

Consultation Statement: Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan



*Prepared by Planning With People on behalf of the Neighbourhood Planning Group
and Ranskill Parish Council*



22 April 2022

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Pre- Regulation 14 Consultation	3
Regulation 14 Consultation.....	5
Comments from Statutory Consultees	5
Appendix A Village Survey	22
Appendix B First Public Consultation	23
Appendix C Second Consultation	24
Appendix D Explanatory Statement from Bassetlaw District Council	25
Appendix E Fourth Consultation	28
Appendix F Fifth Consultation.....	30
Appendix G Regulation 14 Consultation.....	31

Introduction

- 1.1 This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations in accordance with the Localism Act 2011 for Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan (RNP). The legal basis of the statement is provided by Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations which states that a consultation statement should:
- Contain details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Plan;
 - Explain how they were consulted;
 - Summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
 - Describe how those issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.

Pre- Regulation 14 Consultation

- 1.2 Throughout the process of producing a neighbourhood plan a report was presented to the PC at monthly Parish Council (PC) meetings and all Neighbourhood Plan Group (NPG) meeting agendas and minutes were posted on the PC website. Open NPG meetings were advertised as necessary.
- 1.3 Once the Parish Council had decided to do a Neighbourhood Plan the Parish Council conducted a Village Survey. This was hand delivered to all 618 households in the Parish in 2016. 330 were returned which at 53% is a very good response rate.
- 1.4 The Village Survey front page is at Appendix A and the full report is at <https://www.ranskillplan.co.uk/public-consultations/village-survey-2016>.
- 1.5 Initially there was a focus on site allocation as BDC emerging policy was seeking up to 20% growth in small rural settlements like Ranskill. Considerable time and energy went into working with landowners and seeking community gain based on the findings of the Village Survey. In particular, the Survey showed the community remained keen on having a village hall. Ranskill does not have a village hall and despite previous attempts and the allocation of lottery funding this had not been achieved. With the requirement around the need to deliver approx. 120 dwellings, the NPG spent much of their time undertaking consultation on site allocation. This background is relevant as it explains why there were five public consultations including one withdrawn Regulation 14 consultation before the Regulation 14 proper was undertaken.
- 1.6 In mid 2021 BDCs emerging policy approach changed and only required 5% growth in villages like Ranskill. This resulted in a fourth and fifth consultation and the residential site being removed. At Regulation 14 comments from BDC and a few residents saw the removal of the employment site, so the RNP no longer includes any site allocations.
- 1.7 It is worth setting out the timescale and scope of each consultation as it demonstrates the extent of consultation with the community throughout the neighbourhood plan process.

First Consultation 4th March 2020



- 1.8 This was a drop-in session to consult on the range of sites proposed, the vision and objectives of the RNP. The summary of responses is at Appendix B and the full report on this consultation is at <https://www.ranskillplan.co.uk/public-consultations/first-public-consultation-march-2020>

Second Consultation July 2020

- 1.9 Consultation methods were now affected by Covid lockdowns and the limitations on face-to-face meetings. However, the NPG continued to seek ways of getting feedback from the local community. In July 2020 the NPG consulted on the two preferred sites for residential (which at that time was still in the RNP as this was a way of meeting the growth requirements in the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan). A consultation leaflet was sent to all households. The front page of the consultation leaflet is at Appendix C and the full report on this consultation is at <https://www.ranskillplan.co.uk/public-consultations/second-public-consultation-july-2020>.

Third Withdrawn Consultation 15th November withdrawn December 2020

- 1.10 This was intended to be the Regulation 14 consultation. A leaflet was produced and delivered to all households – Covid restrictions meant that face to face consultation was still not allowed. The Pre Submission Draft RNP which was the basis of this first Regulation 14 consultation still included NP19 and NP25. As the Regulation 14 consultation began the policy position in the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan materially changed. The requirement for up to 20% growth was changed to a 5% requirement.
- 1.11 Bassetlaw District Council produced an explanatory statement explaining this policy change and the relationship between the latest version of the Local Plan (which would become the Publication Draft) and the Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan. The letter is at Appendix D and the consultation was withdrawn.¹ Whilst neighbourhood plans can provide for more growth than is required in District policy this change meant that the RNP did not need to take control of a

¹ See also <https://www.ranskillplan.co.uk/public-consultations/third-public-consultation-now-withdrawn>

policy approach that would otherwise have seen the delivery of approximately 120 houses. The NPG went back to the community with this new information and launched a two more consultations before amending the Pre-Submission RNP and relaunching the Regulation 14 consultation.

