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## Overview

This document compiles all of the responses received during the Regulation 16 consultation. Original copies of the responses have been supplied to the Independent Examiner, so as to inform the assessment of the Plan. Please contact the [Neighbourhood Planning Team](mailto:neighbourhoodplanning@bassetlaw.gov.uk?subject=Babworth%20Neighbourhood%20Plan) with any queries, including reference to any supplementary documents not included here.

## 1: Bassetlaw District Council: Planning Policy

**General Comments:**

The Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038 was adopted on 29 May 2024 and forms part of the district's up-to-date statutory development plan. Neighbourhood plans need to have general conformity to the Bassetlaw Local Plan's policies and national planning policies.

We are supportive of the vision and objectives within the Bassetlaw Local Plan. We have a few general comments to make:

* The vision date of the neighbourhood plan should cover the neighbourhood plan period (2020-2038).
* The latest version of the NPPF is December 2024; the document should be referenced to NPPF 2024 throughout.
* Bassetlaw Local Plan policies should be quoted correctly throughout. For example, Policy E1 refers to Policy ST7; however, it should be Policy ST8 as there are no existing employment sites in the neighbourhood plan area.
* We would suggest adding a key to the maps for clarity.

**Policies map**:

We suggest adding a policies map to make the policies more straightforward to understand and to show how policies interlink. This could aid with decision-making within the neighbourhood plan area. A map could be included as an appendix and could include for example, the development boundary, residential allocation, local green space, open spaces, community facilities, important views, footpaths.

**Housing and the Built Environment Chapter:**

We note and support the changes to the Local Plan housing requirement.

We understand that paragraph 6 has been removed from the submission plan.

We would suggest including the following text is added to paragraph 5 for clarity regarding residential development: “The minimum housing requirement for Ranby is 13, minus existing commitments and completions which stand at four currently leaving a net requirement of 9. Where settlements have met their minimum requirement, additional residential development will be considered appropriate if it meets the criteria in Policy ST2 of the Local Plan and Policy HBE1 of this Plan.

**Policy HBE1: Development Boundary:**

A settlement boundary is a useful tool for managing development, directing it to the most sustainable parts of a Parish. We understand why sites with planning permission, site allocation, and all the built area known locally as Ranby are included within the boundary. But that could have unintended consequences.

Once included in the settlement boundary, such land is no longer considered to be in the countryside, and so different national and local planning policies apply. For example, a landowner could vary a planning permission for a site in the boundary and increase the number of homes. Sites within the boundary are ‘sustainable’, so these changes might be difficult to resist, but the LPA would be in a stronger position to resist if the site is outside the settlement boundary, in the countryside, where more restrictive policies apply.

The supporting text explains how the settlement boundary has been identified. Point 4 says, ' Non - residential land which relates better to the countryside, including agricultural land, paddock, meadow, woodland and/or other green-field land has been excluded.’ However, the settlement boundary appears to include land that would fit under this definition, particularly in the linear northern part of the boundary. Paragraph 2 also says that a development boundary helps mange ribbon development but submitted boundary includes an area resembling ribbon development, this potential conflict should be addressed.

We suggest that the settlement boundary be redrawn to reflect the neighbourhood plan’s methodology for identifying a settlement boundary and to also more closely align with the concentration of the built form of Ranby.

We’d also suggest the following slight change to Policy HBE1 for clarity and consistency:

Development proposals within the Settlement Boundary in figure 2 above will be supported where they comply with all relevant policies contained in this Plan and other local planning policies.

**Policy HBE 2: Residential Site Allocation**

We support the changes to this policy. We have no other comments to make.

**Policy HB4: Affordable Housing**

We support and note the changes, including the addition of the Local Plan connection, the Babworth Local Housing Needs Assessment 2023 and the removal of ‘subject to viability’ referring to the First Homes Discount. It is positive that the neighbourhood plan supports rural exception sites.

**Policy HB5: Windfall Sites:**

We support the changes to this policy. We have no other comments to make.

**Policy HB6: Design**

It is positive that the policy incorporates reference to the Design Code and Guidance.

