

Consultation Statement

Kings Clipstone Neighbourhood Plan

17 July 2018

Contents

1. Background	3
2. Regulation 14 Consultation.....	5
3. Local Residents/Landowners	6
4. Statutory Consultee Responses	9
Appendix A.....	12
Appendix B	14

1. Background

1. This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 Section 15(2) Part 5 of the regulation states that this Consultation Statement shall contain.
 - Details of the persons and bodies who were consulted.
 - Details of how they were consulted.
 - A summary of the main issues raised by these consultees.
 - Describe how these issues have been considered.

2. Following the establishment of Kings Clipstone as a Parish Council the council agreed to explore and develop a 'Neighbourhood Plan'. In July 2013 a Newsletter was circulated and contained a Survey in the form of a questionnaire. Every dwelling in the village was consulted and a total of 88 forms were returned. From this the council were able to analyse the broad concerns of the village. Table 1 shows these key findings.

Table 1

2013 survey results – forms to 138 households 88 returned			
What's needed in the village	Yes	No	No preference
Village Hall	58	17	13
Community Groups	46	12	3
Improved roads/footpath	80	1	7
Safer routes through the village	83	0	5
Village tidiness	74	2	12
Industrial/commercial sites	4	68	16
More housing	3	64	21
Tourist facilities	10	54	24

3. March/ April 2014 armed with the above, the preparation of the neighbourhood plan began formally. Newsletters were circulated to both dwellings and businesses. These invited attendance at Parish meetings. 14th April 2014 a working group was established and an open Parish Meeting held.

4. A survey was undertaken across the parish sampling more than a third of the homes in the Village. The sampling process and geographical spread of the respondents is shown in Appendix B (e.g long term residents, new residents, young families, families with teenagers, single people, all age groups). 49 households canvassed – return from 44 - 90% response rate.
5. Most responders chose to discuss the portrait of the parish, the questions and purpose of the neighbourhood Plan, a minority chose to take the form and return (and they did). The table below shows the findings for the completed forms.

Table 2

In planning terms the important issues that need to be taken into account are			
• Polices that protect and enhance the important landscape, wildlife and heritage assets of the parish.	Disagree	0%	Neutral 0%
	Agree	100%	
• Recreation and tourism – improving provision for residents and visitors without harming the environment that attracts visitors to Sherwood Forest.	Disagree	0%	Neutral 7%
	Agree	93%	
• Housing policy that reflects the gradual growth of the village and the wishes of residents.	Disagree	0%	Neutral 7%
	Agree	93%	
• Employment – Using the high quality aspects of Newark and Sherwood’s Core Strategy policies on recreation and tourism to support employment in a sustainable way.	Disagree	0%	Neutral 7%
	Agree	93%	
• Services – The provision of services in the village is not seen as a realistic option.	Disagree	0%	Neutral 7%
	Agree	93%	
• Rural Access – safe pedestrian/cycle access connecting the hamlets and Sherwood Pines to the Village core and a public transport link for Sherwood Pines.	Disagree	0%	Neutral 7%
	Agree	93%	

6. July 2014 a two week exhibition was held at the ‘Tin Tabernacle’ in the village. This included photographs, maps, documentation etc. with at least 2 parish councillors available at any one time. Both Residents and stakeholders were invited to attend. A further refined survey was conducted with 78 Responses. These findings are at Appendix A.
7. September 2014 onwards the Working party further refined the plan until the Council Engaged Helen Metcalf as a consultant.
8. In December 2016 a First Draft Plan was prepared by Helen Metcalf and circulated to all members of the steering group. Following collation of their responses a 2nd Draft was circulated and again responses collated. Once approved (V2) it was professionally printed. Together with two other documents. A ‘Design Guide’ and a ‘Projects and Initiatives Guide’ and presented to the Parish Council.
9. It should be noted multiple consultations were made with N.S.D.C. on relevant points and where they were able to advise us.

2. Regulation 14 Consultation

10. Regulation 14 Consultation ran from 1st Oct 2017 to 19th November 2017. The NP was available to view on the Parish Website and a copy placed with N.S.D.C. Formal consultation took place in a number of ways during this period.
11. Businesses were approached personally by Parish Council Members and a copy of the Plan lodged with them.
12. Residents were circulated by Newsletter (personally delivered) this contained a questionnaire for their responses, where requested a personal visit by a councillor was made to discuss any issues. A phone number was also provided as a point of contact. As well as pointing them towards the Web Site.
13. Local libraries – a file containing a copy of the Plan and newsletter together with copies of the questionnaire were lodged with them during the above dates and collected at the conclusion.
14. Two open days were held at the ‘Tin Tabernacle’ in the village. On the 8th and 13th of October 2017 with copies of the plan and councillors in attendance.
15. Copies of the Plan were available on the Parish Web Site for some weeks prior to and all during the consultation period. The questionnaire was also on the web site and residents were able to fill it in directly if they wished.
16. Following the consultation period all responses were collated and put to the Council/ Steering group were relevant. Amendments being made where appropriate.
17. In addition, the ‘Neighbourhood Plan’ has been a continuing item on the agenda at Parish Council Meetings.
18. The following is a synopsis of representations made and the amendments to the Plan that resulted.
19. Table 3 shows the responses to the questionnaire and the very high support from respondents to the policies.

