

-
Contents

1.	Introduction	
	The East Markham Neighbourhood Plan	2
	The Consultation Statement	2
2.	Methodology	3
3.	Acknowledgements	3
3.	Responses	
	Local Residents.....	4
	Statutory Bodies.....	10
4	Amendments to the Plan	19
5.	Appendices	
	A - Consultation Time Line	26
	B - Statutory and Other Consultees	28
	C - Examples of Consultation Documents and Events.....	29
	D - Summary of Resident Questionnaire Responses.....	33

1. Introduction

The East Markham Neighbourhood Plan

- 1.1 The East Markham Neighbourhood Development Plan (EMNP) has been prepared in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Order Act 2004, the Localism Act 2011, the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 and the Directive 2001/42/EC on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). The EMNP establishes a vision for the future of the Parish and sets out how this vision will be realised through planning and managing future land use and development change over the lifetime of the EMNP.
- 1.2 The EMNP is a new type of planning document prepared by the EMNP Steering Group on behalf of the East Markham Parish Council and residents. It is a document with statutory weight (legal status) and when "made" by Bassetlaw District Council (BDC) it must be used by
- a) Planning Officers at BDC when assessing planning applications and
 - b) Applicants as they prepare planning applications for submission to BDC.
- 1.3 Planning Applications must be decided in accordance with BDC adopted planning policies, which include the EMNP.
- 1.4 To ensure its legal status, the EMNP will be examined by an independent examiner who will check that, it complies with all relevant planning law and local district policies.
- 1.5 After approval by the independent examiner the EMNP must be approved by a simple majority of votes cast by residents in a local referendum (i.e. 50% of those voting) and "made" by the District Council.

The Consultation Statement

- 1.6 The Consultation Statement relates to the Draft East Markham Neighbourhood Plan and has been prepared to meet the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 (NPR2012) . Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the Regulations sets out that a Consultation Statement should contain:
- Details of the bodies and persons who were consulted about the proposed EMNP
 - Explain how they were consulted
 - Summarise the main issues and concerns raised by those consulted and
 - Describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and where relevant, addressed in the proposed EMNP.
- 1.7 In accordance with Regulation 14 of the NPR2012, the consultation period for the Draft EMNP ran for 6 weeks from 18th June 2016 to 31st July 2016.
- 1.8 Appendix A sets out the time line of the consultation events for the EMNP from launch to the end of the statutory six week period on 31st July 2016

2. Methodology

- 2.1 A number of methods were used to ensure that relevant bodies and residents were kept informed and consulted at all stages in the planning and preparation of the Draft EMNP.

These included:

public meetings, drop-in sessions, questionnaires, surveys, presentations, group meetings, articles in local and village media and publications, attendance at village events, posters, flyers, an advertising banner, the village Facebook page, a Powerpoint presentation, a photographic slide show of the Parish, the Parish Council website, BDC website and the EMNP's own website. E-mails to statutory bodies and organisations who may be affected by or have views on the Draft Plan.

<http://www.eastmarkham.org.uk>

<http://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk>

<http://www.eastmarkhamnp.org.uk>

Appendix B details the statutory bodies and other organisations consulted

Appendix C contains examples of consultation documents and events

- 2.2 Following publication of the Draft EMNP, copies of the Draft Plan, the Maps and Photographic Appendices were placed in the Village Hall and the Queens Hotel for public consultation. A summary of the plan and a questionnaire were prepared and made available to all. Copies could be downloaded from the Parish Council website with paper copies being available in the Village Hall, the Queens Hotel and from members of the Steering Group. Posters and flyers were distributed throughout the six week consultation period.
- 2.3 Returned questionnaires were summarised and showed universal support for the objectives, policies and projects in the Draft Plan, although there were differing views on the future of the listed main school building. See Appendix D for the summary.
- 2.4 Sections 3 of this Consultation Statement detail all responses from the public and statutory bodies and Section 4 indicates how they have affected the Draft EMNP.
- 2.5 Relevant documents, including summaries of Resident and Statutory Consultee responses and recent minutes of Steering Group meetings are on the EMNP website. Completed resident questionnaires have not been added as they contain personal information.

3. Acknowledgements

The Steering Group wish to acknowledge the help and support given to them by officers and staff of Bassetlaw District Council, East Markham Parish Council and Planning with People. Thanks are also due to staff from the Statutory Consultees for their responses. Special thanks go to all local residents, businessmen, landowners, school governors and pupils who have contributed in any way to the production of this Plan, to the landlord and staff of the Queens Hotel for allowing us to hold meetings there and to them and the Village Hall for the display of posters and stocking summaries and questionnaires for collection by residents.