Fourth Consultation February 2021 and Fifth Consultation July 2021

- 1.12 These consultations reflected the reassessment required by the community to consider the implication of the new strategic position in the Publication Version Local Plan. A Leaflet was distributed to every household in July 2021 (see Appendix E and F.) The findings of the consultation is at <https://www.ranskillplan.co.uk/public-consultations/fifth-public-consultation-july-2021> The majority of the community decided that they did not support the community gain that had been negotiated with the landowners (village hall etc) if 122 houses were developed.
- 1.13 Consequently, the Revised Pre-Submission Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan that went out to Regulation 14 consultation did not include a residential site allocation. At this stage it still included an employment site allocation NP25 (but this was removed after the Regulation 14 consultation – please see below.)

Regulation 14 Consultation

- 1.14 The Regulation 14 consultation ran from 1st December to 31st 2021 to January 2022. The revised Pre-Submission Plan was available on the RNP web site and a letter was delivered to every household and put in the Star (the Local newspaper) inviting people to comment. A copy is at Appendix G.

Comments from Statutory Consultees

Bassetlaw District Council Conservation Team

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
Page 35 – Policy 4, part 7: “	Suggest adding the underlined text The retrofit of heritage properties/assets will be permitted to reduce energy demand and to generate renewable energy where appropriate, providing it safeguards <u>the significance and setting</u> of the heritage assets <u>affected.</u> ”	Amended	Y

Neighbourhood Planning Team

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
Overall	The Draft Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan is a constructive document which utilises a good mixture of robust evidence to encapsulate the context and aspirations of the local community	Noted	N
Map 3	Not clear enough – BDC can assist	BDC agreed to a produce better heritage assets map and to use an alternative base map to show field boundaries for the SGGs and Development Boundary	Y
Para 11 and 12	Potential to reflect updated Local Plan context, particularly Policy ST2.	Amended	Y
Policy 1	Is the mention of site allocations here necessary? As the only allocation in this version of the plan is for an employment site, large parts of this policy will not apply to it	Agreed and Policy 1 amended	Y
Policy 1d	Include key views and LGSS	Agreed and Policy 1 amended	Y
Policy 1 (2)	A reference could be made here for Rural Exception Sites	Amended	Y
Ref to Suds	Needs clarifying not required on all development	Amended	Y
Map 10	Should the land to the west of Great North Road (former NP19) now be included as an SGG, given that the former NP24 (land to the north of Arundel Drive) is identified as such? A consistent approach and narrative is needed.	The land to the west of the Great North Road has pp for development – however the NP group agree that the open space around this application would meet the SGG criteria and should be included.	
Para 67	This mention of allocated sites should be removed following the removal of the housing allocation site	Amended	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
Table 58	For the sake of clarity, this could be redone and retitled to fit in with the wider plan	Table redone all data copied from table 58	Y
List of community groups	As this section is a particular snapshot in time it is likely that it will lose relevance quite quickly, for this reason it is debatable how necessary this is in the plan.	This list was intended to show the community spirit and vibrancy of the village and the need to protect and expand the provision of community facilities in the village	N

Housing

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
Para 33 and para 88	Developers consulting with residents. Para 88 sets out what is needed and will form any planning application. So why would residents need consulting when it is set out? What argument would they put over only to say I don't want that next to my house?	The key principle is an approach that the NP encourages but is it not a legal requirement. Whilst para 88 does set out what housing mix is required there is much evidence across the district to indicate that houses of less than 10 dwellings tend to be larger 4 bed dwellings not the smaller 2/3 bed dwellings required.	N

Planning Policy Team

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
General	Some elements of the Plan could be written more positively to meet the requirements of the NPPF. The NPPF does not mention a 'limit' to development. It puts more emphasis on meeting the development needs of an area. This should also be kept under regularly review (recommend that the Plan is reviewed every five years).	Noted ref to limited removed at para 37 – Existing and emerging District Policy supports the location of very limited development where it adjoins the built-up part of Ranskill' and in objectives Other references considered appropriate ie definition of infill development etc	Y
	References to the Core Strategy should be: <i>Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD</i> and References to	Amended	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
	the Bassetlaw Local Plan should be: <i>Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037</i>		
Objectives	Make sure all covered by policy	Whilst protecting heritage assets is an important community objective it was not considered necessary to have it as a locally specific policy in the NP however extra criteria in policy 1 added.	Y
	Background docs for the LP have been updated reference should be made to them	Background documents updated and content noted	Y
	Development boundary principles needs to be in conformity with BDCs	Background paper on DB noted – the approach in the NP is consistent with BDCs – text added after options table	Y
Para 36	Revise sentence to reflect importance of Local Plan in decision making (There may be instances where the community are supportive of a scheme that isn't policy compliant/acceptable in planning terms. As such, the sentence could be misleading.)	Amended	Y
Policy 1	The concern with this Policy is that it is, effectively, limiting development to within the development boundary and is only supporting small-scale infill of only 1 or 2 dwellings per site. So it is unlikely that much of the proposed criteria (such as criterion points a), d), f) and g) would actually apply to developments. Suggest splitting policy 1 e – Policy 1 (2) should refer to rural exception sites	The NPG contend that the follow up phrase 'unless a greater number would not lead to a site becoming over developed' addressed this matter Agreed and amended Agreed and amended	N Y Y
Policy 2	The majority of development that is supported through Policy 1 will be small in scale and isn't likely to trigger a large number of the criteria identified in Policy 2 such as those issues related to biodiversity net gain, drainage and flooding.	Noted but the changes in policy approach at district level (Ranskill going from 20% growth to 5% growth) indicate that it is prudent to leave such references in.	N

