



Newark and Sherwood Local Development Framework

Plan Review

Preferred Approach - Strategy

Consultation Responses Document

February 2017

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Newark and Sherwood Local Development Framework Plan Review: Preferred Approach – Strategy (hereafter referred to as the Preferred Approach – Strategy) was published for a period of public consultation on 29 July 2016. Representations were requested to be received by 23 September 2016. The Local Development Framework Task Group approved the document for publication on 13 July 2016 following delegated authority from the Economic Development Committee on 15 June 2016.
- 1.2 This statement sets out how many representations were made on the Preferred Approach – Strategy document and a summary of the main issues raised in those representations, in accordance with Regulation 22(c)(iii) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. It goes on to set out the District Council’s Response to these and any actions which flow from the District Council’s response that have informed the development of the Plan Review.

2. Summary of Main Issues Raised

- 2.1 A total of 336 representations were received from 64 respondents to the Preferred Approach – Strategy document. Most of these representations were responses to the 20 questions raised within the consultation document, however, some representations were received making additional comments and others responded to the Draft Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA).
- 2.2 The summary below of the main issues raised sets out the responses in relation to each question in turn and then deals with the additional and IIA comments at the end of the report.

Question 1: Do you agree with the Council’s Preferred Approach to the housing target? If you think a different target should be used, please set out which Option, or other figure, you think is most appropriate along with your reasons.

- 2.3 Twenty-nine representations were received in relation to Question 1 of which four explicitly supported the Council’s preferred approach and twenty objected to the Preferred Approach. The remaining representations were not specific in expressing either support or objection.
- 2.4 Those respondents supporting Option 1 included Gedling Borough Council (59(1)). The site proponents for Thoresby Colliery (12(1)) stated that the redevelopment of the Colliery would provide the opportunity to deliver new homes and meet the District’s housing requirements.
- 2.5 Of those objecting to the Council’s preferred approach, eleven respondents considered that Option 2 was preferable, one considered that Option 3 was preferable and three stated that either Option 2 or 3 would be preferred. Although expressing their support for the Council’s preferred approach, Fernwood Parish Council (47(1)) also stated that more affordable housing is needed and that this should be on a freehold basis, with affordable rented accommodation to be provided by the Local Authority. A number of respondents who objected to Option 1 raised concerns in relation to the Full Objectively Assessed Needs for housing (FOAN) and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) on which it was based. These concerns included issues such as that they are out of date, not justified and not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) or the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). One developer (27(1))

provided an additional report relating to their objections to the FOAN and another developer (50(1)) stated that the documents should be based on the 2014 population and household projection information and that insufficient consideration has been given to factors such as affordability, household formation rates and unattributable population change. These concerns are shared by many respondents who raised objections. One respondent (27(1)) added to this that the approach to affordable housing is flawed. The recent appeal decision at Farnsfield has been cited by most of the objectors as grounds for justifying a higher housing target than is within Option 1 and the District Council's reasons for disagreeing with the appeal decision have been brought into question. A developer (56(1)) stated that the District Council's desire to ensure that it can demonstrate a five year supply of housing land is not appropriate justification for choosing a lower housing target. Of particular concern to a number of respondents is the requirement in the NPPF and NPPG to significantly boost the supply of housing and a positive approach to achieve this is promoted by those objectors to Option 1. The delivery of affordable housing through a higher housing target is also promoted.

- 2.6 The representations which neither expressed support nor objection included one from Collingham Parish Council (1(1)) which stated that it supported Option 1 but considered that Option 2 was most likely in light of the Farnsfield appeal Inspector's report. Highways England (31(1)) did not comment on a preferred approach but note that all options are significantly lower than the adopted Core Strategy and therefore would have less of an impact on the Strategic Road Network. Historic England (46(1)) also chose not to comment on a preferred approach but stated that the forthcoming Site Locations DPD will need to ensure appropriate consideration is given to the historic environment and historic assets.

District Council Response: The District Council has considered the various issues raised by the consultation regarding the evidence base which supports the Councils proposed housing target. The Council believes that the Nottingham Outer Strategic Housing Market Assessment prepared by GL Hearn provides an assessment of objectively assessed housing need which meets the provisions of the NPPF and associated guidance. We note the comments regarding the publication of the 2014 Sub National Population Projections and we have undertaken further work in the HMA to assess the impact of this.

Actions: Further work to address the 2014 demographic update has been undertaken.

Question 2: Do you agree with the Council's Preferred Approach to the employment target? If you think a different target should be used, please set out which Scenario, or other figure, you think is most appropriate along with your reasons.

- 2.7 Twelve representations were received in relation to Question 2, eight of which explicitly supported (or supported in principle) the Preferred Approach, including Fernwood Parish Council (47(2)); three representations did not express a view either way but made comments including from Collingham Parish Council (1(2)), the Highways Agency (31(2)) and Historic England (46(2)).
- 2.8 There was one objection to the Preferred Approach (40(2)). This respondent stated that after Brexit the degree of uncertainty makes all such targets debatable and the respondent considered that such figures may be determined by prejudice and self-interest.
- 2.9 Those who supported or supported in principle the Preferred Approach often made no caveats or concerns. Two concerns that were identified are the interlinking of housing growth with employment land take-up (Collingham Parish Council) and the current/historic slow rate of development of identified/permitted employment land in the District and places such as Mansfield (5(2)) and 37 (2)).
- 2.10 The Highways Agency and Historic England stated that they were not commenting on the Preferred Approach but that any new sites subsequently identified for employment purposes should meet the respective requirements of these two bodies which they summarised in their representations.

District Council Response: The comments are noted.

Actions: None required.

Spatial Policy 1: Settlement Hierarchy

Question 3: Do you agree with the Council's Preferred Approach to the status of Edwinstowe within the Settlement Hierarchy to accommodate a strategic site at Thoresby Colliery? If you think a different approach is more appropriate, please provide details along with your reasons.

- 2.11 Twenty-six representations were received in relation to Question 3, two of which supported the Preferred Approach without any amplification including Fernwood Parish Council (47(3)) and respondent 63(3). Eight other respondents supported the Preferred Approach but had comments that did not affect the policy wording. The National Trust (24(1)) supported the Preferred Approach provided that there was no adverse impact upon the environment. The National Trust also provided more detail on how the leisure/tourism aspects could be integrated with other such uses in the Sherwood Forest area. One respondent (5(3)) supported the Preferred Approach provided that the development land at Bilsthorpe was not affected. Respondent 12(2) supported the Preferred Approach and as the proponents of the Colliery redevelopment gave more detail in support of those proposals. Newark Town Council (52(1)) gave qualified support for the Preferred Approach as there was concern that the Colliery redevelopment could affect the necessary development of sites in and around Newark, and a similar view but applying to sites elsewhere in the District was made by two other respondents (53(3)) and (62(3)). One respondent (37(3)) supported the Preferred Approach but considered that the masterplan prepared by the developers needed to show better linkage between the site and the village of Edwinstowe and that care needs to be taken to ensure that the development of the Colliery site does not adversely affect the development potential of land at Bilsthorpe. One respondent (51(2)) supported the policy approach with particular reference to Collingham where they supported the fresh approach being taken by the Council from that set out for the settlement in the adopted Core Strategy.
- 2.12 Three respondents neither supported nor objected to the Preferred Approach. Nottinghamshire County Council (44(1)) stated that whilst they did not support or object to the Preferred Approach, they could not find any Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) for the proposals and an HRA would need to be undertaken given the sensitivity of the surrounding countryside. The County Council considered that all aspects of the Preferred Approach – the Colliery and the changed status of Edwinstowe would need careful assessment. The Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (42(1)) also did not object to the Preferred Approach and called for more investigations into potential impacts upon the natural environment. The Wildlife Trust was only concerned with the Colliery redevelopment aspects of the Preferred Approach. The RSPB (35(1)) does not object to the Preferred Approach in as much that development takes place on previously used land but requests that there is a clear buffer between built development land and the restored heathland. The respondent makes various comments which are relevant to more detailed planning issues concerning the Thoresby Colliery site and surrounding

areas which have valuable ecological and landscape value. The respondent also considers that more safeguards for ecological interests needs to be written into the policy and its supporting text.