4. Responses

4.1 Local Resident Responses

Com ment Num ber	NP Section	Comment
1	CO3	I think Objective 3 should include "affordable housing" if a truly mixed and sustainable environment is to be achieved as in Objective 6.
2	CO5	A new school building and relocation is not necessary.
3	CO5	As a parent of EM school children, we are aware of the campaign to raise £250,000 to extend the original building. Any new development of more than one house should be made to contribute to this. More houses equal more children. The sale of one new house on Beckland Hill would pay for the school plan with the developer having profit from the other houses.
4	CO5	The new building to incorporate the existing school building. Retain the historic building for its original educational purpose
5	CO5	No to a school, Yes to a Hall
6	CO7	Would a new business on the Chicken Factory Site be preferred to new houses? The public meeting referred to developments of 4/5 bed houses are there any plans for smaller houses?
7	CO7	What type of new businesses would be acceptable in the village?
8	CO7	It is difficult to plan for this,
9	CO7	What type of business? Shops do not work in EM. Other businesses to increase local employment could mean larger sale types, which I would not like to see. There are several local business parks in the area for these, thus keeping EM as a village.
10	CO7	This cannot be done at the expense of existing businesses including agriculture

11	CO7	Yes but not an industrial site
12	CO8	Maintain the existing paths and green lanes, no need for more
13	NP1	Yes for new developments, not for house improvements
14	NP1	Providing the Parish Council follows the guidelines and remain unbiased on decisions, not just on their own likes and dislikes.
15	NP1	Do not lengthen the planning process, ensure the guidelines are stuck to as in NP2.
16	NP1	Too subjective, the Parish Council is too "emotionally attached" to village to distinguish between personal and community applicants.
17	NP2	Pity that this has not always been followed previously
18	NP2	Who would be responsible for implementing item (3)?
19	NP2	This should not exclude buildings of an innovative design with minimal environmental impact that could sit well within the existing environment.
20	NP3	Removal of the Hovis sign from the Old Bakery and the building opposite the former Methodist Chapel do not fit in.
21	NP3	Wording is too vague, it will be ignored
22	NP3	When plans are submitted for any new development it is essential to have mix of size of property, perhaps the Parish Council could seek the support of our MP to plead our case, if we continue to have applications for developments of purely executive houses.
23	NP5	Consider the security at side and rear of existing properties when giving access to land previously not accessible to the public.
24	NP5	Cannot work out what this means
25	NP5	Need to add, "which do not detract from NP2,6 & 7

26	NP6	This has not been considered previously
27	NP6	Mix needs to include affordable housing
28	NP6	Housing which young adults who were born and bred in the village can purchase. Not a shared scheme - I don't know its name but know it exists. It's not affordable housing, they have to apply to purchase, smaller housing (2/3 bed) and they have to have family/ancestral links to the village.
29	NP7	How will this be done? The policy is likely to be ignored.
30	NP9	Policy impractical without footpaths and traffic management at school start and end. Suggest a tidal flow trial and one way system, into the village from A57 by Askham Road out via High Street to A57.
31	CP1	What would happen to the existing school building
32	CP1	No opinion either way
33	CP1	What the existing school requires is a hall. With a hall the classrooms would be adequate. The existing school has a excellent playing field which will be difficult to replicate anywhere within the heart of the village.
34	CP1	Yes but I think this is very unlikely
35	CP1	Whilst clearly held in high esteem the provision of a new school building is not as straight forward as the Parish Council are finding out. I object mostly to the regard expressed for admitting only EM children. Has the PC undertaken research as to how many pupils from outside of EM make up the total headcount? I don't know the data but perhaps they are part of the reason the village school is still an asset to our village. Unless the Governing Body and LA agreed to changing the admission policy pupils from outside the village remain vital members of he school community. Do the Governing Body support this proposal?
35A	CP1	No new school site. School lacks a hall but many additions and alterations have kept it upto date. New hall on existing site is more cost effective. Does school want to relocate? Struggle to find a use for listed building, parking to be managed, there is inadequate provision
35B	CP1	Do not know enough to comment
35C	CP1	Impractical and uneconomic
35D	CP1	School parking provision is inadequate, it needs to be managed

35E	CP1	Develop existing site - see Mighty School project
36	CP2	Footpaths are a huge issue, which need addressing urgently. Many are impassable.
37	CP2	Maintain existing ones
38	CP3	Statutory bodies increase the drainage capacity. A wish to improve drainage can be expressed, but the Plan has no authority to insist or demand that it is done.
39	CP4	Unsure what is being proposed
40	CP4	Depends on proposed facilities. As a village it seems to have adequate. An outdoor "pod" is required for young people to meet, maybe on Rayners Field or near Bowls Club and Tennis Courts.
41	CP5	Unsure what is being proposed
42	CP5	Who would own the Community Assets.
43	CP5	Is this for say a pavilion on the playing fields or new play equipment
44	CP5	What other assets are required
45	CP6	Low Street footpath is not level, have to walk on road in places
46	CP6	Don't see this as a priority
47	Question 5 Other Comments	It seems that BDC have already taken decisions on planning matters for development which appears to be outside of the original boundaries of the village
48		Priority should be given to rounding off and infill development rather than ill conceived linear extensions into the countryside and conservation areas
49		Parking is a nightmare in the school area. I feel it is an accident waiting to happen. It will be a tragedy if this proves to be the case and we as a village had not managed to find a solution in time. Is a school bus out of the question?
50		Planning application 16/00586 - rear of Farm Lane does not comply with the neighbourhood Plan. Is it withdrawn? Have new drawings been submitted?. It does not preserve the village character and would have a detrimental effect on the quality of life

