

Thurgarton Neighbourhood Plan

Consultation Statement
December 2016

Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Activities that contributed to the pre-submission final draft	3
3. Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation.....	9
4. SEA & HRA.....	10
5. Preparing the proposed plan.....	10

Appendix 1: Publicity and communications

Appendix 2: Consultation Tools

Appendix 3: Consultation outcomes

Appendix 4: Regulation 14 Publicity

Appendix 5: Regulation 14 Consultation Feedback

1. Introduction

- 1.1. Thurgarton Parish Council, as qualifying body as defined by the Localism Act 2011, has submitted its Neighbourhood Plan to Newark and Sherwood District Council on 19th December 2016 for independent examination. This Consultation Statement meets the requirements of Regulation 15 to provide a detailed description and record of the pre-submission consultation required by Regulation 14. It also contains an outline of the earlier consultation efforts made while developing the Thurgarton Draft Neighbourhood Plan (the Draft Plan).
- 1.2. Section 15(2) of the Regulations states that a Consultation Statement is a document which:
 - (a) contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
 - (b) explains how they were consulted;
 - (c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
 - (d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.
 - (e) This Consultation Statement summarises all statutory and non-statutory consultation undertaken within the local community and with other relevant bodies and stakeholders in developing the Proposed Plan. In particular, it describes how some of the concerns that arose during the statutory pre-submission consultation have been addressed and what changes have been made to convert the Draft Plan into the Proposed Plan.
- 1.3. The Parish Council established a formal Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (the Steering Group) in November 2015 (made up of Parish Councillors and members of the community) and asked it to lead the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan, on the Council's behalf
- 1.4. The various consultation activities on the Draft Plan carried out prior the pre-submission consultation are summarised in Section 2 of this Consultation Statement. The main documents used to publicise the consultation activities are listed in Appendix 1; any tools used during these consultation activities are presented in Appendix 2, and their outcomes is presented in Appendix 3.
- 1.5. The statutory pre-submission consultation on the Draft Plan and its resulting development into the Proposed Plan are described in Sections 3. The main documents to publicise the pre-submission consultation are listed in Appendix 4; any tools used during these consultation activities are presented in Appendix 5, and their outcomes is presented in Appendix 6.
- 1.6. The result of the Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal scoping exercise are presented in Section 4.
- 1.7. The Proposed Plan differs from the Draft Plan only in respect of changes made as a result of comments received during the pre-submission consultation period; these changes are summarised in Section 5.

2. Activities that contribute to the pre-submission final draft

Activity Log

Date	Activity	Who participated (number and typologies)	How it has been publicised
March 2012	Thurgarton Community Questionnaire	35% return rate	Sent by email through the Thurgarton email service which serves about 80% of the community and posted to all households.
June 2014	Neighbourhood Plan Survey	170 surveys delivered, 50 returned (29% return rate)	Sent by email through the Thurgarton email service which serves about 80% of the community
September 2014	Parish Council Meeting: agreement to produce a Neighbourhood Plan	Parish Councillors	Parish Council website
October 2014	Parish Council Meeting: Vision and objectives discussed	Parish Councillors	Parish Council website
January – March 2015	Consultation on Designation of Neighbourhood Area	-	NSDC led consultation
July 2015	Housing Need Survey	184 questionnaires delivered 73 questionnaires returned, 40% return rate	Sent by regular mail to all households of the parish of Thurgarton who are on the electoral register
November 2015	Formation of the Steering Group	Steering group formed of 2 Parish Councillors and 5 parishioners	Sent by email through the Thurgarton email service which serves about 80% of the community Article in Thurgarton People
January 2016	Letter to landowners and local business owners		Letters sent to 13 local landowners and local business owners
February 2016	Email to village groups incl churches, cricket club, WI, Bleasby Primary & Minster Secondary Schools	No feedback received	Letter sent by email