- 2.13 Eleven respondents made objections to the Preferred Approach. Natural England (4(1)) objected to the Preferred Approach stating that the development proposals at Edwinstowe/Thoresby Colliery needed to be screened for potential impacts upon the natural environment. Historic England (46(3)) also objected stating that there was a lack of evidence in relation to possible impacts upon the historic environment and this evidence base should be in place before an allocation was made. This respondent also considered that if the Preferred Approach was accepted by the Council, it would effectively allocate the site before the Site Allocations Plan Document was out for public consultation and this may affect the soundness of that Plan. Historic England also felt that the Council's own admission that they were investigating potential environmental and other impacts also raised soundness issues with regard to the impact of the Preferred Approach on the nearby countryside assets. Wellow Parish Council ((9(1)) objects to the Preferred Approach considering that Edwinstowe should remain a principal village (and not a service centre) and that any further increase of services should be directed to Ollerton and Boughton where there would be greater benefits as well as assisting in the extension of the Robin Hood Railway Line to Ollerton.
- 2.14 One representation (11(1)) objects to the Preferred Approach in that the housing and employment elements at the Colliery site are outside the existing village envelope and within or adjacent to sensitive areas of countryside; redevelopment of the Colliery site should be restricted to appropriate leisure /tourism uses which are in keeping with established policies for the Sherwood Forest area. A respondent (22(3)) objected to the Preferred Approach stating that the allocation of former Colliery sites for housing and employment had not been very successful in terms of the actual delivery of dwellings and employment uses over the Plan period. The proposals for Thoresby Colliery were very unlikely to provide the scale of housing being proposed. A similar argument is put forward by another respondent (20(1)) who considers the redevelopment proposals are poorly located with respect to the village of Edwinstowe and that there are doubts as to the sustainability of the proposals in themselves. One objector (25(2)) also considers the proposals for Thoresby Colliery are poorly linked to the village of Edwinstowe and considers that the housing element proposed at the Colliery site could be better located elsewhere and the respondent suggests a number of sites in and around other settlements in the District.

- 2.15 Another respondent (34(2)) objects to the Preferred Approach again because the Colliery site is not well related to Edwinstowe, that too much reliance would be placed on a major development site with large infrastructure costs and that the employment element should be in more modern, high technology, IT sectors and that a better location would be in places such as Brackenhurst College. One respondent (45(1)) objected to the Preferred Approach in that too much reliance was being placed on the Thoresby Colliery site delivering 800 dwellings over the next ten years.
- 2.16 An objection to the Preferred Approach was made by another respondent (60(3)) who considered that the site was of poor quality and would not be developed quickly and should be redeveloped as a woodland site.
- 2.17 The objection from respondent 61(3) considered that there was no need to change the status of Edwinstowe and that whilst the Thoresby Colliery site should be redeveloped, the priority should be for employment development with a bit of housing rather than with a larger volume of housing.
- 2.18 Collingham Parish Council (1(3)) stated that this question was a matter for Edwinstowe and surrounding Parish Councils and made no other comment. A similar view was expressed by another respondent (40(3)).

District Council Response: Comments are noted. A number of respondents made comments in relation to the suitability or otherwise of Thoresby Colliery being allocated, and a number of these comments informed work that was subsequently done as part of the Preferred Approach – Sites and Settlements consultation. The District Council is committed to the regeneration of the Thoresby Colliery site and views the site as a sustainable location to accommodate growth and therefore Edwinstowe is best regarded as a Service Centre.

Action: Further work has been undertaken to support the allocation and informed the proposed Plan Review amendments.

Spatial Policy 2: Spatial Distribution of Growth

Question 4: Do you agree with the Council's Preferred Approach to the distribution of development within the Settlement Hierarchy? If you think a different approach is more appropriate, please provide details along with your reasons.

- 2.19 Twenty-seven representations were received in relation to this question of which three supported the Council's Preferred Approach, twenty objected and four were not specific in either supporting or objecting. Gedling Borough Council (59(2)) supported the Council's Preferred Approach. The developers (12(4)) promoting the redevelopment of Thoresby Colliery stated that this was an opportunity to meet housing and employment targets on a highly sustainable brownfield site. They also expressed support for moving Edwinstowe up the settlement hierarchy.
- 2.20 The objections raised to the Council's Preferred Approach covered a number of issues and were from a range of respondents including local residents and a number of developers and agents. The key issues raised by developers and agents related to a recommendation for a more flexible approach to the settlement hierarchy to deliver sustainable development in accordance with paragraphs 14 and 55 of the NPPF; the need to include higher housing target figures; and concerns that the preferred approach would not boost the supply of housing as required by the NPPF. Objections were raised to the reliance on Edwinstowe to accommodate a significant proportion of the overall housing requirement. One respondent (11(2)) specifically stated that Edwinstowe should remain a Principal Village. Respondents suggested that further work should be undertaken to assess the needs of rural settlements and Spatial Policy 2 should be amended to take into account their housing needs, including affordable housing needs, and the need to support and improve services and facilities in rural areas through growth. One respondent (5(4)) recommended that 5% of growth should be allocated to "limited growth villages" as it was considered that the previous approach had starved settlements below Principal Village level of organic and sustainable growth through the application of Spatial Policy 3.
- 2.21 The justification for the distribution of growth was called into question and increased growth was promoted by various respondents in Newark, Southwell, Lowdham, Bilsthorpe, Bleasby, Harby, Norwell, Walesby and Blidworth. However, concerns were raised in relation to the proportion of growth proposed in Farnsfield and Collingham and an objection was stated to the displaced housing need from Blidworth being accommodated in Southwell, which is stated to have the highest house prices in the District. One local resident suggested that Caunton should be considered as a sustainable village and housing development be allowed. In promoting the further allocation of housing in the Mansfield Fringe Area, specifically in Blidworth, one local resident stated that the Council cannot reasonably adopt the SHMA housing figure and

ignore the other advice and findings of the SHMA, such as locational need and suggested directions for growth.

- 2.22 One respondent (37(4)) considered that the category of “Principal Village” was too wide in its scope and too large and should be broken down into four separate village categories to reflect their facilities.
- 2.23 In addition to this, Historic England (46(4)) objected on the basis that there had been no historic impact assessment in relation to Thoresby Colliery, Edwinstowe and Ollerton Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sherwood Forest and the wider landscape. Historic England consider that the change in status of Edwinstowe is not sound within the context of the NPPF and that the promotion of Thoresby Colliery as a strategic housing site through the Preferred Approach rather than a Site Allocation document would result in it not being sound. Collingham Parish Council (1(4)) and Fernwood Parish Council (47(4)) both raised objections with Collingham Parish Council stating that their community had consistently voted for no more development in the Parish due to the highways issues already experienced. The National Trust (24(2)) queried how employment growth had been calculated and that the growth levels in Spatial Policy 2 need to be clearly linked to, and informed by, a Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (referring to the NPPG) otherwise the targets may be undeliverable in some settlements.
- 2.24 The four representations which were not specific in their support or objection raised issues such as any changes to the settlement hierarchy needing to take into full account any impacts on the natural environment (Natural England (4(2))); a desire to ensure local communities have the opportunity to see any boundary changes; a presumption that any adverse impacts on the A46 had already been taking into account given that no additional sites are proposed for Collingham and Newark (Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee (54(1))); and that Newark and Sherwood District Council and Nottinghamshire County Council need to be satisfied that the highway infrastructure can accommodate any increase in traffic on a site by site and cumulative basis, or alternatively, identification of the necessary highways infrastructure improvement required and how they would be delivered (Mansfield District Council (16(1))).