Table 3

	Yes Total	No Total	Yes as a %	No as a %
Q1. Do you agree principles in NP 1. Sustainable Development	21	4	84	16
Q2. Do you agree principles in NP2. Settlement Boundary	21	4	84	16
Q.3 Do you agree principles in NP3. Protection Landscape Character	22	3	88	12
Q.4 Do you agree principles in NP4. Design Principles for Residential Development	23	2	92	8
Q.5 Do you agree principles in NP5. Protecting and Enhancing Heritage Assets	22	3	88	12
Q.6 Do you agree principles in NP6. Conserve/enhance Walking Cycling Bridleways	24	1	96	4
Q.7 Do you agree principles in NP7. Protect and enhance Parish Biodiversity	24	1	96	4
Q.8 Do you agree principles in NP8. Enhancing Community Facilities	23	2	92	8
Q.9 Do you agree principles in NP9. Tourism Development	24	1	96	4
Q.10 Do you agree Aspirational Policy re Sherwood Forest Regional Park	25	0	100	0
Q.11 Do you agree Aspirational Policy relating to Road Safety.	25	0	100	0

20. This shows that the vast majority of responses were positive and expressed approval for the plan.

3. Local Residents/Landowners

This section contains those comments that required a specific response – some of which resulted in an amendment to the Plan.

Respon- dent No	Comment	NP Response
3	Qu 1 Did not agree that additional community facilities are required. They state this is 'purely from a N.I.M.B.Y. point of view.' Further states opposed to any development on Squires Lane. They purchased and developed their building plot in the belief that the plot next door would be kept for children. Objects to any proposal for a village hall. Spoil their view – threaten privacy – provide for developers to purchase from the parish council. This	The Parish Council have recently purchased the land in question (previously rented and used as a village open space amenity) specifically to prevent it falling into the hands of developers. There are no plans to sell it on. The land is identified in the plan as suitable for a village hall/community asset. Consultations prior to the publishing of the draft N.P. showed 74% of the responses identifying the need for a village hall. Noise, parking etc are a material consideration that will need to be taken into account when any planning application is made. NP 8 identifies that such a village hall should be completed without unacceptable impact

Respon- dent No	Comment	NP Response
	respondent lives adjacent to the playing field.	on Residents. Their rights are protected by the Planning Process.
9	<p>Identifies that the Settlement boundary is inaccurate. Qu 3 Disagrees with the descriptions and historic significance of the 'Dog and Duck meadow' Qu 5 Contests other archaeological references to the 'Great Pond'. States that 'King John's Palace' is not a public asset and who benefits from this asset.</p>	<p>The settlement boundary excludes rear gardens – this is a recognised planning policy approach and is explained in revised text in the NP</p> <p>The Archaeological existence of the items is identified in the plan and remains so. There have been numerous articles and ongoing exploratory work on the site over decades. The Palace and the surrounding area are made freely available by the current owner to both public and villagers for events and further archaeological work. Schools for archaeology students are frequent users of the site. The statements whilst they express a view are not factual or relevant to the N.P and its contents.</p>
10	<p>Did not agree to any further houses or industrial buildings within the Parish.</p> <p>Qu 8 Expressed concern that the Playing Field as a community asset could be hired out to 3rd parties.</p>	<p>Whilst the majority of residents expressed a wish for no more housing of any type the N.P. recognises that some development may be necessary and identifies this in NP 2.</p> <p>The 'playing field' is identified as a historical community asset and has been recently purchased. With or without the provision of a 'Village Hall' it is identified in N.P. 8 the conditions needed to be considered by the body administrating this asset (currently the Parish Council).</p>
25	<p>Two page letter that did not correspond to questionnaire format. Land owner within the village who has made multiple planning applications for the area of land between castle field and the Dog and Duck that they own. 2 local businesses have been omitted</p>	<p>Businesses added</p>

