDC	A second round of reports from statutory consultees	Published on the village website
October 2018	Results of public consultation on sites	A detailed analysis of the comments from residents following the above consultation events on the 5 most preferred sites	Published on the village website

<b>Date</b>	<b>What</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Consultation</b>
1 November 2018	Public notice	Announcement of the results of the analysis from public consultation on sites and containing extracts from it	Distributed with the November Crier and published on the village website
1 January 2019	Article	Announcement of BDC's latest Local Development Plan and a public consultation event in Lound run by BDC	Published in the Crier
January 2019	Design Code	The report from AECOM of their Design Code work	Document published on the village website
1 February 2019	Article	A reminder of the forthcoming public event run by BDC	Published in the Crier
12 February 2019	Public event	Presentation by BDC of Bassetlaw's Local Plan. Some interpretation by the Steering Group and discussion on what this will mean for housing development in Lound	All residents were encouraged to attend
1 December 2019	Article	Update describing the work done over the year in preparing a Pre-Submission Draft of the Neighbourhood Plan. The proposed changes to site NP21 (south) described	Published in the Crier and on the village website
1 February 2020	Article	Update urging Parishioners to object to the increased number of houses required for Lound in the latest Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (January 2020)	Published in the Crier and on the village website
March 2020	Sustainability Appraisal - Scoping Report	The publication of the final version of this report	Document published on the village website
August 2020	Pre-Submission Draft of the Neighbourhood Plan	The publication of the Draft Plan for the Regulation 14 Consultation, based on a 10% increase in housing	Document published on the village website. Hard copies made available
1 August 2020	Regulation 14 Consultation	A description of the consultation and how to take part, together with extracts from the 15 Policies contained in the Plan. The two public events were publicised	Published in the Crier and on the village website. BDC contacted statutory consultees

<b>Date</b>	<b>What</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Consultation</b>
22 August 2020	First Regulation 14 exhibition event (socially distanced)	Information about the Lound Neighbourhood Plan and how it would be put into practice	All residents were invited to attend
1 September 2020	Follow-up article	A reminder of the second public event and an exhortation to participate as the consultation nears its conclusion	Published in the Crier
3 September 2020	Second Regulation 14 exhibition event (socially distanced)	Information about the Lound Neighbourhood Plan and how it would be put into practice	All residents were invited to attend
1 December 2020	Article	The results of the Regulation 14 Consultation, with a strong majority of residents supporting the Draft Lound Plan	Published in the Crier
December 2020	Report	A report on the Regulation 14 Consultation showing all the detailed comments from residents, statutory consultees and interested parties	Document published on the village website
December 2020	Consultation on the Level of Housing Development	Following the publication of the November 2020 Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan, residents were asked to express their preference for 5% housing development, rather than 10%	Published as a hand delivered Information Sheet to every household in the Parish
1 January 2021	Article	The results of the December consultation, with an overwhelming majority of residents in favour of 5% housing development, rather than 10%	Published in the Crier
January 2021	Report	A report on the consultation on the Level of Housing Development	Document published on the village website

## **Regulation 14 Consultation**

- 1.5 The Consultation period ran from 1<sup>st</sup> August 2020 to 30<sup>th</sup> September. The LNP Pre-Submission Draft and an explanatory flyer was placed on the Lound Village website.

- 1.6 The August edition of the Lound Crier listed the 15 policies, together with a few key words, describing their content. The Crier announced the consultation period and encouraged all interested parties to participate. The Crier was hand delivered to all residents.
- 1.7 In addition the Crier publicised two socially-distanced Exhibition events in Lound Village Hall as follows:
- Saturday 22 August 2020 from 2 pm to 4 pm (when 14 Parishioners attended) and
  - Thursday 3 September 2020 from 6 pm to 8 pm (when 11 Parishioners attended)
- 1.8 A shorter follow-up article, encouraging last-minute participation, appeared in the September Lound Crier.
- 1.9 Lound Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (LNPSG) consulted Parishioners, including residents involved with businesses, clubs and association in the village, via The Lound Crier, Lound Village website and Social Media
- 1.10 Lound Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group consulted the following Businesses, Clubs and Associations operating in the village, via hard copy leaflet drops and emails:

A.P.E. Coppice Resources Sutton Grange Services Sutton Grange AD Sutton Grange Energy G. Williams Grain Storage Forever Fuels Fred Walter & Sons Ltd Charcon Construction Solutions	Wright Equestrian FCC Environment <b>Acknowledgement only</b> Severn Trent Water MPS Care Limited M & K Hurst Lee Farms Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust <b>Replied</b> Lound Water Ski Club Sutton-cum-Lound Parochial Church Council
---	--

- 1.11 Bassetlaw District Council consulted the following Statutory Consultees on behalf of the Steering Group:

BDC Strategic Housing BDC Planning Policy <b>Replied</b> BDC Conservation <b>Replied</b> BDC Development Management <b>Replied</b> BDC Estates NCC Highways <b>Replied</b> NCC Planning Policy <b>Replied</b> NCC Public Health National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups Canal and River Trust <b>Replied</b> Environment Agency Natural England <b>Replied</b> NFU NHS Property Services	Internal Drainage Board Coal Authority <b>Replied</b> Sport England <b>Replied</b> Highways England <b>Replied</b> Historic England <b>Replied</b> Sustrans Anglian Water <b>Replied</b> Severn Trent Water <b>Replied</b> Cadent Gas National Grid <b>Replied</b> Western Power Hayton Parish Council Sutton Parish Council Torworth Parish Council Ranskill Parish Council Mattersey Parish Council
---	--

## The Results

- A total of **68** responses were received to this consultation
- **15** of these were from statutory consultees
- The remaining **53** replies were from Residents, representing the views of **86** people

1.12 The following table reflects the views of these Residents within six broad categories:

Serial Number	Number of Residents	Views
1	1	Oppose any new housing development in Lound and oppose the development of a Neighbourhood Plan
2	6	Oppose any new housing development in Lound
3	3	Oppose any new housing development in Lound but, if some growth is inevitable, are prepared to support the Draft Lound Plan and its limited aim for 21 new dwellings only, this being the number identified as required. This development would be subject to a number of detailed policies within the Plan designed to ensure the special historic rural character of Lound is protected
4	61	Support the Draft Lound Plan and its limited aim for 21 new dwellings only, this being the number identified as required. This development would be subject to a number of detailed policies within the plan designed to ensure the special historic rural character of Lound is protected
5	13	Oppose that aspect of the Plan which concerns development adjacent to their home
6	2	Support the building of more new homes than the required 21 dwellings envisaged in the Draft Lound Plan
Total	86	

1.13 The details of all the responses are shown in the two tables below. All correspondence was by emails, backed up by telephone calls and face-to-face conversations.



**Regulation 14 Consultation Event Lound Village Hall August 2020 (socially distanced)**



## Detailed Responses to the Regulation 14 Consultation<sup>1</sup>

S/N	No of Residents	Date	Comments from Residents	Plan Amendments
R1	1	010820	May I take this opportunity to confirm to you and the remainder of the Lound village Steering Group that I fully support paragraph 11 of the Draft plan in its endeavour to protect Lound village and its surrounding countryside from inappropriate development	Noted, no changes required
R2	2	020820	Having looked at the Lound Neighbourhood Plan, we would like to confirm that we agree that a growth of up to 10% is sustainable and of a suitable amount for Lound. We believe that any more than this would put too much strain on our limited local resources. Thank you for passing on our views	Noted, no changes required
R3	1	040820	Having read the Lound Neighbourhood Draft Plan in detail, I write to congratulate the planning team on the production of an excellent document. It has my full support. In particular, I noted the sensitive, excellent public consultation about where new housing might be located. The outcome of the consultation will have pleased the vast majority of the village's population, precisely because decisions have been based on what Lound residents want to see in the future. The number of new houses to be built is completely appropriate given the size, amenities and other village features. Indeed, to increase the number of houses would be to put to one side years of careful community-oriented work and Lound residents' clear views. Thank you for your work	Noted, no changes required
R4	1	050820	Six months ago, the steering group informed The Parish Council that its work was now stalled. Having reached impasse, due to Bassetlaw District Councils unreasonable demand for housing development, and Lound villages well documented opposition to development. So, what has changed. Did the vote take place to change Bassetlaw's core planning strategy? Has BDC climbed down from its unreasonable demands for housing. Or have Lound residents capitulated from the need to protect the village from speculative development? I just do not understand what possible motive there can be to continue carrying on with the plan, when LNP steering group committee calls the situation an	Noted, no changes required See footnote below

<sup>1</sup> In November 2020, after the Reg 14 consultation had ended, BDC produced an amended Draft Local Plan that reduced the housing requirement figure in Lound to 10 dwellings (equivalent to 5% growth). A further consultation on the reduction in the housing requirement was undertaken and feedback was that 5% was the preferred growth level. Where resident feedback is for fewer dwellings than proposed in the Pre-Submission Draft it is considered that this matter has been addressed in the Submission Plan.

S/N	No of Residents	Date	Comments from Residents	Plan Amendments
			<p>impasse and against residents' wishes. The gall then of asking residents now to back it, when it is no more than a mandate for development in itself, "Turkeys voting for Christmas" springs to mind. The plan over the years has morphed from the intention to protect our village from speculative development, to one that now outlines what to build, how many to build, where to build them. A blatant case of Gamekeeper turned poacher. Less than 20% of the 71 listed settlements in Bassetlaw have completed neighbourhood plans. The few that do, appear to attract development more than those that don't. Just look at Sutton, Ranskill and Barnby Moor. Not exactly local shining examples of affordable housing for rural young first time buyers. Or desirable locations, for single parent families to live. Our beautiful village has a charm and reason for its being. It merits all the protection we can give it. Obviously not a concept understood in Worksop. As you probably aware by now, I am not a fan of neighbourhood plans. For me Lound's plan has lost its way, lost credibility, and along the way lost the confidence of its residents. Calling unnecessary meetings at the time this of pandemic and government concern is irresponsible. Any actions resulting from the meetings would disenfranchise the elderly, vulnerable, and computer illiterate. To discredit the resolve of residents to protect the village that resulted from the 2016 residents' survey would be a waste of money and time. There are also rules for meetings of compliance, conformance, disclosure of interests and involvements. Any enmity and division within a community must be avoided. A caring community is all important, particularly at this time. I have copied the text of this input to the Parish Council</p>	
R5	1	050820	<p>Thank you very much for all the hard work that you &amp; the other members of your Steering Group have put into producing this document. I think this is something of which we as a village can be can justly proud. I agree with your proposal to limit the number of new buildings built during the life of the plan to be no more than 21</p>	Noted, no changes required
R6	1	060820	<p>The Draft Neighbourhood Plan for Lound is very good, reflecting residents' views about housing allocations and other important matters. The extensive public consultation that took place was crucial to the acceptance of the plan within the village. We now know where 21 houses should be located and, crucially, that village infrastructure is adequate to support them. A greater number of properties, other than any planned for 'infill sites', would be wholly inappropriate. I support the Draft plan strongly</p>	Noted, no changes required
R7	1	060820	<p>I have read the January 2017 results of the survey and agree totally with the "obvious emphatic resistance to any change". The report represents my opinion that the number of new houses should be the absolute minimum considering that the Village does not provide</p>	Following the amendment to the Draft

S/N	No of Residents	Date	Comments from Residents	Plan Amendments
			even the basic requirements eg bus services, Doctor's surgery, shop, decent mobile reception or broadband, car parking and the sewerage and drainage are totally inadequate even with the present number of houses. I am in agreement with the policies 1-15. Policies 1,5,7 and 8 refer to the street scene which must be preserved or enhanced. The materials and design and boundary fences must be complimentary to the existing properties on Town Street. The 5 houses built on the main road into Barnby Moor and the new properties on Mattersey Road Everton are totally inappropriate, in their design and materials used, to their surroundings of a small Nottinghamshire Village and this must not be permitted in our Village. I am concerned that policy 11 NP02 allows 5 dwellings. This development will probably result in the provision (unnecessary in my opinion) of a pavement with the removal of hedges and the resulting deleterious effect on the entrance to Lound	Bassetlaw Local Plan November 2020 NP02 has been removed.
R8	1	110820	As requested, my views on the Lound Neighbourhood Plan, I agree with the 21 dwellings planned, this in my view is a reasonable increase and in proportion with the present size of the Village. I would oppose a higher number of dwellings as having too much impact on the size and facilities of Lound. My only suggestion is to perhaps include bungalows here and there, though I know they take up more land and may not be popular. Thank you for all your hard work	Policy 10 <sup>2</sup> house types recognises that Lound has an ageing population and that accessible houses are needed Policy 14 (NP21 south) supports the provision of two bungalows.
R9	1	170820	I fully support the Draft Neighbourhood Plan as shown on the Village Website. I commend the Steering Group for its stance regarding the number of new dwellings proposed for Lound. A figure of 21 new dwellings to be built within the lifetime of the Plan is realistic, sustainable and should be acceptable to the majority of Lound residents, who have expressed the wish to see the village unchanged. Any attempts to increase development beyond this figure at the present time would impinge upon the character of the village and the safety and comfort of its residents	Noted, no changes required