	for some Farm Lane residents
51	Concern that any new housing development off Mark Lane would increase traffic at the crossroads, which is a dangerous junction due to lack of visibility.
52	We have three children at the school and believe that it has reached capacity. There is need for enhancement or relocation. Proud of the education the school provides and wish for this standard to be maintained for the future.
53	Village children should have priority of admission over pupils from out of the area, if new developments bring increased numbers.
54	It is dangerous to cross from Church Street to Low Street, especially with children and a buggy, cannot see around the corner and traffic is going too fast. Could a safety mirror be erected on the lamppost near the post box to enable better vision and safe crossing.
55	I would wish to see cycle paths/routes developed in the village and surrounding area, to encourage a healthy pastime and lifestyle, which may in time reduce school traffic.
56	Has the impact of Fracking been considered? Could the Plan protect the village from Fracking
57	Community policies and projects are, we hope, being undertaken as an ongoing vision for East Markham. The EM Parish Council has responsibility to see that all are paramount to their individual responsibilities to the village. The Plan and the future of EM is for them to uphold to the best of their abilities.
58	The results of this paper must be published as EM parishioners rightly believed that everything in this neighbourhood Plan was already being undertaken
59	There is a distinct lack of emphasis on employment opportunities for villagers, particularly young villagers. It is Objective 7 but there is no Project 7. This is a serious omission
60	There are two road improvements which need to be undertaken:- 1) The Mark Lane, Beckland Hill, Priestgate crossroads need attention - it is an accident waiting to happen. 2) The exit from Church street onto Mark Lane needs re-ordering to avoid use of the right hand fork for exiting vehicles.
61	We should encourage developments and not impose too many constraints as they will be over-ruled by the District Council. The village needs development, this will encourage greater Council Tax receipts and seek change and seek local employment

62	Very well presented information.
63	Congratulations to the Steering Group on all your hard work

64	<p>Public Meeting Comments</p> <p>What effect does Plan have on approved planning applications?</p>
65	Can Plan have an effect on Outline approvals when resubmitted or only after Plan is legal?
66	Do new developments have to contribute to village facilities?
67	Parking - almost impossible to change existing on street parking but hopefully Plan will prevent more
68	School - what effect will proposed new developments have on the school.?
69	If school already full, where will additional village children go?
70	Will village children be given priority over outsiders?
71	National speed limit on Mark Lane is stupid. Can it be changed? Can a lit up speed indicator sign be put up?
72	Will proposed developments outside of the Conservation Area be treated as strictly as those inside it?
73	Footpaths - new ones should protect security/privacy of existing properties
74	More pedestrian routes through village should be encouraged.
75	More should be done to improve inconsiderate school parking

76	Road safety is not always considered when approving access to new developments
77	Link up the East Markham to Askham footpath
78	Much interest was shown in the maps on display. people were checking-where development was proposed, the routes of public footpaths and pedestrian routes, drainage problem areas and parking difficulties.

4.2 Key Contact Responses

4.2.1 Bassetlaw District Council

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
79	General comments	To ensure this NP is a usable planning document and its policies can be used in planning decisions, it is recommended that the following comments are considered and the proposed changes made to the East Markham Neighbourhood Plan. It would be helpful to the readability of the Plan to integrate all maps into the text, on the page that they are referred to. The use of the Village Design Statement (VDS) needs to be carefully considered. This document is now 17 years old, if the principles contained are still up-to-date they should be brought into the Neighbourhood Plan in their entirety and consulted upon in this way. This would then allow the principles of the VDS to be formally adopted as part of the Neighbourhood Plan.
80	Page 4 Section 2 Para 1	Suggest replacing "legal planning policy document" with " <i>document with statutory weight</i> "
81	Page 4 Para 2	on final line change "the" to " <i>is</i> "
82	Page 5 Para 3	Suggest replacing paragraph 3 with a clearer introduction, about what the Plan hopes to achieve. This could be achieved by deleting the first paragraph and replacing it with paragraphs 9 & 10

83	Page 5 Para 6	Suggest removing final two sentences , so that paragraph stands as a statement of fact
84	Page 6 Para 11	This should refer to the council having a " <i>statutory</i> " duty to prepare a Local Plan rather than a "legal" duty
85	Page 6 Para 12	suggest deleting the word "development"
86	Page 6 Para 13	include direct link to Core Strategy Webpage rather than to BDC webpage
87	Page 6 Para 14	Unclear of source for statistical analysis by NPSG, if it is Rural profile this should be published on website
88	Page 9 Para 23	Abbreviation CA (assumed to be Conservation Area) is used without explanation of where abbreviation is drawn from
89	Page 9 Para 25	Paragraph 25 (and other places): We would recommend replacing all references to a particular century (e.g. 15C) with the full wording (15 th Century) as the current wording is somewhat confusing.
90	Page 9 Para 27	Paragraph 27 makes reference to a privately owned orchard that is identified as a community asset. However this does not appear to be identified as a community asset on Map 5. Instead it may be more helpful to recognise the contribution that the orchard makes to the village's character. Recommend reference to orchard as a community asset is removed.
91	Page 9 Para 30	Paragraph 30: It isn't clear which time period the last 5 years refers to and this will no longer be accurate when the plan is part way through its lifecycle. It would instead be helpful to refer to a specific base year, since which these services have closed
92	Page 10 Para 32	Paragraph 32: We are concerned that this paragraph is overly negative and should be removed in its entirety. Instead see comment on use of VDS principles under 'General Comments'
93	Page 10 Para 37	Why is a higher proportion of people over 65 significant? Whilst this is not incorrect it does need to be further explained, in order to draw out the implications of this for the Neighbourhood Plan.
94	Page 10 Table 1	Table 1: The source for this data/diagram needs to be referenced
95	Page 10	It was not immediately clear how the breweries have amenity value for the village.