January/February 2016	Article in Thurgarton People and village email: to raise awareness of the NP and to seek input from these groups on the issues that need to be addressed in the NP		Thurgarton People hand delivered to all parts of the Parish except Thurgarton Quarters and 4 houses towards Hoveringham
March/April 2016	Article in Thurgarton People to keep parishioners informed as to the work being undertaken by the Steering Group		Thurgarton People hand delivered to all parts of the Parish except Thurgarton Quarters and 4 houses towards Hoveringham
June 2016	Thurgarton Community Questionnaire	74 questionnaires returned, 40% return rate	Survey Monkey's link sent by email through the Thurgarton email service which serves about 80%, hard copies available at Village Hall and included in Thurgarton People.
June 2016	2 nd Letter to landowners and local business owners to invite all the landowners and local business owners to the Drop-in event on 2 nd July		Letters sent to 13 local business owners and land owners
July 2016	Community Drop-in event: Group based workshop	47 parishioners, 1 representative of NSDC	Flyers distributed in the village, general email invitation to all residents, and specific emails sent to local businesses, landowners, Cricket Club, St Peters' Church, the Methodist Chapel, Gardening Club, Blebby and Minster Schools, WI
July 2016	Workshop at Minster School	Pupils of the local primary school	Organised in collaboration with school Head and teachers.
July 2016	NP talk at WI meeting	6 Parishioner members of the WI	
September 2016	Steering Group send letter to The Park residents		Letters delivered to all homes in the Park.
October 2016	Email update to residents		Sent by email through the Thurgarton email service which serves about 80% of the community

Community Questionnaire

- 2.1. **Purpose:** The questionnaire was built on the Parish Plan published in July 2008, and aimed to get residents' opinions on how the Plan should be updated according to its 4 main themes: environment and planting schemes, communication and information, events and activities, and traffic.
- 2.2. **Consultation Technique:** A questionnaire of 10 closed questions (yes or no answer) with optional comment boxes and divided into four themes was sent to Thurgarton's residents to fill in and return (see appendix 2.1). A collection service was also available.
- 2.3. **Outcomes:** Approximately 35% of the questionnaires sent out were returned; this was probably due to the short return time given.
- 2.4. **Key finding and Response:** The majority of residents gave a positive answer to all the questions, except question 5 (call for contributions to village newsletter). The Parish Council has undertaken several actions to address the needs identified in the survey and considered them during the preparation of the first stages of the Neighbourhood Plan (see appendix 3 for further information on results and response).

Neighbourhood Plan Survey 2014

- 2.5. **Purpose:** Gather residents' opinion on five main themes identified through the Thurgarton Community Questionnaire and discussion within the Parish Council, namely planning and housing developments, speeding, flooding, parking, and use of the village hall. The responses to this survey helped to identify the main issues affecting the village and consequently informed the vision for the Plan.
- 2.6. **Consultation Technique:** A survey composed of 15 open and closed questions were sent by regular mail to all households of the parish (170) of Thurgarton who are on the electoral register, asking their opinions on the five themes mentioned above. For each question there was an opportunity to raise additional comments (see appendix 2.2).
- 2.7. **Outcomes:** 50 questionnaires were returned, equating to a 29% return rate.
- 2.8. **Key Findings and Response:** Vast majority supported the idea of a Neighbourhood Plan, and provided interesting comments in terms of housing need, perceived flood risk and management solutions, and concern about speeding and parking (see appendix 3). Although not all comments and needs are planning or land use related (thus outside the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan) the Parish Council used the results of this survey to design the vision and objectives for the future of the parish.

Housing Needs Survey

- 2.9. **Purpose:** The survey was conducted in order to obtain clear evidence of any local housing need for a range of housing tenures for Thurgarton residents. This evidence provided the Parish Council with the information it requires to anticipate future housing requirements for the purposes of developing a neighbourhood plan including:
 - Establishing the need for affordable housing within the parish
 - Identifying the extent and nature of the affordable housing need
 - Calculating demand and preferences for market housing
 - Establishing attitudes towards further residential development
 - Awareness of residents' opinions about life in the parish

- 2.10. **Consultation Technique:** Sending out a survey form, explanatory letter and question and answer sheet to all households of the parish of Thurgarton who are on the electoral register (184 in total) in May 2015. A freepost return address for the replies were made via a postage paid envelope directly to the District Council, the Village's Local Post Box, Parish Council Clerk or at the Parish's annual general meeting on the 20th May, 2015. The standard questionnaire is available in appendix 2.3. A comments section within the questionnaire for residents to expand on their responses.
- 2.11. **Outcomes:** A total of 184 survey forms were sent out, of which 1 was returned by Royal Mail as undeliverable (Public House). In total 73 questionnaires were completed giving a response rate of 40% which ensures statistical validity at the confidence level of 95% and a confidence interval of 9%
- 2.12. **Key Findings and Response:** The survey provided a clear snapshot of households composition and household occupancy rate. It also highlighted a need for relocation and downsizing and provision of started homes for families. The report suggests the need of:
- 2-4 affordable properties for residents in housing need
 - Smaller properties to allow people to downsize
 - Starter homes for first time buyers trying to enter the market
 - Bungalow homes for people who need single storey accommodation or have disabilities.