District Council Response: The comments are noted. The Council believes that the amended policy does provide for the appropriate level of future housing and employment need as

required by the NPPF. With regard to the question of flexibility in terms of the levels of future development, it should be noted that the levels in the policy are minima and therefore in line with the principals of sustainable development (as encapsulated in Policy DM12 Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development and the various other policies of the development plan) other development proposals will be allowed in sustainable locations where appropriate. Furthermore many of the points regarding further development elsewhere in the district have been addressed in amendments to Spatial Policy 3.

Comments relating to the suitability of Edwinstowe to be elevated in the hierarchy are addressed in the Council's response to Question 3.

Actions: None proposed.

Spatial Policy 3: Rural Areas

Question 5: Do you agree with the Council's Preferred Approach to the Rural Areas? If you think a different Option is more appropriate, please provide details along with your reasons.

- 2.25 Thirty-one representations were received in relation to this question. Seven representations supported the Council's Preferred Approach and twenty-four objected to it. Collingham Parish Council (1(5)), Harby Parish Council (14(1)), Norwell Parish Council (48(1)) and the National Trust (24(3)) submitted representations of support. Harby Parish Council noted that Option 3 provided additional scope and flexibility for communities to support appropriate small scale development which is missing from the current policy.
- 2.26 Amongst those objecting to the Council's Preferred Approach were Caunton Parish Council (7(5)), Coddington Parish Council (17(1)), Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council (18(1)), South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council (39(1)) and Fernwood Parish Council (47(5)). Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council and South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council consider the existing Spatial Policy 3 works well and should remain unchanged, whereas Coddington Parish Council does not support Option 2 as there is no definition of local need. Caunton Parish Council consider that Option 3 does not go far enough to meet the needs of Caunton which should be explicitly regarded as a village eligible for development to ensure its sustainability and status. Coddington Parish Council raise queries regarding how the wording of the policy under Option 3 would be interpreted and suggest the removal of references to assessing viability of facilities and services and that information regarding housing tenure and type should be

included within the policy. Coddington Parish Council also stated that within criterion 5 of the policy, additional weight should be given to the consideration of development within or affecting the setting of a Conservation Area.

- 2.27 Two key issues can be drawn out of many of the objections raised. The first issue is that relating to development being limited to within the built up area of settlements. Respondents raised concerns that this was too restrictive and suggested that the policy should be reworded to either include sites adjoining the main built up area or sites which relate well to the main built up area to enable sustainable growth. One respondent (41(11)) stated that the approach was inconsistent with paragraph 55 of the NPPF which promotes sustainable development in rural areas by locating housing where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. One respondent (23(2)) stated that sometimes the open spaces within the main built up areas are historic or restrictive and therefore considers that sites should be considered which are closely related to the built envelope of the village. It is suggested by two respondents that Spatial Policy 3 is at odds with Spatial Policy 9 which enables sites to be allocated adjacent to settlements and that Spatial Policy 3 should be amended accordingly.
- 2.28 Secondly, concern has been expressed regarding the lack of understanding as to what “local need” is defined as and the difficulties which have been experienced in relation to the interpretation of the existing Spatial Policy 3. A number of respondents requested that this matter be dealt with to provide clarity.
- 2.29 Of those representations objecting to the Council’s Preferred Approach, three representations explicitly supported Option 1, one explicitly supported Option 2 and two supported Option 3 but recommended amendments.
- 2.30 Other comments were made in the objections raised, including one local resident requesting that the village boundary be re-instated around Edingley and raising flooding and drainage concerns if any further development was to take place within the village; queries as to how Lowham’s housing shortfall would be met and that it shouldn’t be met in Edwinstowe; concerns that Spatial Policy 3 does not reflect the changes to Core Policy 7, leading them to be contradictory and changes are therefore recommended to Spatial Policy 3 regarding tourism; a query regarding the appropriateness of including a clause about the re-use of rural buildings of architectural merit given that under permitted development rights no such restrictions apply to the conversion of agricultural buildings; a requirement to consider the implications of an ageing

population in North Muskham; the promotion of sites in Walesby and a request that it should move up the settlement hierarchy; the promotion of a site in Besthorpe; sites being promoted for development in Bleasby (25(4)); and Historic England (46(5)) recommended that the fourth paragraph of the policy be extended to refer to encouraging enhancement of heritage assets.

District Council Response: The responses to the consultation are diverse and set out a number of different and to some extent divergent views on the various potential approaches to this policy area. The Council notes these comments however, it has proceeded on the basis that Spatial Policy 3 will be amended to allow a more flexible approach. Therefore it will not look to keep the same policy nor go so far as to name specific settlements as some Parish Councils have requested. The comments regarding the 'restricting' of development within the main built up areas of villages is noted however going beyond this approach introduces a whole new level of judgement of what is acceptable, which we do not believe is possible to codify adequately within a development plan policy. In terms of further defining what 'local need' constitutes the need to further define this is accepted. With regard to the issue of the impact of changes to Core Policy 7 and its impact on Spatial Policy 3 the Council accepts that this needs to be addressed in an amendment. The Council also accepts Historic England's comments regarding schemes to enhance heritage assets and proposed to accept the change.

Actions: provide further clarification of local need and amend Spatial Policy 3 to reflect the requirements of amended Core Policy 7 and Historic England's comment.

Spatial Policy 4A: Extent of the Green Belt

Spatial Policy 4B: Green Belt Development

Question 6: Do you agree with the Council's approach to the Green Belt? If not, please set out what other approach you think is more appropriate.

2.31 Fifteen representations were received in relation to Question 6 of which six representations were in support of the Council's approach, eight raised objections and Collingham Parish Council (1(6)) stated that the issue wasn't applicable to their community so hadn't been considered. Oxtun Parish Council (8(1)) and Fernwood Parish Council (47(6)) were amongst those expressing support. The National Trust (24(4)) also supported the approach, stating that Parishes are best placed to consider the approach to individual villages and Historic England (46(6)) also supported Spatial Policies 4A and 4B, subject to rural exception sites being assessed in respect of the impact on the historic environment. One supporter of the approach stated that Green

Belt releases should be avoided as there are alternative sustainable options for accommodating growth.

- 2.32 Of the objections raised in relation to the Green Belt, four representations promoted further development in Lowdham, three promoted further development in Blidworth and one promoted further development in Rainworth. Issues were raised that the previous Green Belt review was small scale and local communities were significantly under provided for, most notably in Lowdham and Blidworth. One respondent (50(4)) stated that given the uncertainties regarding the Council's housing needs evidence, a Green Belt review may be required and therefore it is critical that a methodology is defined. Concern was also raised that the answer to meet housing needs in Lowdham cannot be addressed by re-allocating housing development elsewhere. One respondent (34(5)) stated that the statement regarding the permanence of the Green Belt being an overriding factor is too restrictive. A suggestion is also made that Spatial Policy 4B should allow limited infilling in the "washed over" part of Lowdham. Another respondent (41(2)) queried the meaning of the addition text within Spatial Policy 4B that "No villages "washed over" by the Green Belt have been identified for limited infilling" and that it may be contrary to the NPPF.

District Council Response: The Council notes the comments; when the review of the Green Belt was undertaken as part of the production of Allocations & Development Management DPD process it was intended to be a one off and not a continual approach which would be revisited at every review of the Development Plan as set out in Paragraph 83 of the NPPF. Indeed, especially given the plentiful supply of housing and employment land and the limited area that the Green Belt covers in Newark & Sherwood it is not necessary to consider Green Belt release. In terms of the status of 'washed over' villages, the NPPF at Paragraph 89 bullet point 5 states that exceptions include "limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs **under policies set out in the Local Plan**" (my emphasis) and therefore it is for local planning authority to decide in its Local Plan policies where this applies. The approach that the Council took when developing the Core Strategy and through the review is that beyond those settlements (or parts of settlements) excluded from the Green Belt no communities will be identified for limited infilling in line with the former PPG 2 Green Belts and the current provisions of the NPPF. In order to make this clear reference to this will be made in the amended supporting text.