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
	<p>What is the purpose of the proposed Green Gaps? Are they to prevent development, prevent coalescence between settlements, or limit types of development? Doesn't the development boundary effectively do this? Are most of all of the green gaps outside the boundary where development is already limited to countryside use? It would be useful if the definition or description of the Green Gap is clear within the supporting text to the Policy.</p> <p>Referring to the proposed Green Gaps as 'Significant' seems to be unnecessary and doesn't accord with the terminology used in the Green Gap Policy (ST38) of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan</p> <p>Why has the area to the north west of Ranskill not been designated as a Green Gap? Is it not as sensitive as the other areas? For consistency, it is recommended that this area is reviewed to determine if it should be included as a Green Gap.</p>	<p>The criteria the NPG used to identifying the SGGs has been added at Appendix H. See also comment above re the value to the community of having them</p> <p>The reference to Significant Green gaps has been used for 4 years in NPs in Bassetlaw. The use of the word significant is to assist the community in their assessment to avoid an over identification which would potentially weaken the policy.</p> <p>Part of this areas includes a site with planning permission for 32 dwellings it was the location for the larger scheme now removed from the NP. The NPG agree that part of the open area should be identified as a SGG and map 10 has been amended</p>	<p>Y</p> <p>N</p> <p>Y</p>
Policy 3	No concerns. However, the Parish Council should just be aware that the designation of a Local Green Space can prevent or restrict certain improvements to facilities if it includes any large scale development, such as the development of a village hall or sports facility.	Noted - The NPG do not consider any of the proposed LGSs to be suitable for development	N
Policy 4	Good to see more use of the Design Guide in this section and the Policy. Again, the criteria should really relate to the likely development Ranskill is going to see over the Plan period.	Detail from the text that summarized the key points from the design guide made into table 3 and added to policy 4	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
Policy 5	This policy is unlikely to be effective or deliverable whilst the Plan is only supporting small-scale development. It might be useful to identify what the local accommodation shortfalls are in the village and then seek to support larger scale developments through Policy 1	<p>The previous site allocation for 129 dwellings that was removed from the NP sought to meet wider community needs (a village hall and affordable housing) the community feedback would indicate that larger scale development of any sort would not be supported.</p> <p>Policy 5 has been amended to reflect small scale development, self-build supported to enable end users to meet specific needs</p>	Y
Policy 6	Is this policy needed?	The NPG value the contribution their local businesses make, this is not a dormitory village and wanted a policy that reflected this in their NP.	N
Policy 7	The Policy should provide further clarity for criteria a and b. Are new facilities supported within or outside the development boundary or both and why? Also, how does the developer demonstrate criteria b? further clarity will also help the decision maker during the determination of a planning application.	The community identified a need for a village hall, doctors surgery and village shop with sufficient parking. The location could be within or adjoining the DB and this has been added. Criteria b has been removed.	Y
Policy 8	<p>The proposed site was assessed through the EDNA as site LLAA55 (LAA057) and concludes that it is not commercially attractive and should not be included.</p> <p>The emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan identifies that the Council's employment land needs will be more than sufficiently met through existing commitments and the proposed employment allocation at Apleyhead</p> <p>Unless there is a proven need for this site to be allocated for employment for local needs, it is recommended that it should be removed from the Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	NP25 has been removed due to these objections	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
Appendix A	The identification of existing and new footpaths on page 50 is very useful. It is recommended that the Neighbourhood Plan identifies priority projects and maximises any CIL receipts for this purpose to improve connections through the village. As the Highway Authority, Nottinghamshire County Council's Rights of Way Officer and Highways department should be involved in this process	Text added at appendix A to make this point.	Y

Historic England

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
General	Supportive of proposal reflects our general advice	Noted.	N

Natural England

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
Objective 1	We recommend altering the wording of this objective to include not only minimizing impacts, but also creating enhancements to the environment, in line with the environmental objective of the NPPF (Paragraph 8, part C)	Amended	Y
	We would like to broadly welcome both the plan and design guide, and are encouraged by the inclusion of policies which aim to protect the two adjacent SSSIs. We also note the inclusion of the allocated site NP25; advise that any development must be designed to ensure no adverse	NP25 has been removed from the NP.	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
	impacts will occur on the nearby SSSI Mattersey Hill Marsh. With regard to the Design Guidelines for site NP25, we welcome the reference made to limiting disruption to the PRow on Common Lane, and would encourage enhancement of this via the development of the site.		

