

Teversal, Stanton Hill and Skegby Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2031

**Report by Independent Examiner to Ashfield District
Council**

Janet L Cheesley BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

CHEC Planning Ltd

10 July 2017

Contents	Page
Summary and Conclusion	3
Introduction	3
Legislative Background	3
EU Obligations	4
Policy Background	5
The Neighbourhood Plan Preparation	6
The Teversal, Stanton Hill and Skegby Neighbourhood Plan	7
NP 1: Sustainable Development	8
NP 2: Design Principles for Residential Development	9
NP 3: Housing Type	10
NP 4: Protecting the Landscape Character	11
NP 5: Protecting and Enhancing Heritage Assets	12
NP 6: Improving Access to the Countryside	13
NP 7: Strengthening the Retail Centre in Stanton Hill	14
NP 8: Improving Digital Connectivity	15
AP 1: Road Safety and Public Transport	15
Referendum & the TSS Neighbourhood Plan Area	15
Minor Modifications	16
Appendix 1 Background Documents	17

Summary and Conclusion

1. The Teversal, Stanton Hill and Skegby Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2031 has a clear Community Vision and list of Community Objectives. This is an extremely well written neighbourhood plan. Those involved in the production of this Plan should feel proud of their achievements.
2. I have recommended modification to some of the policies and supporting text in the Plan. In particular, I have recommended modification to Policy NP 5 to ensure that it has regard to national policy for conserving heritage assets.
3. **Whilst I have set out my reasoning under individual policies, my overall conclusion is that, subject to my recommendations, the Plan meets the Basic Conditions. It is appropriate to make the Plan. Subject to my recommendations being accepted, I consider that the Teversal, Stanton Hill and Skegby Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2031 will provide a strong practical framework against which decisions on development can be made. I am pleased to recommend that the Teversal, Stanton Hill and Skegby Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2031, as modified by my recommendations, should proceed to Referendum.**

Introduction

4. I was appointed as an independent Examiner for the Teversal, Stanton Hill and Skegby Neighbourhood Plan in June 2017. The Plan covers the period 2016-2031.
5. The qualifying body is the Teversal, Stanton Hill and Skegby Neighbourhood Forum. The Teversal, Stanton Hill and Skegby Neighbourhood Forum and the Neighbourhood Area were approved by Ashfield District Council (ADC) on 23rd February 2015. As such the Forum is authorised to act in relation to the Neighbourhood Plan Area. The Area covers the three settlements of Teversal, Stanton Hill and Skegby and the two hamlets of Fackley and Stanley.

Legislative Background

6. As an independent Examiner, I am required to determine, under Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, whether:
 - the policies in the Plan relate to the development and use of land for a designated Neighbourhood Area in line with the requirements of Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (PCPA) 2004;
 - the Plan meets the requirements of Section 38B of the 2004 PCPA where the plan must specify the period to which it has effect, must not

include provision about development that is excluded development, and must not relate to more than one Neighbourhood Area; and

- that the Plan has been prepared for an area that has been designated under the Localism Act 2011 and has been developed and submitted for examination by a qualifying body.

7. I am obliged to determine whether the Plan complies with the Basic Conditions. The Basic Conditions are:

- having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood plan;
- the making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;
- the making of the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the Development Plan for the area of the authority; and
- the making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations and human rights requirements.

8. Subject to the modifications I have recommended in this report, I am content that these requirements have been satisfied.

EU Obligations

9. Directive 2001/42/EC and the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (as amended) (EA Regulations) set out various legal requirements and stages in the production of a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).
10. A Sustainability Matrix for the Plan and a Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report have been submitted as part of the background evidence identifying the environmental, economic and social impacts of the policies in the Plan.
11. ADC prepared a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening Report in March 2017 to determine whether the Plan required a SEA and/or a Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA). The Report concludes that the Plan is unlikely to have significant environmental effects and neither a SEA nor HRA are required. This is endorsed by the statutory consultees.
12. Based on the screening determination and consultee response, I consider that it was not necessary for the Plan to require a full SEA. The SEA screening accords with the provisions of the European Directive 2001/42/EC.

13. Based on the screening determination and consultee response, I consider that the Plan did not require a full HRA under Articles 6 or 7 of the Habitats Directive.
14. A Neighbourhood Plan must be compatible with European Union obligations, as incorporated into UK law, in order to be legally compliant. I am satisfied that the Plan is compatible with EU obligations and does not breach the European Convention on Human Rights obligations.