Actions: Ensure the amendment to the supporting text is clear.

Spatial Policy 5: Delivering the Strategy

Question 7: Do you agree with the Council's proposed amendments to Spatial Policy 5? If not, please give details of any alternative proposals.

- 2.33 Eighteen representations were received in relation to Question 7, six of which explicitly supported the proposed amendment, including Fernwood Parish Council (47(7)) and the National Trust (24(5)) whilst two other respondents supported the amendments but made other comments. One respondent (19(4)) supported the proposed amendment but considered that the need for additional development land in the Newark area should be reassessed downwards or that the revised policy met the District's development land requirements over the Plan period. One respondent (37(7)) specifically supported the Thoresby Colliery development site with the caveats expressed on their representation on Question 3 regarding wider community benefits to be included in the scheme, that the outline masterplan prepared by Harworth Estates does not provide sufficient integration and linkages with Edwinstowe and that concerning the phasing of the release of employment land at this site consideration should be given to give priority to employment sites at Bilsthorpe in order to avoid two uncompleted employment sites arising.
- 2.34 There were eight objections to the proposed amendment including Historic England (46(7)). One respondent (60(7)) just objected to the proposed amendments. The other objectors went into more detail much of which repeated in summary their comments on other questions and in particular Question 3. Historic England specifically objected to the inclusion of the Thoresby Colliery site for the reasons set out by them under Question 3. Respondent 5(6) also objected to the inclusion of Thoresby Colliery particularly with regard to the adverse impact this may have on the development of existing identified sites at Bilsthorpe. Another respondent (27(3)) whilst supporting the overarching principle of Spatial Policy 5 to monitor the delivery rate for development against the anticipated rate of delivery, considered in the light of their representations on Questions 1 and 4 that sufficient sites have been allocated to meet the District's housing needs over the Plan period. This is viewed as an objection to the Thoresby Colliery addition to the policy. An objection to the policy with regard to the inclusion of the Thoresby Colliery site was made by one respondent (22(5)) whilst one respondent (25(5)) considered that the Plan should not rely on a small number of large sites. Representation 21(1) objected to the proposed amendments in that the policy makes no reference to supporting and encouraging the delivery from allocated sites to overcome constraints and to unlock sites for development as a first step before bringing forward

opportunity sites. This respondent considered that there was a risk that the proposed amendments could be read in a way that was contradictory to a number of the core principles set out in the NPPF by moving away from a plan-led approach and ducking the harder option of redeveloping previously used land. One respondent (61(7)) reiterated Edwinstowe and that whilst the Thoresby Colliery site should be redeveloped, the priority should be for employment with a bit of housing rather than with a larger volume of housing.

- 2.35 Collingham Parish Council (1(7)) and one other representation (40(7)) pointed out that the amendments did not affect Collingham and therefore the matter had not been considered.

District Council Response: The Council notes the comments. Comments relating to Thoresby Colliery and the suitability of Edwinstowe to be elevated in the hierarchy are addressed in the Council's response to Question 3. The Council agrees with the comments regarding the need to ensure that the Council's delivery strategy is in line with National Policy and therefore the Policy has been amended and expanded to fully detail its strategy on this matter.

Actions: Amend Spatial Policy 5 to fully detail the Council's delivery strategy.

Core Policy 1: Affordable Housing Provision

Question 8: Do you agree with the Council's Preferred Approach to Affordable Housing and amendments to Core Policy 1? If you think a different option is preferable, please set out which option, or other figures, you think are most appropriate along with your reasons.

- 2.36 Nineteen representations were received in relation to this question of which four were in support, including from two local residents and fifteen raised objections.
- 2.37 Objections were raised by Collingham Parish Council (1(8)), Fernwood Parish Council (47(8)), Newark Town Council (52(2)), local residents, developers and agents. Collingham Parish Council wish to retain the current different thresholds of 10 and 5 dwellings (or 0.4 hectares and 0.2 hectares, respectively) for seeking affordable housing and queried whether developers could submit a number of small schemes over time to avoid having to consider affordable housing. Fernwood Parish Council support the Preferred Approach but state that the affordable housing should be freehold, with affordable rented accommodation being provided by the Local Authority, not private developers. Newark Town Council also supported Option 4 but sought to expand the

definition of “affordable housing” to achieve a mix of provision (shared ownership) and overcome issues regarding stalled sites, commuted sums being applied to alternative sites and reduced allocations within sites. One local resident (40(8)) also queried the definition of “affordable housing”.

- 2.38 One respondent (5(7)) raised concerns that a 40% target for Central Newark and Sherwood was too high given that a CIL charge would still apply and that development has already stalled on a number of sites due to viability issues and other policies such as Core Policy 3 and So/HN/1, which affect the viability of schemes. However, another respondent (36(2)) stated that they had no objection to the 40% target for this area. Viability issues were also raised by a different respondent in their suggestion that the target for the Sherwood and Mansfield Fringe area should be reduced.
- 2.39 Three respondents sought to increase the overall housing targets in order to deliver affordable housing through cross-subsidisation. Two of these respondents (26(3) and 36(2)) acknowledged the difficulties arising in securing sufficient affordable housing in light of a Court of Appeal decision and a change in the NPPG leading to a threshold of ten market houses being imposed before affordable housing can be required.
- 2.40 One developer (56(3)) supported Option 2 as it incorporates starter homes within the overall affordable housing target but allows flexibility in future negotiations with Housing Associations. Another respondent (34(6)) also supported Option 2 unless CIL rates are reduced. One respondent (55(4)) requested that additional text be added to the policy referring to affordable housing being sought “where it is practicable and viable to do so”. A further respondent (37(8)) objected to a different set of sub areas being used in Core Policy 1 based on viability which are not used elsewhere in the plan and so considered that this causes confusion. It was also stated that this policy should not specify tenure and size mix as it is too inflexible. One respondent (26(3)) welcomed the principle of the provision of one and two bedroomed affordable units in Southwell. A local resident (43(3)) highlighted the need to consider the challenges of an ageing population.

District Council Response: The comments are noted. Since the Preferred Approach – Strategy was consulted upon the government have confirmed that they will not be introducing a mandatory 20% requirement for Starter Homes in all new developments over 10 dwellings. Given that the reason for amending Core Policy 1 was to accommodate this approach, the District Council is now minded not to make fundamental changes to the policy and instead

simply update it to reflect the NPPF and up-to-date housing requirements. The Council has retested its affordable housing requirements in regard to viability and believes that the 30% target is appropriate as a district-wide figure.

Action Required: Revert the principals of the original Core Policy 1 amendment to reflect current evidence and policy.

Core Policy 3: Housing Mix, Type and Density

Question 9: Do you agree with the Council's Preferred Approach to housing mix, type and density and the changes to Core Policy 3? If not, please give details of any suggested alternative approach.

- 2.41 Fifteen representations have been received in relation to this question, five in support, nine raising objections and one was not specific. Collingham Parish Council (1(9)), Historic England (46(8)) and Fernwood Parish Council (47(9)) all supported the Council's Preferred Approach. Historic England particularly welcomed the provision made within the policy for a lower housing density from the preferred housing density should circumstances warrant it, as it could assist situations where a lower density may be required for heritage reasons.
- 2.42 Two respondents stated that they broadly agreed with the Preferred Approach but sought one bedroomed dwellings in the Sherwood Area. Two respondents stated that the policy should include reference to Custom Build as well as self-build homes to reflect the NPPF and the wider Government agenda. One respondent (43(4)) highlighted the need to consider the challenges of an ageing population.
- 2.43 Four respondents, including two developers (27(4) and 56(4)), objected to the policy as it is considered to be too prescriptive and should provide flexibility in relation to mix, type and density in accordance with paragraph 50 of the NPPF and to promote sustainable development in accordance with paragraph 14 of the NPPF and to allow locational factors to be taken into account and to reflect demand. One of these respondents (27(4)) suggested that the approach in the adopted Core Policy 3 should be reflected in the proposed amendments and stated that the SHMA suggests that the market is a better judge of what is the most appropriate profile of homes to deliver at any given point and recommends flexibility.