National Grid

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
General	An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission assets which include high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines. National Grid has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area.	Noted.	N

National Highways

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
General	Due to the minimal growth planned in the area and distance from the SRN, we maintain the view that this will not result in any material change to the operation of the SRN.	Noted	N

Isle of Axholme and North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
Section 10	The Board supports the preference for sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) and recommends that SUDS are	Noted	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
	<p>incorporated into all developments where feasible.</p> <p>The Board recommends including in this section that drainage design needs to take into account climate change by allowing for an expected increase in the volume of rainfall, when assessing the storage and conveyance requirements for potential development sites.</p> <p>The Board maintained (AXD540900) Main Drain lies to the East of the settlement and any development that has the potential to increase flows into this watercourse will require consideration and may require consent.</p>	<p>Text added</p> <p>Noted</p>	

Severn Trent

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
Policy 1	Generally supportive but would recommend adding references to the Drainage Hierarchy Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 80, to ensure that development also discharges surface water in the most sustainable way.	Policy 1 amended and footnote added	Y
Para 55 and policy 2	Supportive of the approach to highlight the need for SuDS and for them to be design in accordance with current industry Best Practice. Severn Trent are supportive of the need to incorporate SuDS within new development and that SuDS should provide multifunctional benefits such as natural flood management.	Noted	N

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
Policy 3	Local green spaces can provide suitable locations for schemes such as flood alleviation to be delivered without adversely impacting on the primary function of the open space. We would therefore recommend that the following point is added to Policy 3 to support the delivery of flood alleviation projects where required within green spaces.	Noted but this does not apply to the LGSs identified.	
Policy 4	Recommend that this policy highlights key design considerations about the performance of development sites, in such that they are built to manage surface water sustainably and utilise resources sustainably during use.	Ref to water efficient design added to policy 4. Other ref to drainage hierarchy and SuDs are included in policy 1 and policy 2.	Y

Coal Authority

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
General	Our records indicate that within the Neighbourhood Plan area identified there are coal mining features at surface and shallow depth. In this case these take the form of fissures or break lines and reported surface hazards. These features may pose a potential risk to surface stability and public safety. We provide the Local Planning Authority with downloadable GIS data which identifies the Development High Risk Area where our records indicate that mining features are present at surface and shallow depth. This information should be used to assess any sites being considered for potential allocation in respect of new development.	Noted	N

NCC Highways

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
Policy 7,1 a	make reference to all users such that it is clear that the Policy includes pedestrians, cyclists, the mobility impaired etc	Amended	Y
Design Guide Movements and Streets section	<p>Whilst I appreciate the aspirations of the Street hierarchy guidance, I'm not convinced that these are realistic in part whilst maintaining the necessary movement function of the existing highway network. It is also unlikely that future development in Ranskill would be of a sufficient scale to warrant a significant reallocation of road space in favour of enhanced pedestrian and cycle provision along the length on any given corridor.</p> <p>We would be likely to seek footway improvements and suitable connections to existing footways where this is considered necessary to access a development safely and where existing facilities are lacking.</p>	<p>This is noted – the report was produced by AECOM not the NPG Map 2 shows the street hierarchy and is taken from the AECOM guide. The NPG recognise that reduced scale of development now proposed makes it unlikely that development will provide an opportunity for new cycleways – this is not referenced in the NP in any event.</p> <p>Noted</p>	N

Lichfield on behalf of Scholeys

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
Significant Green Gaps	<p>Owners of sites NP18, 24 and 25</p> <p>One of the stated 'basic conditions' (Condition E) is that the plan should be prepared in general conformity with the strategic policies contained within the Local Plan for the area.</p> <p>Map 10 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan shows our client's land (namely sites N18 and NP24) as forming part of proposed 'significant green gaps' to the north of Ranskill. These gaps are described in paragraph 66 as providing a</p>	<p>The identification of significant green gaps by local people based on their analysis of the gaps around their settlement is based on set criteria – this has been added for clarity at Appendix H</p> <p>'Land identified as significant green gaps should have an open and undeveloped character and meet at least one of these criteria:</p> <p>a) Form a visual break between settlements – actual and perceived (from physical development or level of activity).</p>	N