Respon- dent No	Comment	NP Response
	<p>They refer to Para 108 The settlement Boundary. Asking why some rear gardens at 1,2,3, and 4 King Johns Court have not been included within the Settlement Boundary Claim the Plan approach will strangle the village.</p> <p>Disagree with identifying the area known as the water meadows as a ‘non-designated community’ asset on the grounds that is owned by ‘My family’</p> <p>They dispute the importance of ‘King John’s Palace and the Heritage Assets connected with it. Stating that it is Privately Owned and claiming that the General Public have no right of access. That there are no sign boards etc.</p> <p>Why does the NP not include areas for public amenities i.e. Shops. Café etc.</p>	<p>The settlement boundary excludes rear gardens – this is a recognised planning policy approach and is explained in revised text in the NP</p> <p>The NP supports limited housing growth to meet local need but seeks to protect the most sensitive landscape character areas. The Plan has been prepared to reflect the village views as a whole. The owner of this land has a diametrically opposite view which does not reflect the wishes of the inhabitants or Historic England or both NCC and Newark and Sherwood D.C. This proposed designation has been removed from the list.</p> <p>This is simply untrue. The Palace site has been the subject of continuing Archaeological and Historical investigations for decades. The last book on the site ‘A Palace for our Kings’ by James Wright being published as recent as 2016. The Palace site has listing status and Historic England have recently expanded the ‘listed’ area, such is the importance of the site. HE in conjunction with other agencies have also undertaken physical work to preserve it and provided a number of information boards at the site for the general public The preservation and protection of this site and its curtilage is and remains a corner stone of the ‘Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>This was not raised as a requirement by anyone else in any of the previous consultation.</p>

4. Statutory Consultee Responses

21. It should be noted that NSDCs comments are based on the Publication Amended Core Strategy which was not available when the NP was drafted (at pre-submission stage). Some of the suggestions are made reflecting the emerging Core Strategy approach. Given the need to future proof the NP as much as possible, wherever reasonable, amendments that assisted in increasing conformity with the emerging Amended Core Strategy were supported.
22. These matters were worked through by our planning consultant in conjunction with the NSDC and the Parish Council at a meeting with NSDC on 28TH March 2018 and further consultation with Oliver Scott the Conservation Officer on 17th April 2018

Organisation	Comment	NP Response
NSDC	When NSDC's Amended CS is adopted it will cover the period until 2033.	Amended CS not available when NP drafted - given the imminent adoption of the Amended CS and the importance of future proofing the NP the date was changed to 2033.
	Update in references to status of Kings Clipstone Parish in relation to the district council. Para 3.6	Amendments made to reflect how district policy does reflect existence of KC parish
	Amendments to Spatial Policy 3 have been proposed in the Amended CS and debated as the planning inquiry on the Amended Core Strategy	Status of SP 3 in CS clarified NP text references most recent spatial policy 3 noting its status at time of submission. Appendix 2 that set out spatial policy 3 from adopted CS removed.
	CIL will be very limited – only for retail likely benefit very small	Ref to CIL removed
	More recent SHMA reports	2017 as well as 2015 Hearn Report used Hearn 2017 study not available when pre submission NP draft was prepared
	Status of Edwinstowe as a service centre amended to reflect ref in emerging CS	Amendment made

Organisation	Comment	NP Response
	Commitment to 5-year review – especially in relation to settlement boundary	Additional text added to reinforce this commitment.
	<p>Additional information required to justify why the landscape character should be protected.</p> <p>Consideration of Local green Space designation</p>	<p>More information added in relation to King Johns palace and the view corridors map amended to provide more focus and evidence. Distinction between vistas and viewpoints made as per meeting with NSDC conservation officer</p> <p>The main opportunity for LGS designation was for the area called the playing fields but as the PC are seeking to develop the site LGS designation was considered unsuitable</p>
	NP 4 suggested amending of wording to NP 4 to make it more positive and ref to courtyards revised	Amendments made
	NP 5 work done on non-designated heritage assets following meeting with NSDC’s conservation officer and in a meeting with policy lanners at NSCC. Suggestions re wording amendments based on Fernwood NP examiners report	Work completed and amendments made based on discussion with NSDC
	NP 6 amendment to wording proposed	Amendment agreed
	NP 8 confirmed that emerging CS approach will support village hall type proposals and amendment to wording proposed	NPs are tested against adopted policy not emerging but text amended to reflect intention in new SP8 where this does not conflict with adopted SP8.
	Aspirational Policies should be removed	AP 1 was turned into a community project AP 2 road safety was considered

Organisation	Comment	NP Response
		too important to local people to not be represented in the NP. Text also amended to make clear they are land use based and contribute to the NP vision and objectives
Environment Agency	Supports the NP – no further comment	No change required
Highways England	Supports the NP – no further comment	No change required
Natural England	Supports the NP – no further comment	No change required
Historic England	Supports the NP – no further comment	No change required

Appendix A

Kings Clipstone Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Resident's Response Form 2014 cumulative answers 78 forms

HOUSING – Options in response to constraints and residents views

NSDC's Policies restrict building of new houses to the built core of the village. An envelope that defines the main built up area(s) of the village would provide a focus for any new development where it is justified in relation to NSDC Spatial Policy 3.

