


STATUTORY CONSULTEES FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
<p>Felicity Bingham, Sustainable Development Adviser East Midlands Team, NATURAL ENGLAND</p>		
<p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan. However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	Noted.	Noted.
<p>Comments: We support Policy 1: Protecting the Landscape Character of Mattersey Parish. We recognise that the neighbourhood plan area is within a Green Infrastructure (GI) zone. We would therefore suggest that, either within the above policies or as a separate policy, the issue of GI is covered and the opportunity to make GI links within new developments at the earliest stages of the planning process is emphasised more strongly. For further details on Green Infrastructure please see Annex 1</p>	<p>Noted. It is considered that the Plan sufficiently reflects the importance that the community attaches to the rural environment and of the strong desire to protect green spaces within the parish, as demonstrated by the plan objectives and policies :- Objective 3: Requires new developments to reflect the rural nature of the parish. Objective 7: Requires future developments to minimise environmental impacts and to promote the use of energy efficient materials. Policy 1: Creates a 'settlement break' between settlements in order to prevent developments within this important rural open space. Policy 2: Requires development proposals to enhance and contribute to the rural character of the parish. Policy 3: Requires new developments to be in keeping with the character of the area. Policy 6: Requires enhancement or creation of facilities to be appropriate to the rural setting. Policy 7: Protects public open spaces by designating them as Local Green Spaces. Policy 8: Promotes the extension or creation of non-vehicular routes, providing they do not detract from the character of the area.</p>	<p>Noted. Noted.</p>
<p>Allocations: We note that all of the site allocations are within Impact Risk Zones (IRZ's) for discharge of ground or surface water. This means that we would expect to be consulted on any planning applications that plan to discharge to ground or to surface water. For Further information on Natural England's IRZ's see this document or Annexe 1</p>	Noted.	Noted.
<p>Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land We have not checked the agricultural land classification of the proposed allocations, but we advise you ensure that any allocations on best and most versatile land are justified in line with para 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	Noted.	Noted.
<p>Additionally we refer you to Annex 1 which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	Noted.	Noted.
<p>Annex 1 - Neighbourhood planning and the natural environment: information, issues and opportunities</p>		
<p>Natural environment issues to consider Your plans or orders may present opportunities to protect and enhance locally valued landscapes. You may want to consider identifying distinctive local landscape features or characteristics such as ponds, woodland or dry stone walls and think about how any new development proposals can respect and enhance local landscape character and distinctiveness.</p>	Noted.	Noted.

STATUTORY CONSULTEES FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
<p><u>Landscape:</u> If you are proposing development within or close to a protected landscape (National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) or other sensitive location, we recommend that you carry out a landscape assessment of the proposal. Landscape assessments can help you to choose the most appropriate sites for development and help to avoid or minimise impacts of development on the landscape through careful siting, design and landscaping.</p>	Noted.	Noted.
<p><u>Wildlife habitats:</u> Some proposals can have adverse impacts on designated wildlife sites or other priority habitats (listed here⁹), such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest or Ancient woodland¹⁰. If there are likely to be any adverse impacts you'll need to think about how such impacts can be avoided, mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for.</p>	Noted.	Noted.
<p>Priority and protected species You'll also want to consider whether any proposals might affect priority species (listed here¹¹) or protected species. To help you do this, Natural England has produced advice here¹² to help understand the impact of particular developments on protected species.</p>	Noted.	Noted.
<p><u>Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land :</u> Soil is a finite resource that fulfils many important functions and services for society. It is a growing medium for food, timber and other crops, a store for carbon and water, a reservoir of biodiversity and a buffer against pollution. If you are proposing development, you should seek to use areas of poorer quality agricultural land in preference to that of a higher quality in line with National Planning Policy Framework para 112.</p>	Noted.	Noted.
<p><u>Improving your natural environment:</u> Your plan or order can offer exciting opportunities to enhance your local environment. If you are setting out policies on new development or proposing sites for development, you may wish to consider identifying what environmental features you want to be retained or enhanced or new features you would like to see created as part of any new development. Examples might include:</p>	Noted.	Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Providing a new footpath through the new development to link into existing rights of way. 	Noted.	Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Restoring a neglected hedgerow. 	Noted.	Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Creating a new pond as an attractive feature on the site. 	Noted.	Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planting trees characteristic to the local area to make a positive contribution to the local landscape. 	Noted.	Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Using native plants in landscaping schemes for better nectar and seed sources for bees and birds. 	Noted.	Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Incorporating swift boxes or bat boxes into the design of new buildings. 	Noted.	Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Think about how lighting can be best managed to encourage wildlife. 	Noted.	Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adding a green roof to new buildings. 	Noted.	Noted.