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
	<p><i>“valued landscape feature with the topography providing sweeping views across from the open countryside”.</i></p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan does not appear to be supported by any evidence (beyond photographs of key views) with which to justify the proposed ‘significant green gap’ designations or their associated value as landscape features. Indeed, the Ranskill Design Code – which forms part of the consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan – includes, guidance as to how sites NP24 and NP18 could be developed, noting at Section 4.0 that this land is enclosed by hedgerows and that <i>“no significant landscape features remain within the site”.</i></p> <p>Furthermore, whilst draft Policy ST38 of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan includes various green gap designations for sensitive landscapes that have been identified around particular settlements in Bassetlaw, it includes no such designation around Ranskill.</p>	<p>b) Reinforce the loose grained rural character within the settlement.</p> <p>c) Boundaries follow physical features on the ground taking account of the need to accommodate the development requirements of the Plan.</p> <p>d) Only land necessary to secure the objectives of gaps on a long-term basis should be included.</p> <p>It should be stressed that the significant green gaps have not been defined on the basis of landscape features, although gap areas may happen to contain areas of good quality, due to the fact that they contain historic buildings; or because they afford attractive and/or significant views. ‘</p> <p>The previous Draft Local Plan requirement for proportionate growth to a maximum of 20% had required the community to identify NP19 for residential development. The design code assessment was done to allow consideration of all sites that had scored orange in the initial site assessment. Once the draft Local Plan was amended to require only 5% growth in Ranskill and, following further community consultation, there was no support to allocate a site for housing.</p> <p>It should also be noted that SGGs do not of themselves have to have specific landscape features but their openness next to the built form contributes to the rural character of the parish.</p>	

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
		<p>This meant the NPG went back to review the SGGs again. Without the requirement to meet higher development targets the fields that make up SGG18 and 25 meet the SGG criteria. There is no inconsistency with the design code, as that was assessing the site on its suitability for development within a different district wide policy framework.</p> <p>In terms of the robustness of the assessment process the evidence base for a neighbourhood plan needs to be proportionate. See PPG Paragraph: 040 Reference ID: 41-040-20160211 Local analysis and this approach has proven sufficiently robust to be considered acceptable in other neighbourhood plans that have got through referendum. The SGGs do not have to feature in BDCs Submission Local Plan.</p>	
	We endorse the continued inclusion of Site NP25 as a proposed employment site under Policy 8. We would suggest, however, that Policy 8 should not seek to dictate the exact number and nature of employment units that can be accommodated on the site.	NP25 has been removed from the Plan due to objections from BDC.	Y

Written Responses from Residents

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
Site allocation NP25	Access to the Site is Not a Public Highway - There has already been a high increase in heavy	NP25 has been removed from the Plan due to objections from BDC.	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
	goods vehicles and work vehicles using the area by access down Station Road. This has been highly increased since a change of ownership of Retford Skip Hire, and the introduction of The Sleeper Company and Mudfords in the area.		
	Speeding vehicles - Although this is not a designated road a national speed limit sign is present. This seems to give drivers the right to speed where it is clearly not safe due to the quality of the road surface and surrounding area.	The location of the speed sign would have been considered as part of the planning application process.	Y
	Light Pollution - Our house (Bushel Cottage), adjoining and surrounding houses will be affected by the increased light pollution Noise Pollution - Although the plans suggest so, it would not be possible to keep noise levels at an acceptable level during the day, night or weekends	This matter would have been addressed as part of the planning application process. This matter would have been addressed as part of the planning application process.	Y
	Map 13, Housing Types and Location is Incorrect- To be specific, it does not show the dwelling currently being developed at the back of The Old Mill. This brings with it concerns regarding loss of privacy as proposed distances are incorrect.	NP25 has been removed so this will no longer be a matter of concern.	Y
	Pedestrian Access - It is suggested that this development would benefit local employment. At present there are no suitable footpaths that would allow access to the site, so can local people really benefit from this when pedestrian safety would be in question?	Safe access and egress to the site would have been assessed as part of the planning application process.	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
	<p>Public Footpath and Right of Way - Common Lane and Access Road is a popular access route for families and dog walkers to Daneshill Lakes Nature Reserve and woods.</p> <p>Increased Traffic - Increased traffic on Station Road would mean further danger to pedestrians and other road users especially with Station Road being an access road to the local nursery and primary school. Station Road can not possibly accept more traffic.</p> <p>Wildlife - We have concerns that the development would affect the local wildlife with Daneshill Lakes Nature Reserve and woods being nearby. By implementing a wildlife pond in our back garden which attracts frogs, toads and newts and regularly witnessing birds of prey flying over the fields, we can 100% recommend that wildlife thrives in this area.</p>	<p>NP25 has been removed so this will no longer be a matter of concern.</p> <p>NP25 has been removed so this will no longer be a matter of concern.</p> <p>NP25 has been removed so this will no longer be a matter of concern.</p>	
	<p>Traffic at Railway Crossings - More traffic sitting at the railway crossings will cause an increase of air pollution. This seriously needs to be taken into account with the fact that the alleyway next to the crossings has a high footfall of people travelling to and from the nursery and primary school.</p> <p>Drainage - The site is regularly flooded. We believe the development of the site will have a knock on effect to neighbouring properties and the railway</p>	<p>NP25 has been removed so this will no longer be a matter of concern.</p> <p>Map 7 of the RNP identifies the flood risk and national, district and NP policies require the use of SuDs to mitigate this</p>	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
	Local Employment Improvement - This cannot be guaranteed like suggested	The provision of a local employment site may provide local jobs but NP25 has been removed so this will no longer be a matter of concern.	Y
	Visual Pollution - Without a doubt, the development would be an eyesore for us and our neighbouring properties	The design of development will be in accordance with the design guide, NP policy district and national policy. This matter would be addressed as part of the planning application process	Y
	Japanese Knotweed - It came up in our neighbours survey (Malkiln Cottage) when they bought their house that Japanese Knotweed has been present on the site and has been reported. Has this been investigated by the Parish Council? What would be the plan to eradicate it?	This is a matter for the landowner	Y
	<p>Increased Litter - During lockdown myself and my wife collected six bin bags worth of litter around the site. With the development, litter is only likely to increase for the whole village.</p> <p>Detriment to House Pricing - Ours, our neighbouring properties, properties on Station Road, and other surrounding properties, are very likely to decrease in value because of visual, light and noise pollution and increase of traffic.</p> <p>Smells - We are also concerned about smells which an industrial site might bring.</p> <p>Fear of crime - The development would increase the likelihood of opportunistic crime in the area</p>	<p>The NPG applaud the efforts of local people to keep the II parish litter free but this is not a planning matter.</p> <p>Devaluation is not a planning matter per sey and the other issues, light and noise pollution would be addressed as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>This matter would have been addressed as part of the planning application process</p> <p>The design and layout of the scheme would have taken into account designing out crime and the NPG consider that well designed starter</p>	Y