Question 1

- Do you agree with the establishment of a village envelope? **Yes 78 No -**
- The suggested boundaries shown on Map 1? **Yes 75 No 2**

Development within a village envelope would need to comply with NSDC's Development Management Policies, but these apply to the whole district and could be made more specific to Kings Clipstone.

Question 2 – Specific policies could be developed around:

- Local distinctiveness including design and layout. **Yes 77 No -**
- Respecting local landscape character **Yes 74 No 2**
- Protecting local green infrastructure **Yes 72 No 2**
- Protecting local wildlife sites **Yes 78 No -**

TOURISM AND EMPLOYMENT

NSDC's Policies state that new development of employment sites will be restricted to proposals needing a rural setting such as Farming, Forestry and Tourism. The latter is particularly important as NSDC see the Heart of Sherwood Forest as a major growth zone for tourism.

Question 3 - Should there be policies to

- Protect the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside. **Yes 78**
- Ensure a high standard so as to fit harmoniously with the surroundings. **Yes 78**
- Be served by approach roads and access points of a suitable standard. **Yes 76 No 2**
- Not be detrimental to nearby green infrastructure such as local wildlife sites, heritage assets or informal recreational facilities. **Yes 76 No 2**
- Is not out of scale with nearby settlements. **Yes 78**
- Does not spoil residents' enjoyment of their homes because of undue disturbance and noise. **Yes 78**

SHERWOOD FOREST GATEWAY

Kings Clipstone and Clipstone have separate but equally important character. To maintain this distinctiveness there could be a designated zone of open countryside between the two villages.

Question 4 – Do you agree with the establishment of special policy to protect the open

countryside zone between the two villages shown in Map 2?

Yes 74 No 3

WILDLIFE AND BIODIVERSITY

Question 5 To allow wildlife to adapt to climate change should there be proposals to identify, protect and enhance wildlife sites such as the Maun river corridor and the former sidings and rail line?

Yes 77 No 1

PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE COUNTRYSIDE AND SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT

Public access routes aren't just places to go for a walk or ride. They also serve as safe sustainable transport links to surrounding communities, shops and jobs, act as wildlife green lanes and allow the public to visit historic assets and see and understand Sherwood Forest.

Question 6 Should there be policies supporting the need for

- A safe link from Squires Lane to the Dog & Duck and Sherwood Pines. **Yes 78**
- Recognition of the importance of the views to the enjoyment of the path. **Yes 74**
No 3

LANDSCAPE – the display shows some of the key landscape views from public access points

These are very important for the enjoyment and understanding of people accessing the countryside around the village, whether residents or visitors. The setting of significant historical assets is particularly important as once lost they can never be recovered.

Question 7 Should policies be included

- stating why these key landscape views should be valued and protected. **Yes 73 No 2**
- Do you support the inclusion of these as examples of key landscape views.
 - a. Maun Valley towards Edwinstowe **Yes 74 No 3**
 - b. Vicar Water Valley from the Dog & Duck and the Palace **Yes 75 No 2**
 - c. Maun Valley in the village. **Yes 75 No 2**
 - d. Maun Valley towards Mansfield **Yes 75 No 3**
 - e. Royal Hunting Park – Parliament Oak and Churn Oak **Yes 76 No 2**

HISTORICAL ASSETS

Historical sites (assets) are important because they contribute to the character of our parish and help people, both residents and visitors, set their experience in a sense of place. They are given special recognition in national and NSDC planning policies. The Neighbourhood Plan needs to identify them.

Question 8 Should we use expert opinion to define the Palace site and setting? **Yes 71 No**

The display shows the sites that are considered important to the character of the parish. Are there sites that we have missed off or should not be included?

Appendix B

Consultation 2 methodology -

This survey was designed to allow residents to check the description of the village and suggest improvements to the text. One of our farmers picked up ‘decline in farming’ and suggested ‘mechanisation of farming’ as a better description. Originally the exercise was designed as a 10% sample of the village households, but the response was so positive that the survey covered over 30% of the village – just 5 declined to take part or didn’t return forms.

A geographic spread of homes were visited over a three day weekend with a spread of ages, disability, families with young children and teenagers, residents with businesses & 3 of the farms was sort. Also sort a wide range of times living in the parish, from recent arrivals to people who have lived in the village for over 80 years. The Neighbourhood Plan was generally discussed on the doorstep or at the kitchen table and then residents were asked about the actual survey. Some took the form and promised to drop it off (and they did). At Annual Parish Meeting a short time after, which had been advertised by a leaflet to all households, those residents who attended and hadn’t been included in the door to door survey were offered forms.