Policy Background

15. *The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) (NPPF) outlines the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. The Planning Practice Guidance (2014) (PPG) provides Government guidance on planning policy.*
16. Paragraph 7 in the NPPF identifies the three dimensions to sustainable development:

There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:

*• **an economic role** – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure;*

*• **a social role** – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and*

*• **an environmental role** – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.*

17. The Teversal, Stanton Hill and Skegby Neighbourhood Forum area is within the local authority area of Ashfield District Council. The development plan for the Neighbourhood Plan Area comprises the saved policies in the Ashfield Local Plan Review (ALPR) (2002). Not all policies in the ALPR are strategic policies. Saved strategic policies include policies regarding the environment and general location of development.

18. On 24 February 2017 the Ashfield Local Plan Publication (September 2016) was submitted for examination. There is no legal requirement to test the Neighbourhood Plan against emerging policy although Planning Policy Guidance advises that the reasoning and evidence informing the Local Plan process may be relevant to the consideration of the basic conditions against which the neighbourhood development plan is tested. The qualifying body and the local planning authority should aim to agree the relationship between policies in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, the emerging Local Plan and the adopted development plan, with appropriate regard to national policy and guidance.
19. The Neighbourhood Plan and the emerging Local Plan have been advancing in parallel. Although the Neighbourhood Plan period does not correspond to the plan period of the emerging Local Plan, there is no requirement for it to do so.
20. Documents commissioned by ADC to support their emerging Local Plan have been used to guide the Neighbourhood Plan policies, and there has been close collaboration between ADC and the Forum in the preparation of this Neighbourhood Plan.

The Neighbourhood Plan Preparation

21. I am required under The Localism Act 2011 to check the consultation process that has led to the production of the Plan. The requirements are set out in Regulation 14 in The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.
22. The initial consultation process included a series of meetings in September and October 2014 regarding forming the Neighbourhood Forum. This was followed in early 2015 by public consultation, which included questionnaires for residents and businesses and consultation events.
23. The events included coffee mornings and displays in shops. A Newsletter was produced and copies were left in public buildings and distributed to households. Children were actively encouraged to participate. Other methods included publicising consultation details in the Teversal Parish Magazine, parent's questionnaires, and a display in the Teversal Trails Visitor Centre. I congratulate all those involved on this considerable consultation effort.
24. The Consultation period on the pre-submission draft of the Plan ran from 29 August 2016 to 28 October 2016. Consultation included the setting up of points throughout the Neighbourhood Area where copies of the Plan and an Executive Summary could be read and a questionnaire collected. Documents and a questionnaire were included on the Forum website. A flyer was delivered to households.

25. I am satisfied that the pre-submission consultation and publicity has met the requirements of Regulation 14 in The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The consultation and publicity went well beyond the requirements and it is clear that the qualifying body went to considerable lengths to ensure that local residents and businesses were able to engage in the production of the Plan. I commend them on their efforts.
26. ADC publicised the submission Plan for comment during the publicity period between 28 April 2017 and 12 June 2017 in line with Regulation 16 in The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. A total of ten responses were received, including those from ADC. I am satisfied that all these responses can be assessed without the need for a public hearing.
27. Some responses suggest additions and amendments to the Plan. My remit is to determine whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions. Where I find that policies do meet the Basic Conditions, it is not necessary for me to consider if further suggested additions or amendments are required. Whilst I have not made reference to all the responses in my report, I have taken them into consideration.

The Teversal, Stanton Hill and Skegby Neighbourhood Plan

28. I have been provided with a detailed evidence base in background supporting documents. This has provided a useful and easily accessible source of background information. In addition, the Plan includes detailed background information regarding the Plan area.
29. Where I have found editing errors, I have identified them as minor editing matters and highlighted these as such. These have no bearing on whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions.
30. The Plan includes a clear Community Vision statement: *In 20 years' time the TSS Plan area will be a prosperous and thriving community. It will value its rural heritage and high quality natural environment. It will provide people with employment, education and relaxation. It will be a regenerated place where everyone can fulfil their potential.*
31. A list of Community Objectives to achieve the Community Vision has been identified. These objectives are the basis upon which the policies have been prepared.
32. It is necessary for Neighbourhood Plans to provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency as stated in the core planning principles in paragraph 17 in the NPPF. I do refer to clarity and precision with regard to some recommendations to modifications to the Plan. Where I do so, I have in mind the need to provide a practical framework in

accordance with the core principles in the NPPF, thus ensuring that the Plan has regard to national policy in this respect.