<sup>2</sup> All Policy and paragraph numbers refer to the new policy and paragraph numbers in the submitted LNP

S/N	No of Residents	Date	Comments from Residents	Plan Amendments
R10	2	170820	We strongly object with any further building in our rural village. The impact it would have on the roads, is totally unreasonable, based on the fact that the road is single track in places. There are no facilities other than the Bluebell. It's just not viable to congest our narrow roads further	The reduction in growth allowance in the Draft Local Plan reflects the feedback BDC got from Lound residents.
R11	1	180820	I have read through the Pre-submission Draft of our Plan and am satisfied with it. I am pleased the Steering Group and the Parish Council have stayed true to the principle of respecting the wishes of Lound parishioners regarding proposed new development. The Draft NP is realistic and sustainable. An additional housing requirement of 10%, i.e., 21 new homes to be built within the period covered by the Plan, appears fully acceptable to the majority of residents. The sites proposed, if developed using the Policies contained in the Plan, will enhance rather than detract from the rural character of the village. Local amenities would not support a higher rate of development without seriously affecting the safety and quality of life of Lound's residents. I sincerely hope that officers at Bassetlaw District Council will take heed of the strong public opinion that future development should be both appropriate and sustainable	The NP has decided to follow BDC's 5% requirement so the housing requirement figure is now only 10.
R12	2	180820	We support the provisions of the Lound Draft Plan, which provides for 10% housing development in the village. We believe that this is the maximum that Lound can accommodate, given its very limited amenities and its network of narrow roads. The Sustainability Appraisal – Scoping Report 2019 listed at the top of page 5 of the Draft Plan should have a footnote with a link to the document	Footnote and link added
R13	1	190820	I just wanted to drop you and email to confirm that I fully support the Lound Neighbourhood Plan and particularly that a 10% increase (and no more) would be sustainable in the village. I agree with all elements of the plan and believe that any further development would be of great detriment to the fabric of this wonderful village. Thank you for all your hard work and those of the team, it is greatly appreciated	Noted, no changes required
R14	1	190820	Further to the August Crier I write to advise I was not in favour of any development in Lound at the start of the Neighbourhood Plan process. My opinion has not changed and believe any further development will spoil the unique character of our small village. However, I support the steering group and all the hard work done and endorse its approach and local	The reduction in growth allowance in the Draft Local Plan reflects the feedback BDC

S/N	No of Residents	Date	Comments from Residents	Plan Amendments
			opinion that the growth in housing stock should be no more than 21 dwellings, this being 10% maximum sustainable growth figure	got from Lound residents.
R15	2	190820	As long-time residents of Lound we would strongly endorse our support of the Lound Neighbourhood Plan Paragraph 11, which identifies a housing growth of 10% i.e., 21 dwellings. This confirms the wish of the majority of respondents in the village and reflects the limited local facilities. Any increase would certainly not be sustainable and we consider it totally unacceptable	Noted, no changes required
R16	2	200820	For information of the Steering Group. We believe that a maximum increase of 10% in housing stock for Lound would be sustainable and proportionate with regards to the extent of local facilities and amenities	Noted, no changes required
R17	1	210820	In response to your article in Augusts Crier regarding the proposed sites for new housing in Lound & the numbers that might be built. I still feel that any future building in our lovely village will be detrimental to its charm & rustic character. This has already been changed over the years, due to the amount of infill on any existing vacant plots of land here. So, I am far from happy about the 10% increase, or 21 houses that have been suggested. I do however realise the amount of work & time given by all the village steering group regarding the above, a far from easy task to be involved with. What became of all the information & consultations that went into Lound's Village Design Statement done in November 2007, will this be the same?? So I shall wait & see what Bassetlaw District Council Planning Department finally decide, but it will be a NO from me	The reduction in growth allowance in the Draft Local Plan reflects the feedback BDC got from Lound residents.
R18	2	220820	We fully support the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, particularly the recommendation for no more than a 10% increase. We both strongly feel that, due to limited infrastructure and lack of public transport or essential facilities within or close to the village, more than 21 houses would be unsustainable. We would strongly oppose any development proposals that would exceed the Plan's recommendation. Not least because that would also destroy the character of the village, as well as the community cohesion which has been so amply demonstrated in response to the Covid19 pandemic over the last few months	Noted, no changes required
R19	2	230820	We fully endorse the village plan in its current form. The 21 dwellings proposed would certainly be the limit for development at the present time. Any more would severely strain the local infrastructure, and change the character of the village. Town Street is a bus route and in several places is narrow enough to cause problems already on occasion. If there were to be a significant increase in traffic through the village there would certainly be difficulties. The final list of proposed sites for development and the nature of those	Noted, no changes required

S/N	No of Residents	Date	Comments from Residents	Plan Amendments
			developments seems practical and appropriate and the preservation of green sites is important in preserving the character of the village, a large part of which is a conservation area. The nearest area to us is NP12 where a single building is proposed. We would fully support this, but access for a larger development would cause a problem and we would definitely strongly oppose any increase	
R20	2	230820	As life-long residents we fully support the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, particularly the recommendation for no more than 10% increase. We would most definitely oppose any development proposals that would exceed the Plan's recommendation. This would spoil the character of this small rural community, notwithstanding the lack of public transport, also poor road networks which would not support any heavier usage, and the lack of quality infrastructure to supply greater use of water, sewage etc. Lound does not have any essential facilities neither in or close to the village	Noted, no changes required
R21	2	230820	We have studied the Draft Plan and concur with local opinion that the housing requirement for Lound of twenty one dwellings is sustainable and reasonable. We further have no adverse comments about the identified sites and therefore are pleased to endorse the Draft. We feel that the Steering Group have handled this lengthy process very well. Thank you	Noted, no changes required
R22	2	230820	As a resident of Lound for 59 years I have always loved living in this special village. Many visitors remark on how lovely the village is! I was serving on the Parish Council when we were informed that we should produce and adopt a Village Neighbourhood Plan. I was very sceptical at the time as only a few years previously, Bassetlaw District Council deemed that Lound was one of those villages in which there should be no development because it would be unsustainable. The village plan would have to have at least a 10% increase in the number of dwellings as I remember. Anything less was not an option. The village had a vote and decided to go with the 10% increase, i.e. 21 new dwellings with many villagers against this amount as being too many. I was dismayed to then hear that Bassetlaw want a 20% increase. Surely this goes against the principles of having a Village Plan? We only have a few Green spaces in the village and I would like to see those remain. I support all the work that the Steering Committee has done and believe that the 21 extra dwellings is the maximum that this village could accommodate	Noted, no changes required
R23	2	250820	Our response to the proposals in Lound's Draft Neighbourhood Plan is that we support a requirement for 21 additional dwellings in the village, ie 10%. A larger number would be excessive given the character of Lound. 10% would be eminently more sustainable and proportionate to the extent of facilities available locally	Noted, no changes required

S/N	No of Residents	Date	Comments from Residents	Plan Amendments
R24	1	310820	I believe that given the narrow roads and minimum facilities in Lound that a maximum number of new builds that would be sustainable would be 10%. There should be a mix of dwellings taking account of the local character and building styles. Smaller dwellings (2/3 bedrooms) are particularly needed	Noted and the NP supports the focus on smaller dwellings.
R25	2	310820	Our view from Little Top Lane is that the current plan is about right. We ideally wouldn't want any new builds due to noise etc but as a reasonable compromise are happy to support the Draft neighbourhood plan	Noted, no changes required
R26	1	010920	Given the nature of our village infrastructure my opinion is that no further housing development should take place in Lound	The reduction in growth allowance in the Draft Local Plan reflects the feedback BDC got from Lound residents.
R27	1	010920	In response to the Neighbourhood Plan detailed in the Crier I consider the balance of new housing at 10% is the right way forward	Noted, no changes required
R28	2	020920	We support the Draft Lound Neighbourhood Plan, and especially the Plan's desire to restrict new houses to up to 21 and definitely NO MORE! We do not believe the Lound infrastructure can support more than 21 new houses	Noted, no changes required
R29	1	020920	I am in support of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan as proposed. I would obviously wish to conserve the village's heritage and appearance by ideally reducing development to a bare minimum. Given recent proposals by Bassetlaw District Council in regard to the Local Plan and other Government's proposals I believe the Draft achieves a fair balance	Noted, no changes required
R30	1	030920	Thank you so much for the hard work that you and your colleagues have done in order to create the Lound Neighbourhood Plan. It is a shame that the sites chosen by the villagers are all on the periphery of the village causing unnecessary sprawl. I support the Plan's view that no more than a 10% increase in the number of houses in the village is supportable, and that Bassetlaw District Councils requirement for more is not justifiable. Their own figures show that there is no need for such a requirement	Noted, no changes required
R31	1	030920	It has been interesting to read the Lound Neighbourhood Plan. I support the Plan's view that no more than a 10% increase in the number of houses in the village is supportable, and that Bassetlaw District Councils requirement for more is not justifiable. Their own figures show that there is no need for such a requirement. I note that the sites chosen by the villagers are	Noted, no changes required



S/N	No of Residents	Date	Comments from Residents	Plan Amendments
			all on the periphery of the village. I feel that infill may have been more appropriate rather than extending the village	
R32	5	030920	Thanks to the committee for a very comprehensive Draft. The proposal for 5 houses at site NP02 directly abuts our property. So, we have been opposed to any proposal for this site throughout as it directly affects us. It is also a green field site which should not be developed if possible. A very slim majority of villagers voted for this site in the first place. Sections of land have been ruled out as they affect the general aspect of the village and I believe this site should be one of those. While we can see why this site was chosen as it is out of the way of a lot of the village, I will be objecting to any planning proposals if they are forthcoming once the Lound NP has been adopted	NP02 has been removed from the Submission version due to the reduction in the housing requirement in the Draft Local Plan.
R33	1	060920	I would like to thank the Steering Group for their hard work in putting together an impressive Lound village plan. Would you kindly put forward to BDC my views concerning the proposals? I give my full support to the Plan as it stands with a 10% cap on building. I do not support any increase on this cap as BDC proposes. The village is classed as a small rural settlement anything above 10% would be out of proportion and unsustainable. We have no village amenities except the pub and the infrastructure particularly drainage, water pressure and transport are already inadequate for our needs. The approaches to the village are narrow undulating with some blind spots on entering the village itself. An increase in traffic with a greater percentage of houses will not only be detrimental to the environment but also increase risk and danger to the villagers, walkers and bikers that pass through. The paths in the village are limited to one side, narrow and uneven and not suitable for a considerable increase in footfall. The village attractiveness is its small compact character with farm field approaches. A 20% increase in density will not reflect our local distinctiveness. The majority of the village voted for little or no development. The proposal of a 10% increase is a compromise some of us are willing to accept but no more than that. The village may not be able to sustain affordable housing but any development should be mindful of the needs of an ageing population with perhaps smaller houses and bungalows for villagers to downsize	Noted, no changes required
R34	1	060920	I'd like to confirm that I support the Steering Group recommendation to plan for a 10% increase in housing within the village (21 houses). I believe that our infrastructure is unsuitable for any increase on this. I would like to see all new housing built in such a way that it supports the UK's target of net zero by 2050, therefore my preference would be for all new homes to be extremely energy efficient and to preferably be heated by new technology	Policy 8 supports the construction of low carbon homes.