However, we still believe the policy could be strengthened and the wording tighter. Ranby has a distinctive character. It would be worth highlighting the key requirements identified in the Design Code in this policy, including density requirements. Densities that reflect local character help avoid the over-intensification of sites and would make a positive contribution to helping to deliver the aims of this policy.

**Policy ENV1: Local Green Space**

We support the changes to this policy. We have no other comments to make.

**Policy ENV2: Important Open Spaces**

We support the changes to moving Figure 6 above the policy.

We are supportive of the inclusion of important open spaces, but the policy covers open spaces and sports facilities. These have different roles and are considered differently in national and local policy. Currently, the policy is still inconsistent with both policy areas, so the second sentence should be revisited. Alternatively, national policy and relevant strategic local plan policies would cover these issues appropriately.

It would also be helpful to identify in the policy any spaces that would benefit from improvement. This would help evidence the need for developer contributions if relevant in the future from new development.

**Policy ENV3: Sites and Features of Natural Environment Significance/Policy ENV4 Biodiversity and Habitat Connectivity.**

We are supportive of policies that protect and enhance the natural environment.

However, Policy ENV3 appears to cover national and strategic planning policy and conflicts with both.

We would still suggest removing ENV3 and focusing on ENV4: Biodiversity and Habitat Connectivity. This would add significant value to the neighbourhood plan and help identify priority areas where biodiversity opportunities could be in the future.

**Policy ENV6: Footpaths and other walking routes**

We support policies that protect footpaths and other walking routes.

It would also be useful to identify in the policy any footpaths that would benefit from improvement. This would help evidence the need for developer contributions if relevant in the future.

**Policy ENV7: Flood Risk Resilience**

We advise that the policy is inconsistent with national and local planning policy and suggest it be re-visited.

**Policy ENV9: Renewable Energy Generation Infrastructure**

We understand why there might be a need for a Renewable Energy Generation policy. We advise that the Government changed their approach to wind energy in December 2024 – the policy should be revisited to reflect that.

The Council does have an up-to-date landscape character assessment: the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment (2009). We advise that the policy is inconsistent with national and local planning policies and should be re-visited.

**Policy CF1: The Retention of Community Facilities and Amenities**

We support the changes to this policy's wording. However, we would still suggest including a map and key to the community facilities and amenities.

**Policy E1: Employment Development**

The Local Plan provides sufficient employment land to meet identified needs over the Plan Period. We advise that Policy ST7 refers to specific Existing Employment Sites and Rural Employment Sites. None are in Babworth Parish. We’d ask that the reference to ST7 be removed from Policy E1.

The supporting text looks to promote appropriate rural economic growth. We suggest changing the second paragraph of Policy E1 as below to clarify this point and to be consistent with Policy ST8 – importantly rural economic growth must be supported by a proven need for the development.

We would suggest that the policy should be changed to:

Development proposals that result in the loss of, or have a significant adverse effect on,a business in the rural area will ~~not~~ only be supported ~~unless it can be demonstrated that the site or building is no longer suitable for employment use~~ where it is in line with Bassetlaw Local Plan (2020-2038) Policy ST~~7~~8.

Proposals for ~~employment-related~~ rural employment development (~~for new and/or expansion of employment uses~~) will be supported where there is a proven need for the development in that location and where it can be demonstrated that the development will not generate unacceptable disturbance, noise, fumes, smell, or traffic; has appropriate off-road parking; that it will respect and be compatible with the local character and surrounding uses; and that it will, where appropriate, protect residential amenity.

**Policy E3: Re-use of Agricultural and Commercial Buildings.**

We support the retitling of Policy E2.

We are supportive of the appropriate positive re-use of agricultural buildings. We’d suggest that the policy still needs to focus on a specific planning issue – employment is covered by Policy E1 and tourism is covered by E3. We still suggest aligning this policy with ST8 of the Local Plan.

**Policy E4: Tourism**

We are supportive of the inclusion of policies that can bring tourism to the rural areas of Bassetlaw. We note the change of Policy numbering from ST12 to ST10.

We would suggest revisiting the policy to ensure it is consistent with national and local planning policy.