33. A Key Principle in the Plan is concerned with encouraging pre-application Community Consultation. This has regard to national policy as outlined in paragraph 189 in the NPPF.
34. In paragraph 128 in the Plan, the supporting text to this Key Principle recognises that pre-application consultation is encouraged but is not a statutory requirement. However, this is contradicted in paragraph 129, where it outlines the circumstances where pre-application consultation is *required*. In the interest of precision, I recommend modification to paragraph 129 to specify that such consultation is *encouraged*, rather than *required*.
35. At the bottom of each page in the Plan it is stated that: *all policies should be read in conjunction with District wide adopted policies. No neighbourhood plan policy will be applied in isolation; account will be taken of all relevant policies*. This is a helpful reference to the context within which the policies are to be read.
36. For ease of reference, I have used the same policy titles as those in the Plan.
37. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions, I recommend modification to paragraph 129 to read as follows:**

Due to the varied nature of the area and the resources of the Forum pre-application consultation is encouraged on major development in Stanton Hill and Skegby but for all applications in Teversal village due to its Conservation Area status.

NP 1: Sustainable Development

38. The NPPF states at paragraph 14: *At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a **presumption in favour of sustainable development**, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.*
39. The NPPF in paragraph 185 is clear that outside the strategic elements *neighbourhood plans will be able to shape and direct sustainable development in their area*. National policy emphasises that development means growth.
40. The ALPR does not have a specific policy concerned with sustainable development but does recognise at paragraph 2.4 that: *all issues relating to sustainable development are embodied within the overall strategic approach to land use issues in this Plan.*

41. The Neighbourhood Plan does not seek to allocate sites for retail, employment or residential development, but does recognise that there is a likelihood that there will be substantial numbers of additional dwellings built in the Plan area to meet the housing requirements in the emerging Local Plan.
42. The Plan has sought to provide for sustainable growth by taking a positive approach to development that meets the criteria in Policy NP 1. The criteria seek to ensure that development meets local requirements and integrates with the existing settlements and the wider environment. As such, Policy NP 1 has regard to national policy, contributes towards sustainable development and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Policy NP 1 meets the Basic Conditions.
43. Paragraph 136 supporting Policy NP 1 refers to priority for schemes that provide contributions towards bus services, raised kerbs and waiting facilities over those that do not. This is not included as a priority requirement in Policy NP 1. To avoid internal conflict in the Plan, in the interest of providing a practical framework for decision making, I recommend deletion of that sentence in paragraph 136.
44. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions, I recommend deletion of the last sentence in paragraph 136.**

NP 2: Design Principles for Residential Development

45. The NPPF, at paragraph 58, requires neighbourhood plans to include policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. Such policies should be based on stated objectives for the future of the area and an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics.
46. ALPR Policy ST1 is a strategic all-encompassing policy. It permits development subject to a list of criteria including that development will not adversely affect the character, quality, amenity or safety of the environment. In addition, it states that development should not conflict with other policies in the plan. A relevant design policy in the ALPR is Policy HG5. This is a site consideration policy for new residential development, which includes design criteria.
47. Policy NP 2 sets design principles and specifies design principles for each of the three main settlements and two hamlets. The TSS Design Guide provides a detailed understanding and evaluation of the defining characteristics of the three main settlements and two hamlets. This analysis underpins Policy NP 2 and should be read in conjunction with it.
48. Apart from the specific design requirements for the settlements and hamlets, Policy NP 2 sets general design principles, including the need to respect local character and encourages the use of Building for Life Standards and

supports the use of Sustainable Drainage Solutions. The Building for Life Standards set out deliverable standards for 12 topics relating to the design of new developments. Building for Life is a well-respected set of standards and the NPPF places great emphasis on the importance of good design.