2.44 One local resident made a representation stating that if the suitable sites are available, the mix would be fine but doesn't indicate whether this is in support or objection to the proposals or whether they consider that suitable sites are available.

District Council Response: The comments are noted. The Council has taken on board the comments regarding the prescriptive nature of elements of the policy, and it is proposed to retain instead the facilitative word of the current Core Policy 3.

Actions Required: Amend Core Policy 3.

Core Policy 4: Gypsies & Travellers – New Pitch Provision

Question 10: Do you agree with the Council's Preferred Approach to providing for the accommodation needs of the Gypsy and Traveller community and the changes to Core Policy 4? If not, please give details of any alternative approach which is more appropriate.

2.45 Seven representations were received in relation to Question 10, two of which explicitly supported the Preferred Approach, including from Newark Town Council (52(3)); four of which objected; and one representation was received from Collingham Parish Council (1(10)) which stated that the issue wasn't applicable to their community so hadn't been considered.

2.46 Fernwood Parish Council (47(10)) disagreed with the Preferred Approach and South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council (39(2)) stated that they do not want gypsy / traveller sites located next to or within the small settlements of South Muskham and Little Carlton. One respondent (6(2)) emphasised the importance of undertaking a district-wide assessment of appropriate sites against specific criteria and the need to ensure any identified site is sustainable and would not impact on the privacy or amenity of existing uses and another respondent queried whether the existing sites are in full use.

District Council Response: The comments are noted; the policy seeks to distribute future pitch provision in line with the spatial distribution of growth provided by Spatial Policy 2. Sites received through the 'call for sites' process have been assessed. Core Policy 5 both in its existing and current form require impact on privacy and amenity into account. Given the consents granted elsewhere the focus for additional need is within the Newark Urban Area, the ability of the existing community at Tolney Lane to accommodate additional development is constrained by flood risk.

Action: None.

Core Policy 5: Criteria for considering Gypsies & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Question 11: Do you agree with the proposed pitch sizes and amendments to Core Policy 5? If not please give details.

- 2.47 Six representations were received in relation to Question 11. Two representations support the approach, including one from Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (42(2)) which particularly supported criterion 1 and two objections were received.
- 2.48 Fernwood Parish Council (47(11)) did not agree with the proposed pitch sizes and amendments. The Environment Agency (13(1)) welcomed the consideration of flood risk and the compliance with national policy which is sought in relation to Tolney Lane, however, it maintains its position that to allow additional pitch provision on Tolney Lane is not appropriate given that a large part of the site and access road is within functional floodplain and there would be an unacceptable flood risk to residents. The amendments to Core Policy 5 in relation to the sequential and exception tests are supported but the Environment Agency recommended further amendments to ensure that planning permission is only granted at Tolney Lane as a last resort. The Environment Agency suggest that a proactive approach should be taken to finding new sites not within high flood risk areas and notes that caravan sites are not appropriate in flood zones 3a or 3b, hence the flood risk vulnerability classification tables in the NPPG do not require sequential or exception tests. The Environment Agency also refer to comments made at a previous stage of consultation.
- 2.49 In addition to the representations of support and objection, two comments were received neither supporting nor objecting to the proposed approach. Historic England (46(9)) noted that heritage assets and their setting have already been addressed and did not comment further. Collingham Parish Council (1(11)) stated that the issue wasn't applicable to their community so hadn't been considered.

District Council Response: The comments are noted; the proposed indicative pitch sizes are meant to guide the allocations of sites and consideration of planning applications and remain robust, notably no objections have been received from representatives of the gypsy and traveller community. The support from the EA for the amendments which seek to address the issue of flood risk at Tolney Lane is welcomed. The EA have proposed that the content on the

Sequential Test and Tolney Lane ought to include reference the appropriate geographic extent for the Test being District-wide. This is disagreed with, and viewed as unnecessary. Whilst the most appropriate scale to apply the test will usually be District-wide this is not the case where there are specific objectives within the Development Plan. In this case the content on the spatial distribution of development is relevant. The proposed policy wording makes reference to applying the Test in line with the Planning Practice Guidance and so the suggested amendments are deemed unnecessary.

Action: None.

Minor Policy Amendments

Spatial Policy 6: Infrastructure for Growth

Question 12: Do you agree with the minor changes proposed to Spatial Policy 6? If not, please give details of any suggested alternative.

- 2.50 Nine representations were received in relation to Question 12 all supporting the minor policy changes, including Historic England (46(10)), Collingham Parish Council (1(12)) and Fernwood Parish Council (47(12)). Historic England also welcomed the reference to the Developer Contributions & Planning Obligations SPD.
- 2.51 Collingham Parish Council and an individual (40(11)) who also lives in Collingham commented that the settlement is bisected by the A1133 and as a result is badly affected by traffic congestion as well as from substandard road junctions. Both representations stress the unique nature of Collingham within the District in this regard. The Parish Council comments on the poor accident record on the main link to the A1 at Potters Hill and the existing heavy congestion at the junction of the A1133 and the A1 at Winthorpe Roundabout. Whilst not objecting to the minor changes to Spatial Policy 6, the two representations imply that small development allocations in the settlement are unlikely through developer contributions to remove, or meaningfully reduce, traffic and highway issues affecting Collingham.

District Council Response: Comments noted.

Actions: None Required.

Minor Policy Amendments

Spatial Policy 7: Sustainable Transport

Question 13: Do you agree with the minor changes proposed to Spatial Policy 7? If not, please give details of any suggested alternative.

- 2.52 Twelve representations were received in relation to Question 13, nine of which supported the minor policy changes without modifications, including Natural England (4(3)), Collingham Parish Council (1(13)), Nottinghamshire County Council (44(2)) and Fernwood Parish Council (47(13)).
- 2.53 There were three objections. One representation (6(3)) agreed with the revisions in principle but would not wish the policy to be applied to rural hotels and tourist destinations where most visitors would use private motor vehicles. Newark Town Council (52(4)) considered that the words “sought to” should be inserted before the word ‘ensure’ in the sixth bullet point as past experience has shown that it is not always possible to ensure that traffic problems do not arise. Another respondent (53(7)) considered that the Council should define the phrase ‘significant amounts of movement’ in the first bullet point for the sake of clarity.
- 2.54 Collingham Parish Council (1(13)) and an individual (40(12)) commented that the use of public transport was of great importance, given the state of traffic in Collingham and the fact that the District has an ageing population.

District Council Response: Comments noted. The Council believe that the policy does not require further amendment

Actions: None Required.

Minor Policy Amendments

Spatial Policy 8: Protecting and Promoting Leisure and Community Facilities

Question 14: Do you agree with the minor changes proposed to Spatial Policy 8? If not, please give details of any suggested alternative.

- 2.55 Nine representations were received in relation to Question 14, six of which supported the minor policy changes without modifications, including Natural England (4(3)), Nottinghamshire County Council (44(2)), Newark Town Council (52(4)) and Fernwood Parish Council (47(14)).

- 2.56 Sport England (32) agreed with the revisions in principle but suggested a wording change to clarify that the policy covers sports facilities and playing pitches. Collingham Parish Council (1(14)) agreed with most of the policy apart from the last paragraph as they considered that small scale development in village can gradually reduce recreation land and open space.
- 2.57 The Theatres Trust (64(1)) objected to the policy which they considered was not in line with the NPPF. More support and protection should be given for arts and cultural facilities.