The Parish Council took these recommendations into account when drafting the NP housing and design policy.

Formation of the Steering Group

- 2.13. **Purpose:** The aim of this consultation was to form the Steering Group to lead the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan using the information generated from the activities described above as a basis and starting point.
- 2.14. **Consultation Technique:** a flyer calling for interested people to join the group, with all contact details, has been circulated among the residents (see appendix 1).
- 2.15. **Outcomes:** as a result of the consultation, 6 persons joined the group.
- 2.16. **Key Findings and Response:** the Steering Group was created and took responsibility for the next phases of evidence collection, community consultation and preparation of the final Neighbourhood Plan document. Analysing the results from previous consultations, the Steering Group structured the draft vision and objectives around 4 main themes: Housing, Employment, Environmental and Heritage, and Community Facilities.

Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire 2016

- 2.17. **Purpose:** The purpose of the resident questionnaire was to identify where future development should be located in the Parish, as well as to identify important heritage, natural and community assets. A specific question on the presence of dog walkers and horse riders on footpath and bridleways was asked to understand how these were used. The questionnaire was developed for the purpose of informing NP policies and was based on vision and aspiration identified earlier in the consultation stage.
- 2.18. **Consultation Technique:** A questionnaire of 15 questions were designed, asking residents' opinions on the themes of Housing, Employment, Environmental and Heritage, and Community Facilities. The complete list of questions can be found in Appendix 2.
- 2.19. The questionnaire was administered through SurveyMonkey and advertised on the Parish website. In addition, an email with the direct link to the survey was sent to all residents. To ensure for those with limited IT skills to participate, it was possible to get hard copies of the survey and to return it during the community event the 2nd of July.
- 2.20. **Outcomes:** 74 people replied to the survey (40% return rate), with the vast majority over 56 years old (49%), 17 between 36 and 55 year old and 7 between 17 and 35 years old. The turnover is consistent with the demographic of the village, mostly composed by over 45 years old.
- 2.21. **Key Findings and Outcomes:** The majority of the sample agrees with all the questions asked, except the possibility to support new development outside of the curtilage (67% disagree). A number of changes to the proposed curtilage have been suggested, in particular the inclusion of the Park and Cricket Ground (see appendix 3 for details). Several sites were suggested as areas of natural/ecological value and as heritage assets.
- 2.22. The comments were consistent with the draft vision and objectives resulted from previous activities. The proposed village envelope was amended slightly following comments from the survey. The exclusion of the Park from the village envelope is justified and the rationale was explained in detail in a letter sent to the Parishioner living in the proximity of the Park, which can be found in Appendix 1. The suggestions received in term of heritage assets and areas of ecological and natural value were considered for inclusion in potential policies.

Community Drop-in Event

- 2.23. **Purpose:** Gather residents, specific groups (landowners and local businesses) and organisations (Cricket Club, the Church, Blebby and Minster Schools, WI) to confirm the vision and objectives prepared as a result of previous consultations and consult of proposed policies regarding the four identified themes.
- 2.24. **Consultation Techniques:** The 4 themes and the vision for Thurgarton were presented to the attendants, and they were asked whether they agree on the statement. Following that, each theme's objective was presented in detail along with draft policies. The suggestions in term of heritage assets and green open space identified as a result of previous consultation were included. A poster for the vision and for each theme was prepared to help the discussion. Each group was provided with a template to complete with comments related to each field (see appendix 2).
- 2.25. **Outcomes:** 47 parishioners, 1 representative of NSDC.

2.26. **Key Findings and Response:** General agreement on the vision, objective and proposed policies. Specific comments related to the need to maintain the pub and existing community facilities, restricting industrial development to specific areas and in maintaining residential development to infill within the village envelope. Attendees demonstrated general appreciation for the quality of the event. The comments have been considered in the preparation of final policies and in the preparation of the draft NP that was later subject to Regulation 14 consultation.

Workshop at Minster School

2.27. **Purpose:** Engage with the younger member of the community to understand their needs in term of open space and recreation facilities

2.28. **Consultation Technique:** A workshop was organised at the Minster School and children were asked to respond to the following questions and to draw a map including these places:

- Which places are important to you?
- Where do you go/use in Thurgarton?
- What facilities are important to you?