STATUTORY CONSULTEES FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Setting out in your plan how you would like to implement elements of a wider Green Infrastructure Strategy (if one exists) in your community. - Assessing needs for accessible greenspace and setting out proposals to address any deficiencies or enhance provision. - Identifying green areas of particular importance for special protection through Local Green Space designation (see Planning Practice Guidance on this 14). - Managing existing (and new) public spaces to be more wildlife friendly (e.g. by sowing wild flower strips in less used parts of parks, changing hedge cutting timings and frequency). - Planting additional street trees. - Identifying any improvements to the existing public right of way network, e.g. cutting back hedges, improving the surface, clearing litter or installing kissing gates) or extending the network to create missing links. - Restoring neglected environmental features (e.g. coppicing a prominent hedge that is in poor condition, or clearing away an eyesore). 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Stewart Patience, Spatial Planning Manager Anglian Water Services Limited		
<p>20 Site Allocations</p> <p>We note that a number of specific allocation sites for residential development are proposed within Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Anglian Water would be able to comment further on the implications of these sites for the existing water supply network when the scale of residential development is known.</p> <p>The following comments relate to the encroachment of existing assets in Anglian Water's ownership (where relevant).</p> <p>Policy 9: Land west of Main Street Mattersey</p> <p>There is an existing water main which crosses the frontage of this site.</p> <p>Where there are water mains crossing the site, the site layout should be designed to take these into account; this existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. If it is not possible to accommodate the existing mains within the design then a diversion may be possible under section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991.</p> <p>Further information relating to the process for applying for a water main diversion can be found on our website at the following link http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/developers/diversion-of-a-watermain.aspx</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>A site development proposal would be subject to the normal process of statutory consultation, to ensure that infrastructure and drainage requirements are protected.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

STATUTORY CONSULTEES FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
<p>Policy 11: Land East of Retford Road</p> <p>There is an existing water main which crosses the frontage of this site.</p> <p>Where there are water mains crossing the site, the site layout should be designed to take these into account; this existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. If it is not possible to accommodate the existing mains within the design then a diversion may be possible under section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991.</p> <p>Further information relating to the process for applying for a water main diversion can be found on our website at the following link http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/developers/diversion-of-a-watermain.aspx</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>A site development proposal would be subject to the normal process of statutory consultation, to ensure that infrastructure and drainage requirements are protected.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>Policy 12: Land south of Thorpe Road Mattersey</p> <p>There is an existing water main which crosses the frontage of this site.</p> <p>Where there are water mains crossing the site, the site layout should be designed to take these into account; this existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. If it is not possible to accommodate the existing mains within the design then a diversion may be possible under section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>A site development proposal would be subject to the normal process of statutory consultation, to ensure that infrastructure and drainage requirements are protected.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>Tim Dawson, Planning Officer (Policy) Bassetlaw District Council</p>		
<p>Bassetlaw District Council (the council) has the following comments to make on the Draft Mattersey Neighbourhood Plan (MNP). These comments are split into the following sections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment on the Basic Conditions 2. Comments and proposed changes to the wording of policies <p>PART 1: Basic Conditions</p> <p>Bassetlaw District Council considers the Draft MNP to be generally compliant with the requirements of the relevant basic conditions for Neighbourhood Plans, as set out in Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