**Policy E5: Broadband Infrastructure:**

We are supportive of policies that introduce high-quality broadband infrastructure within the rural areas of Bassetlaw. Policy ST57: Digital Infrastructure needs to be retitled as Policy ST55.

**Policy T1: Traffic Management**

We understand why there is a need for a traffic management policy. We would suggest revisiting the policy for consistency with national and local planning policy.

## 2: Bassetlaw District Council: Neighbourhood Planning

The Neighbourhood Planning Team support the production of the Babworth Neighbourhood Plan, and are pleased to see that it has progressed to the current stage of development. The comments below are intended to be constructive, written with a view to refining the Plan as it progresses towards adoption.

**General**

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

**Policy Format and Numbering:** As above, it would be useful for all policies to be re-formatted to include clause and sub-section numbering (or lettering, where relevant), to make them easier to reference. It may be useful to include the policies in boxes to ensure they are more clearly differentiated from the supporting text.

**Maps:** The resolution of some of the maps included within the Plan would benefit from adjustment, as some of the detailed content is difficult to read at present. For example, Figure 4.2 and Figure 8 are particularly difficult to read.

**Specific**

**Page 11:** The title of The Vision is incorrectly labelled as 2031 (as opposed to 2038).

**Pages 15 – 16:** We note thediscussion in the Consultation Statement (page 23) regarding our previous comment about the section of the proposed development boundary to the north of the village core. We acknowledge the response, but are still of the opinion that the proposed arrangement includes land that would be better classified as open countryside within the boundary, and would open the possibility of a not insignificant amount of ribbon development along Blyth Road. In addition, the alignment of the boundary around the proposed site allocation (Policy HBE2) may benefit from refinement. In the Bassetlaw Local Plan, site allocations have not been included within development boundaries unless they have been progressed to the point of construction.

**Pages 17 – 18:** It may be useful to include a more detailed plan of the site, so as to identify the key features of note, particularly the location of the trees to be retained. It is not clear which trees to the north are being addressed in the policy – the most obvious ones are not within the allocation boundary.

**Page 26, Figures 4.1 and 4.2**: The two maps would benefit from being increased in size, as the information is not legible at present.

**Page 39, Statutorily protected heritage assets:** It may be helpful to move this section ahead of Policy ENV5, so as to match the formatting conventions elsewhere in the Plan (supporting text, followed by policy).

**Page 45:** The first and second paragraphs about The Chequers Inn could be combined, as currently there is some duplication of the content.

**Pages 47 – 48:** The discussion of the historical context of St Martin’s Church and All Saints’ Church is interesting and relevant but does not clarify the current use / role of the two churches as community facilities.

**Policy CF1:** It would be useful to accompany the Policy with a map detailing the locations of the community facilities and amenities that are proposed to be protected.

**Neighbourhood Planning**

Bassetlaw District Council

19-03-25

Email: [neighbourhoodplanning@bassetlaw.gov.uk](mailto:neighbourhoodplanning@bassetlaw.gov.uk)

Tel: 01909 533 495

## 3: Bassetlaw District Council: Conservation

Please see the comments below in relation to the Babworth Neighbourhood Plan Draft Submission.

Submission Version: January 2025

P12 – I would advise re-wording ‘To ensure that all listed buildings and any identified community or environmental heritage assets are protected and improved’ to ‘To ensure that all listed buildings, other heritage assets and any identified community or environmental assets are protected and improved’

P24 – I would advise re-wording the section in brackets at the end of ‘It is important that new building in Ranby and across the Parish benefits from high-quality design so that it makes a positive contribution to enhancing this distinctive character. It should take inspiration from the rich heritage of Ranby. This includes ensuring that it would not lead to a significant adverse impact on key heritage assets (both nationally and locally designated) to (both designated and non-designated).

P28 – Where it is stated that ‘In the historical environment, Historic England has designated 21 Listed Buildings at grades I, II and II\*, and one site in the historic parks and gardens category. The Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Record (HER) includes more than 50 sites, although some of them are findspots or cropmark records from aerial photographic surveys (see policy ENV 5)’ I would also advise listing the number of non-designated heritage assets within the area.