2.29. Following this activity, children has been divided into groups and has they discussed the housing and community facilities proposed in the Draft Plan.

2.30. **Outcomes:** 15 pupils where involved in the activity

2.31. **Key Findings and Response:** Insight into the open spaces and community facilities that young members of the community value the most. These sites are included for protection in the specific NP policy.

3. Regulation 14 Pre-submission Consultation

3.1 Consultation with the community and statutory bodies on the final Draft Plan began on 28th October 2016 and ended 9th December 2016.

3.2 The Consultation exercise involved a survey asking consultees to support or not support each of the six policies presented in the Draft Plan, and to add comments if desired. The survey is included in Appendix 5.

3.3 The survey was prepared through SurveyMonkey and the link sent to all statutory and non statutory consultees. The survey was also available in hard copies at the Village Hall during two community drop-in events held on Saturday 5th November between 1:00 pm and 3:00 pm, and Tuesday 15th November 2016 between 7:00 pm and 9:00 pm. A contact number was provided to receive hard copies of the Draft Plan and of the Survey.

3.4 Newark and Sherwood District Council contacted the Statutory Consultees in behalf of the Parish Council. The official letter is available in Appendix 4. Below is the complete list of consulted bodies:

- The Coal Authority
- Environment Agency
- English Heritage
- Natural England
- Network Rail
- Highways Agency
- Newark & Sherwood District Council
- Nottinghamshire County Council
- Upper Witham Internal Drainage Board
- Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board
- Mono Consultants
- British Telecom
- NHS England
- Newark and Sherwood Clinical Commissioning Group
- Western Power Distribution (WPD)
- National Grid
- Anglian Water
- Homes & Communities Agency
- Severn Trent Water
- Halloughton Parish Council
- Southwell Town Council
- Epperstone Parish Council
- Hoveringham Parish Council
- Bleasby Parish Council

3.5 The non-statutory consultees include all residents of the Parish, and the following local businesses, local landowners and organisations

- Cricket Club
- St Peters' Church
- Methodist Chapel
- Gardening Club
- Minster Schools
- WI
- Yates Engineering Ltd
- Acacia Aveda Hair Salon
- A1 Mobile Ltd
- Grove Farm
- Meadow Agricultural Ltd
- The Priory
- Woodside Farm
- Thereby
- Lee Reclaim Ltd
- The Red Lion
- Trinity College c/o Saville Nottingham
- Jackeroo AG Services

3.6 An email containing the link to the survey and information on the drop in events was sent through the Thurgarton email service, which serves about 80% of the community, while a second email was sent to the above mentioned local businesses, local landowners and organisations. Both emails are available in appendix 4.

Comment and change log

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
All Plan	NSDC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> . At paragraph 1.7 it should be said that the District Council's Development Plan is currently under review. . Throughout the document I suggest using the term 'previously developed land' instead of or, as well as 'brownfield' to be consistent with national policy. . At paragraph 4.3 I suggest using the term 'village envelope' rather than 'village curtilage' to be consistent with the rest of the document and the LDF. 	All noted and agreement with suggestions	Paragraphs changed accordingly.
All Plan	Natural England	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.	Noted	None
Vision	Environment Agency	The references to the natural environment with the Plan are welcomed and we recommend that these messages are strengthened by incorporating a commitment to the protection and enhancement of the natural environment (as supported within paragraph 4.30) within the Plans' 'vision'.	Noted	No change required
Objective 4	Environment Agency	We welcome that flood risk has been considered within paragraphs 2.7 & 2.8 which provides detailed, locally specific information that will help to deliver adaptation and reduce the impacts of climate change. Whilst we have no concerns with the Plans reliance on district level planning policies we recommend that objective 4 include 'flood risk' as this has been identified as a concern within the Plan.	Noted	Objected 4 amended as suggested.
Policy 1	Trent Valley IDB	The Board recommends that any proposed development in the Parish of Thurgarton incorporates sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) where feasible.	Noted	Incorporated in policy 1.