	Table 2	It would therefore be helpful to name the two breweries and explain the additional facilities they provide other than brewing alcohol e.g. the bookable space at the Pheasantry.
96	Page 11 Paras 39 & 40	Suggest combining into a single paragraph
97	Page 12 Para 52	Whilst this is not incorrect, a much fuller explanation is needed as to why the predominance of detached housing has implications for the future sustainability of the village.
98	Page 12 Table 3	The source for this data/diagram needs to be referenced under the table.
99	Page 12 Para 54	The reference to the Housing and Planning Bill needs to be updated to the 2016 Housing and Planning Act, in order to reflect that this is now law. Under this Bassetlaw District Council has a statutory duty to promote the supply of Starter Homes and the text should be updated to reflect this.
100	Page 12 Para 56	This paragraph needs to explain why building smaller dwellings will be sufficient to meet the needs of older generations. Will smaller dwellings be sufficient to meet all of the needs of older residents?
101	Page 13 Figure 1	The source for this data/diagram needs to be referenced under the table.
102	Page 13 Para 62	It would be helpful if further explanation could be provided of what evidence there is for a lack of car parking. We feel that the comment about BDC's application of parking standards is overly negative and we would like to see this replaced. If car parking is a significant issue in East Markham that requires a higher level of car parking provision to be made as part of new development, above that set out in the SPD, this should be evidenced and put forward as a policy in this Neighbourhood Plan.
103	Pages 15-17	SWOT Analysis: In relation to the final row of the table considering the school, it is generally considered preferable to maintain the active use of listed buildings, if possible for their original use, in order to preserve them for future generations. It should be noted that the school building's listing does not necessarily preclude it from being sensitively altered and adapted to meet changing needs, allowing it to continue to be used as a school. At this point we feel it has not been demonstrated that the existing building cannot be modified to address the identified constraints without the need for a new school. We would recommend undertaking further work to understand whether the school could be extended on its existing site and changing the SWOT Analysis to identify this need for further work in the 'Proposed Neighbourhood Plan Response' column.
104	Page 19	Whilst the aims set out in this paragraph are laudable they are not coherent with

	Para 79	the meaning of sustainable development set out in paragraph 77. This list should either be rewritten to better reflect paragraph 77, or should have references to sustainable development removed.
105	Page 19 Para 81	This should be amended to clarify which Core Strategy policy is being referred to. The reference appears to be to Policy CS8
106	Footnot e 3	Should read ‘outcomes’ rather than ‘outcome’.
107	NP1	We would recommend moving the contents of Appendix A into the policy, to explain what the guidelines are without requiring applicants to look elsewhere
108	Page 20 Paras 85-87	As noted under ‘General Comments’ the use of the Village Design Statement (VDS) needs to be carefully thought about. We feel that the tone of these paragraphs is overly negative and we would be grateful if references to the document not being used as intended by BDC could be removed. Instead this section could be replaced with an explanation of the principles contained in the VDS and how they are still relevant to the village. This would allow them to be given statutory status through the Neighbourhood Plan.
109	Page 20 Para 92	A clearer explanation is needed of how quality of life is reflected in the village’s property values.
110	Page 21 Para 97 & elsewher e	The reference to Buildings for Life is helpful but needs to be accurately cited for the avoidance of any confusion. The correct shorthand is ‘BfL 12’ (with a small ‘f’ – this also needs to be corrected in other parts of the Plan). We would suggest including a link to the appropriate resource as a footnote: http://www.designcouncil.org.uk/resources/guide/building-life-12-third-edition
111	Page 22 NP2	As currently written Parts 1b, 1c and 2 add little to Policy DM4 in the Core Strategy and should be considered for removal. However, if they are not removed the following changes are needed: Part 1C: In order for this part of the policy to make sense it would be helpful to remove the word ‘should’. Part 2: This part of the policy would be significantly strengthened by identifying sites on which development might contribute to strengthening footpath network. Part 3: CABE Design Council have ended their accredited assessor scheme and describe BfL 12 as a tool to be used in discussions between developers and local authorities. For this reason the requirement for applicants to produce a report is overly onerous and Part 3 of the policy should be removed. As noted under ‘General Comments’ References to the Village Design Statement