STATUTORY CONSULTEES FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
<p><u>PART 2: Comments and Proposed Changes</u></p> <p>Overall, Bassetlaw District Council welcomes the positive approach that this draft of the MNP takes towards development - particularly new residential development.</p> <p>Paragraphs 5 - 10: The MNP must be in conformity with the adopted Core Strategy. While the Initial Draft Bassetlaw Plan sets out an indication of policy direction, it carries no material planning weight for the purposes of Neighbourhood Plan making. As such, it is not appropriate for the Draft Mattersey Plan to put forward Mattersey Thorpe as a 'sustainable location for growth' on this basis alone. It may form a part of the justification, but must also build a narrative as to why it is sustainable and warrants a departure from the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Paragraph 14: This (and at numerous other points throughout the Draft MNP) references out of date or superseded documents, such as the 2013 (not 2014) Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The 2017 OAN SHMA Update should be referenced instead. In order to be found sound emerging plans should be based on the most up to date evidence.</p> <p>Map 1b: This map lacks sufficient detail to be of relevance/use in the plan. Given Mattersey's scale and role in the wider area, villages of a comparative size should be labelled and connecting roads highlighted to give context of the functional relationship Mattersey has with nearby settlements. This is particularly relevant in building the case for Mattersey Thorpe's inclusion in the plan as a growth area.</p> <p>Paragraph 57: As noted above, this should refer to the 2017 SHMA OAN Update.</p> <p>Paragraph 67: It is not clear what the potential implications of climate change may be in this locality, therefore if this reference is to be retained in the plan it should be expanded to make clear potential impacts.</p> <p>Objective 1: What constitutes 'sufficient' housing growth? Unless an appropriate definition is provided elsewhere in the plan, dropping 'sufficient' would not significantly change the objective. It is not necessary to cite examples of facilities as part of the</p> <p>Objective 2: This objective would benefit from greater clarity - e.g. the type or tenure of new housing to meet local need.</p> <p>Objective 5: While we support the basis of this objective, again, it is not necessary to provide a limited range of examples.</p> <p>Objective 8: Objectives are intended to set out how the plan will be delivered - reflecting the content of the vision. To include the aspiration for involvement in development at pre-application stage, although understandable, is not something that can be insisted upon and seems somewhat misplaced.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Paragraph 5 amended to reflect the comments made.</p> <p>References updated in the Plan, to reflect the comments made.</p> <p>Map 1b replaced by a more detailed map, to reflect the comments made.</p> <p>References updated in the Plan, to reflect the comments made.</p> <p>References to climate change have been removed from the plan</p> <p>Objective 1 updated by removing the word "sufficient".</p> <p>Objective 2 updated to clarify the need by adding the phrase "smaller 2 to 3 bed dwellings."</p> <p>Objective 5 updated by removing the examples.</p> <p>The Steering Group has discussed these feedback comments in some depth, but believes this to be good practice for development proposals. It has been decided, therefore, to retain Objective 8.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Para 5 amended.</p> <p>Para 14 references updated</p> <p>Map 1b replaced.</p> <p>Para 57 references updated</p> <p>Para 67 updated.</p> <p>Objective 1 updated</p> <p>Objective 2 updated</p> <p>Objective 5 updated</p> <p>Objective 8 unchanged.</p>