49. I have visited the Plan area and seen for myself the defining characteristics described in the TSS Design Guide. This Design Guide provides comprehensive robust evidence to support the detailed design requirements specified in Policy NP 2 for the settlements and hamlets and the general design principles for the whole plan area. This is a very useful and detailed document.
50. The design criteria in Policy NP 2 are justified by robust evidence in the Design Guidance. Policy NP 2 has regard to national policy, particularly where it seeks high quality design and ensures that the Plan sets out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. Policy NP 2 contributes towards the environmental role of sustainable development and is in general conformity with strategic policy. Policy NP 2 meets the Basic Conditions.

NP 3: Housing Type

51. The NPPF seeks to ensure that there is provision of a wide choice of quality homes that reflects the needs of different groups in the community. There is no strategic policy with regard to housing type in the ALPR.
52. Background evidence supporting the Neighbourhood Plan identifies a need for housing for older people and first time buyers. Policy NP 3 seeks to ensure that new housing development reflects such a need. In addition, it recognises that the location of small dwellings suitable for elderly people will be encouraged in close walking distance to facilities in the Local Centre at Stanton Hill.
53. I am satisfied that Policy NP 3 has regard to national policy as outlined above and contributes towards the social role of sustainable development where it contributes towards providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations. Policy NP 3 meets the Basic Conditions.
54. Supporting text in paragraph 189 summarises key points from the SHMA 2015 and the Nottingham Core and Outer Housing Market Areas A Strategic Approach to Older Persons' Accommodation and Support Consultants Brief (November 2009). I note that the Older Person' Accommodation Brief does not form part of the emerging Local Plan evidence base. In neither document does it specifically refer to the need for terraced or semi-detached family properties, although the SHMA does identify the need for 2 and 3 bedroom houses. In the interest of precision, reference to the need for

terraced or semi-detached family properties in paragraph 189 c) should be deleted.

55. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions, I recommend deletion of reference to the need for terraced or semi-detached family properties in paragraph 189 c).**

NP 4: Protecting the Landscape Character

56. Paragraph 109 in the NPPF emphasises the need to conserve and enhance the natural environment.
57. As mentioned above, ALPR Policy ST1 permits development subject to a list of criteria including that development will not adversely affect the character, quality, amenity or safety of the environment. ALPR Policy EV4 seeks to protect identified mature landscape.
58. The TSS Design Guide analyses both the character of the settlements and hamlets and how they relate to their landscape. Policy NP 4 seeks to protect existing landscape character and identifies green corridors for protection. The background evidence supports this approach.
59. The Ashfield Technical Paper: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity (September 2013) identifies a draft green infrastructure network for Ashfield. This includes a Strategic Corridor between Skegby-Huthwaite Reference GI-23. Policy NP 4 requires development in the vicinity of this corridor to contribute to its improvement.
60. Developer contributions can only be sought where they meet the tests that they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. These tests are set out as statutory tests in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. The definition of development in planning policy encompasses a wide range, including change of use and there may be many instances where small scale development does not meet the test for contributions towards the improvement of the Strategic Corridor. Therefore, I consider it necessary to modify Policy NP 4 by including reference to the statutory tests. This will ensure that the policy has regard to this national policy.
61. Subject to the suggested modification outlined above, Policy NP 4 has regard to national policy seeking to conserve and enhance the natural environment, contributes towards the environmental role of sustainable development and is in general conformity with strategic policy seeking to protect the character and quality of the environment. The modified policy meets the Basic Conditions.
62. The National Trust has suggested that the second sentence in paragraph 199 is amended to accurately reflect the findings of the Hardwick Study.

Their recommendation is that this sentence should read as follows: *It does not make an assessment of the sensitivity of landscape character, per se, but considers the landscape as part of the setting around the Hall and Park.* In addition, the National Trust has stated that the footnote at the bottom of page 52 refers to the correct title of the Hardwick Setting Study i.e. removing 'Rural' from the title. In addition, the National Trust suggests amendment to paragraph 84 to refer to part of the Registered Park and garden, rather than the whole of it, falls within the Plan area. **I see these as minor editing matters.**

63. Paragraph 193 refers to Map 13, where it should refer to Map 12. Paragraph 202 refers to section 16 when it should refer to section 15. **I see these as minor editing matters.**

64. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions, I recommend modification to Policy NP 4 Criterion 3. To read as follows:**

Contributions will be sought for the improvement of Strategic Corridor G1-23 from developments in the vicinity of that Strategic Corridor in accordance with the tests as set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

NP 5: Protecting and Enhancing Heritage Assets

65. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 imposes duties requiring special regard to be had to the desirability: firstly at Section 16(2), of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses; and secondly, at Section 72(1), of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.