		(both here and elsewhere in the Plan) are problematic; if the principles of this statement are important they should be repeated in the main text of the document and not relegated to the Appendices. Particularly, as they are referred to by Policy NP2, they need to be subject to consultation. However, in doing so, we would note that the references to specific materials may be overly restrictive; please see our comments regarding Policy NP3, below, for further detail.
112	Page 23 NP3	Part C, recommending the use of particular materials, does not recognise where materials other than these might be appropriate. We would recommend deleting ‘red brick and clay pantiles as detailed in the Conservation Area Appraisal’ and replacing with ‘character of surrounding development’.
113	Page 25 NP4	The reference to the VDS should be removed as this is not an adopted document. As per earlier comments the VDS principles should be brought into the Neighbourhood Plan if it is desired that they should have significant material weight.
114	Page 26 Para123	This refers to ‘circular routes’, which is assumed to mean routes around the village but is not explained. Further detail is needed as to what is meant by this, particularly as it is referred to in Policy NP5. It may be helpful to indicate what routes would be desirable on a map.
115	Page 26 NP5	We are concerned that, as currently worded, this policy could be taken to include any development that includes the improvement of footpaths as part of it e.g. a distribution warehouse that includes a public footpath as part of the proposal. If this is not what is intended the policy will need to be reworded.
116	Page 27 Para 138	This paragraph misinterprets Policy CS8 in the Core Strategy. The need for community support is specifically related to the provision of community facilities outside of the Development Boundary and is not necessary for proposals within the Development Boundary. The text will need to be updated to reflect this.
117	Page 28 NP7	Part A should be removed or amended as applicants should not be required to demonstrate a local need for proposed development inside the existing development boundary. This would be an unreasonable demand as developers will generally only take on the financial risk of opening a new facility, especially if it is a commercial enterprise e.g. a local shop, where they are confident of its viability. This policy suggests that new community facilities should be in accordance with Policy NP2. However NP2 is entitled ‘Design Principles for Residential Development’, suggesting that it only relates to residential development. As such the reference to Policy NP2 needs to be removed from NP7 or the title of NP2 needs to be changed to reflect that it is intended to encompass all new development.
118	Page 29 NP8	We would recommend removing this policy from the Plan as it does not add anything to Policy DM12 in the Core Strategy. Furthermore Policy DM12 is more stringent and does not give developers the option of managing flood risk with an alternative, off-site solution.
118A	Page30	The earlier part of the Plan makes it clear that the village is unhappy with how

NP9	<p>BDC current applies car parking standards. However this policy does not set out any different standards and it is difficult to see how it could be applied in practice. For reference the current SPD on parking standards is available at the following link: https://www.bassetlaw.gov.uk/media/90195/ResidentialParkingSPD.pdf We would recommend that this policy is either removed in its entirety or is strengthened through the inclusion of specific parking standards that can be justified by the evidence.</p>
119	<p>Page 34 App. C It appears that this SWOT analysis is a summary of consultation responses received. However it is important that this is made clear as the section appears to contain many conflicting statements</p>

4.2.2 Nottinghamshire County Council

Com ment Num ber	NP Section	Comment
120		<p>Consider reference to waste management issues within all developments as well as local waste management sites, to ensures sustainable design of future developments in the village</p>
121		<p>Policies should play a vital role in ensuring health and wellbeing of population. Ensure plan is age friendly providing good access to health and social care facilities</p>
122	Community Objectives	<p>CC broadly supports the Community Objectives but has some concerns re CO5. - New School Building A more consolidated and rethought development of the school, that retained the heritage value and enhanced the condition of the historic fabric, could deliver the educational requirements for the future, retain the heritage significance of the site and help deal with some of the other issues</p>
123	School Parking	<p>Consider a School Travel Plan Consider other travel mechanisms and incentives such as a New Community Objective focussed on improved local bus services and/or residential car sharing schemes</p>
124	CO2	<p>Suggest identifying the BDC Conservation Area Appraisal</p>

		for EM as a guide to identifying the aspects of architectural heritage worthwhile promoting in new developments
125	CO6	Community transport/ carsharing initiatives could be identified as means of achieving CO 6 and Community Vision
126	Paragraph 115	Recommend that Planning Applications are accompanied by a landscape and visual impact assessment.
127	NP4	Should be more specific & suggest following amendment <i>c) it conforms to the principles of the Conservation Area Appraisal and the Village Design Statement</i> <i>d) it conforms to the actions for landscape and built features recommended for the Policy Zones as designated in the Landscape Character Assessment .Where appropriate mitigation planting should include native species recommended for the Mid Notts Farmland Character Area</i>

4.2.3 Environment Agency

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
128	Community Vision	Agreed with as it seeks to protect and enhance the natural environment which will assist in providing social and economic benefits to the Plan area
129	Community Objectives	Supported but :- there is no consideration of natural environment
130	CO4	We support the aspirations of CO4 but:- consider it prudent to consider flood risk as a whole
	NP1	Support
131	NP8(b)	Support, but request text amended at point (b) to read :- <i>"the development does not increase flood risk or surface water run off"</i>

4.2.4 Natural England

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
132		Whilst making no specific comments on this draft Neighbourhood Plan, we :- Welcome NP5 - Conservation and Enhancement of Non Vehicular Routes Support - NP8 - Reducing the Risk of Flooding

4.2.5 Severn Trent Water

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
133		We have no specific comments to make but enclose some General Guidelines which may be useful. Under Surface Water and Sewer Flooding, the Guidelines endorse Neighbourhood Policy 8 - Reducing the Risk of Flooding

4.2.6 Anglian Water

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
134		Anglian Water has no comments

4.2.7 Highways England

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment
135		No comment as Plan has no impact on the operation of the A1

4.2.8 *The Coal Authority*

Com ment Num ber	NP Section	Comment
136		The Coal Authority has no comments

4.2.9 *Historic England*

Com ment Num ber	NP Section	Comment
137		We don't consider a need for Historic England to be involved but it is important to safeguard the elements contributing to the importance of historic assets

5. Amendments to the Neighbourhood Plan

5.1 The following table outlines how the comments received listed in the preceding section of this document have been used to amend and improve the NP, or if the comment has not resulted in an amendment reasons are given as to why this decision has been reached.