P28 – A group of sites has significant community value as open space for amenity, sport & recreation, children’s play, etc., as allotments, churchyards or memorial gardens, or for their natural environment or village landscape value. They have been identified in fieldwork, community consultations and in Parish records; six are already recognised as Open Space, Sport & Recreation sites in the Bassetlaw DC Open Space Assessment update 2020 and are shown on the 2021 Policies Map for the Local Plan (2020-2038). Details are in Appendix 4. I would advise adding the heritage value of open spaces here as well, especially in relation to churchyards, cemeteries, memorial gardens or parks.

P38 – It is stated that ‘All new development proposals will be required to take into account their settings, as defined on a case-by-case basis by Historic England’. However, although Historic England provide guidance on setting this is rarely in relation to specific listed buildings and list descriptions are often minimal. Perhaps the NPPF definition of setting may ne more appropriate as follows; ‘The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral’.

P45 – It is stated that ‘The Chequers Inn reopened on 19th February 2016 following an extensive quarter-of-a-million pound refurbishment completed by the Pub People Company.

The pub has been transformed both inside and outside and also introduced a brand new menu following an extensive quarter-of-a-million pound refurbishment completed by the Pub People Company’. However, I cannot see any site history for alterations to this listed building since 2006. I would therefore recommend removing this paragraph, as the need for LBC and the appropriateness of the alterations may not have been assessed.

P50 – Where it is stated ‘To help maintain the rural economy and protect the open countryside from inappropriate development, the Plan supports the sustainable growth and expansion of business and enterprise through the development and where appropriate conversion of existing farm buildings in the countryside’ would it make sense to indicate that the sensitive conversion of historic mass walled agricultural buildings is often supported from a heritage perspective in order to secure a future use and prevent these from falling into disrepair.

Babworth: Design Guidance and Codes

P13 – I would suggest the following alteration: ‘This should include orientating buildings to maximise the opportunities for memorable views and visual connectivity. However, it is also important to respect the historic layout of the area typically characterised by buildings situated parallel or perpendicular to the roadside edge rather than introducing suburban style layouts’.

P23 – It is important to highlight that Ranby provides a largely rural rather than urban canal setting, so some of the industrial canal-side architecture located in a town or city may not be appropriate here. I would recommend removing Figure 23, as the development shown in this image appears urban rather than rural and the materials shown are not considered to be particularly in keeping with the local vernacular.

P24 – I would suggest the following alteration: ‘Extensions should consider the materials, architectural features, window sizes and proportions of the existing building, and respect these elements to design an extension that complements and may also match the existing building. A range of roof heights add interest to the village roofscape and enhances the integration of extensions with original buildings’.

P24 – I would suggest the following alteration: ‘It may be most appropriate for smaller scale extensions on significant or notable buildings to be clearly different from the original building. This can allow the merits of the original building to stand out. However such a decision should always be based on an understanding of the building’s character, and it is often more appropriate for larger scale extensions to be in matching materials’.

P25 – I would advise changing the title above the loft conversion examples to ‘Design treatment where dormers are considered acceptable’. Dormers will only be considered acceptable on certain buildings where consent is required. There is little historic precedent for dormers in this location and dormers are likely to be considered unacceptable on listed buildings, so their use is not generally encouraged.

P28 – I would suggest removing the text in red: ‘Dwellings in the Neighbourhood Area are generally of a modest scale and are typically comparable in size and height. Rooflines are between one and two storeys in height (three storey dwellings can be found in the parish in either dormer style or with a subfloor). This similarity creates a sense of cohesion across the Neighbourhood Area.

P28 – Figure 29 is not a particularly good example of a two storey dwelling. There are likely to be some more appropriate examples of two storey houses, but the below example is in red brick and clay pantile (materials to be encouraged) and has a simple form, although the windows are uPVC.



P29 – It is suggested that the permeable fencing shown in figure 30 is replaced by estate style fencing or post and rail/wire fencing.

P36 – Perhaps include a sentence stating that ‘historic mass walled buildings require a certain amount of through draft to prevent damp, and non-breathable insulation types are not suited to these types of buildings’.