Section of the Plan	Comments	NPG Comments	Amendments Made
		units would be unlikely to increase opportunistic crime but NP25 has been removed so this will no longer be a matter of concern.	

Appendix A Village Survey

The full report is at <https://www.ranskillplan.co.uk/public-consultations/village-survey-2016>



A **VISION** FOR RANSKILL



THE FINDINGS OF YOUR VILLAGE SURVEY 2016.

Appendix B First Public Consultation

The full report is at <https://www.ranskillplan.co.uk/public-consultations/first-public-consultation-march-2020>

Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan - Summary					
Potential Site Allocations - Analysis of Responses					
	Yes	No	Maybe	No response	Yes+Maybe
Site					
NP10	16%	57%	12%	15%	28%
NP11	25%	48%	13%	14%	39%
NP12	8%	72%	7%	13%	15%
NP13	6%	72%	7%	16%	12%
NP14	14%	57%	10%	20%	24%
NP15	17%	57%	9%	17%	26%
NP16	10%	66%	7%	16%	17%
NP17	6%	70%	6%	18%	11%
NP18	20%	46%	16%	18%	36%
NP19	48%	25%	18%	8%	66%
NP21	5%	74%	5%	16%	10%
NP22	8%	66%	8%	17%	16%
NP24	43%	30%	16%	11%	59%
NP25	30%	28%	22%	20%	52%
Village Hall					
NP19	48%	25%	18%	8%	66%
NP24	43%	30%	16%	11%	59%
Playground	30%	38%	8%	25%	38%
Shop					
NP19	41%	20%	20%	20%	61%
NP24	34%	27%	9%	30%	43%
Building					
NP20	56%	17%	4%	23%	Now in construction

Appendix C Second Consultation

Front page of flyer delivered to all households; the full report is at <https://www.ranskillplan.co.uk/public-consultations/second-public-consultation-july-2020>



Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan

Steering Group

SECOND

PUBLIC

CONSULTATION

CLOSING DATE : 31st JULY 2020

The Parish Council is seeking your view as to which of the two alternative visions you prefer for future development in the village put forward by both landowners.

The chosen site will go forward to be included in our formal Neighbourhood Plan.

Appendix D Explanatory Statement from Bassetlaw District Council

The third consultation was withdrawn due to a need to pause and consider the implications of the change to strategic policy during the preparation of the emerging Local Plan.



Position Statement: Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan and Draft Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan

1: Overview

This position statement seeks to clarify the relationship between the emerging Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan and the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan, and to identify how recent developments have led to the decision by Ranskill Parish Council to withdraw the Draft Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan and curtail the associated regulation 14 consultation.

2: Current Situation

2.1: Withdrawal of the Draft Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan

As of 7 December 2020, Ranskill Parish Council has decided, reluctantly, to withdraw the Draft Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan and to curtail the associated regulation 14 consultation, which had commenced on 15 November 2020 and was due to conclude on 15 January 2021. This is formalised in the accompanying notice from the Parish Council. This action is intended to stem any confusion that could arise following the subsequent publication of and public consultation on the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan (November 2020), which includes a revised housing requirement figure for Ranskill, different to that used to develop the Neighbourhood Plan.