Amendments to the NP			
Comment Number	Comment Source	Amendment Required?	
1	Local resident	No	Term 'affordable housing' misunderstood. EM has some 'affordable housing'
2	Local resident	Yes	Plan amended to reflect the various views regarding a new school against a new hall or further alterations and retention of listed building. See CP1 CO5 and Swot analysis
3	Local resident	Yes	as above
4	Local resident	Yes	as above
5	Local resident	Yes	as above
6	Local resident	No	Residents expressed preference for housing on the site
7	Local resident	Yes	CO7 removed. Existing and potential employment sits are outside of village
8	Local resident	Yes	as above
9	Local resident	Yes	as above
10	Local resident	Yes	as above
11	Local resident	Yes	as above
12	Local resident	No	Policy covers maintenance and need to rejoin East Markham to Askham. Notts CC Health policy promotes footpath provision
13	Local resident	No	Policy intended for new developments, but some extensions can be v. large
14	Local resident	No	The Parish Council is obliged to be unbiased
15	Local resident	No	Early consultation will not lengthen the process
16	Local resident	No	The Parish Council is democratically elected by the residents
17	Local resident	No	Commented noted but no action required
18	Local resident	No	District Council would be responsible for implementation

19	Local resident	No	Policy NP2 not intended to stifle development
20	Local resident	No	Comments noted no action required
21	Local resident	No	Wording is in style to conform to NPPF requirements
22	Local resident	No	The Plan supports a mix of housing types
23	Local resident	No	No evidence of increased vulnerability arising from footpaths
24	Local resident	No	Noted - not relevant
25	Local resident	No	NP 5 only relates to development that improves footpaths
26	Local resident	No	Comment noted - no action required
27	Local resident	No	Affordable housing will be delivered as part of District Policies
28	Local resident	No	Scheme referred to is part of 'affordable housing
29	Local resident	No	Comment noted - no action required. Policy reflects a community aspiration to improve facilities
30	Local resident	No	School parking difficulties are addressed in the Plan
31	Local resident	Yes	Plan seeks to balance the opportunity for a new building with that of incorporating the listed building with a new hall and further extensions See CO5 CP1 and SWOT
32	Local resident	Yes	As above
33	Local resident	Yes	As above
34	Local resident	Yes	As above
35	Local resident	No	Comments noted - but outside scope of Plan
35 A to 35 E	Local residents	Yes	See 31 -34 above
36	Local resident	No	Noted. Responsibility lies with Notts CC in conjunction with Parish Council
23	Local resident	No	No evidence of increased vulnerability arising from footpaths
24	Local resident	No	Noted - not relevant
25	Local resident	No	NP 5 only relates to development that improves footpaths
26	Local resident	No	Comment noted - no action required
27	Local resident	No	Affordable housing will be delivered as part of District Policies
28	Local	No	Scheme referred to is part of 'affordable housing

	resident		
29	Local resident	No	Comment noted - no action required. Policy reflects a community aspiration to improve facilities
30	Local resident	No	School parking difficulties are addressed in the Plan
31	Local resident	Yes	Plan seeks to balance the opportunity for a new building with that of incorporating the listed building with a new hall and further extensions See CO5 CP1 and SWOT
32	Local resident	Yes	As above
33	Local resident	Yes	As above
34	Local resident	Yes	As above
35	Local resident	No	Comments noted - but outside scope of Plan
35 A to 35 E	Local residents	Yes	See 31 -34 above
36	Local resident	No	Noted. Responsibility lies with Notts CC in conjunction with Parish Council
35	Local resident	No	Comments noted - but outside scope of Plan
37	Local resident	No	Comment noted - no action required
38	Local resident	No	Noted. In response Severn Trent state capacity can be increased where needed for new developments
39	Local resident	No	Noted - this is to cover community's wishes for improved facilities in the future
40	Local resident	No	As 39
41	Local resident	Yes	List of proposed Community Assets to be added to Plan
42	Local resident	Yes	Assets as defined by Parish Council and listed.
41	Local resident	Yes	List of proposed Community Assets to be added to Plan
42	Local resident	Yes	Assets as defined by Parish Council and listed.
43	Local resident	No	Community Asset must be an existing facility

44	Local resident	No	
45	Local resident	No	Hence the Project
46	Local resident	No	Comment noted
47	Local resident	No	Outside scope of Plan

48	Local resident	No	Plan cannot specify sites where development takes place
49	Local resident	No	School parking issues covered elsewhere. Bus is outside scope of Plan
50	Local resident	No	A "Made" Plan has no power to retrospectively seek to amend approved planning applications
51	Local resident	No	Comment noted but outside scope of Plan
52	Local resident	No	Comment noted, no action required
53	Local resident	No	School Admission Policy outside scope of Plan
54	Local resident	No	Noted and referred to Parish Council. Outside scope of Plan
55	Local resident	No	Noted - Good principle NP5 covers non -vehicular routes
56	Local resident	No	Outside scope of Plan
57	Local resident	No	Comment noted but no action required
58	Local resident	No	Comment noted
59	Local resident	Yes	CO 7 removed - employment sites are outside of village
60	Local resident	No	Outside scope of Plan
61	Local resident	No	Plan does not seek to limit development
62	Local resident	No	Comment noted
63	Local resident	No	Comment noted
64	Local resident	No	A "Made" Plan has no effect on approved planning applications
65	Local resident	No	Plan only effective when 'made', but draft could be consulted
66	Local resident	No	Outside scope of Plan
67	Local resident	Yes	East Markham Parking Standard recommended see NP9
68	Local resident	No	Increased number of pupils resident in village hence policy etc re school
69	Local resident	No	Comment noted - hence need for new school facilities
70	Local resident	No	Comment noted - outside scope of Plan
71	Local resident	No	Comment noted - outside scope of Plan
72	Local resident	No	Comment noted - outside scope of Plan
73	Local resident	No	Comment noted -no crime in EM attributed to access from Public Footpaths
74	Local resident	No	See Policy NP5