Other matters

* The established material palette of the area is red-facing bricks and either natural clay pantiles or slate, and buildings historically have a simple steeply pitched or hipped roof design – can this be referenced somewhere?
* There is limited reference to the impact on heritage assets. Could the following or similar be added? The heritage assets found locally shall be appreciated and valued for their significant contribution to the distinctive character of Babworth. Great weight shall be afforded to the preservation and enhancement of such assets, especially in respects to the decision making process in planning functions; New development should either preserve or enhance the special interest and setting of any Listed Buildings that might be affected by such development. Any new development should be designed in a way to minimise its incurred impact. Any scheme which results in either direct or indirect harm to the special interest or setting of a listed building, shall likely be refused, unless there is a strong justification for such scheme; New development should either preserve or enhance the significance of Non-Designated heritage assets, as well as those heritage assets which are archaeological in nature, most of which can be found on the the Nottinghamshire HER (Historic Environment Record). The significance of these assets shall be taken into account when assessing any proposed development that may affect these assets.

## 4: National Highways

Thank you for consulting National Highways on the pre submission Babworth Neighbourhood Plan (Review) which covers the period 2020 to 2038 in line with the Bassetlaw Local Plan. The plan is to be in conformity with the Bassetlaw Local Plan and this is acknowledged within the document.

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

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

National Highways principal interest is in safeguarding the safe operation of the SRN in the area, namely the A1trunk road which routes adjacent to the eastern boundary of the Plan area.

It is acknowledged that due to the scale and anticipated distribution of any additional development growth being proposed through the Neighbourhood Plan, it is unlikely that there will be any significant impacts on the operation of the SRN in the area.

It is encouraging to know that the Parish Council will take a positive approach to the consideration of development proposals that contribute to sustainable development and meet the policies identified in the Neighbourhood Plan. This includes working with the District Council and other partners to encourage the formulation of development proposals, which clearly demonstrate how sustainable development has been considered and addressed.

This Reg 16 consultation identifies the scale of acceptable residential development along with any windfall opportunities that may arise, including small employment sites which may come forward for development. These sites will be assessed through the planning process (Transport Assessment). However, as mentioned, when considering the scale of the development concerned, it is unlikely that there will be any significant impacts on the safe operation of the SRN in the area. As such we have no further comments to make.

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

## 5: Natural England

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 06 February 2025.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 6: Sport England

Thank you for consulting Sport England on the Babworth Neighbourhood Plan (Review): Regulation 16 Consultation.

Sport England provided comments on the Regulation 14 version of the Neighbourhood Plan by email dated 25th November 2024. However, these comments do not appear within the Consultation Statement. Our comments recommended that the wording of Policy ENV2 be amended to ensure that the Policy conforms with the criteria set out in paragraph 103 (now 104) of the NPPF. No amendments have been made to Policy ENV2. Sport England therefore has the following comments to make:

Policy ENV2 - Sport England welcomes the inclusion of Policy ENV2 which seeks to protect open spaces including playing field. Paragraph 104 of the NPPF provides clear advice on how sports facilities and playing fields should be considered in the planning system. The criteria in Policy ENV2 requiring proposals to demonstrate that the open space is no longer required by the community does not conform with paragraph 104 which requires an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements. Paragraph 104 also requires replacement provision to be equivalent or better in terms of quantity and quality. It is therefore recommended that the wording of the policy is amended to conform with the criteria set out in paragraph 104 of the NPPF.

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

## 7: Coal Authority

Thank you for your notification of the 7th February 2025 seeking the views of the Coal Authority on the above.

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

Our records indicate that within the Babworth Parish Neighbourhood Plan area there are fissures present. These appear to lie between Upper Morton and Old London Road. These features may pose a potential risk to surface stability and public safety.

It is noted that the Neighbour Plan proposes to allocate a new site for future development, although this lies outside of the area where coal mining features are recorded to be present. On this basis we have no specific comments to make on this document.

## 8: Nottinghamshire County Council

Thank you for your email dated 6th February 2025 requesting strategic planning observations on the above Neighbourhood Plan Consultation. I have consulted with my colleagues across relevant divisions of the County Council and have the following comments to make.