S/N	No of Residents	Date	Comments from Residents	Plan Amendments
			such as heat pumps rather than traditional gas or oil systems. I would also be supportive of any future plans for local energy generation, for example solar/wind, again only if they were in line with the UK's net zero target. Many thanks to the Steering Group for all their work in creating the plan for Lound	
R35	1	070920	I would like to thank the Steering Group for all their time and efforts in putting together the Plan. Would you please pass on my views and concerns to BDC regarding this? I am prepared to support the plan if it is limited to a 10% building cap and am strictly against the BDC proposal of a 20% cap. I along with a considerable majority of villagers voted for no or very limited building. The village is small, peaceful and compact. This is part of its attractiveness and uniqueness. The village would lose its local distinctiveness if the larger percentage was imposed. Village amenities are limited to a pub and the infrastructure is already not meeting our needs. Poor drainage leads to localised flooding down Chainbridge Avenue and on the low road approach to the village. More than 10% of housing will increase problems we already have with sewage disposal, water pressure and main drains. Previously planning has been refused in the village precisely for these poor amenities and infrastructure. The approach roads into the village are narrow, undulating and dangerous in places with blind bends and hills. Additional traffic on these roads will put villagers at greater risk and increase noise and air pollution. The pavements are limited to one side of the road and are uneven and narrow this further increases hazards for pedestrians. The attractiveness of the village is its tree lined and farmland approaches. A 20% increase in housing would spoil its landscape character and create a density of housing which is unsustainable and undesired. Finally BDC need to be mindful that a 10% housing cap was already a compromise from the starting point of no or minimal housing that the majority voted for	Noted, no changes required
R36	1	070920	I wish to add my objections to an increase in the amount of new building developments in Lound. 10% is quite a significant increase in our small village. To increase this to 20% is highly unacceptable and would have a detrimental effect on the locality. I trust that the local opinions will be taken into consideration by the council	Noted, no changes required
R37	1	080920	I would like to register my support for the Lound Neighbourhood plan. I believe that the level of housing stock required in Lound at 10% max is sustainable, will not adversely affect the village and is the way forward	Noted, no changes required
R38	4	090920	I am going to struggle to write this without sounding like a complete NIMBY especially as one site will affect us in a negative way, however I feel there are some important points not	The reduction in growth allowance

S/N	No of Residents	Date	Comments from Residents	Plan Amendments
			<p>just for us but village wide. We all understand there is a shortage of housing in the UK however the shortage is for affordable starter homes not 4/5 bedroom mansions and the developers are exploiting the under 9 dwelling loopholes in villages such as Sutton and Everton and we moved to Lound as the negative effect of over developing a small village (Everton). We believe the main danger is the expansion beyond current village limits, especially towards the main road as this then sets a president to develop the green belt that separates and makes us a village. On a safety point the roads in and out of the village beyond the 30mph limit don't have footpaths and are already narrow especially when busses, tractors and the odd sat nav lost cement truck, this is a real danger for those walking into the village to access the bus stop etc. On an ecology front the green belt has supported broods of English partridges along with Barn Owls, Kestrels and Grass snakes. We also found for the first time a Common Lizard (not so common) one of the UKs only 3 species. As a household we strongly believe that developments beyond one or two properties in any one place would have a negative effect on the village as a whole and there are sites within the village limits that can accommodate this. Well I failed on the NIMBY front however as one site is literally in our back yard so to speak I feel it's justified. I hope our comments are received and understood in the way we hoped, we have first-hand experience of a village over developing too much too fast and would hate for Lound go the same way</p>	means the village will only grow by 5%. The plan supports the provision of smaller dwellings (2/3 bed).
R39	2	090920	<p>We would like to register our comments as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We are generally in agreement with the NP as currently Drafted with a build of ca 21 new houses in various locations across the village.</li> <li>2. We struggle to see how the existing village infrastructure could support any additional houses (a further 10%, i.e up to 50 new houses) in addition to those set out in the NP.</li> <li>3. There are already a number of traffic pinch points along the entire length of Town Street and evidence of speeding motorists.</li> <li>4. Roadside flooding is prevalent at a number of locations through the village and the STW plant appears to be at capacity.</li> <li>5. The village doesn't have sufficient infrastructure (for example bus services, shops and Broadband) to support the existing population even before any increase from the NP or the further increase proposed by Bassetlaw.</li> <li>6. Can the local schools (in particular preschool and primary) cope with the potential increase in the number of children in Lound and the surrounding villages, for example,</li> </ol>	Noted, no changes required

S/N	No of Residents	Date	Comments from Residents	Plan Amendments
			<p>Sutton cum Lound?</p> <p>We are conscious of the need for additional housing on a national basis and the Draft NP for 21 houses to be built we feel has been well researched and considered and they would be a discreet addition to the village. We fear that any substantial increase in the number of new houses beyond this is likely to compromise the character of the village and put a further strain on its infrastructure</p>	
R40	3	100920	As a family of three adults we all agree with the Steering Group in Lound that a 10% increase ie 21 houses is appropriate. We feel that the infrastructure of the village and lack of amenities could not sustain any more than this	Noted, no changes required
R41	1	110920	Thank you for looking after our village regarding future development, you are doing a good job with all the information provided. I am an avid "leave our lovely village alone" person and would prefer no more building in our small village but I feel that the Parish Council has come up with the right balance of 21 houses to be built - at the most! - in contribution to the housing shortage	Noted, no changes required
R42	1	110920	As you are aware, I actually disagreed with the ranking of the sites within the village plan and do not think that the location adjacent to The Paddocks is appropriate as the next development - but that is water under the bridge. Had I been a villager in the 1960s, I would have been opposed to The Paddocks. As far as development as a whole is concerned, I feel that the current ad hoc system where individual developments are considered on merit is best - and that larger scale expansion of the village is not in the interest of current inhabitants. My last perusing of development statistics for Bassetlaw indicated that a blanket percentage increase was being applied to each community throughout the region. This is an easy solution for the planners despite differences in circumstances - i.e. whether or not expansion is appropriate for each community. Yesterday, after walking to collect my papers just after 8.00am, buses were hampered by the narrowness of the main street as a wagon was unloading scaffolding for the ex-council houses opposite Pinfold Close. This morning, a school bus had to reverse, turn round, retrace its steps and go back to the main road due to a builder's merchants wagon unloading materials onto the building site opposite Pinfold. I did not see what happened to the service bus which is scheduled for about the same time. Our main street is too narrow for the current situation and is not appropriate for an enlarged community	The reduction in growth allowance in the Draft Local Plan reflects the feedback BDC got from Lound residents.

S/N	No of Residents	Date	Comments from Residents	Plan Amendments
R43	2	110920	Having read the neighbourhood plan, we agree with the committee that 10% new housing is the absolute limit for a village of this size. We have few facilities for a greater increase than 10% and we feel that the village cannot accommodate any more residents than that	Noted, no changes required
R44	1	110920	I have lived in the village for over 15 years and have no desire to see it expand, especially near our home in The Paddocks where there is a proposed site. If it is inevitable that there must be expansion, I would object less to the bare minimum of 10% increase in housing stock	Noted, no changes required
R45	2	130920	<p>Following our attendance at the open evening and having read the Draft neighbourhood plan for the village we would like to make the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is our understanding that Bassetlaw District Council require rural villages to allocate sites for development at 20% of the current properties. This Draft does not even achieve 10% and relies on "windfall development" to make up almost a quarter of your targeted 10%. The Draft plan states that 19 new properties were added to the village between 2001 and 2011. We have lived here for most of this period and cannot identify this number of properties. This would have been a 10% increase in 10 years which has not had any noticeable impact.</li> <li>2. The Draft plan states a requirement in the village for 2/3 bed smaller dwellings for young families and people downsizing. Only a half of one proposed site identified for development meets this requirement.</li> <li>3. The plan also calls for new properties close to the centre of the village and amenities i.e. pub, village hall and playground/ green. All four sites identified in the plan are on the outer edges of the village.</li> <li>4. Drainage is identified as a constraint for development in the village. However, it is our understanding that all new development taking place in Sutton is coming through the Lound foul drain system. Why should this be identified as a reason to restrict future development in Lound and not Sutton?</li> <li>5. The "narrow historic lane" of Town Street is identified in the plan as a further constraint yet all the proposed sites except one would lead to additional commuter and local traffic on Town Street.</li> <li>6. We disagree with the areas used for site densities. Map 4 in the plan identifies a housing density for Chainbridge Lane / Daneshill Road which encompasses playing fields, the green and pony paddocks in with the small number of houses. Surely any development off Chainbridge Lane should reflect the density of adjacent properties along Town Street.</li> </ol>	<p>LNP amended to meet BDC's reduced growth allowance – NP21 includes provision for two bungalows and Policy 10 requires development to meet local need.</p> <p>Density of character area for Chainbridge</p>

S/N	No of Residents	Date	Comments from Residents	Plan Amendments
			We appreciate the time and effort that has been put into developing this plan however by slavishly adhering to the 10% goal we feel the plan will fail to be adopted by BDC and the village will be left exposed to unplanned development. Alternatively, the sites identified will be developed at a much higher density and not in keeping with what has been proposed in the neighbourhood plan. Obviously, we are writing as the owners of a site identified in public consultation as the fifth preferred site for possible development in the village. This site was dismissed at the time as the number of properties proposed would mean the 10% goal was exceeded. Given the new requirement for 20% we would welcome the opportunity for our site to be identified in the neighbourhood plan for possible future development should the necessary development goal for Lound be greater than 10%. 6 pages of further comment are available from this respondent in Appendix 1 below.	amended to remove fields.
R46	2	130920	We acknowledge the need to contribute to the development of suitable housing nationally and our view is that our village steering group have worked hard to establish a reasonable plan for development. We are concerned that local infrastructure only just meets current demands and any significant increase in the number of homes in the village would require further development of local services and improvements to local roads which are already unable to cope with excessive traffic. A balanced approach would include an increase in housing stock but should not exceed the 10% (21 houses) as recommended by the steering group. Development beyond this figure would be inappropriate and significantly damage the village and surroundings	Noted, no changes required
R47	1	130920	Just a few observations and comments regarding the NP Draft. As you know my main concerns and interest has and has always been NP12. Therefore my concerns regarding NP12 are as follows:- Infill Development - If and when a single dwelling is built on the eastern boundary of NP12 potentially the land between it and the existing properties, i.e. The Paddocks and other properties surrounding NP12 could trigger infill development. Neighbourhood planning policy 2, should be strictly adhered to. I have in the past objected to the Aecom report specifically to a section within NP12 Key frontages and edge treatments. This is within appendix D specific extracts for the site allocations from the code. This shows a boundary in key code orange that states future development to respond to the street. This key is not appropriate considering that a single dwelling on NP12 has been allocated. This could have been amended after our comments at the time but our concerns were dismissed. My concerns regarding this matter still stands. The most popular walk for the residents of Lound is Town	Due to the reduction in the housing growth allowance, NP12 has been removed.

