

## BASSETLAW LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

### POST- HEARINGS NOTE

30 January 2023

Following the recent formal hearings, we would like to take this opportunity to confirm the main areas of on-going work requested during the hearings, and to confirm the process for the next stage of the examination.

We have already discussed at the hearings a number of potential modifications to the Plan, including those proposed by the Council which are set out in [BDC-20a]. Once the outstanding areas of work below have been completed and we have had time to consider these, we will be in the position to confirm our recommended modifications necessary to make the Plan sound and will write to you formally. In the meantime, we would be grateful for an indication from the Council of when they will be in a position to provide the following additional information.

#### ICENI Report – Further Employment Information

The latest ICENI report provides an indication of likely additional jobs based on the most up to date information on proposed employment floorspace within the Plan. However, to assist with understanding the implications of this jobs figure it should also be “translated” into an indicative employment led housing need figure, as was provided in pages 18-19 of [SS-024].

#### Review of Policy ST2

At the initial hearing session on the 29<sup>th</sup> November we identified that the policy as drafted was unclear as to whether the figures quoted were meant as a minimum requirement or a maximum target. The policy also lacked sufficient detail in relation to how development in the Countryside would be considered. We discussed the Council’s proposed modification to this policy at our session on Tuesday and together suggested further modifications that would provide clarity. These modifications should now be finalised and added to the draft schedule of Modifications [BDC-20a].

#### Policy ST7 and SEM001 – Apleyhead

This matter was discussed on Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup> January. We note the views of NCC and the Council’s Transport advisers, that the Transport Assessment demonstrates that the site can be developed to the extent set out in the assessment, without the need for carriage widening to the A57. We are considering the Council’s proposed modifications to the policy along with the views expressed by Caddick Developments and will advise in due course on whether we consider it necessary for a “cap” to development on site to be expressed within the Policy.

We also discussed the potential mix of development within the site and whether a proportion of B2 development should be accommodated. We are considering this matter,

and whether part 4 of the policy, which refers to “ancillary development” would provide sufficient clarity for future decision makers. To assist it would be helpful to have the Council’s suggested modification to the Policy, to reflect the potential for composite or complementary uses at the site.

#### Chapter 7 – Living Communities

We had a number of questions at the hearings which relating to how the housing figures were derived. These included neighbourhood plan housing requirements, housing delivery and build out rates, lapse rates and phasing assumptions. To provide background to how the figures were arrived at the Council undertook to provide a “Housing Background Paper” by the 10<sup>th</sup> of February. Taking into account the extent of other matters that are currently being worked on, please advise if this date is still considered to be achievable.

#### Policy ST38 Green Gaps

At the hearing sessions in December the Council agreed to provide a note that would provide information regarding the process that had been undertaken for identifying the Green Gaps and also to explain how development proposals within Green Gaps would be considered. In addition, the boundaries of GG7 and GG8 were to be considered in relation to the Ordsall South allocation and discussed with Mr Mitchell, and the southern boundary of GG4 was to be looked at too. At the hearing session on 24<sup>th</sup> January it was suggested that the focus of the policy should be on preventing the coalescence of settlements and the Council were asked to consider if this would be appropriate as part of the work already being carried out. This may include the need to strengthen the wording of other policies such as ST37 and ST35. A date of 27<sup>th</sup> January had been identified for this work, please advise if this is still achievable.

#### Policy ST51 – Renewable Energy Generation and High Marnham

At the hearing session on 13<sup>th</sup> December, we indicated that the policy didn’t provide a clear strategy for the renewable energy provision within the district. The Plan as a whole failed to provide sufficient direction as to the future development potential for High Marnham. The Council committed to providing some additional work on both matters which we understand was initially to be provided by the 31<sup>st</sup> of January. The Council have provided a note regarding renewable energy generation but we would be grateful for an update as to the other matter is progressing.

#### Policy ST54 – Transport Infrastructure and Supporting Transport Assessments

We are grateful for the additional transport assessment work and note the comments of Nottinghamshire County Council Highways, along with the initial comments of National Highways (full response awaited). We will not be requiring any further transport assessment work to support the plan and will advise of any necessary modifications in due course.

## Policy ST58 – Infrastructure Provision and Supporting Information

At the Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup> January hearing we discussed the extent of the infrastructure funding gap identified within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan [BG-041]. The Council agreed to review the document to clarify whether items were being erroneously identified as needing funding in relation to education and green infrastructure. The Council also agreed to provide further explanation on how CIL receipts were estimated. Lastly, in order to provide some indication that any identified infrastructure gap could be met by alternative funding, the Council should provide information on the potential sources for such funding that will be explored.

Throughout the event you have helpfully provided a list of on-going actions arising from the hearings which sets out all of our various requests for documents or further information. As this is a “live” document, and most of its content relates to minor administrative matters at the event, it need not be included within the examination library. This note, which should be included within the library, should instead serve as a record of on-going matters following the formal hearings.

Finally, we would like to thank you for your continued help during the Examination and for the smooth running of the event, which we found to be very productive. If you have any queries, please let us know through Ms Edwards.

*Anne Jordan and Alison Partington*