In terms of the County Council’s responsibilities there are a number of elements of national planning policy and guidance that are of particular relevance in the assessment of Neighbourhood Plans. These include Minerals and Waste, Education, Transport and Public Health.

**County Planning Context**

Highways and Flood Risk Management

The County Council as Highway Authority and Lead Local Flood Authority is a statutory consultee to Local Planning Authorities and therefore makes separate responses on the relevant highway and flood risk technical aspects for planning applications.

Should further information on the highway and flood risk elements be required contact should be made directly with the Highway Development Control Team and the Flood Risk Management Team to discuss this matter further with the relevant officers dealing with the application.

Minerals and Waste

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 adopted Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan (adopted March 2021), form part of the development plan for the area. The Pre-Submission Version (August 2023) of the emerging Waste Local Plan, which has been submitted for examination (March 2024), should also be given weight as a material consideration. 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 Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan, these should be taken into account where proposals for non-minerals 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. Considering the proposed policies within the Babworth Neighbourhood Plan, these do not appear to conflict with the Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Core Strategy, Waste Local Plan, emerging Waste Local Plan nor the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local plan.

The Neighbourhood Plan boundary area also does not fall within or nearby to any active waste management facilities nor any Mineral Safeguarding and Consultation Areas. Therefore, the plan does not pose any sterilisation risk to either mineral resources nor waste facilities. The County Council therefore does not wish to raise any objections to the neighbourhood plan from a minerals or waste perspective.

**Public Transport**

*Background*

The Transport Act 1985 places a duty on Nottinghamshire County Council to secure a “Socially necessary” bus network. Local bus operators provide services that they consider as commercial, and the Council provide revenue subsidies to provide additional services to ensure communities have access to essential services including education, work, health, shopping and leisure.

In 2021 the government published its document ‘Bus Back Better – A **National Bus Strategy** for England’. The strategy requires Local Transport Authorities to implement ambitious bus priority schemes and Bus Service Improvement Plans (BSIPs) which consider how a coherent and integrated network should serve schools, health, social care, employment and other services. This includes requiring the provision of economically necessary bus services, including those which improve people’s access to employment. The aims of the Strategy should be reflected in the Neighbourhood Plan.

The level of revenue funding available to the Council to provide supported services is diminishing. Therefore, other funding sources are required to enable the council to maintain a socially necessary and sustainable public transport network.

*Current Babworth Public Transport Network*

Stagecoach operates Service 43 which provides links to Retford and Worksop, Monday to Saturdays. The service is operated commercially with the County Council providing funding support for journeys to the Manton Wood employment area. School buses also serve Babworth and Ranby.

*Neighbourhood Plan*

The Council welcome the emphasis on sustainable development. The ‘Foreward’ refers to transport and is also covered at Section 3’ Traffic’ and Bassetlaw Local Plan Policy ST55. A brief reference to the bus service would demonstrate how the plan area is sustainably served by public transport along the A620.

*Community Transport*

Community transport services are provided in the plan area by Bassetlaw Action Centre. They operate a Community Car Scheme for eligible registered users: <https://bassetlawactioncentre.org.uk/bassetlaw-community-car-scheme/> . It is suggested that reference could be included within the Plan, with the potential for Community Transport and other services i.e. demand responsive transport to complement the bus network.

*Taxis*

There is no reference in the document to the role of taxis, which are licensed by Bassetlaw District Council and play an import role in the local economy. It is suggested that reference to the role of taxis is included in the plan

**Archaeology**

The Neighbourhood Plan presents a history of the parish on page 6 and considers the rich archaeological potential in Policy Section B starting on page 25. Policy ENV 5 makes provision for assessment of archaeological sites and heritage assets.

The parish history section (page 6) provides a good review of the recent history, especially the significant connection with the Pilgrim Fathers. The medieval Church of All Saints is also well represented; however, the medieval history could be expanded upon to include the deserted medieval village at Babworth which was cleared when the park was created.

The parish also contains evidence for extensive late Iron Age and Roman settlement, which is mentioned later in the document, but might be useful to include in the background. Few parishes can compete with the level of known archaeological sites of this period and it is a positive heritage story that could be presented here.

