**Treswell with Cottam Neighbourhood Development Plan Review**

**Responses to Examiner’s Clarification Note (in red)**

This Note sets out my initial comments on the submitted Plan. It also sets out areas where it would be helpful to have some further clarification. For the avoidance of any doubt matters of clarification are entirely normal at this early stage of the examination process.

Noted.

***Initial Comments***

The Plan provides a distinctive vision for the neighbourhood area. The presentation of the Plan is good. The difference between the policies and the supporting text is very clear.

Thank you.

The document is a very good example of a community reviewing its neighbourhood plan. The Plan itself and the Statement on the extent and nature of the review helpfully capture the differences between the submitted Plan and the made Plan. I agree with the conclusion that the Plan needs both examination and a referendum. The examination process will proceed on that basis.

Noted thanks.

***Points for Clarification***

I have read the submitted documents and the representations made to the Plan. I have also visited the neighbourhood area. I am now able to raise issues for clarification with the Parish Council.

The comments made on the points in this Note will be used to assist in the preparation of my report and in recommending any modifications that may be necessary to the Plan to ensure that it meets the basic conditions.

I set out specific policy clarification points below in the order in which they appear in the submitted Plan. To avoid repetition, several of the points apply equally to several or all the four housing allocations.

As the Plan is a review of the made Plan, the questions focus on the proposed new policies.

*Policies 1-4*

These policies take a positive approach to the now well-advanced emerging planning policy context in Bassetlaw. In addition, the criteria are locally-distinctive.

Based on my own observations of the sites, and the representations received, I am minded to recommend the following modifications to each policy:

* the replacement of the site identifications with geographic descriptions;

Noted and agreed.

This was also raised in a comment made at Regulation 16. Our response to that comment was to say the following:

Agreed, however the lack of specific landmarks makes this a challenge! We are happy to work with BDC on applying appropriate descriptions for the sites, and offer the following suggestions:

NP01 – the junction of Rectory Road and Town Street.

NP09 – adjacent to East End Farm.

NP10 – land east of Cocking Lane.

NP12 – land on the Shenval Cottage site.

* the inclusion of an additional criterion in each policy on biodiversity net gain; and

Agreed

* the inclusion of an additional criterion in each policy on how the development of each site should relate to the details in the Character Assessment.

Agreed

Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

As above. Thank you.

*Policies 1/3/4*

It would be helpful if the Parish Council would clarify what it sees as linear development. Is it single-plot depth development on the sites which would deliver two houses?

Yes that is correct. On reflection, the term ‘linear’ will only apply on site 1 where there are two dwellings.

*Policy 5*

On the one hand, this is a general infill development policy with appropriate criteria. On the other hand, it appears after the previous four policies, two of which allocate land for one house and two of which allocate land for two houses.

In this context, is the proposed maximum yield of two houses appropriate for a general policy and should it more simply comment about the size and character of the site concerned?

The policy seeks to restrict development to two dwellings, ‘unless a greater number of dwellings would not cause undue harm to the character of that part of the settlement or an over intensification of a site’. We considered this to be an appropriate policy but if it is considered that rewording the policy along the lines suggested will achieve the same end, then we are content for the change to be made.

*Policy 6*

Whilst the national approach to character and design (and the NPPF) has moved on significantly since the Plan was made, this policy is a very effective response to Section 12 of the current version of the NPPF (December 2023).

Thank you.

***Representations***

Does the Parish Council wish to comment on any of the representations made to the Plan?

I would find it helpful to receive the Parish Council’s comments on the representations made by Bassetlaw District Council (both Planning Policy and Neighbourhood Planning);

***Protocol for responses***

I would be grateful for responses and the information requested by 12 May 2024. Please let me know if this timetable may be challenging to achieve. It is intended to maintain the momentum of the examination.

If certain responses are available before others, I am happy to receive the information on a piecemeal basis. Irrespective of how the information is assembled please could it come to me directly from the District Council. In addition, please can all responses make direct reference to the policy or the matter concerned.
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