2.2: Context

The pre-submission Draft Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan was published for consultation on 15 November 2020. Development of the Neighbourhood Plan has been underway since 2016. Following a spell of inactivity during 2018, the Steering Group was revived in 2019, and sought to realise a Plan that reflected the aspirations of the community, as captured in the 2016 Village Survey.

Key to this process was the identification of housing sites to meet the housing requirement figure provided by Bassetlaw District Council in the emerging Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan. As published, the pre-submission Draft Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan reflected the 20% housing requirement figure for Ranskill included in the then-current January 2020 version of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan. To do this, the Plan proposed allocating one site to the west of Great North Road (NP19), capable of accommodating all of the outstanding housing requirement, alongside a village hall, retail provision, and public open space. These proposals had been worked-up following a call for sites, site assessment work, and two rounds of public consultation.

2.3: Local Plan context

The Bassetlaw Local Plan has been under development since 2016. This has been in response to changes to national planning policy and feedback from the consultation periods that have been

undertaken during that time. Various strategies and approaches have been consulted on, including consideration of the specific needs of rural communities. In 2016, the initial 'issues and options' version of the Plan proposed an approach to rural growth characterised by functional clusters. It set a cap on future growth of 20% for those clustered settlements – for which Ranskill was one. Although a cap was set, at this point, this was not a required number. At the same time several neighbourhood plan groups – including Ranskill - were seeking further clarity on how they should apply the cap to their community.

A draft Local Plan (Strategic Plan), published in early 2019, kept the 20% cap (based on the number of dwellings in the parish) but also added-in a 10% requirement for rural settlements (based on the number of dwellings in the settlement). The addition of a housing requirement figure reflected an update to national planning policy, whereby it became a requirement for local authorities to provide neighbourhood plan areas with a housing/growth requirement figure. In the case of Ranskill, the 10% requirement figure equated to 60 dwellings, whilst the 20% cap equated to 119 dwellings.

Responses to this consultation stated that the proposed application of two growth figures for each settlement, requirement and cap, was confusing, and that the Council should refine this approach. In addition, it was also identified that the broader spatial strategy needed to be refined in order to address complexities with other locations and sites. In early 2020, these refinements were reflected in the publication of a full draft Local Plan. This removed the cap figure previously proposed for rural settlements, and maintained the growth requirement figures, albeit at a higher level. This was set at 20% of the existing number of dwellings in the parish. For Ranskill, this equated to 121 dwellings (a slight revision from the previous number).

Following the publication of the next version of the Draft Bassetlaw Plan, on 25 November 2020, the housing requirement figure for Ranskill and the majority of other Small Rural Settlements has been reduced to 5%, as part of a reframing of policy ST2. This revision reflects changes to the spatial strategy as a whole, the high level of planning commitments already in place in the rural area, and comments received from the rural communities during the last consultation, earlier this year.

Producing a District-level housing strategy in the context of an area with significant uptake of neighbourhood planning is challenging, as it needs to be broad enough to cover all parishes, whilst still supporting their different contexts and aspirations. Consultation earlier in the year suggested that the previous approach to rural growth strategy was not achieving this, and was leading some communities into planning for more growth than they were able to or comfortable in accommodating. The revised strategy is intended to rectify this, by reducing the housing requirement for Small Rural Settlements to 5%, but still permitting growth above that subject to it being justified and supported by the community through a neighbourhood plan. In doing so, this approach is intended to place more power in the hands of communities, allowing them to consider how best to plan for their future needs. The Council considers that this is consistent with the requirements of national planning policy.

The figures detailed in Policy ST2 are supplemented by a [Rural Monitoring Table](#), which details progress in meeting the requirement figures across the District. Naturally, as time has elapsed since work to develop the Local Plan began, the number of permissions has increased. In the case of Ranskill, with 42 eligible commitments / completions recorded, this means that the revised housing requirement figure of 30 dwellings has already been met, with the figure currently showing as -12. It is acknowledged, however, that this figure could fluctuate, if it includes any permissions that eventually lapse.

2.4: Recent Developments

Revised Policy ST2 in the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan would still accommodate the principle of the approach to housing growth proposed in the Draft Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan, as it would not

preclude development over the requirement, subject to evidence-based justification and community support. In the case of Ranskill, housing development is proposed as an enabler for delivering new community facilities which may not otherwise be deliverable.

However, as this version of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan now identifies this level of growth as optional, rather than required as previously, the narrative in the Draft Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan is out-of-step. The Parish Council, rightly, wish to clarify the situation, and to understand the views of the community on this change and its implications for the Neighbourhood Plan before proceeding.