District Council Response: Comments noted. Supporting text will be amended to address Sport England's concerns. The comments of the Theatres Trust are noted, however the Plan should be read as a whole and the Council does seek to secure facilities which can be used to secure culture and arts as part of its wider strategy.

Actions: Amend supporting text.

Minor Policy Amendments

Spatial Policy 9: Selecting Appropriate Sites for Allocation

Question 15: Do you agree with the minor changes proposed to Spatial Policy 9? If not, please give details of any suggested alternative.

- 2.58 Nineteen representations were received in relation to this question, nine of which were in support and ten in objection. Representations of support for the minor policy amendments included those received from Natural England (4(4)), National Trust (24(6)), Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (42(3)) and Nottinghamshire County Council (44(3)), which all particularly supported the amendments to criterion 7. Natural England and one further respondent (21(2)) stated that the amendments will guide development to the most sustainable locations in line with the approach of paragraph 110 of the NPPF. Support was also received from Fernwood Parish Council (47(15)).
- 2.59 Collingham Parish Council (1(15)) generally support the changes but raise concerns that flood risk should be considered for the whole area, not just the development being considered and that the policy should not lead to a loss in open space.
- 2.60 The Environment Agency (13(2)) supported the principle of the changes to criteria 7 and 9 but sought further amendments such that in criterion 7 impacts on biodiversity should

be avoided and in criterion 9 that development should not increase flood risk on neighbouring sites. One respondent (49(2)) suggested amended wording to criterion 7 to include reference to internationally, nationally and locally designated sites for biodiversity to bring this into line with the approach in criteria 5 and 8.

2.61 Historic England (46(11)) state that the proposed amendments are outwith its remit, however, it has requested that criterion 5 of the policy be amended to bring it in line with the NPPF in considering designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings; specific wording is suggested. Historic England also highlight the need to consider non-designated heritage assets being lost outside Conservation Areas through Demolition Notices and that the NPPF uses the term “harm” rather than “adverse impact”.

2.62 Three further representations suggested amendments to this policy to include references to previously developed land, as encouraged in paragraph 111 of the NPPF (respondent 19(5)); sites being relevant in scale to the size of the development; development only being permitted in Conservation Areas where it preserved or enhanced the area; consideration of local space that contributes to the character and structure of a settlement; a wider assessment of flood risk; clarification of the meaning of “and be the least to increase flood risk on neighbouring sites”; and consideration of allocations within Neighbourhood Plans, including reserved sites and safeguarded land for future development. One local resident raised concerns that Trent villages, including Collingham, are becoming increasingly vulnerable. A developer (60(13)) queried the appropriateness of certain housing allocations in Blidworth.

District Council Response: Comments noted. Amendments to the policy wording suggested by the Environment Agency, Historic England and the Local Nature Partnership have been incorporated.

Actions: Amend Policy

Minor Policy Amendments

Core Policy 6: Shaping our Employment Profile

Question 16: Do you agree with the minor changes proposed to Core Policy 6? If not, please give details of any suggested alternative.

- 2.63 Eleven representations were received in relation to Question 16, eight of which supported the minor policy changes without modifications, including Collingham Parish Council (1(16)), Fernwood Parish Council (47(16)) and Newark Town Council (52(6)). Collingham Parish Council reiterated the point made on Question 2 that without good employment opportunities, houses are unlikely to sell. One respondent (6(4)) particularly supported bullet point 6. Another respondent (5(8)) considered the proposed policy to be in line with NPPF and that the revised policy would enable alternative land uses to be proposed on a long standing employment site in the Fernwood area.
- 2.64 There were two objections to the revised policy. One respondent (19(6)) considered that the fourth bullet point needed to be revised to reflect fully the matters set out in paragraph 22 of the NPPF. Another respondent (26(6)) considered that the revised policy should place more emphasis on the support for expansion of existing businesses.
- 2.65 One respondent (40(15)) made a comment regarding the lack of workspaces in Collingham stating that if there is no local work, house prices may be too high.

District Council Response: The comments are noted; with respect to paragraph 22 of the NPPF this only concerns land allocated for employment purposes, whereas the proposed amendment to the Core Policy covers both allocated and non-allocated sites. Notwithstanding this the policy seeks to provide for an appropriate approach to considering employment land loss in both circumstances. In respect of allocated sites it is not considered necessary to repeat national policy verbatim, and that treating applications for alternative uses on their merits, having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses are implicitly covered by 'reasonable prospect of them being required'.

It is considered that the expansion of existing businesses would be covered by the 'enhancing the employment base of out towns and settlements...and supporting the economies of our rural communities'.

Action: None.

Minor Policy Amendments

Core Policy 7: Tourism Development

Question 17: Do you agree with the minor changes proposed to Core Policy 7? If not, please give details of any suggested alternative.

- 2.66 Thirteen representations were received in relation to Question 17, eleven of which supported the minor policy changes without modifications, including Collingham Parish Council (1(17)), Newark Town Council (52(7)), Fernwood Parish Council (47(17)), Natural England (4(5)), the National Trust (24(7)) and Historic England (46(12)).
- 2.67 Two respondents whilst welcoming Core Policy 7 suggested revisions to the text of the policy. One respondent (6(5)) wanted the policy to support the enhancement and expansion of tourism accommodation and attractions. The respondent also considered that the policy reflects NPPF advice in the reuse of historic buildings for alternative uses such as tourism provided there is no harm to the asset or its setting. With regard to tourism development in rural areas, the respondent objected to the requirement in the second bullet point for compliance with the spatial requirements of Spatial Policy 3 as this latter policy is defined in a way which would unnecessarily limit tourism development potential in rural areas. The second respondent (33(2)) also considered that Spatial Policy 3 would affect tourism development in rural areas and considered that this part of the bullet point in Core Policy 7 be removed.

District Council Response: The comments are noted. It is not considered necessary to make explicit reference to the enhancement and expansion of tourism accommodation and attractions. Support is indicated through 'viewing positively proposals which help to realise the tourism potential of the District, support the meeting of identified tourism needs, complement and enhance existing attractions or that address shortfalls in existing provision', subject of course to compliance with the supplementary criteria. With respect to assessing the impact of a proposal on the heritage value of an asset or its setting, and the ability to secure their long-term future the appropriate way to deal with this matter is through application of Core Policy 14 and Policy DM9.

Reference to the locational requirements of SP3 is considered to be appropriate as this defines those areas where the policy would apply. However SP3 only refers to tourism development which requires a rural location. Amendment is required to bring this into line with the amended Core Policy 7.

Action: Amend Spatial Policy 3 to provide support for appropriate sustainable tourism proposals in line with Core Policy 7

Minor Policy Amendments

Core Policy 10: Climate Change

Question 18: Do you agree with the minor changes proposed to Core Policy 10? If not, please give details of any suggested alternative.

- 2.68 Twelve representations were received in relation to Question 18, six of which supported the minor policy changes without modifications, including Fernwood Parish Council (47(18)).
- 2.69 Five respondents whilst welcoming the policy considered that changes to the text were required. Collingham Parish Council (1(18)) considered that specific mention should be made of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) which should be considered for all new developments. This point concerning SUDS was also made by the National Trust (24(8)) and by another respondent (49(3)). The Environment Agency (13(3)) considered the policy should be strengthened to promote increased water efficiency for all new development.
- 2.70 One respondent (40(18)) commented that Collingham has a drainage issue.

District Council Response: The comments are noted; Collingham PC, The National Trust, Lowland Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Local Nature Partnership made recommendation that the promotion of SUDS should be included within Core Policy 10. The District Council considers that this matter is addressed by Core Policy 9 – (Sustainable Design) and as such Core Policy 10 does not need to be amended.

Action: None required.

Minor Policy Amendments

Core Policy 13: Landscape Character

Question 19: Do you agree with the minor changes proposed to Core Policy 13? If not, please give details of any suggested alternative.