75	Local resident	No	School parking problems considered in Plan
76	Local resident	No	Comment noted - outside scope of Plan
77	Local resident	No	Already included in Plan
78	Local resident	No	Public interest noted - no action required
79	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	No legal requirement for maps to be in body of Plan Village Design Statement incorporated into Plan
80	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Wording changed as suggested
81	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Wording changed
82	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Paragraphs changed around as suggested and renumbered
83	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Sentences deleted and new wording added
84	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Wording changed as suggested
85	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Word "development" deleted
86	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Link changed to that of Core Strategy webpage
87	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Wording amended
88	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Abbreviation source added
89	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Century references changed
90	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Map 5 legend amended
91	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Specific year inserted
92	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Paragraph deleted
93	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Helen to add wording
94	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Source referenced
95	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Table amended
96	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Paragraphs combined
97	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Wording changed
98	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Source referenced
99	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Paragraph updated
100	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Helen to do wording
101	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Source referenced

102	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Ref to BDC removed. New NP 9 for an EM Parking Standard
103	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Wording changed - also CO5 and CP1
104	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Word 'sustainable' removed
105	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	It is Core Strategy
106	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Word changed
107	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Appendix incorporated into NP 1
108	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Paragraphs amended
109	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Wording changed
110	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Abbreviation corrected- Website link added
111	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Policy amended
112	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Wording amended
113	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	References to VDS emoved
114	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Example added
115	Bassetlaw D.C.	No	Wording amended
116	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Text amended
117	Bassetlaw D.C.	No Yes	1a) Applicants who do not show a need cannot expect local support Removed "Residential" from heading of NP2
118	Bassetlaw D.C.	No	See support from Severn Trent & Environment Agency
118 A	Bassetlaw D.C.	YES	Parking Standard to be developed and included in Plan
119	Bassetlaw D.C.	Yes	Explanation added
120	NottInghamshire. CC	Yes	Paragraph added re wider waste management issues
121	NottInghamshire. CC		Awaiting better info from Notts CC
122	NottInghamshire. CC	Yes	Noted that NCC broadly support Community Objectives but have reservations about CO5 Wording of CO5 amended to reflect the desire to retain the listed building for educational purposes whilst noting that this may not be possible also CP1 amended and swot analysis
123	NottInghamshire. CC	No	There is a school travel plan in existence. Wording added stating many children walk to school and the parking problem is caused by a small number of parents
124	NottInghamshire. CC	Yes	CO2 amended to identify BDC Conservation Area Appraisal
125	NottInghamshire. CC	No	BDC has car sharing policy. difficult to implement in EM

126	NottInghamshire. CC	Yes	Para 115 amended to include landscape and visual impact assessment
127	NottInghamshire. CC	Yes	NP4 amended as NCC recommendation
128	Environment Agency	Yes	References added 1) Environment Agency agree with the Community Vision 2) Environment Agency supports Community Objective 4
129	Environment Agency	No	Comments noted and referenced in consultation statement
130	Environment Agency	Yes	1) CO4 amended to consider flood risk as a whole 2) Reference added that Environment agency support NP1
131	Environment Agency	Yes	Text amended at (1b) as comment
132	Natural England	Yes	References added 1) Nat. Eng. Welcome NP5 2) Nat. Eng. Support NP8
133	Severn Trent Water	Yes	Reference added - ST Guidelines endorses NP8
134	Anglian Water	No	No comments made
135	Highways England	No	No comments on Plan as it has no impact on A1 trunk road
136	The Coal Authority	No	No comments made
137	Historic England	Yes	Paragraph added recognising the need to safeguard elements contributing to the importance of historic assets A list of the village's historic assets added to the plan

6. Appendices

6.1 Appendix A - Consultation Time Line

June 2012	Housing Needs Survey
16 May 2013	Public Meeting - Presentation on NP"s, agreement to have a Plan for East Markham, formation of Steering Group
15 July 2013	First Steering Group Meeting
9 Sept. 2013	Steering Group Meeting
19 Sept. 2013	Conservation Area Consultation
24 October 2013	Public Launch Event - collection of views on planning issues - 40+ present
November 2013	Publication of Analysis of Launch Event response
18 Dec 2013	Parish Council Formal Application to BDC to carry out a Neighbourhood Plan
January 2014	Update to residents at local events, 75+ questionnaires distributed at Village Hall -
February 2014	Publication of Analysis of Questionnaire responses
12 May 2014	Meeting with Governors of EM Primary School
July 2014	Survey Monkey issued re Village facilities
November 2014	Consultation with local pupils at Tuxford Academy
May 2015	Update 2 issued and invitation to Public Meeting
June 2015	Public Meeting 45 present -- Presentation and consultation
July 2015- Mar 2016	Informal consultations with residents at village groups and events. Photographs commissioned of parking problems, village facilities and local views to illustrate resident's concerns.
20 Oct 2015	Meeting with local landowner and Chair of School Governors re possible site for a new school building if planning approval granted for a housing development