S/N	No of Residents	Date	Comments from Residents	Plan Amendments
			<p>Street north past my property via Lound Grange onto the lakes. This for some reason has not been mentioned when other walks have been included. Any development on NP12 would have a negative visual impact (ref 10 KV5). This fact is highlighted within the NP Draft Example 2, green gap between The Paddocks and Lound Grange Farm.</p> <p>General comments on the Draft - The Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan requires the Parish to provide 21 new dwellings in the period 2020-2035. Given the fact that Lound has an ageing population it is important that at least some part of future development is set aside for old age properties. I simply mention this because past development has been upmarket types of build such as the infills within Lound and recent developments at Sutton - some are currently on the market for over half a million pounds. If these examples were to be built within Lound then it would be building for profit and not for local needs. I have read the Draft plan in its entirety so apart from the comments I have previously made the plan seems to be satisfactory and generally meets with my approval. I appreciate all the hard work that has gone into the Draft Plan to date and hope that the Residents of Lound respond to it favourably</p>	<p>Policy 10 requires housing type to meet local need and encourages the construction of smaller dwellings and NP21 south allocates the site for two bungalows.</p>
R48	2	140920	<p>As relative newcomers to Lound we never got to comment on the neighbourhood plan at the first attempt. I have not read it in its entirety but fully accept that there is a need for communities to develop and expand in line with the expected population growth. My main concern with the plan is site NP02 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) I am not convinced that the site can be accessed safely for five houses. We previously lived in Clayworth in a small number of barn conversions (4 plus a farm) which generated a surprisingly high volume of traffic for five properties (9 cars). The junction to the main road to that development was in a much safer and central position than any junction would be for site NP02 and a lot further away from a National Speed Limit road. The road for site NP02 is particularly narrow in that area and I think there would need to be considerable engineering works from the Local Authority to make a junction in that area viable;</li> <li>(2) Having lived in a house which had a public footpath running past it, this is again likely to be an issue in terms of privacy and the potential for crime (it is another escape route and a short distance to the main road).</li> <li>(3) This site would increase the village footprint (or the building footprint within the village). One of the big plusses at the minute is that the village is largely invisible from Mattersey Road and you almost have to know it is here for it to be seen. I think</li> </ul>	<p>Due to the reduction in the housing growth allowance NP02 has been removed.</p>

S/N	No of Residents	Date	Comments from Residents	Plan Amendments
			<p>a development of two storey houses (in particular) would make the village a lot more visible from the main road and could attract unwanted visitors and the potential for crime in an area which has a really low crime rate. The same is not the case of the other roads which lead into the village.</p> <p>Other observations would be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) The focus is on two storey buildings yet there is an acknowledgement that one of the ways to encourage younger people to the village is downsizing in later life. Both sets of our parents are in their 70s and 80s and mobility is becoming an issue. I think some small single storey buildings or almost a retirement complex in keeping with the character of the village could be a very good idea. Another idea is that some of the two storey buildings could become single floor retirement properties (i.e. with a lift to the upper floor).</li> <li>(2) As the sites are in a rural area, the number of car parking spaces for each property will probably need to be higher than the national average (or what the Council suggests). This should hopefully prevent further problems with the number of cars parked on Town Street, although I don't anticipate that the sites would affect most of the village apart from in those specific areas (for NP02 it could increase any hazard if cars spill out for parking onto the main road).</li> <li>(3) For the larger site(s) could the village not consider asking the developer for a new village hall / facility to be built (in the same way that Gringley did – they have a badminton court in theirs). The village hall could then potentially be re-developed and included as a site.</li> <li>(4) Could the village not re-survey existing property owners to identify people who might be thinking of building in their gardens to see if they could be included as sites? (I can think of two houses in particular where the owners are thinking of putting property in their gardens or the nature of their properties would lend itself to it).</li> <li>(5) The intention of the plan is to provide an increase in living accommodation. Should extensions not be included on this – i.e. a 3 bed house (as ours is) extended into a 4 bed house (which we are starting work on next year) will provide an additional 25% living space in our house. Could those not be argued as already increasing the living space in the village.</li> <li>(6) The existing conservation zone only extends half way down our garden – could the village not look again at the conservation zone to see if that should be extended to</li> </ol>	<p>Policy 10 does require developers to meet local housing need and that need is for smaller accessible dwellings and NP21 south is allocated for two bungalows.</p> <p>To secure this sort of community planning gain would require a larger amount of housing than most of Lound residents want.</p> <p>The Conservation Area boundary is decided by BDC but your comment</p>



S/N	No of Residents	Date	Comments from Residents	Plan Amendments
			<p>include all of the gardens (and make sure there is a better control over the type and nature of properties being considered).</p> <p>(7) To what extent has the Travellers' site on Daneshill Road been considered? This presumably would explain the high proportion of Band A properties in Lound which could mean that Bassetlaw could accept or suggest larger properties over smaller ones</p>	is noted for when BDC do a review. The assessment of housing need is separate from the need for Gypsy and Traveller Sites.
R49	3	150920	Having read the Neighbourhood Plan we are of the opinion that 21 new houses in the village would be acceptable. Should you require a more detailed opinion we will be happy to supply	Noted, no changes required
R50	2	170920	Re Neighbourhood Plan, I feel that the proposed increase in housing should be kept to the minimum. Given that there are so few facilities in the village with even the pub closing more frequently it would require a much greater increase in traffic for incomers to fulfil their needs. The main road through is very narrow in places with a number of properties unable to see traffic approaching thus making any level of increase more dangerous for the rising number of young children in the village. The building of a significant number of houses in the village would be detrimental to current and future residents and should be avoided	The reduction in growth allowance in the Draft Local Plan reflects the feedback BDC got from Lound residents.
R51	2	180920	With regards the Plan as it stands, I agree with the choices made as to the sites put forward as being the most sensible options. I think it would be naive to think that it will please everyone. So, It is ultimately a compromise. However, I do recognise what has happened in other villages and feel there should be some official reserve list of plots for the additional housing that may/will be imposed upon us by Bassetlaw in the near future. What the village doesn't need is for a developer to come in and double the houses on the existing plots as it would possibly concentrate traffic and noise out of proportion to the rest of the village. As a suggestion for example having read through the surveys carried out by the village consultants, I notice that the three plots on little top lane were all put in the doubtful category as they were all assumed to front onto the Lane itself. However, it would be easy to join into the services on the Lane whilst creating an access along the back of the plots joining into Town Street nearer to Mattersey Road. This would then mean far less traffic potentially coming through the village centre Via Daneshill Road or the crossroads whilst the residents could have a walkway via Little Top Lane to the playing field, Village Hall and the Bluebell Pub. Obviously this is just one example and I am sure there could be more. One thing I didn't understand was the coloured maps differentiating area of the village and the inclusion	The LNPSG have followed the scale of growth proposed in the Draft BDC Local Plan which has reduced the number of houses required.

S/N	No of Residents	Date	Comments from Residents	Plan Amendments
			of the playing fields. Not sure why that was included at the exhibition. With a village our size it is vitally important to treat it as one area which would then enhance the existing character of the village without it losing some of its appeal	
R52	2	200920	The current infrastructure does not adequately support the existing community; any increase will only increase and will only aggravate the situation which has not been addressed during the 20 years we have lived here. Until this has been rectified, we object to any further new builds	The reduction in growth allowance in the Draft Local Plan reflects the feedback BDC got from Lound residents.
R53	2	300920	I'm just emailing to note my content with the Neighbourhood Plan for Lound. I think it presents a good balance between building new homes in places which are suitable whilst not trying to cram too many in which may have a detrimental impact on the village	Noted, no changes required

S/N and Respondent	Date	Summary of Comments from Statutory and Other Consultees	Plan Amendments
C1 Simon Tucker, Canal and River Trust	030820	Thank you for your consultation on the Lound Neighbourhood Plan. Having reviewed the location of the area covered by the Neighbourhood Plan and the location of our assets, I can confirm that the Canal & River Trust do not wish to provide comments in relation to the regulation 14 consultation	Noted, no changes required
C2 Clive Fletcher, Historic England	040820	Thank you for consulting us on the Lound Neighbourhood Plan. We do not wish to make any comments	Noted, no changes required
C3 Martin Green, NCC Highways	040820	I have been forwarded the neighbourhood plan consultation for consideration as per the email below. The County Council provided comments on potential neighbourhood plan allocations in 2018 and 2019. Some of these sites have now made it into the Draft plan. Each site is supported by a policy that requires satisfactory details of access which is welcomed. However, I do have the following comments. NP02 - Can the footway be provided? NP12 – The size and shape of the site has now changed. It would appear that access would be from Town Street adjacent the bus stop. It does not appear possible to provide safe access from that location	Both these sites have been removed from the Plan due to the reduction in growth requirement in BDC's Draft Local Plan.
C4 Ben Jones, Natural England	070820	<p><b>Lound Neighbourhood Plan: Draft Consultation (Reg 14). Natural England does not have any specific comments on this Draft neighbourhood plan.</b> However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan. For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: <a href="mailto:consultations@naturalengland.org.uk">consultations@naturalengland.org.uk</a></p> <p><b><u>Neighbourhood planning and the natural environment: information, issues and opportunities</u></b></p> <p><b>Natural environment information sources</b> The Magic<sup>1</sup> website will provide you with much of the nationally held natural environment data for your plan area.</p> <p><b>Natural environment issues to consider</b> The National Planning Policy Framework<sup>7</sup> sets out national planning policy on protecting and enhancing the natural environment. Planning Practice Guidance<sup>8</sup> sets out supporting guidance. <b>Your local planning authority should be able to provide you with further advice on the potential impacts of your plan or order on the natural environment and the need for any environmental assessments.</b></p>	The LNP refers to BDC's mapping which is based on magic map data. The environmental quality of Lound Parish is significant and the NP places great emphasis on the protection of this natural environment.

		<p><b>Landscape</b> - Your plans or orders may present opportunities to protect and enhance locally valued landscapes. You may want to consider identifying distinctive local landscape features or characteristics such as ponds, woodland or dry stone walls and think about how any new development proposals can respect and enhance local landscape character and distinctiveness. If you are proposing development within or close to a protected landscape (National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) or other sensitive location, we recommend that you carry out a landscape assessment of the proposal. Landscape assessments can help you to choose the most appropriate sites for development and help to avoid or minimise impacts of development on the landscape through careful siting, design and landscaping</p> <p><b>Wildlife habitats</b> - Some proposals can have adverse impacts on designated wildlife sites or other priority habitats (listed here<sup>9</sup>), such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest or Ancient woodland<sup>10</sup>. If there are likely to be any adverse impacts you'll need to think about how such impacts can be avoided, mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for.</p> <p><b>Priority and protected species</b> - You'll also want to consider whether any proposals might affect priority species (listed here<sup>11</sup>) or protected species. To help you do this, Natural England has produced advice here<sup>12</sup> to help understand the impact of particular developments on protected species.</p> <p><b>Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land</b> - Soil is a finite resource that fulfils many important functions and services for society. It is a growing medium for food, timber and other crops, a store for carbon and water, a reservoir of biodiversity and a buffer against pollution. If you are proposing development, you should seek to use areas of poorer quality agricultural land in preference to that of a higher quality in line with National Planning Policy Framework para 171. For more information, see our publication Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land<sup>13</sup>.</p> <p><b>Improving your natural environment</b></p> <p>Your plan or order can offer exciting opportunities to enhance your local environment. If you are setting out policies on new development or proposing sites for development, you may wish to consider identifying what environmental features you want to be retained or enhanced or new features you would like to see created as part of any new development. Examples might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing a new footpath through the new development to link into existing rights of way.</li> <li>• Restoring a neglected hedgerow.</li> <li>• Creating a new pond as an attractive feature on the site.</li> </ul>	<p>Significant Green Gaps have been identified and Linghurst Lakes is proposed as a Local Green Space.</p> <p>An SEA/HRA screening assessment has been undertaken and environmental impacts assessed.</p> <p>A map is included in the NP that shows the agricultural value of the land.</p> <p>Agree and Policy 3 (1) e supports the provision of habitat enhancements as part of new development.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planting trees characteristic to the local area to make a positive contribution to the local landscape.</li> <li>• Using native plants in landscaping schemes for better nectar and seed sources for bees and birds.</li> <li>• Incorporating swift boxes or bat boxes into the design of new buildings.</li> <li>• Think about how lighting can be best managed to encourage wildlife.</li> <li>• Adding a green roof to new buildings.</li> </ul> <p>You may also want to consider enhancing your local area in other ways, for example by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Setting out in your plan how you would like to implement elements of a wider Green Infrastructure Strategy (if one exists) in your community.</li> <li>• Assessing needs for accessible greenspace and setting out proposals to address any deficiencies or enhance provision.</li> <li>• Identifying green areas of particular importance for special protection through Local Green Space designation (see Planning Practice Guidance on this <sup>14</sup>).</li> <li>• Managing existing (and new) public spaces to be more wildlife friendly (e.g. by sowing wild flower strips in less used parts of parks, changing hedge cutting timings and frequency).</li> <li>• Planting additional street trees.</li> <li>• Identifying any improvements to the existing public right of way network, e.g. cutting back hedges, improving the surface, clearing litter or installing kissing gates) or extending the network to create missing links.</li> <li>• Restoring neglected environmental features (e.g. coppicing a prominent hedge that is in poor condition, or clearing away an eyesore)</li> </ul>	<p>Agree the LNP proposes 5 Local Green Spaces.</p>
C5 Sport England	110820	<p>Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above neighbourhood plan. Government planning policy, within the <b>National Planning Policy Framework</b> (NPPF), identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important. It is essential therefore that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in</p>	<p>Agree and the importance of protecting the well-equipped play area is supported in the LNP. The Playing Fields are community facilities that are protected (the additional community facility map helps to clarify this). Given the limited scale of</p>