66. The NPPF advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

67. ALPR Policy EV10 seeks to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas. I consider this to be a strategic policy for the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment.

68. Policy NP 5 seeks to protect and enhance heritage assets, including Skegby Hall Gardens and the importance of the setting of Hardwick Hall. In addition, it recognises the need for a public car park in Teversal. The TSS Design Guide; the Teversal Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (2012); and TSS Planning Forum Heritage Report (July 2015) are background evidence to support Policy NP 5.

69. Criterion 2 in Policy NP 5 refers to development not causing substantial harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area or setting of Listed Buildings. Paragraph 133 in the NPPF lists exceptional

circumstances when development could be allowed, including where there would be the achievement of substantial public benefits. I have not been provided with robust evidence to justify departure from this approach to allowing exceptions. Whilst it is not necessary to repeat national policy, in the interest of clarity and precision and to have regard to national policy, I recommend modification to Criterion 2 to accurately reflect policy outlined in paragraph 133 in the NPPF.

70. Subject to my recommended modification outlined above, Policy NP 5 has regard to national policy, contributes towards the environmental role of sustainable development where it seeks to protect and enhance the historic environment and is in general conformity with strategic policy. As such, Policy NP 5 meets the Basic Conditions.
71. ADC has pointed out that the reference to the Historic England web site in paragraph 211 relates to the National Heritage List for England and does not include local listings, which can be found on the ADC web site. I suggest that paragraph 211 is amended to make this clear. **I see this as a minor editing matter.**
72. Paragraph 213 should cross refer to paragraph 199, not paragraph 152. **I see this as a minor editing matter.**
73. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions, I recommend modification to Criterion 2 in Policy NP 5 to read as follows:**
- 2. Development adjacent and within the setting of Teversal Conservation Area should not cause substantial harm to the character and appearance of the area and/or the setting of the Listed Buildings, unless there are exceptional circumstances as outlined in the NPPF. New development within the Conservation Area and/or its setting should reflect the historic character of the village in terms of site layout, scale and boundary treatments.**

NP 6: Improving Access to the Countryside

74. The NPPF seeks to promote healthy communities, including access to recreational facilities. At paragraph 75, the NPPF specifically seeks to protect and enhance public rights of way and access.
75. ALPR Policy TR6 seeks developer contributions to transport improvements. These include improvements to the cycling network and pedestrian facilities. I consider this to be a strategic policy for the delivery of infrastructure for transport.
76. Policy NP 6 recognises the economic benefits of attracting people to the area and the social benefits of improving access to the countryside. To avoid ambiguity, in the interest of clarity and precision, I recommend modification to criterion 3 to make it clear that proposals for housing

development can only be expected to protect and enhance existing rights of way affected by those developments. Subject to this modification, Policy NP 6 has regard to national policy as outlined above, contributes towards the economic and social role of sustainable development and is in general conformity with strategic policy in ALPR Policy TR6. As such, Policy NP 6 meets the Basic Conditions.

77. **Recommendation: to meet the Basic Conditions, I recommend modification to Criterion 3 in Policy NP 6 to read as follows:**

3. Proposals for housing development will be expected to demonstrate how they protect and enhance existing public rights of way affected by those developments and show the opportunities taken to improve linkages between those existing routes and from the edge of the existing settlement to the countryside and open spaces.