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
Policy 1	Highway England	It is noted that the small scale housing growth of eleven dwellings is proposed for Thurgarton. Given this low level of growth proposed and the distance of the Neighbourhood Plan are for the A4, Highways England considers that there will be no negative impacts upon its operation.	Noted	No change required.
Policy 1	NSDC	I consider that the sequential order set out in the first paragraph of Policy 1 may not be wholly compliant with Spatial Policy 3 of the Core Strategy. SP3 states that new development should be within 'the main built up area of villages..' which would be defined by your proposed village envelope. Policy 1 however allows for development on greenfield sites adjacent to the village envelope which would be contrary to planning policy on development in the countryside. We would not be able to support this approach however there may be an alternative approach that is compliant with the LDF. The District Council has set out a stance as part of its current position on 5 year housing supply whereby until the current housing requirement for the district is tested through the examination of the Plan Review it will consider housing development on sustainable sites which are immediately adjacent to village envelopes which meet the requirements of the Development Plan in all other respects. Re-wording for Policy 1 suggested.	Agreement with the explanation and recommendation.	Policy 1 re-worded accordingly.
Policy 1	Resident	Support all 4 proposals	Noted	No change required.
Policy 1	Resident	I have concerns that any criteria would be adhered to given the recent developments that have been passed already. The new development on the Coach & Horses pub site is not in keeping and just a crush of dwellings with no consideration for much but profits.	Noted.	No change required
Policy 1	Resident	A property density map should be produced for the Village Envelope, no development should be allowed that exceeds the average density in that area of the village. In addition no development should exceed the average density of the village.	Noted. Density matters could be considered as	No change required

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
Policy 1	Resident	The village envelope needs to follow existing edge boundaries rather than creating a tidy straight edge boundary. Priory Lane / Butts Lane should not allow infill along footpath (land between "The Barn" and the Gravyard).	Noted.	No change required
Policy 1	Resident	Lower cost housing should be a priority	Noted.	No change required
Policy 1	Resident	Thurgarton has so far managed to maintain a pleasant village environment without inappropriate development. New builds and extensions have been sympathetic to the present character of the present building stock. It would be a shame to lose this either through over development or new inappropriate designs.	Noted.	No change required
Policy 1	Resident	Support as long as road safety is taken into consideration with regard to speed and safe access to and from properties.	Noted.	No change required
Policy 1	2 Residents	Building should not take place on greenfield sites Do not support the use of greenfield sites anywhere	Noted.	Amendments to policy 1 to emphasize preference for brownfield sites.
Policy 1	2 Residents	I strongly object to the fact that the rear lawn of the Old Rectory is shown in the Neighbourhood Plan as an "Important Open Space" and excluded from the "Village Envelope". It is felt that any dwelling within the village should not be "split" as such. This is inconsistent with the rest of the Neighbourhood Plan and would have a significantly detrimental effect on the value of the property. The rear lawn is considered to be a private amenity of the dwelling and should definitely be included within the "Village Envelope" The garden of The Old Rectory has been excluded from the village envelope. And instead has been defined as green belt. In our opinion the Dwelling should remain whole within the village envelope and not split.	Boundary reviewed in response to comment. Justification in Appendix 1 considered appropriate.	No change required
Policy 1	Resident	Support, but not too much development to spoil the village	Noted	No change required
Policy 1	Resident	Subject to restrictions, like possible flooding	Noted	No change required
Policy 1	Resident	Agree that any future housing should be within the village envelope	Noted	No change required

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
Policy 1	Resident	Would not support building houses in existing gardens	Noted	No change required.
Policy 1	Resident	Could the wording "infill sites" be construed to mean gardens? It would be a shame to lose more of the green space, trees, hedges and havens for wildlife as well as the innate character of Thurgarton, that's provided by its gardens. I also wonder if there should be an added requirement that new developments provide garden space with planted trees and shrubs, as well as car parking spaces	Definition in the glossary explains intention: "A small gap within an otherwise built-up frontage or group of houses"	No change required.
Policy 1	Resident	The village boundary to the North should be increased to INCLUDE the land/gardens belonging to and behind the 3 properties; Hilltop Cottage Southwell Rd.(i.e. the white cottage), Overfield House and the White House i.e. And NOT as shown in a line with the end of Orchard View. It should follow the conservation area boundary at this point otherwise these properties have their gardens part in and part out of the envelope, which does not occur elsewhere in the envelope. In particular it should include ALL of the old allotments behind Hilltop Cottage and not just part as shown	Boundary reviewed in response to comment. Justification in Appendix 1 considered appropriate.	No change required.
Policy 1	Resident	(Re Highfield House) There is no robust justifiable evidence to indicate that this land is demonstrably special and that it holds a particular local significance. Therefore, it is not appropriate to designate this land as local green space.	Boundary reviewed in response to comment. Justification in Appendix 1 considered appropriate. The writer is confusing the 'important open space' designation with a 'local green space designation' as defined in the NPPF, which is different and more akin to Green Belt. IOP designation relates to areas that contribute to the form and character of the village through their openness and lack of development rather than public access or views, although some areas may achieve both.	No change required.
Policy 1	Resident	We are happy with the size of the village	Noted.	No change required.