The publication of the most recent version of the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan was authorised at a Cabinet meeting on 23 November 2020. It is vital that the Local Plan process is fair, and does not afford any party advantage over another. On that basis, as the nature and scope of the Plan includes site allocations and development proposals, the Plan was deemed confidential until approval, and was not publicly-available until 25 November 2020. For this reason, it was not possible for officers to provide notification of the impending changes to the Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group in advance of the publication of their Draft Neighbourhood Plan.

3: Progression

With the Draft Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan now withdrawn, and the associated regulation 14 consultation curtailed, it is at the discretion of the Steering Group / Parish Council as to how they wish to proceed. The Planning Policy and Neighbourhood Planning teams at Bassetlaw District Council will gladly support this process.

It is important to note that the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan is, as its name suggests, a draft, and that its contents could change before it is finalised and enforceable. Equally, until the new Local Plan is adopted, a neighbourhood plan examiner will look to the existing Core Strategy for guidance, supplemented by the emerging Local Plan, alongside the National Planning Policy Framework, and evidence of work to seek local opinion and support; this leaves some room for interpretation. Consequently, it is important that any proposals made in a neighbourhood plan have the in-principle support of the community, regardless of the policy context that they sit within. Further to the above, all interested parties are encouraged to engage with the ongoing consultation on the [Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan](#), which closes on 20 January 2021, and make representations, where relevant, to assist further refinement.

Karen Johnson

Planning Policy Manager

Bassetlaw District Council

9 December 2020



Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Fourth Public Consultation

CLOSING DATE : 28th February 2021

The Parish Council is seeking your view as to whether you are prepared to accept further housing development on site NP19 in exchange for village owned assets being a village hall and a doctor's surgery, both identified as long desired assets in prior village surveys. Please see our website for further details: -

www.ranskillplan.co.uk

The Parish Council feels that this decision should be a democratic mandate decided by you, the residents.

This decision will then become incorporated in the Neighbourhood Plan, which will protect the village from any further development.

Planning consent is already granted for up to 32 houses on site NP19. The developer has indicated that they will need a further 79 houses, a total of 111 properties on this site to release sufficient financial headroom to provide the assets for the benefit of the village.

The steering group needs your decision as to whether you prefer:-

Yes: allow limited housing development together with a new community centre and doctor's surgery

No: no new housing development and no community centre

Please cut out the forms below and post in one of five local houses who have agreed to be used as a drop off point during the voting period to the 28th February 2021: -

- **The Chapter House, Great North Road (next to St Barnabas church)**
- **8 Witton Close**
- **Holly Tree Cottage, Station Road**
- **Raynes, Folly Nook Lane**
- **Osceola, Mattersey Road (corner of Ravenshill Close)**

Should you need any help or have any further queries, please contact: -

Telephone: 07584 169028

Email: parishcouncil@ranskill.org.uk

Ranskill <u>NP</u> <u>Public</u> Consultation February 2021	YES or NO
I consent to limited housing development on site NP19 to gain a gifted dedicated village assets to include a village hall and a GP surgery	
I confirm that I am a permanent resident of Ranskill	
Signature	Postcode

Ranskill <u>NP</u> <u>Public</u> Consultation February 2021	YES or NO
I consent to limited housing development on site NP19 to gain a gifted dedicated village assets to include a village hall and a GP surgery	
I confirm that I am a permanent resident of Ranskill	
Signature	Postcode

Appendix F Fifth Consultation

Front page of flyer delivered to all households; the full report is at <https://www.ranskillplan.co.uk/public-consultations/fifth-public-consultation-july-2021>



Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

1st to 31st July 2021

***The future of Ranskill
still depends on you!***

Appendix G Regulation 14 Consultation



Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan Update

As you are aware the 5th public consultation resulted in the village voting that no further development was needed in Ranskill, with the exception of those that have already been granted planning permission.

This result was ratified by the Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Plan re-drafted to reflect the results of the consultation.

Following the redrafting the updated version of the Plan was unanimously adopted by the Parish Council at our October meeting. After liaising with Bassetlaw District Council it was decided that the Plan is ready to progress to the next stage.

Regulation 14 Consultation.

This is primarily for statutory bodies to comment on the draft Neighbourhood Plan but is also another opportunity for those that live and work in Ranskill to put forward any further comments they may have on the latest version of the draft plan.

The latest version of the Plan can be found on the Neighbourhood Plan website www.ranskillplan.co.uk along with all supporting documents.

If you have any new comments on the Ranskill Neighbourhood Plan please email parishcouncil@ranskill.org.uk

Alternatively you can drop your comments off at:

3 Southfall Close, Ranskill DN22 8NE

As with previous consultations individual comments cannot be replied to.

The consultation period runs as follows: -
1ST DECEMBER 2021 TO 31ST JANUARY 2022

Thank you all once again for your help in shaping the future of Ranskill.