- 2.71 Ten representations were received in relation to Question 19, seven of which supported the minor policy changes without modifications, including Collingham Parish Council (1(19)), Fernwood Parish Council (47(19)) and Historic England (46(13)).
- 2.72 Several respondents whilst welcoming the policy considered that changes to the text were required. Nottinghamshire County Council (44(5)) generally supported the policy but considered that the Landscape Character Assessment should be based on the

section in the NPPF regarding “valued landscapes”. The National Trust (24(9)) also supported the policy in principle but considered that the policy be modified so that a) it applies to all landscapes and b) valued landscapes are protected and enhanced. One respondent (6(7)) welcomed the policy in general but considered the policy should have as its key approach the balancing of environmental concerns with the social and economic benefits of development.

District Council Response: The comments are noted. The policy and supporting text has been amended to make clear that it applies to all landscape; additionally the supporting text makes clear that the Landscape character assessment will be updated. We note the comments of (6(7)) however this policy should be read within the context of the whole plan which balances these considerations appropriately.

Action: Amend policy and supporting text for clarity.

Minor Policy Amendments

Core Policy 14: Historic Environment

Question 20: Do you agree with the minor changes proposed to Core Policy 14? If not, please give details of any suggested alternative.

- 2.73 Twelve representations were received in relation to Question 20, nine of which supported the minor policy changes without modifications, including Collingham Parish Council (1(20)), Fernwood Parish Council (47(20)) and the National Trust (24(10)).
- 2.74 Two respondents whilst welcoming the policy considered that changes to the text were required. Newark Town Council (52(8)) supported the policy but wished specific reference is made to Newark Castle and the spire of St Mary Magdalene Church. Historic England (46(14)) also supported the policy in principle but suggested minor wording changes to the first bullet point to make the policy more in line with the wording in the NPPF.
- 2.75 One respondent (6(8)) objected as they considered the policy should allow for enabling development such as for tourism that respected the asset and its setting.

District Council Response: The comments are noted; it is not intended to include specific reference to individual heritage assets other than those linking through to other policies or where they are the only element of that nature in the District (e.g. Stoke Battlefield). Newark’s

Heritage Assets will be fully recognised as part of the forthcoming Conservation Area Character Appraisal. The comments made by Historic England will be addressed by amendments to Core Policy.

Action: Amend Core Policy 14 to reflect Historic England comments

Comments on the Draft Integrated Impact Assessment

- 2.76 Three comments raising objections to the Draft Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) were received from Natural England (4(7)), the Environment Agency (13(4)) and Historic England (46(15)). Natural England welcomed the change to Sustainability Objective 6 in relation to biodiversity but stated that in Appendix Two, objective 6 in relation to Thoresby Colliery ought to identify the potential risks to biodiversity from redeveloping the site due to its close proximity to Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Special Area of Conservation (SAC).
- 2.77 The Environment Agency made comments in relation to Appendix One and Two, suggesting that amendments should be made to the wording of the Sustainability Objectives and stating that in Appendix Two the consideration of Core Policy 10 focuses exclusively on flood risk management, despite provision within the policy otherwise, and therefore recommend that this is changed to promote increased water efficiency in new developments.
- 2.78 Historic England raised objections to Appendix One, Two and Three. In relation to Sustainability Objective 3 in Appendix One, Historic England state that many of the commentary boxes are empty but have a “0” outcome and therefore this needs to be addressed in the explanatory text otherwise it could be considered uncertain leading to a “?” outcome. Changes to wording were also suggested in several places. In relation to Appendix Two, Historic England made representations with regard to Housing Target, Employment Target, Former Thoresby Colliery, Settlement Hierarchy and Distribution, Green Belt, Delivery Strategy, Sustainable Transport, Selecting Appropriate Sites for Allocation, Affordable Housing, Landscape Character and Historic Environment. The key themes of the objections raised were disagreement with the assessments of options having no impact, or the impacts being neutral, and that insufficient consideration had been given to the historic environment. Historic England state that there is no evidence base to support these assessments and they are instead based on assumptions in relation to impacts on the historic environment. In relation to the former Thoresby

Colliery in particular, objections are raised that no historic impact assessment has been undertaken and no assessment of impacts has taken place on Edwinstowe and Ollerton Conservation Areas, listed buildings and the colliery site itself, Sherwood Forest and its landscape setting and other heritage assets. It is stated that the outcome should be registered as “?”. The effects and approaches within the Historic Environment section of Appendix Two were accepted but a query was raised as to why the introductory text says that this wasn’t consulted upon as part of the Issues Paper.

- 2.79 In relation to Appendix Three, Historic England state that it does not include all of the historic environment and cultural heritage references which should be taken into account in IIA preparation and refer to Historic England’s advice notes regarding Sustainability Appraisals and Strategic Environmental Assessment. Representations were also made that the terminology used throughout the IIA should reflect that in the NPPF, for example, preservation should be replaced by conservation and reference should be made to the historic environment and heritage assets and their settings to ensure all designated and non-designated assets are encompassed.

District Council Response: These comments are noted. The changes suggested by Natural England and all but one suggested by the Environment Agency will be incorporated into the document. The Environment Agency request that the word ‘sensitive’ be omitted from ‘Objective 16: To direct sensitive development away from areas at risk of flooding and to assist in the positive management of the water environment.’ The original wording will be retained as not all development is inappropriate in areas at risk of flooding.

It is not proposed to change the IIA to include text commenting on every ‘O’ outcome. The approach taken is consistent with SA and SEA work undertaken at previous stages of the development of the Local Plan. It is considered that impacts on the historic environment are addressed in existing and proposed amended Core Policy 14, in the proposed Shap4 and through other existing and proposed amended policies. Also, impacts on the historic environment will be addressed through development management processes. The IIA assesses the Plan Review and not any specific development proposal.

Actions: Objective 6 in the IIA of the potential redevelopment of Thoresby Colliery will be amended as suggested by Natural England. All the changes to wording and other suggestions from the Environment Agency will be incorporated into the document, with one exception, set out above.

Changes to the wording of Objective 3 suggested by Historic England will be made. Additionally, new documents will be included in Appendix 3: Relevant Plans, Policies and Programmes, in line with Historic England advice.

Additional Comments

- 2.80 The final section of the representation form invited respondents to make any additional comments they wished. Those comments which were specific to the IIA have been set out above. In addition to these, further comments were submitted by nineteen respondents. Five of these were from respondents promoting sites that they wish to be allocated for development. Collingham Parish Council (1(21)) made a number of additional comments including stating that the maps within the consultation document were difficult to read, concerns in relation to highways issues in Collingham and the need for a by-pass and infrastructure prior to any further development. Collingham Parish Council also stated that there is a need to consider surface water, sewage and capacity in the local primary school and medical centre. Oxtun Parish Council (8(2)) raised concerns about the sustainability of the affordable housing stock if Government policy continues to allow it to be sold. Fernwood Parish Council (47(21)) stated the views of a specific Councillor that the plan review is made in good faith and would work if the infrastructure was sufficient to cope with it, although it is stated that the roads, drains and transport are insufficient. Fernwood Parish Council also state more development will compound existing traffic problems in Newark and that constituents' views should be taken into account but consider that they are usually overlooked. One respondent (63(18)) stated that should any of the policies be at variance with a Neighbourhood Plan which is in force, the Neighbourhood Plan should preside.
- 2.81 Nottinghamshire County Council (44(6)) highlighted the need for the Minerals and Waste Local Plans to be taken into consideration in the preparation of the current plan, including the emerging Minerals Local Plan. Nottinghamshire County Council draw specific attention to a number of minerals and waste policies relating to the safeguarding of waste management facilities, the need to minimise waste and maximise recycling, existing and proposed minerals sites and the safeguarding and consultation areas around minerals sites. Nottinghamshire County Council also highlight many issues for consideration as a result of a Rapid Health Impact Assessment having been undertaken.