The Plan considers data from the Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Record (NHER) in the section titled ‘Sites and features of Historical Environment significance’ starting on page 35. This is well considered and researched, and The Council welcome the inclusion of this section in the Plan.

Policy ENV 5: Sites of Historical Environment Significance makes provision for assessment of archaeological remains during the development. This is also welcomed; however the wording could be altered slightly to better reflect the local and national planning policy guidance and procedures. A recommendation of the following (or similar) as a replacement for the second paragraph of the Policy:

*In view of the evidence for extensive prehistoric and historic occupation and other potential archaeological features (figure 8.2), all development proposals throughout the Plan Area should be required to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. As a minimum the Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, the applicant should submit appropriate desk-based research, supported by field evaluation where necessary, and to inform a programme of further archaeological mitigation work if required.*

This would give clarity to developers of future sites. The plan could also highlight a level of outreach and public engagement that might be aspired to from archaeology undertaken as part of a development project. Increased public understanding of heritage assets is an aspiration of the NPPF, and provision in project designs for outreach and engagement are always welcomed.

Overall, the Plan has provided a good level of consideration to the extensive archaeological resource within the parish. Clear and appropriate consultation of the relevant data sources including the NHER is evident in the Plan and The Council support the inclusion of Policy ENV 5 to protect the valuable archaeological resource within the Parish.

**Public Health**

The Public Health response is outlined in Appendix 1, however if any further information is required, the Public Health team will be able to provide further advice via email planning.publichealth@nottscc.gov.uk

**Conclusion**

These comments are based on the information supplied and are without prejudice to any comments the County Council may make on any future planning applications submitted within the Plan area.

Should you require any further assistance in relation to any of these matters please do not hesitate to contact me.

## 9: Environment Agency

Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the submission draft of the Babworth Neighbourhood Plan (Review). We previously made comments at the pre-submission draft plan stage.

We previously commented that we welcome the inclusion of POLICY ENV 7: FLOOD RISK RESILIENCE. We also commented that our national flood modelling update is due to be released in Spring 2025. This data release is due 25 March 2025, though not yet publicly released at the time of writing, we have assessed the internal pre-release of the flood data and can confirm that there are some changes to how flood risk is presented for the plan area. The data presented in Figure 11 should be updated to reflect the newly available data. We have screened the site allocations and can confirm that none of the site allocations have been impacted by increased flood risk.

The comments below are copied from our previous response for completeness:

The Environment Agency has an important role in the protection of groundwater and it’s sources. The area covered by the Babworth Neighbourhood Plan intersects with Source Protection Zones (SPZs) 1, 2 & 3. SPZs have not been identified or considered within the site options. They’re an important consideration and should be included. More information and mapping data for SPZs can be found here:

[*Groundwater source protection zones (SPZs)*](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/groundwater-source-protection-zones-spzs#find-groundwater-spzs)

## 10: Anglian Water

Thank you for notifying Anglian Water on the current consultation on the draft Babworth Neighbourhood Plan.

We have previously submitted comments on the pre-submission version (Reg 14) of the neighbourhood plan. We welcome the amendments in the submission version of the neighbourhood plan, following our comments and recommended changes.

I can confirm, Anglian Water has no further comments to make on the documents.

## 11: Chesterfield Canal Trust

Thank you for consulting the trust about the formal submission of the neighbourhood plan. We do not wish to make any further comments about the plan.

## 12: Canal & River Trust

Thank you for your consultation on the above document.

We are the charity who look after and bring to life 2000 miles of canals Samp; rivers. Our waterways contribute to the health and wellbeing of local communities and economies, creating attractive and connected places to live, work, volunteer and spend leisure time. These historic, natural and cultural assets form part of the strategic and local green-blue infrastructure network, linking urban and rural communities as well as habitats. By caring for our waterways and promoting their use we believe we can improve the wellbeing of our nation. The Canal & River Trust (the Trust) is a statutory consultee in the Development Management process, and as such we welcome the opportunity to input into planning policy related matters to ensure that our waterways are protected, safeguarded and enhanced within an appropriate policy framework.

The Trust has reviewed the Draft Plan, and we can advise that we have no comments to make.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any queries you may have.