		<p>the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 96 and 97. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's statutory consultee role in <b>protecting playing fields</b> and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England's playing fields policy is set out in our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document.</p> <p><a href="https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy">https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy</a></p> <p>Any <b>new housing</b> developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered.</p>	<p>development, the existing playing fields are adequate. Poplar Walk is proposed as a Local Green Space because it is a highly valued walking route out to the wider countryside. Linghurst Lakes is valued both for its wildlife and leisure and recreational opportunities.</p>
C6 Michael Tagg, BDC Conservation	240820	<p>On the Draft Lound NP, Conservation has the following comments (changes in red): <b><u>Policies:</u></b></p> <p><b>Neighbourhood Plan Policy 13: Development of NP19</b></p> <p>1. High quality residential development will be supported for approximately 5 dwellings on the site shown on Map 19 where the proposals demonstrate;</p> <p>a) a layout that reinforces the positive attributes of Town Street Character Area as set out at Appendix D; and</p> <p>b) <b>a layout, scale, design and materials which preserve or enhance the setting of the nearby Listed Building and the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area;</b></p> <p>b) the use of materials and a narrow colour palette that compliments that Character Area as set out in the AECOM Design Code page 23; and</p> <p>c) a design and layout that protects the setting of the Conservation Area; and</p> <p>d) a boundary treatment of low walls or hedges that creates private space to allow for the planting of native trees and shrubs; and</p> <p>e) the boundary treatment on the west side to be in the form of hedges or low walls/fences that allows for a soft transition to the open countryside; and</p> <p>f) access arrangements for pedestrians and vehicles that meet NCC Highway standards (that will include only one access to the site and a pedestrian link to the opposite footway and the rest of the village).</p> <p>2. The mature trees and hedgerows surrounding the site are character forming (see Map 9) and enhance biodiversity and should be protected. Where this is not possible the scheme should minimise their loss.</p> <p><b>Neighbourhood Plan Policy 14: Development of NP21 (north)</b></p> <p>1. High quality residential development will be supported for one dwelling on the site shown on Map 20 where the proposals demonstrate;</p>	<p>Minor changes suggested to new Policy number 12: 1. b) – NP amended as suggested by text in red.</p>

	<p>a) a layout that reinforces the positive character attributes of the Town Street Character Area as set out in Appendix D; and</p> <p>b) the use of materials and a narrow colour palette that compliments the Town Street Character Area as set out in the AECOM Design Code page 23; and</p> <p>c) the rear boundary that adjoins the open countryside in the form of hedges that allow for a soft transition to the open countryside; and</p> <p>d) safe access with adequate visibility splays and a footway across the frontage in accordance with NCC Highway standards.</p> <p>2. The mature hedgerows along Town Street are character forming (see Map 9), enhance biodiversity and should be protected. Where this is not possible the scheme should minimise their loss by ensuring that the front boundary includes <b>an appropriately designed low wall or traditional post and rail/estate fencing</b> which incorporates a native hedge species that creates private space to allow for the planting of native trees and shrubs.</p> <p><b>Paragraphs:</b></p> <p><b>Paragraph 116:</b> The historic nature of much of the existing housing stock means that a large number of buildings have solid walls (without cavity wall insulation). This makes them costly to heat. <b>However, care needs to be taken to ensure that any adaptations, such as wall insulation, do not harm the character of historic buildings in the plan area, and do not impact on the breathability of the buildings' fabric. Bassetlaw District Council's Conservation Team can provide advice on these types of alterations where historic buildings are affected.</b></p> <p><b>Paragraph 135:</b> 4. The War Memorial dedicated to the villagers <b>who served and those who</b> lost their lives in both World Wars, first unveiled 14<sup>th</sup> August 1921 using donations from parishioners.</p> <p><i>-I hope the attached is of interest to the NP group.</i></p> <p><b>Paragraph 185:</b> The site contains large <b>mid-20<sup>th</sup></b> century farm storage buildings and hard standing. The site is outside, but immediately adjoining, the Conservation Area <b>and is in the setting of Yew Tree Farmhouse, a grade II Listed Building. As such, any development would need to have regard to this historic setting, the most appropriate types of buildings being of a traditional agricultural style which relate well to the listed Yew Tree Farmhouse in terms of their layout, design and materials. Standard detached suburban-style dwellings are unlikely to be supported.</b></p> <p><b>Paragraph 186:</b> (now a separate paragraph) <b>This site is outside of</b> the accepted Development Boundary (as defined for the work on the Core Strategy). However, NPP 1 and Map 3 show</p>	<p>Additional text in red added.</p> <p>Additional text in red added.</p> <p>The LNPSG advise that this is factually incorrect, so no amendment has been made.</p> <p>Agreed, addition text in red added</p> <p>Minor amendment - added</p>
--	--	---

		how the Neighbourhood Plan proposes to amend the Development Boundary to include this site. Along the site boundary to the south there are mature trees and hedgerows that are character forming and should be retained	
C7 Christopher Johnson, Avison Young for National Grid	280820	<p><b>Lound Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation. August – September 2020. Representations on behalf of National Grid</b> - National Grid has appointed Avison Young to review and respond to Neighbourhood Plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regard to the current consultation on the above document.</p> <p><b>Proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets</b> - An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission assets which include high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines. National Grid has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area. National Grid provides information in relation to its assets at the website below. • <a href="http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/">www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/</a>. Please also see attached information outlining guidance on development close to National Grid infrastructure.</p>	Noted, no changes required
C8 Stewart Patience, Anglian Water Services Limited	080920	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Lound Pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan. The following comments are submitted on behalf of Anglian Water. Anglian Water is the water undertaker for the parish. The views of Severn Trent who provide wastewater services should be sought on the neighbourhood plan. <b>Neighbourhood Planning Policy 1: Sustainable Development and the Development Boundary</b> - The policy as Drafted states that all development proposals located outside of the defined development boundary would need to be related to the rural economy and be in accordance with other relevant neighbourhood plan policies. The focus of the policy is proposals in support of the rural economy. However, there is no reference made to the provision of utilities infrastructure provided by Anglian Water or other infrastructure providers which could be located outside of the development boundary. We therefore consider the Neighbourhood Plan should be amended to state that the principle of development which is proposed by Anglian Water as an infrastructure provider within the designated countryside is supported subject to other development plan policies. It is therefore proposed that the point 2 of Policy 1 be amended as follows: '2. <b>Outside the Development Boundary proposals will be limited to development that is necessary to support the rural economy or the provision of utilities infrastructure</b> in accordance with District countryside and other relevant policies in this Neighbourhood Plan reflecting the Parish's intrinsic open, rural character.' <b>Site allocations</b> - Given the scale of the housing allocation sites and their</p>	Wording added in red to Policy 1: 2. as advised.



		locations within or close to the built form of the existing village it is unlikely that there will be constraints to water supply but these would need to be reviewed as part of a detailed site assessment to establish specific connection points	
C9 Will Wilson, BDC Neighbourhood Planning Note point re merging policy 1,2,3 into one policy repeat of C15 comments – C15 addressed in this response	090920	<p><b>Overall</b> - The Draft previews a constructive Neighbourhood Plan, founded on robust evidence, designed to reflect the needs and aspirations of the local community, and that effectively encapsulates the local context. The points identified below are intended as constructive feedback, and should be read in conjunction with the comments of other consultees; further dialogue on any of the points raised and how they could be addressed is welcomed.</p> <p><b>Specific observations</b> -</p> <p><b>Themes:</b> It may be useful to consider opportunities for co-locating policies and supporting content within the Plan for consistency / ease of reading. This could be relevant for the multiple policies concerning residential development (development boundary, infill, allocations, types, design), and those concerning green infrastructure, which are presently separated by other sections / policies. There appears to be an overlap and conflict between Policy 1, Policy 2 and Policy 3. Policy 1 seeks to manage development within a proposed development boundary and Policy 2 seeks to manage infilling and Policy 3 seeks to manage density. We suggest the use of a single Policy to replace these three policies</p> <p><b>‘unless a greater number would not lead to the site becoming overdeveloped and therefore out of scale with the immediate character of the locality;’</b></p> <p><b>Para 60:</b> It may be useful to re-address the first sentence in the interests of clarity, as the first part, reading “[t]he accepted Development Boundary in the Core Strategy” implies that this was formalised, which is then contradicted by the second part of the sentence.</p> <p><b>Table 3:</b> As part of the above, it would be useful to reference Table 3 in the text, so as to assist in explaining the strategy (i.e going from a position on no boundary to adopting a modified version of the one initially considered for inclusion in the CS).</p> <p><b>Table 4:</b> Minor point – a title would be helpful (i.e. Characteristics of Idle Lowlands Policy Zone 7).</p> <p><b>P38 – Table detailing LGS1:</b> Minor point – area may need checking. Also, a clearer header / title for the table may be useful to clarify its purpose; this point also applies to the other LGS tables.</p>	<p>Some of the layout has been amended – section on village amenities moved to section on community facilities.</p> <p>Policy 2 and 3 merged, Policy 1 remains as it was as it considered that this best reflected community aspiration.</p> <p>Wording added in red to amended Policy 2: 1. a Wording amended now Paragraph 54</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Table 3 heading added Amended</p> <p>Header added</p>

		<p><b>Policy 7 and supporting text:</b> In light of the wealth of important content in this section / policy, it may be worth considering splitting it in two, so as to address design and energy efficiency separately – although it is acknowledged that the themes are interrelated.</p> <p><b>Policy 10:</b> It may be useful to itemise the community facilities within the policy so as to clarify what is being addressed / protected. It may also be useful to map the facilities.</p> <p><b>Para 166:</b> As per Para 60 above, describing the un-adopted development boundary as “accepted”, despite the footnote, may be seen as misleading.</p> <p><b>Policies 11 – 15:</b> Consider amending the policy titles to incorporate the site name, with the reference in brackets at the end.</p> <p><b>Para 169:</b> Useful justification of projected capacity for growth compared to BDC projected housing requirement. However, be aware that, should the BDC housing requirement figure stay at 20% (as per the January 2020 Draft), this would still apply upon adoption of the LP, and any additional growth over your allocations would be managed through your windfall policy</p>	<p>Energy efficiency made separate policy.</p> <p>Map showing community facilities added. Text clarified</p> <p>Policy titles amended to include site name descriptor BDC Draft policy now reduced to 5% for Lound.</p>
C10 Steve Freek, Highways England	150920	<p>Highways England welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Pre-Submission Draft Lound Neighbourhood Plan which covers the period from 2020 to 2035. <b>Due to the location and scale of the proposed allocations – totalling 21 dwellings across all 9 sites – we do not consider that these will have any impact on the SRN.</b> We note that no specific employment sites have been allocated in the Local Plan for the Parish, although the Neighbourhood Plan will support small scale employment developments within the main built-up area of Lound village to serve local demands. <b>Considering the limited level of growth proposed across the Neighbourhood Plan area we do not expect that there will be any impacts on the operation of the SRN. We therefore have no further comments to provide and trust the above is useful in the progression of the Lound Neighbourhood Plan</b></p>	Noted, no changes required
C11 Melanie Lindsley, The Coal Authority	160920	<p>The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body which works to protect the public and the environment in coal mining areas. As you will be aware the Neighbourhood Plan area lies within the current defined deep coalfield. However the Neighbourhood Plan area does not contain any surface coal resources or recorded risks from past coal mining activity at shallow depth. <b>On the basis of the above the Coal Authority has no specific comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.</b> This letter can be used as evidence for the legal and procedural consultation requirements.</p>	Noted, no changes required
C12 Mark Speck, Nottingham shire	160920	<p>Overall, we very much welcome the constructive approach to biodiversity/ wildlife conservation in this Draft plan. We hope you find the following comments helpful.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A strong biodiversity / Green network can help improve resilience to climate change and can help alleviate flooding, as well as supporting nature. It might be worth pointing out</li> </ul>	Additional text added to reflect this.