February 2016	Survey Monkey for Drainage Survey
March 2016	Drainage Survey - questionnaire to 500+ houses.
May 2016	Second Survey of On-Street Parking
June 2016	Consultation Version of Plan (V5) agreed by SG
June 2016	Summary and Questionnaire produced for residents Flyers distributed to 500+ houses Consultation Copies of full Draft Plan placed in Village hall and Queens Hotel Press releases re consultation to local press, community publications, and Village Facebook Page Draft Plan sent to Statutory Consultees
21 June 2016	Drop in Session for residents at Village Hall - summary and questionnaires available Short presentation to EM WI members, summary and questionnaires distributed Posters in Village re Draft Plan and Events
27 June 2016	Posters outside Queens Hotel re Drop in Session
28 June 2016	Second Drop in Session at Queens Hotel
9 July 2016	Steering Group Stand at Village/Church Fete Draft Plan for consultation. Issues, Policies, Photographs etc. displayed. Summaries and Questionnaires distributed. Flyers handed out re Public meeting in July.
July 2016	500+ Flyers distributed re Public meeting for Draft Plan
21 July 2016	Public meeting - 20 present - Report on Plan, Powerpoint presentation, Maps on display, Photographic Slidehow
Aug 2016 - Mar 2017	- Informal updates to residents at local events, meetings etc. on work since the end of consultation period..

6.2 Appendix B

Statutory Consultees

Bassetlaw District Council
Nottinghamshire County Council
The Environment Agency
Natural England
Severn Trent Water
Anglian Water
Highways England
The Coal Authority
Historic England

Other Consultees

Residents
East Markham Primary School Governors
Pupils at Tuxford Academy
Local Landowners
Local Businessmen
Local Groups

6.3 Appendix C - Examples of Consultation Documents and Events

**EAST MARKHAM PARISH
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

6 week Pre-Submission Consultation 18 June to 31 July 2016

Your Village - Your Plan - Your Future
Tell us what you think



What is a Neighbourhood Plan?

A Neighbourhood Plan is a legal planning policy document and once approved by residents in a referendum, it will form part of Bassetlaw District Council's planning policy against which planning applications are assessed.

Prepared by East Markham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
on behalf of East Markham Parish Council, residents and businesses

EAST MARKHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

THE VISION - THE OBJECTIVES - THE POLICIES

**PLANNING - PARKING
HOUSING - DRAINAGE
SCHOOL - FACILITIES
FOOTPATHS - LANDSCAPE**

IF ANY OF THESE CONCERN YOU

COME AND FIND OUT MORE ABOUT THE PLAN

SUMMARY AND QUESTIONNAIRE HERE TODAY

**PUBLIC MEETING - 21ST JULY
VILLAGE HALL 7.30pm**

**REMEMBER - IT IS
YOUR VILLAGE - YOUR PLAN - YOUR FUTURE**

PRESS RELEASE - JUNE / JULY

"

EAST MARKHAM PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN for 2016 -2031

The Draft East Markham Neighbourhood Plan is now out for public consultation. It sets out the Vision , Objectives, Policies and Projects for the village over the next 15 years. Once approved by residents and "made" by Bassetlaw District Council it is a legal planning policy document to be used by the Council and developers.

The full plan is on the East Markham Village Web site together with a Summary and Questionnaire www.eastmarkham.org.uk. Copies for consultation are available in the Village Hall and the Queens Hotel. Copies of the Plan Summary and Questionnaire are available from the Steering Group telephone 01777 871567.

A Public meeting will be held in the Village Hall on 21st July at 7.45 pm to present the Plan and the Summary and Questionnaire will be available.

Residents are asked to complete the Questionnaire and return it by 31st July
Remember it is - Your Village -Your Plan - Your Future.

After consultation and examination by an independent planning inspector, the electorate of the village will be asked to vote for or against the Plan in a referendum.

TONIGHT
28th June
DROP IN SESSION
EAST MARKHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

7.30 pm
Queens Hotel

YOUR VILLAGE - YOUR PLAN

Come and find out more
Your views & comments matter

Don't let others decide its future

EAST MARKHAM PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

PUBLIC MEETING

Thursday 21st July

The Village Hall

7.30pm

Your Village - Your Plan - Your Future

Tell us what you think

Stand at the Village Fete



6.4 Appendix D - Summary of Resident Questionnaire Responses

Extract from the Summary of Resident Questionnaire Responses to Draft Plan

Questionnaires issued 100 +
 Questionnaires returned 37

Questions asked - Do you agree with

Community Vision	Yes 37
Community Objectives	
CO 1	Yes 37
CO 2	Yes 37
CO 3	Yes 37
CO 4	Yes 37
CO 5	Yes 36 No 1
CO 7	Yes 37
CO 8	Yes 37

Plan Policies	
NP1	Yes 35 No 2
NP2	Yes 37
NP3	Yes 37
NP 4	Yes 37
NP5	Yes 36 No 1
NP6	Yes 36 No 1
NP7	Yes 37
NP8	Yes 37
NP 9	Yes 36 No 1

Community Projects	
CP 1	Yes 26 No 6 No answer 5
CP2	Yes 34 No 1 No answer 3
CP 3	Yes 34 No answer 3
CP 4	Yes 34 No answer 3
CP 5	Yes 32 No answer 5
CP 6	Yes 36 No 1

On the 37 Questionnaires returned 44 people answered
 Male 20 Female 23 Not given 1

Age Groups	26-50 9
	51 -65 12
	over 65 22
	no age 1