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
Policy 2	Resident	Affordable housing needs to be considered so that the younger generation can afford to locate within the village.	Noted.	No change required.
Policy 2	Resident	Already a problem in the village as parking by housing association bungalows "The Croft" on Bleasby Road. Safety issues at Bleasby Road"T" junction with road to Southwell and lack of adequate clear vision due to beach hedge (R) or (l) towards Lowdham - very dangerous. Not to mention speeding cars etc. These situations are accidents waiting to happen.	Noted.	No change required.
Policy 2	Resident	The priory has retained it's garden and every other house but one within the plan. You have excluded The Old Rectory's garden on Beck Street. The plan is therefore inconsistent. Many Strawberry Fare has been held in The Rectory Garden and now you choose to exclude it from the village envelope.	Boundary reviewed in response to comment. Justification in Appendix 1 considered appropriate.	No change required.
Policy 2	Resident	The development of more 2 / 3 bed houses should be encouraged in infill or redevelopment sites as it will help make facilities such as a pub, a shop, the station more sustainable	Noted	No change required.
Policy 2	Resident	Crucial that any infil is sympathetic to the design of the surrounding property. Demolishing one property to replace with 3 or 4 will adversely change the environment we live in	Noted	No change required.
Policy 2	Resident	Support policy 2	Noted	No change required.
Policy 2	Resident	Good idea as unused buildings can go derelict very quickly	Noted	No change required.
Policy 2	Resident	As before I am very sceptical about what planning development gets passed. I raised my concerns about flooding in the village having experienced it twice, but it seems the new development on Priory Farm on land that does flood is going ahead anyway. If I believed that strict guidelines would be adhered to - but I am afraid from experiences so far it is difficult to do so.	Noted	No change required.
Policy 2	Resident	3 bed houses later allowed at Coach and Horses development NOT original approval of 2 bed probably more 'affordable' houses supported by PC.	Noted	No change required.

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
Policy 2	Resident	Housing already exceeded requirements of plan	Noted	No change required.
Policy 3	Resident	Support as per comments in number 1. In particular parking at Corner Croft is hazardous, especially when coming off the main road onto Bleasby Road when cars/tractors/buses have no choice but to continue in the centre of the road against oncoming traffic. Surely a grassed area of Corner Croft could be converted to parking to allow the residents to park closer to their homes and alleviate risk of accidents. The added complication of Forge Close adds to this hazard.	Noted	No change required.
Policy 3	Resident	Despite the investment in pavement between Thurgarton and Goverton, it is sparsely used. People who could walk their children to school still prefer to drive and park, adding to the periodic congestion in Bleasby.	Noted	No change required.
Policy 3	Resident	Additionally, considering pedestrian and cycle friendliness, further development should incorporate traffic calming and pedestrian and cyclist safety measures.	Noted	No change required.
Policy 3	Resident	In rural community it is not possible to be without private transport for employment/domestic	Noted	No change required.
Policy 3	Resident	As Southwell increases in size traffic along the A612 increases and creates another divide within the village - need further traffic calming along the A612	Noted	No change required.
Policy 3	Resident	More development will increase vehicles which will impact on the village and people will want to use their cars.	Noted	No change required.
Policy 3	Resident	Will a rational, enforceable speed limit (max 20mph) throughout the village ever be realised ?!	Noted. Not a matter that the Plan can address directly.	No change required.
Policy 3	Resident	No development should result in on street parking or additional manoeuvring space.	Noted	No change required.
Policy 3	Resident	Could bleasby rd be no parking on road with parking for visitors made available at the village hall	Noted. Not a matter that the Plan can address directly.	No change required.
Policy 3	Resident	As Southwell increases in size traffic along the A612 increases and creates another divide within the village - need further traffic calming along the A612	Noted. Not a matter that the Plan can address directly.	No change required.