Wildlife Trust		<p>the value of such 'ecosystem service' provision, which is mentioned under the NPPF (para. 109).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Reasons for notification:</b> Sutton and Lound Gravel Pits contains extensive areas of open water and margins which support an exceptionally rich assemblage of breeding wetland birds and a nationally important population of wintering gadwall. The site supports an exceptional diversity of breeding, wintering and passage birds.</li> <li>• <b>8 Community Objectives</b> - Community Objective 3: To protect and enhance the village landscape, its green spaces and surrounding open countryside, recognising the value of long views and vistas into and out of the rural setting of the Village. Could 'enhance links with Idle Valley Nature Reserve' be included. Could there also be an additional objective to develop and maintain a strong relationship with Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust that highlights the health benefits of experiencing nature and benefits to the local economy.</li> <li>• Nominate a representative to attend River Idle Management Partnership Meetings, a forum for people with an interest in the River Idle and the wider Idle Catchment.</li> <li>• Incorporate bat and bird boxes within the fabric of new development as appose to locating them on the outside of buildings</li> </ul>	<p>Agree, this fact is in the LNP.</p> <p>Objective 3 amended and 'enhance links with the Idle Valley Nature Reserve' added</p> <p>Whilst the LNPSG supports close working with the Wildlife Trust this is something that Lound PC should action rather than an additional objective in the LNP.</p>
C13 Kathryn Haley, NCC Planning Policy	160920	<p><b>County Planning Context</b></p> <p><u>Minerals and Waste</u> - The adopted Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Replacement Waste Local Plan, Part 1: Waste Core Strategy (adopted 10 December 2013) and the saved, non-replaced policies of the Waste Local Plan (adopted 2002), along with the saved policies of the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan (adopted 2005), form part of the development plan for the area. As such, relevant policies in these plans need to be considered. In addition, Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Areas (MSA/MCA) have been identified in Nottinghamshire and in accordance with Policy SP7 of the emerging Publication Version of the Minerals Local Plan (July 2019). These should be taken into account where proposals for nonminerals development fall within them. As the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, it is the responsibility of Nottinghamshire County Council to form policies and determine applications relating to minerals and waste. The County Council has the following comments to make in terms of minerals and waste. In relation to minerals, as recognised within paragraph 21 of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, the entire neighbourhood area, as identified in Map 1, lies within the MSA/MCA for sand and gravel. The eastern area was historically worked for sand and gravel</p>	<p>More detail provided to clarify role of Minerals and Waste Local Plan.</p>

	<p>but this has now ceased. <b>The County Council welcomes the inclusion and reference to the mineral resource and previous extraction within the Neighbourhood Plan. The policies proposed within the Neighbourhood Plan do not appear to conflict with the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan and therefore the County Council does not wish to raise any objections from a mineral perspective. In relation to waste, there is one waste management facility within the area - the sewage treatment works which is approximately 179m to the east of the proposed NP12 allocation for 1 dwelling. Considering the distance and that the allocation is for one dwelling, there should not be any safeguarding issues for the permitted waste management facility in relation to Policy WCS10 and therefore the County Council does not wish to raise any objections from a waste perspective.</b></p> <p><u>Strategic Transport</u> - <b>The County Council does not have any strategic transport planning observations to make.</b></p> <p><u>Transport and Travel Services</u></p> <p><i>Current Lound Public Transport Network</i> - Lound is served by Stagecoach Service 27 operating between Doncaster and Retford with a two-hour frequency Monday to Saturday. The neighbourhood plan provides an opportunity to consider future development in context with the current service, and the potential for different models of service to make better use of time and resources. COVID-19 has placed significant additional challenges for the bus industry. The impact of the pandemic on safe travel means bus operator overhead costs have increased, and this is compounded by a significant drop in patronage. It is possible that this will affect bus service networks in the future.</p> <p><i>Neighbourhood Plan</i> - The County Council's Transport &amp; Travel Services team (TTS) has reviewed the Plan including the community vision, objectives and Neighbourhood Plan Policies and comment as follows: TTS note the emphasis on sustainable development and the Neighbourhood Planning Policy 1: Sustainable Development and the Development Boundary f) promoting walking, cycling and the use of public transport; Appendix H: Building for Life 12 Questions includes reference to access to public transport and reducing car dependency. Section 4.1 of the Design Code refers to Housing Sites and the Bassetlaw Draft Local Plan identifies Lound as part of the Retford and Villages Cluster within Bassetlaw's spatial hierarchy. The village's expected housing delivery by 2034 is capped at 20% of the existing number of dwellings. For Lound this means that approximately 40 additional dwellings could come forward within the plan period, with approximately 15 dwellings identified based on 4 main housing sites. It is noted that over the past 10 years the number of dwellings in the parish has increased from 210 to 229 with the population reducing from 470 to 448 reflecting an ageing population of</p>	<p>Additional information provided on the bus service.</p> <p>The scale of development has been reduced providing fewer opportunities for planning gain in relation to public transport.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>the Parish with fewer houses occupied by families. In 2011 in Lound Parish compared to national averages there were 5% fewer young people and 8% more older people. This indicates a potential for increased reliance on public transport provision in the future. TTS request that public transport access is a criterion for a site to be supported by the Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p> <p><i>Community Transport</i> - Community transport services are provided in the Lound area by Bassetlaw Action Centre. It is suggested that reference to their work is included within the Plan, together with the potential for Community Transport and related services i.e. taxi buses to complement the local bus network.</p> <p><i>Taxis</i> - There is no reference in the document to the role of taxis, which are licensed by Bassetlaw District Council and play an important role in the local economy. It is suggested that reference to the role of taxis is included in the Plan.</p> <p><u>Rights of Way</u> - From a public rights of way perspective the only issue is the delineation of the street hierarchy. This could lead to some confusion as to what is public and what is private access and the status of its use (Map 2 Street hierarchy). It would be wise to clarify this plan. Please see attached plan showing the Public rights of way (black lines) and the adopted tarmacked highway (green). Neatholme Lane (Lound Bridleway no 9) is shown as a tertiary street. It is a bridleway and therefore only open to the public on foot, horseback or cycle. There are no public vehicular rights, although there may be private vehicular rights. Chainbridge Lane (Lound Byway No 10) is shown as a tertiary street. Although this does have public vehicular rights it is mainly for public use on foot, cycle and horseback and is not maintained to the same level as the tarmac highway and therefore should be shown differently to the tarmacked highway. (Only the first 100m a full carriageway like Town Street, Mattersey Road etc). Little Top Lane (Lound Byway no 15) is shown as a tertiary street. Although this does have public vehicular rights it is mainly for public use on foot, cycle and horseback and is not maintained to the same level as the tarmac highway and therefore should be shown differently to the tarmacked highway. (Only the southernmost section for 175m is full carriageway like Town Street, Mattersey Road etc).</p> <p><u>Built Heritage</u> - <b>The Draft Neighbourhood Plan states that: ‘the absence of paving on both sides of the street contributes to Lound’s rural character’. This is a welcome reference that concurs with the Lound Conservation Area designation and highlights the importance at various levels of retaining this rural character.</b> This is never more important than during the design and layout of new housing developments. Section 16 of the Plan (paragraphs 133 – 138) contains policies focussed on the heritage of Lound and these are welcomed. The allocation sites include the site of Yew Tree Farm (NP19), adjacent to which</p>	<p>Noted and the LNP promotes housing suitable for older people</p> <p>Map 2 removed and NCCs Map 7 used in place of previous footpath map as it provided clarity on status of non-vehicular routes.</p> <p>BDC’s conservation officer has provided amended wording which has been added to NP19 and addresses these points.</p>
--	--	--

		stands the original farmhouse, which is a grade II listed building. Development of the farm will potentially impact negatively on the setting of this farmhouse, although there may be ways of mitigating this and improving heritage through conservation improvements to the listed farmhouse (possibly linked to the proposed development of this plot)	
C14 Chris Bramley, Severn Trent Water	180920	<p>Severn Trent are generally supportive of the principles outlined within the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. There are a few areas that we feel would benefit from minor alterations to assist in the delivery of the plan's objectives and support wider benefits, these are detailed below.</p> <p><b>Neighbourhood Planning Policy 1: Sustainable Development and the Development Boundary</b> - Severn Trent are supportive of most of the principle outlined within policy 1, in particular bullet point g which highlights the approach to require SuDS, and that SuDS delivery multiple benefits. We would however note that the Drainage Hierarchy (planning practice guidance Paragraph 80) is equally important in developing a resilient surface water drainage system. The Drainage Hierarchy highlights the need to outfall to infiltration or watercourse prior to sewers, as such this would result in water being return to the natural water cycle in a more appropriate way reducing the risk of flooding from sewers in heavy rainfall events. In relation to bullet point h to ensure that development does not exacerbate existing sewerage problems it is important that developer contact Severn Trent with their proposals to enable appropriate assessments and where required capacity improvements to be carried out. <b>To reduce the impact of development it is important that surface water is appropriately management through the use of SuDS and the Drainage Hierarchy (Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 80).</b></p> <p><b>Neighbourhood Plan Policy 4: Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity</b> - Severn Trent are supportive of the approach to protect and enhance biodiversity, it is noted that bullet point 3a, details the development should demonstrated that they have "retained existing trees and hedges". We would recommend that watercourses are also specified within this bullet point as open watercourses are required to convey surface water and enable sustainable outfalls to be utilised by new development, but that these features are also key for supporting local wildlife and natural habitats. We are also supportive of bullet point 4d and would encourage that when considering the installation of SuDS, including retrofit SuDS that the outfall is considered to ensure that this can be undertaken sustainably.</p> <p><b>Neighbourhood Plan Policy 6: Designation of Local Green Spaces</b> - Severn Trent understand the need for Local Green Space and the need for them to be protected, however local green spaces can provide suitable locations for schemes like flood alleviation to be delivered without adversely impacting on the primary function of the open space. If the correct scheme is chosen, the flood alleviation can result in additional benefits to the local green space</p>	<p>Footnote 17 added</p> <p>Text in bold added to each site allocation policy.</p> <p>Agree and retaining water courses added.</p> <p>Agree additional point made at Policy 3: 1. d)</p> <p>Linghurst Lakes is a proposed LGS and already effectively acts to alleviate flooding. No amendment made.</p>



		<p>scale in nature and a brownfield development site we do not anticipate any significant increase in flows from this development. It is however important that SuDS are incorporated into the site to manage surface water, and that surface water flows are restricted as close as possible to greenfield conditions through the use of SuDS, where this is achieved it may be possible to have a positive impact on the performance / resilience of the sewerage system. The site is located in close proximity to a surface water sewer therefore no surface water should be permitted to drain to the foul sewer network. It is strongly recommended that developers contact Severn Trent to ensure that the impact of the development proposals can be assessed.</p> <p><b>Neighbourhood Plan Policy 14: Development of NP21 (North)</b> - Severn Trent are aware that there are Foul Sewers indicated to be located within the site, it is therefore important that developers contact Severn Trent to understand the impact these sewers will have on the development and ensure that the sewerage assets are protected. Severn Trent would also note that this development is upstream of the known network constraints. However because the site is small-scale in nature we would not anticipate any significant changes to the performance / resilience of the sewer network, provided surface water is managed sustainably and discharged to a sustainable outfall in accordance with the drainage hierarchy. Where any discharge of surface water is proposed to the surface water or foul sewerage system it is vital that developers engage with Severn Trent to ensure that the impact of development can be assessed.</p> <p><b>Neighbourhood Plan Policy 15: Development of NP21 (South)</b> - Severn Trent are aware that there are Foul Sewers indicated to be located within the site, it is therefore important that developers contact Severn Trent to understand the impact these sewers will have on the development and ensure that the sewerage assets are protected. Severn Trent would also note that this development is upstream of the known network constraints. However because the site is small-scale in nature we would not anticipate any significant changes to the performance / resilience of the sewer network, provided surface water is managed sustainably and discharged to a sustainable outfall in accordance with the drainage hierarchy. Where any discharge of surface water is proposed to the surface water or foul sewerage system it is vital that developers engage with Severn Trent to ensure that the impact of development can be assessed. Please keep us informed when your plans are further developed when we will be able to offer more detailed comments and advice. For your information we have set out some general guidelines that may be useful to you</p>	<p>policy to reflect STW's concerns and the need for developers to liaise with them.</p>
C15, BDC Planning Policy	220920	Lound Neighbourhood Plan: Review Draft Consultation (Reg 14) Consultation Response: BDC Planning Policy	