NP 7: Strengthening the Retail Centre in Stanton Hill

78. One of the core principles in the NPPF includes the need to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development.
79. ALPR Policy SH 4 designates Stanton Hill as a Local Shopping Centre.
80. Policy NP 7 seeks to strengthen the Shopping Centre in Stanton Hill, where background evidence clearly shows that this area has fallen into decline. In particular, the TSS Design Guide provides an initial analysis of the situation and identifies opportunities for improvement. I have seen for myself the existing shopping experience at Stanton Hill. The regeneration challenge is met by the positive approach to regeneration in Policy NP 7. I see Policy NP 7 as being a positive policy which has regard to national policy, particularly in that it proactively supports sustainable economic development. Policy NP 7 meets the Basic Conditions.
81. The Co-op has requested an addition to Policy NP 7 to include reference to alternative uses for vacant properties. My remit is restricted to whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions. It is not necessary to include such a reference for Policy NP 7 to meet the Basic Conditions.
82. The Co-op has stated that the former Co-op store is identified as a Use Class A1 store on Map 15, but is now the Starbox Boxing Club (Use Class D2). I suggest that Map 15 is updated accordingly. **I see this as a minor editing matter.**
83. The reference in paragraph 238 is incorrect. It should refer to Section 6, not Section 7 and the reference at the bottom of the page should refer to tables on pages 29 and 30, not pages 33 and 34. **I see these as minor editing matters.**

NP 8: Improving Digital Connectivity

84. The NPPF emphasises that advanced high quality communications infrastructure is essential for sustainable economic growth and plays a vital role in enhancing the provision of local community facilities and services.
85. It is clear that broadband speeds vary considerably over the Plan area. Policy NP 8 seeks to redress this problem by supporting proposals that provide access to superfast broadband and seeking the provision of means to access this network where possible. As such, Policy NP 8 has regard to national policy as referred to above and contributes towards the economic and social roles of sustainable development. Policy NP 8 meets the Basic Conditions.

AP 1: Road Safety and Public Transport

86. Neighbourhood Plans can include non-land use and development policies, but where they do so, there should be a clear indication in the Plan of the status of such policies. It is clear that Policy AP 1 is an aspirational policy. It reflects the concerns of local people about road safety, parking provision and bus services.
87. Paragraph 261 should refer to Table 9, not Table 8. **I see this as a minor editing matter.**

Referendum and the Teversal, Stanton Hill and Skegby Neighbourhood Plan Area

88. I am required to make one of the following recommendations:
- the Plan should proceed to Referendum, on the basis that it meets all legal requirements; or
 - the Plan as modified by my recommendations should proceed to Referendum; or
 - the Plan does not proceed to Referendum, on the basis that it does not meet the relevant legal requirements.
89. **I am pleased to recommend that the Teversal, Stanton Hill and Skegby Neighbourhood Plan as modified by my recommendations should proceed to Referendum.**
90. I am required to consider whether or not the Referendum Area should extend beyond the Teversal, Stanton Hill and Skegby Neighbourhood Plan

Area. I see no reason to alter or extend the Neighbourhood Plan Area for the purpose of holding a referendum.

Minor Modifications

91. The Plan is a well-written document, which is easy to read. Where I have found minor editing errors, I have identified them above. It is not for me to re-write the Plan. If other minor amendments are required as a result of my proposed modifications, I see these as minor editing matters which can be dealt with as minor modifications to the Plan.
92. ADC has identified editing errors in the Plan and outlined these in their representations. I will leave it up to ADC to make these minor editing changes. For the avoidance of doubt, these suggested minor modifications relate to the following pages/paragraphs in the Plan: page 4; and paragraphs 9, 18, 100, 127 and 183.
93. Where ADC has suggested helpful additions, I see these as more than minor modifications and they are not necessary to ensure that the Plan meets the Basic Conditions.

Janet Cheesley

Date 10 July 2017

Appendix 1 Background Documents

The background documents include

The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) (2012)
The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
The Localism Act (2011)
The Neighbourhood Planning Regulations (2012)
The Planning Practice Guidance (2014)
Ashfield Local Plan Review 2002
The Ashfield Local Plan Publication (September 2016)
Nottingham Outer 2015 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (October 2015)
Nottingham Core and Outer Housing Market Areas: A Strategic Approach to Older Persons' Accommodation and Support Consultants Brief (November 2009)
Ashfield Technical Paper Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity (September 2013)
Teversal Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (2012)
Hardwick Setting Study National Trust (March 2016)
Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening Report (March 2017)
TSS Sustainability Matrix: TSS Neighbourhood Plan
TSS Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report
Heritage Report
TSS Housing Needs Assessment Report and ADC comments (November 2015)
Skegby Traffic Survey
Hardwick Setting Study National Trust (March 2016)
TSS Design Guide (May 2016)
TSS Consultation Statement and Addendum
TSS Basic Conditions Statement (January 2017)
Regulation 16 Representations