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
Policy 3	Resident	As a cyclist I find using Bleasby Road very dangerous with parked cars and the speed of some of the traffic through the village on Bleasby Road. The street lighting is poor on this road as well.	Noted. Not a matter that the Plan can address directly.	No change required.
Policy 4	Resident	Subject to provisions I am content with this proposed policy	Noted	No change required.
Policy 4	Resident	Encourage home run businesses	Noted	No change required.
Policy 4	Resident	Parking NOT controllable e.g. parking from clients vehicles from existing working at home arrangements at neighbouring properties already impacts adversely on ourselves and safety of the highway and has not been able to be resolved by NCC or NSDC	Noted	No change required.
Policy 4	Resident	Thurgarton is residential not appropriate for a business park, likewise how could this be controlled once constructed	Noted	No change required.
Policy 4	Resident	Local employment should be a priority	Noted	No change required.
Policy 4	Resident	It may be worth adding more specific wording to address light pollution, given Thurgarton already experiences its fair share of bright light from the aggregate plants at Hoveringham.	Noted	No change required.
Policy 5	Resident	Yes I would support something that helped the community like the village hall.	Noted	No change required.
Policy 5	Resident	Facilities now are not that well supported	Noted	No change required.
Policy 5	2 Residents	Save the Red Lion! We must fight hard to keep the village pub in any future development We do not want to lose our last village public house	Noted	No change required.
Policy 5	2 Residents	Priority should be given to play facilities and recreation resources for younger people - playground, tennis court.	Noted	No change required.
Policy 5	Resident	A children's play park would be great A village shop also	Noted	No change required.
Policy 6	Resident	Some trees within the village do need some attention and can become dangerous if some remedial work is not carried out on them.	Noted	No change required.

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
Policy 6	Resident	Natural environment should be managed, and owners should be allowed to manage without too much interference and cost	Noted	No change required.
Policy 6	Resident	I am very sorry but I am very cynical about this that any wildlife will be prioritised by any planning or construction company. I strongly support the preservation of wildlife and the rural quality of the village.	Noted	No change required.
Policy 6	Environment Agency	It is clear that the Plan has been worked up to be in conformity with the Newark & Sherwood DC Core Strategy/Allocations DPD and Policy 6 is welcome. We would ask that the term 'where practicable' is removed from the second bullet to encourage all future development to work in full towards the aspirations of this policy. New development presents opportunities for habitat creation and being part of an ecological linked network through the creation of space wildlife, improving water quality, flood risk and amenity.	Noted	No change required.
Policy 6	Halloughton Parish Council	There is reference to the character of the village and later at Section 4, to views within the village and the importance especially of Beck Street. However, little is made of the considerable importance to your community – and ours of course – of the views out to and from the surrounding landscape. Thurgarton footpaths link in to many others in the area, including the nationally designated footpath, the Robin Hood Way. Thurgarton's PRow are of real significance to the community as historic and continuing assets, with the landscape that they inhabit needing protection, just as the village envelope requires protecting for future generations. You might find it helpful to refer to the Landscape Character Assessment that was undertaken some time ago by NSDC/NCC?	Noted	No change required.
Policy 6	Yates Engineering Ltd	Two minor points for accuracy only if the document is still in draft form is our house (Thurgarton Station) was built by 'The Midland Railway' in 1847 and is a Grade 2 listed building	Noted	Minor amendments made.

4. SEA & HRA

4.1 The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) screening processes were managed by Newark and Sherwood District Council. The scoping study concluded that the Thurgarton Neighbourhood Plan will not have significant environmental effects and therefore does not need to be subject to a full SEA or HRA.

4.3 The screening included consultation with relevant stakeholders. No comment has been raised on the study.

5. Preparing the Proposed Plan

5.1 The changes made to the plan following pre-submission consultation are summarised below:

- Minor change to paragraph 1.7 to state the District Council's Development Plan is currently under review.
- The term "previously developed land" is included alongside references to "brownfield".
- Minor change to paragraph 4.3 to "village envelope" rather than "village curtilage"
- Rewording Policy 1 and taking out references to sequential order. Associated amendments to the justification text that follows the policy.
- Reference to the use of SUDS added to Policy 1.
- "Where practicable" removed from second bullet of Policy 6
- Flood risk management added to objective 4.
- Minor changes to the descriptions of the cricket club and railway station in Information Box 1

Appendices – [Please click here for separate PDF document](#)