	<p><b>Overall</b> - It is great to see another one of our communities positively planning for their future. The Neighbourhood Plan process is the most proactive way in which to manage future growth within our communities. The Local Authority's role is to act as a moderator or critical friend in providing constructive responses and feedback to emerging Neighbourhood Plans in Bassetlaw. This is so the final Neighbourhood Plan is compliant with current policy and meets the Basic Conditions as set out in the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations. The Lound Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared positively and it is good to see the input from the community through its preparation so far. In general feedback, there are a couple of compliance issues to consider. This includes the proposed housing requirement identified within the Plan. In terms of current planning Policy, the adopted Core Strategy classifies Lound as an 'other settlement' through Policy CS9 where only needs-based residential development is supported. Although the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan seeks to change this position, there needs to be careful consideration on what is being proposed in the emerging Local Plan. Our recommendation is to keep the Neighbourhood Plan process in line with that of the emerging Local Plan so there are no compliance issues moving forward. Planning Policy comments on proposed policies - The response has been broken into two parts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The development management policies (policies 1 – 10); and</li> <li>2. Site Allocation Policies (policies 11 - 15).</li> </ol> <p><b>PART 1: PLANNING POLICIES</b>  <b>Neighbourhood Planning Policy 1: Sustainable Development and the Development Boundary</b>  <b>BDC PROPOSED REVISION Policy 1: Residential Development in Lound</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Outside of the proposed allocated sites, proposals for new residential development, including the conversion of existing buildings, will only be supported if it is located within the development boundary, as identified on Map 3, and it meets the following criteria: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) It is only proposing 1 or 2 dwellings per site within an existing small gap, unless a greater number would not lead to the site becoming overdeveloped and therefore out of scale with the immediate character of the locality;</li> <li>b) It has regard to the overall character of the area and the current layout and size of the surrounding plots and dwellings to which the scheme relates;</li> <li>c) Its density should reflect local distinctiveness as identified on Map 4;</li> <li>d) It safeguards the integrity of existing garden spaces and the relationship between property sizes and their wider curtilages;</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>The NP has been amended to match the growth allowance in the revised Local Plan (5%) for Lound.</p> <p>Addressed in response to C9  Policy 1 remains as it was as it considered that this best reflected community aspiration</p>
--	--	--

		<p>e) It does not lead to the loss of any mature trees, hedgerows and boundary walls that make a positive contribution to the character of the area and wider street scene;</p> <p>f) It provides satisfactory landscaping to provide privacy for new and existing dwellings, where appropriate;</p> <p>g) It does not lead to an unacceptable impact to existing highway capacity and highway safety; and</p> <p>h) It does not lead to an unacceptable impact on existing drainage capacity.</p> <p>2. Proposals for residential development outside the Development Boundary will be limited to development that is necessary to support the rural economy in accordance with national and Local Planning Policy and other relevant policies in this Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p><b>Policy 2: Infill Development and Policy 3: Density.</b> There appears to be an overlap and conflict between Policy 1, Policy 2 and Policy 3. Policy 1 seeks to manage development within a proposed development boundary and Policy 2 seeks to manage infilling and Policy 3 seeks to manage density. We suggest the use of a single Policy to replace these three policies with the following:</p> <p><b>Neighbourhood Plan Policy 4: Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity.</b> The Policy is considered too long and complicated. It will be difficult for Development Management to implement some of the criteria here due to the lack of detail. There is also an overlap with Policy 5. Public Rights of Way and Flood Risk do not appear to fit into this section.</p> <p><b>BDC REVISION: Policy 4: Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity</b></p> <p>1. Biodiversity is an important part of the character of the Parish as identified within the Lound Design Code. All proposals should consider how they will respond, conserve or enhance biodiversity and have considered how they:</p> <p>a) Safeguard against any adverse impact to designated or important sites as identified on Map 5;</p> <p>b) Make the best use of land by reducing the loss of high-grade agricultural land, as identified on Map 7;</p> <p>c) Retain mature trees, hedgerows and grassed verges, as identified on Map 9, where appropriate;</p> <p>d) Enhance biodiversity, where appropriate, by:</p>	<p>Policy 2 and 3 have been merged - BDC's suggestions have been included but also reworked based on emerging NP policy elsewhere. Policy requirement re footpaths added to new policy on landscape character and new policy on flood risk and drainage added with narrative used from this section.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Including the use of wildflowers within landscaping;</li> <li>- Including the planting of native trees and hedgerows;</li> <li>- Providing wildlife movement corridors through the use of appropriate landscaping; and</li> <li>- Include habitat promotion materials such as nesting boxes or bat boxes within the designs of schemes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Neighbourhood Plan Policy 5: Protecting and Enhancing the Landscape Character.</b>  Similar to Policy 4, the policy is considered too long and complicated in the way it is structured. BDC propose the following revision:</p> <p><b>BDC REVISION: Policy 5: Protecting and Enhancing the Landscape Character</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Landscape is an important part of the character of the Parish as identified within the Lound Design Code and the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Study. All proposals should consider they will respond, conserve or enhance the landscape character and have considered:</li> </ol> <p>The Key Views, as identified, on Map 10</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The key views has been designated due to their significance and importance to the openness of the landscape character. Proposals should demonstrate how they are either conserving or enhancing the openness of the affected view(s);</li> </ol> <p>The Significant Green Gap, as identified, on Map 11</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) The Significant Green Gaps has been designated for their contribution towards the character of the landscape. Each Gap has its own qualities and proposals should demonstrate how they seek to maintain or strengthen the identified qualities of the affected Gap(s).</li> </ol> <p><b>Neighbourhood Plan Policy 6: Designation of Local Green Spaces.</b> Local Green Space 4 is considered a large tract of land and therefore fails to meet the criteria for designating Local Green Space in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 99). If this area is considered important due to its character, then maybe it should be classified as a Significant Green Gap. BDC recommendation is to remove, or reconsider the designation, of Local Green Space 4.</p> <p><b>Neighbourhood Plan Policy 7: The Importance of Energy Efficiency and High-Quality Design.</b> BDC supports the use of design codes and the use of character work as identified within the Lound Design code.</p> <p><b>Neighbourhood Plan Policy 8: Protecting and Enhancing Heritage Assets.</b> See Conservation Comments.</p>	<p>This is noted the LNPSG would like this matter to be considered at examination</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p><b>Neighbourhood Plan Policy 9: A Mix of Housing Types.</b> Although it is good to be a policy about housing mix and standards, it will be difficult to implement due to the lack of evidence at a local level. Due to this being largely design related, it might be better to include it in Policy 7 rather than it being a standalone Policy.</p> <p><b>Neighbourhood Plan Policy 10: Protecting and Enhancing the provision of community facilities.</b> In order for the Policy to apply and be effective, it is recommended that all community facilities are identified on a Map and then referenced within the Policy. BDC recommend a revised Policy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The existing facilities listed within this Policy, as shown on Map XX will be safeguarded for community purposes throughout the plan period. The community facilities are as follows: List facilities</li> <li>2. Proposals to redevelop, or change the use of, an existing community facility to a non-community use shall only be supported where one of the following conditions is met: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The facility is demonstrably no longer fit for purpose and the site is not viable to be redeveloped for a new community facility; or</li> <li>b) The service provided by the facility is met by alternative provision that exists within reasonable proximity: what is deemed as reasonable proximity will depend on the nature of the facility and its associated catchment area; or</li> <li>c) The proposal includes the provision of a new community facility of a similar nature and of a similar or greater size in a suitable on or offsite location.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Proposals for a new community facility will only be supported if it is located within the development boundary of Lound, unless there is a demonstrated need for such a proposal and a more central site is not available elsewhere within the village.</li> </ol> <p><b>PART 2: SITE ALLOCATIONS</b></p> <p><b>Neighbourhood Plan Policy 11: Development of NP02.</b> The site is considered suitable for some limited development and BDC support the use of a design code for the site.</p>	<p>Policy 9 amendments made based on conservation comments</p> <p>Policy 10 the community indicated a clear preference for smaller dwellings the evidence used in this section is considered proportionate. It is acknowledged that the reduction in the gross requirement will reduce the opportunity for the provision of smaller dwellings.</p> <p>Policy 11 map added and policy wording amended in accordance with BDC guidance.</p> <p>NP02 has been removed from the LNP</p>
--	---	---

		<p><b>Neighbourhood Plan Policy 12: Development of NP12.</b> There appears to be a conflict between this site and the intention of the Policies earlier in the Neighbourhood Plan. In addition, the NPPF requires allocated sites to make the most effective use of land. The proposed site appears to be in direct contradiction to this and, as currently presented, it would not be in conformity with national policy. The inclusion of a large area of allocated land within the development boundary poses a risk that the site could be developed for more than 1 dwelling in the future. It is recommended that the site area either be reduced or it is removed as an allocation and dealt with through the revised Policy 1.</p> <p><b>Neighbourhood Plan Policy 13: Development of NP19.</b> The site is considered suitable for some limited development and BDC support the use of a design code for the site. However, there needs to be further clarity on whether the site can be appropriately accessed.</p>	<p>NP12 has been removed</p> <p>Noted – NP19 was included in BDC's call for sites in 2017 (LAA323) and 'considered 'suitable' for development as no significant constraints have been identified'. AECOM noted that site has a number of constraints that would need to be resolved or mitigated. This related to the site being outside the development boundary in the Core Strategy. It is expected that highways matters could be addressed as part of the planning application process.</p>
		<p><b>Neighbourhood Plan Policy 14: Development of NP21 (north).</b> The site is considered suitable for some limited development and BDC support the use of a design code for the site.</p> <p><b>Neighbourhood Plan Policy 15: Development of NP21 (south).</b> The site is considered suitable for some limited development and BDC support the use of a design code for the site</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

## Appendix 1 (see R45 above)

Chave Planning Limited  
Enterprise Centre  
Bridge Street  
Derby  
DE1 3LD  
01332 489 407  
07463 048 048  
caroline@chaveplanning.com  
www.chaveplanning.com

Lound Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group  
c/o Nick Prout

16th September 2020  
Our ref.1218.L01.1

**By email only to: [nick.prout@tiscali.co.uk](mailto:nick.prout@tiscali.co.uk)**

Dear Sir/Madam,

### **Lound Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 Consultation**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. I am pleased submit representations on behalf of Tim & Jeanne Pepper, owners of land south of Chainbridge Lane, which is identified as site NP18 in Appendix F of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.

The Neighbourhood Plan must meet the 'basic conditions' and other matters set out in paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The basic conditions (as far as they are relevant to neighbourhood plans) are as follows:

- 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.
- b) the making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.
- c) 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 (or any part of that area).
- d) the making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations.
- e) prescribed conditions are met in relation to the plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the neighbourhood plan.

These representations will have regard to the basic conditions and, in particular, will consider whether the Neighbourhood Plan is compliant with national policies and the development plan and whether it contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.

The Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (dBLP) is at an advanced stage of preparation and therefore the Neighbourhood Plan should have regard to it. The National Planning Practice Guidance<sup>1</sup> says that, although a Draft Neighbourhood Plan is not tested against the policies in an emerging Local Plan, the reasoning and evidence informing the Local Plan process is likely to be relevant to the consideration

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 41-009-20190509

of the basic conditions against which a Neighbourhood Plan is tested. For example, up-to-date housing need evidence is relevant to the question of whether a housing supply policy in a Neighbourhood Plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.

Paragraph 4.1.9 of the dBLP sets out that vision that, by 2037, Small Rural Settlements will have seen small-scale, sensitively located development to support local community objectives and aspirations, to meet local housing needs and sustain village services. In order to achieve this vision Policy ST2 of the dBLP sets out a cap on 20% growth to Small Rural Settlements, which would result in 42 dwellings to be built at Lound over the period 2018-2037. The dBLP explains in the supporting text to this policy that if this is not to be achieved by Neighbourhood Plan allocations of land for housing, then growth would be allowed up to the 20% cap through planning applications in accordance with Policy ST2. Either way, the dBLP clearly envisages 20% growth to the village in order to meet local housing needs and sustain local services. The dBLP cautions at paragraph 5.2.12 that Neighbourhood Plan areas choosing to allocate housing in their Neighbourhood Plans will be less vulnerable to unplanned housing development because they would positively address the requirements of national policy.