- 2.82 Natural England (4(6)) referred to previous comments recommending amendments to Core Policy 12 and recommend further changes to create more coherent and resilient ecological networks.
- 2.83 A developer (50(5)) considered that a substantial further evidence base is required to progress the plan and highlight the need for the Council to demonstrate it has fulfilled the duty to cooperate and the need for a robust, iterative Sustainability Appraisal. One respondent (37(13)) suggested that the Current Settlement Facilities in Appendix B should be completely revised to cover all services and facilities in all settlements that are not defined as “towns” and to reconsider whether the settlement hierarchy is correct on this basis (arguing that currently it is not correct). Detailed tables are provided setting out strategic services, essential services and key local services for these settlements. One respondent (40(19)) expressed concern that landowners were invited to submit available land around Collingham for consideration without the Parish Council having been informed, states that an opportunity for higher density development at Braemar Farm was missed and raises concerns in relation to highways issues due to an increase in cars.
- 2.84 One respondent (41(3)) called for changes to be made to Core Policy 2 to allow some market housing to help facilitate the provision of additional affordable housing to meet local needs in rural areas, such as Lowdham, as advocated in paragraph 54 of the NPPF.
- 2.85 Upper Witham, Witham First and Witham Third Internal Drainage Boards (28(1), 29(1) and 30(1)) stated that generally the District Council have appropriate policies with regard to flood risk and land drainage and that these should be kept up to date to take into account changes in legislation associated with the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 and local practice.
- 2.86 Two respondents (10(1) and 57(1)) stated that the document had been considered and there were no comments to make at this stage.

District Council Responses:

The infrastructure requirements (both site specific and those which cannot be pinned down to a single site) to support planned growth have been considered through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and in respect of highways issues the District-Wide Transport Study. Necessary

infrastructure will be provided through a combination of the Community Infrastructure Levy, planning obligations, developer contributions and where appropriate funding assistance from the District Council. Assumptions over infrastructure requirements will be revisited at the planning application stage and proposals will be expected to include appropriate provision. Where there is evidence supporting their introduction then Core Policy 10a would allow for the introduction of 'Local Drainage Designations' to address severe surface water issues.

The comments from Oxton Parish Council are noted, however the approach of the District Council towards affordable housing provision needs to accord with national policy. In respect of Fernwood the infrastructure requirements to support growth have been considered in line with the response to Collingham PC above. The Fernwood Neighbourhood Plan, once 'made', will form part of the Development Plan and so afforded an appropriate level of weight as part of the planning process.

Comments from the County Council with respect to the safeguarding of minerals and waste resources are noted. Whilst no objections have been made on specific sites the Authority has suggested that the site allocation policy for Land South of Newark should make reference to the existence of sand and gravel resource and highlight the potential for prior extraction of the mineral. However the area beyond the Urban Boundary which the Authority has referred to would not accommodate built development, and the site already benefits from extant consent.

In terms of the comments from Natural England it is not considered necessary to amend Core Policy 12 to make specific reference to SANGS as this matter is dealt with through the linked Policy DM7 'Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure'. The provision of coherent and resilient ecological networks is viewed as integral to, and so implicitly covered by, the protection, promotion and enhancement of a Green Infrastructure Network which is sought through Core Policy 12 and Policy DM7.

The Plan Review process is founded on an appropriate and robust Integrated Impact Assessment and evidence base. Requirements under the Duty to Cooperate have been fully accorded with. The assessment of facilities within settlements is monitored on an annual basis and updated through the Annual Monitoring Report, this provides an appropriate way of assisting with the implementation of Spatial Policy 3. In order to understand potential land supply it has been necessary to undertake a wide ranging 'call for sites' as part of the Plan Review, offering land owners the opportunity to indicate availability for development. Parish Councils have been, and will continue, to be involved in the Plan Review process and have the opportunity to make representations.

With respect to Core Policy 2 amendments will made setting out the circumstances where cross-subsidy from a small market element would be allowed.

Actions:

Amend Core Policy 2 setting out the circumstances in which cross subsidisation of rural affordable housing would be acceptable.

Appendix One

Abbreviations

CIL – Community Infrastructure Levy

DPD – Development Plan Document

FOAN – Full Objectively Assessed Needs for Housing

IIA – Draft Integrated Impact Assessment

NPPF – National Planning Policy Framework

NPPG – National Planning Practice Guidance

SAC – Special Area of Conservation

SHMA – Strategic Housing Market Assessment

SSSI – Site of Special Scientific Interest

Appendix Two

Representations List

Respondent Number	Respondent	Questions Responded To
1	Collingham Parish Council	1 – 20 plus additional comments
2	Local Resident	Specific land in Balderton
3	Local Resident	4, 5
4	Natural England	3, 4, 13, 15, 17 plus Core Policy 12 and additional comments (IIA)
5	Aspbury Planning Ltd for Strawsons	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 16, 17
6	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners for Bourne Leisure Ltd	5, 10, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20
7	Caunton Parish Council	5
8	Oxton Parish Council	6 plus additional comments
9	Wellow Parish Council	3
10	Canal and River Trust	General no comment
11	Local Resident	3, 4
12	Pegasus Group for Harworth Estates	1, 3, 4
13	Environment Agency (x2)	11, 15, 18 plus IIA
14	Harby Parish Council	5
15	Local Resident	5
16	Mansfield District Council	4
17	Coddington Parish Council	5
18	Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	5
19	JLL for Flowserve	1, 4, 6, 7, 15, 16 plus additional comments
20	Conway Land Management Ltd	3
21	Planning and Design Group for NSK Europe Ltd	7, 15
22	GPS Planning and Design Ltd for Coultas Farming	1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9
23	Corylus Planning and	1, 5

	Environmental Ltd	
24	National Trust	3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20
25	JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd for Southwell and Nottingham Diocese	1, 3, 4, 5, 7 plus additional comments
26	Tetlow King Planning for Minster Veterinary Surgery	1, 4, 8, 9, 15, 16
27	Define Planning Design Ltd for William Davis Ltd (x3)	1, 4, 7, 9
28	Upper Witham IDB	Additional comments
29	Witham First IDB	Additional comments
30	Witham Third IDB	Additional comments
31	Highways England	1, 2
32	Sport England	14
33	Concept Town Planning Ltd	5, 17
34	Jigsaw Planning & Development Ltd	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8
35	RSPB	3
36	Walker Morris LLP for The Gascoine Group Ltd	1, 8
37	Town-Planning.co.uk	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 15, 18, 20 plus additional comments
38	Local Resident	1
39	South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	5, 10
40	Local Resident	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20 plus additional comments
41	IBA Planning	5, 6 plus additional comments
42	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	3, 11, 15
43	Local Resident	1, 5, 8, 9
44	Nottinghamshire County Council	3, 13, 15, 19 plus additional comments
45	GPS Planning and Design Ltd on behalf of clients	3, 5, 8, 9
46	Historic England	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17, 19, 20 plus IIA comments
47	Fernwood Parish Council	1 – 20 plus additional comments
48	Norwell Parish Council	5
49	Lowland Derbyshire and	12, 15, 18, 19

	Nottinghamshire Local Nature Partnership	
50	Gladman Developments Ltd	1, 4, 5, 6 plus additional comments
51	Heaton Planning for Collingham Land Owners	1, 3
52	Newark Town Council	3, 8, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20
53	Carter Jonas LLP for Noble Foods Ltd	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 13 plus additional comments and site submissions
54	Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee	4, 15
55	Peacock and Smith Ltd on behalf of clients	1, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20
56	Avant Homes	1, 4, 8, 9
57	Amec Foster Wheeler for National Grid	General no comments
58	Local Resident	Additional comments
59	Gedling Borough Council	1, 4, 7
60	Millcroft Homes Ltd (x2)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 plus additional comments
61	Copesticks Ltd on behalf of clients	1 – 20
62	Local Resident	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
63	Southwell Civic Society	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20 plus additional comments
64	Theatres Trust	14