

Colston Bassett Neighbourhood Plan

Regulation 4(3)(b)(iii). Summary of Representations Received Submitted to the Independent Examiner.

Respondent	Summary of Representation
Coal Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific comments
Colston Bassett Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend that the needs in the Village are regularly reviewed at Plan Review stage to ensure that changing needs are met and, if necessary, additional areas for development can be identified. Policy S1 - Exceptions to the restrictions on development should be appropriately expanded in accordance with the Local Plan Part 2 Policy 22. Policy H1 - Inconsistencies between the supporting text and this policy regarding building heights of Site 1 and Site 2 should be resolved. Policy H1 – Site investigations at the application stage should address any potential contamination issues. Policy H1 – NPPF provides sufficient archaeological protections, as this requires desk based assessments and where necessary field evaluations. This should be determined at the planning application stage. Policy H1 – Policy should require “up to” 6 and 4 dwellings for each site rather than stipulate an exact figure. Policy ENV1 – The paddock to the right of the village hall (proposed as a Local Green Space) is owned by the Trust at their discretion. Community Action TRS4 – Ongoing use of the paddock to the left of the village hall as a car park is at the discretion of the Trust.
Mr Graham Crichton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy H1 Site 2 - the quantum of development being proposed is not consistent with the desires of the village as indicated through the initial consultation run by the parish council. Selection has not been transparent.
Highways England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considering the limited level of growth proposed across the Neighbourhood Plan area Highways England do not expect that there will be any impacts on the operation of the SRN. No further comments.
Historic England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No detailed comments on the plan.

Respondent	Summary of Representation
Kenworthy, Hillary and Nigel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy H1 Site 2 – There is no mandate from the village, as indicated by the petition signed by 83 residents. Changes prior to submission were not consulted upon. Lack of transparency.
Lambert, David	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy H1 Site 2 – The concentration of development is not in keeping with the character of the Conservation Area. It conflicts with the environmental aims of the Plan, particularly Policy ENV2. The evidence of demand for this volume and concentration of housing from village consultations is not strong.
Lindsay, Martin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan should show what the developments will look like. • Lack of transparency between the Parish Council and the Le Marchant Estate. • Petition should be given significant weight.
Marston, Chris	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to Sites 1 and 2 due to the loss of: countryside; agricultural land; wildlife; and the buffer between the village and the cheese factory. Site 1 is highly visible when entering village. Both are large developments in relation to the village. • Petition shows that 70% of the village do not support Site 2.
National Grid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No detailed comments.
Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific comments
Nottinghamshire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments submitted on minerals and waste, education, transport and public health. • No objections regarding minerals and waste issues. • No reference to taxis in the plan. • Rapid Health Impact Assessment has been undertaken. This highlights a number of amendments and supporting information that could benefit health.
Perry, Nick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that public comments that oppose the allocated sites were not accurately reported within the Consultation Statement.
Rushcliffe Borough Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan should correctly set out the status of the Plan and that development can be permitted contrary to the plan where material considerations indicate otherwise. • Policy H1 – The removal of permitted development rights within the allocated sites (to address impacts on the Conservation Area) cannot be required within the plan. These impacts will be determined at the planning application stage. • Policy H1 – The Neighbourhood Plan cannot set higher accessibility standards than the Local Plan.

Respondent	Summary of Representation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental impact assessments cannot be demanded for development greater than one acre. The requirements for EIA are set out in legislation. • Policy BE4 should be consistent with Policy 22.
Severn Trent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy H1 – Surface water should not be connected to the Foul sewer. • No known waste or water issues within the area. • Policy H3 – Streams should be reworded as watercourses. • Policy D1 – Watercourses should be protected as a design feature. SuDS should comply with the Drainage Hierarchy. • Policy ENV2 – Bullet point b should reference watercourses. • Policy ENV7 - Supportive
Skirving, Jarvis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to Site 1 and 2. They conflict with the plan's vision and objectives. • Their allocation is contrary to the wishes of the village. As shown within the petition. • Supports the rest of the plan.