Iterations of the dBLP have, since 2016, proposed 20% growth to Small Rural Settlements in order to meet local needs. The role of each level of the hierarchy reflects population size, their location in respect of other settlements, the range of services present and their ability to expand to accommodate the needs generated by new development, taking into account environmental constraints. This is well evidenced in the documents supporting the dBLP<sup>2</sup>. Resistance to this level of growth should be based on sound planning reasons, but there is no evidence in the Neighbourhood Plan supporting documents that there are environmental constraints to achieving 20% growth.

The 20% growth proposed to the village in the dBLP is over the entire plan period to 2037. This is a period of nearly 20 years, or an average of around 2 dwellings per year. This is nothing for the village to be afraid of – this level of growth need not affect the character of the village as long as the right sites are chosen and the Neighbourhood Plan controls how they are developed. Furthermore, 20% growth would assist in maintaining the vitality of the village. The village had a population of 493 in 2001, reducing to 471 at the 2011 census. This is clearly indicative of a declining population due to shrinking household sizes, owing to an ageing population. Therefore additional houses need to be built at the village in order to at the very least maintain the population and support the vitality of the village and its local businesses, if not allow modest growth to the village to ensure that its businesses are not always operating on a marginal basis and to encourage the opening of new businesses. Shrinking household sizes are another indicator that elderly people may be constrained to living in accommodation that is unsuitable for their needs, if there is no suitable housing built for them to downsize to.

Paragraphs 169-170 of the Neighbourhood Plan says that there has been close collaboration with BDC's policy team since 2016 and that the proposal for the Neighbourhood Plan to deliver in the region of 10% growth, in accordance with local opinion, reflecting the extent of local facilities and the availability of suitable sites '*meets a new housing requirement figure provided by BDC of 21 dwellings*'. The Neighbourhood Plan housing allocations fall short of even achieving this 10% figure, leaving 5 dwellings to windfall within a tightly drawn development boundary, risking high density 'town cramming' within this boundary. Crucially though, contrary to the above statement in the 2 For example the Bassetlaw Rural Settlement Study (2018), the Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy Background Paper (January 2020) and the Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (January 2020).

Neighbourhood Plan, this 10% figure has not been provided or agreed by BDC. I am aware that the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group have made representations in response to consultation on the dBLP, objecting to the 20% growth requirement, but this matter is still unresolved and open to

consultation. As it stands the emerging strategic policies indicate that 20% growth is appropriate in order to meet sustainability objectives and for the village to take its share in contributing towards meeting housing needs, so that should be the premise upon which the Neighbourhood Plan is prepared.

It is in the interests of the village that the required growth is allocated on sites in the Neighbourhood Plan, rather than left to windfall. To fall short of allocating 20% growth risks unplanned development, over which the Neighbourhood Plan Forum has less control, and could result in less sustainable outcomes for the village.

Furthermore, if a Neighbourhood Plan is taken forward which is not in compliance with the dBLP and the dBLP is subsequently adopted in its current form then it will render the Neighbourhood Plan out of date. This would mean it would have no force in determining where and how the village should grow and there would be a significant risk of speculative development outside the built-up area of the village. Surely this risk is worse than grasping the nettle now and positively planning for the growth of the village?

In any event, the direction of the dBLP is likely to be towards further growth, since the latest Government household projections and revisions to the Standard Method for calculating housing need indicate a substantial increase to the housing requirement for Bassetlaw. The dBLP is based upon a housing requirement of 478 dwellings per annum. However the Government's proposed revisions to the Standard Method, combined with the latest household projections, mean that the requirement would be increased to 564 dwellings per annum. Therefore there is likely to be considerable pressure on Bassetlaw to increase housing provision overall, not to reduce it. For these reasons I foresee a strong argument in the examination of the Neighbourhood Plan that, in view of the evidence of housing need, the Neighbourhood Plan as Drafted would not contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development.

Another key area in which the Draft Neighbourhood Plan is likely to result in unsustainable outcomes is in the selection of sites for allocation for housing development. The site selection process has not been fair to my clients' site, therefore the site assessment has been skewed and the resulting choices are neither sustainable nor justified.

The assessment of potential housing sites was carried out in the Lound Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Final Report (AECOM, January 2018). However this report assessed a much wider area of land than is promoted by my clients for housing development, considering the potential of the site for development of 60 dwellings, whereas only 9 dwellings are promoted by my client. The report concluded that the site was unsuitable for allocation because it was adjacent to the concrete casting plant that has potential to have noise and dust issues; Chainbridge Lane is also highly used by heavy truck traffic serving the concrete casting plant and anaerobic digester plant; and development of the site would not be in keeping with the size and character of the village. All three of these considerations would be entirely different for a development of 9 dwellings. The site would be no closer to the concrete casting plant than existing residential gardens; the amount of traffic generated by the development would be negligible; and the development of the site would be in keeping with the size and character of the village, similar to or smaller than the size of other sites



that have been chosen for allocation. In our view the assessment of the much larger area of land set the course for this site to be dismissed throughout the Neighbourhood Plan making process. We think that it should have been re-assessed and the report revised to support the selection of sites on a fair basis.

In April 2018, the Highway Authority were consulted on potential sites and, again, they were consulted on the wider site area. They responded with strong reservations, but were not re-consulted on the smaller site area prior to it being put forward to public consultation.

In June 2018, whilst the public consultation on selection of sites was based on the smaller area of land promoted by my clients, the analysis of public consultation clearly shows that the AECOM report and Highways Authority comments heavily influenced peoples' responses to the consultation. The Site Proformas used in the consultation included comment from my clients about promoting the smaller area, but then simply listed the feedback from AECOM and the Highways Authority without explaining that the feedback related to the larger site area. This is very misleading and has resulted in my clients' site being treated unfairly. This information was used to militate against the site and, had this been corrected to reflect the smaller site area consulted upon, the outcome of the consultation could have been very different for my clients' site. Even so, the site was still the 5<sup>th</sup> most preferable out of all the sites consulted on and, had the Neighbourhood Plan been Drafted so as to respond positively to 20% growth of the village, my clients' site would have been an obvious choice for allocation.

The document entitled 'Selection of Sites for New Housing Development in Lound - How They Were Chosen' explains that, subsequent to the public consultation, further consultation was carried out with statutory bodies. However the 'Site Assessments - Statutory Consultee Responses - 2nd Round' document confirms that no consultation was undertaken with the Highways Authority, therefore they would have not had opportunity to review their comments in view of the reduction in size of my clients' site. This further compounds the unfairness with which my clients' site has been treated.

The 'Selection of Sites for New Housing Development in Lound - How They Were Chosen' document also confirms that discussions have been held with landowners. My clients attended a meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> November 2018, but felt they were only given very short notice of this opportunity, having received an email on 26<sup>th</sup> October seeking that the meeting should take place as soon as possible within the following two weeks. This allowed no time for my clients to engage professional representation, nor to seek that their ideas for the site were professionally presented in an Architect's layout. My clients participated as best they could with their own hand-drawn layout but felt that they were at a significant disadvantage in this exercise. As residents of the Parish who have sought to positively engage with the Neighbourhood Plan making process this treatment is very disappointing.

The document entitled 'Selection of Sites for New Housing Development in Lound - How They Were Chosen' says that *'full consideration was given to site NP18 which the landowners suggested might provide 9 dwellings including 2 pairs of semi-detached houses. This site was rejected in the Public Consultation but only by a small majority. It was agreed that to allocate it in the Site Selection would be contrary to parishioners' wishes on two counts; (a) it was not a preferred site and (b) adding 9 properties to the above figures would be unacceptably high given the conclusions of the Residents' Survey. Additionally, the landowners were considering a potential development date towards the end of the NP. There is a strong argument to identify NP18 in the Draft NP as a "reserve" site should there*

*be changes in the allocation in future years, though some concern was expressed regarding the proposed building density, which is higher than the immediate developed area'.*

My clients do not recall saying in the meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> November 2018 that the timescale of the development would be towards the end of the Neighbourhood Plan. It would appear that this unconfirmed information has counted against their site in the selection process. The fact is that a development of 9 dwellings could easily come forward in the first five years of the Neighbourhood Plan period, if required.

The above commentary gives two main reasons (a) and (b) why the site was not chosen. Taking into account my representations above, neither provides a sound reason for rejecting the site. The concern about building density could also have been mitigated had there been opportunity to present a professionally prepared layout, taking into account the recommendations of the Lound Neighbourhood Plan Design Code. My clients understand and are committed to addressing the requirements of the Design Code as follows:

- responding to the 'rural village edge' character of Chainbridge Lane and the existing density and urban grain by setting detached/semi-detached housing back from the street within larger plots;
- buildings to be a maximum of two storeys high (unless additional floor designed sensitively into roof);
- generous floor to ceiling heights to maintain the grand street scene;
- existing landscape buffer to the south to be maintained and enhanced;
- creation of a landscaped edge to mitigate potential noise from the Charcon concrete factory and protect views into the site;
- development density to respond to adjacent development and close proximity to rural fringe, reducing towards the eastern edge
- housing orientation to respond positively to the street by fronting Chainbridge Lane

My client is open to discussion about fewer dwellings being allocated to their site if the Neighbourhood Forum felt that this would make the site acceptable for allocation. However so far this has not been an option, with my clients being kept at arm's length and simply told that their site is not needed. This is a missed opportunity for housing to be developed in a central location in the village. The responses to public consultation highlighted how local people saw the site as a favourable option due to its location close to the centre of the village. The location of the site was also seen as advantageous because access could be taken from Chainbridge Lane so that the traffic from the site would not impact on the narrow village roads. Another opportunity which has not been considered in the assessment of the site is extension of the 30mph speed limit to encompass the site frontage. This would slow traffic down sooner on the approach to the village crossroads, to the benefit of the existing residential area.

The site selection process has instead led to the proposed allocation of sites at the far ends of the village, furthest from the village core where the pub and recreation ground are located. Future residents of these developments would have up to a 660 metre walk to the centre of the village. This would not encourage future residents to limit their use of the car. This would not assist with integrating new residents into village life and thus supporting local facilities. Furthermore the location of bungalows on the southern edge of the village, presumably to provide homes suitable for elderly people, could lead to those residents feeling isolated.

Aside from the poorly located bungalows, all of the proposed site allocations are for large, detached homes. This does not contribute towards meeting needs for starter homes or for housing suitable for elderly people. Paragraph 4.1.12 of the dBLP says that new housing will reflect local needs in terms of type, size and tenure and enable equality of access to suitable accommodation. Older

people will have increased access to accommodation to better suit their changing needs and affordable homes will have been delivered to enable a new generation of home owners to get onto the housing ladder and to meet the needs of those unable to afford market housing for sale. Neighbourhood Plan paragraph 151 says that it is important that future market housing in Lound provides life-time homes and a mixture of sizes, but with an emphasis on meeting the need for smaller dwellings suitable for older people. The chosen allocations would not contribute towards meeting these dBLP and Neighbourhood Plan objectives and would appear to create a number of small, exclusive developments of large and expensive houses. In particular, one of the allocations (NP12) would appear to use a large swathe of open countryside land to provide one very large detached house. This approach seems to favour the few and ignore the needs of the many, whilst sacrificing a large area of open countryside land.

As such the site selection process has resulted in unsustainable outcomes for the village and it should be revisited. My clients' site should be assessed on a fair basis by AECOM, the Highways Authority and other statutory consultees and the choice of sites should be subject of further community consultation on this basis. As justified above, this should be undertaken on the premise of achieving 20% growth to the village through Neighbourhood Plan allocations, so as to meet local housing needs, sustain village services and protect the village from speculative and unplanned development.

I am grateful for the opportunity to respond to the consultation on behalf of my clients and please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to discuss these representations further.

Yours faithfully

Caroline Chave *BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI*  
Director  
**Chave Planning**

cc. Will Wilson, Lead Neighbourhood Planner, Bassetlaw District Council