STATUTORY CONSULTEES FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
<p>Paragraph 81: While the council does not dispute the potential benefit of community involvement in the pre-application stage planning of development, the wording of this paragraph should emphasise it is the community's desire and not a need.</p> <p>Policy 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the MNP is consistent in its use of the language that refers to the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment (LCA). Landscape recommendations are taken from the relevant Policy Zones. As such, Section 1b should not confuse 'character areas' which have different meanings within the LCA refer to Policy Zones Idle Lowlands 05 (IL05) and IL06. View 09 identified in Map 9a and under Section 1a is arguably compromised within the plan itself through the proposed allocation of the site listed in Policy 14. Section 3: The council has strong concerns about both the size and the shape of the proposed settlement break, relative to the function it is supposed to serve. It is considered that at its limit - adjoining the built-up areas of Mattersey Thorpe and Mattersey village - the extent of the break artificially constrains logical opportunities for the extension of the two settlements, including sites that clearly are available for development based on the evidence of the Site Assessment Report (NP12, 13 and 23). Although the MNP proposes to allocate sites for development, it should not restrict suitable development opportunities that may come forward at a later date - potentially as contingency sites, should the proposed allocations not come forward as anticipated. BDC's Planning Policy Team believe that the outlined area on Figure 1 (below) represents a more realistic settlement break - from the edge of the cemetery on the Mattersey side, to the overhead power/telegraph wires on the Mattersey Thorpe side.  <p>Figure 1: Suggested alternative settlement break</p>	<p>References updated in the Plan, to reflect the comments made by replacing the word "need" with "desire"</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Steering Group would expect a development proposal to deliver dwellings of a size and scale, which would not obscure Idle Valley when seen from View 09. Therefore, View 09 and Policy 14 have both been retained.</p> <p>Steering Group have discussed the size and shape of BDC's proposed revision to the settlement break (as outlined in red on Figure 1 below) and has concluded that the settlement break as contained within the plan should remain unchanged for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The existing boundary accounts for all proposed site developments within the Plan. The existing boundary would not 'restrict suitable development opportunities that may come forward at a later date', because the 'settlement break' could be revised in a future plan update, to reflect the developments that the community also wished to include in that plan update, following the usual plan consultation and feedback process. Figure 1's northern boundary extends beyond the River Idle, (which is the northern boundary to Mattersey parish) and infringes upon part of Everton Parish. 	<p>Para 81 updated.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Plan unchanged.</p> <p>'Settlement break' unchanged.</p>

STATUTORY CONSULTEES FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
<p>Character Appraisal: This is a detailed and useful addition to the plan.</p>	Noted	Noted.
<p>Policy 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o For the benefit of Development Team Case Officers, consider fragmenting this into a few more concise policies or make the layout clearer, with a clear shared set of common design principles for both Mattersey and Mattersey Thorpe, followed by settlement specific criteria. o Section 2d: While we acknowledge the recommendations of the Landscape Character Assessment Policy Zone IL07, where sites are well contained development should not be restricted to construction materials solely reflecting the traditional vernacular. This approach may risk stifling innovative design in the village - particularly where developers may have ambition for more energy efficient developments. Modern architecture can contribute a depth of character to an area by being distinctive and of its time. 	<p>Policy 2 has been reworked to more logically categorise design principles into those which are common to both settlements, followed by Mattersey Thorpe settlement specific, then Mattersey village-specific .</p> <p>All sections of Policy 2 (including Section 2d) have been revised to reflect the specific feedback regarding materials, received from the Conservation Office,</p>	<p>Policy 2 reworked.</p> <p>Section 2d revised.</p>
<p>Paragraph 108: This is a useful definition of infill development and should potentially be incorporated in to the wording of Policy 3.</p>	Reference to the definition within this paragraph has been included in Policy 3.	Policy 3 amended.
<p>Policy 3: Spelling error in criterion b - '...the setting of the listed buildings ...'</p>	<p>Corrections made.</p> <p>An additional paragraph 106 was added at the request of BDC. Mattersey Thorpe is classed within "All Other Settlements", where 'infill development' is not permitted. Therefore , in order to prevent breach of planning rules, a paragraph was added in order to make plain that Mattersey Thorpe is excluded from the policy.</p>	<p>Policy 3 corrected.</p> <p>Para 106, page 41 added.</p>
<p>Chapter 15: For this section of the Draft MNP the Planning Policy Team defers to any comments made by the council's Conservation Team.</p>	Noted.	Noted.
<p>Policy 5: The Council supports the aspiration of this policy.</p>	Noted.	Noted.
<p>Policy 6: Section 1: Consider rewording section 1 of the policy to put emphasis on the specific deliverables/aspirations of the community. Including text in brackets suggests that it is incidental to the preceding text. Wording along the lines of - Particular support will be given to development proposals that support the provision of ...'</p>	Policy 6 has been amended to reflect consultee comments.	Policy 6 amended.
<p>Policy 7: The designation of the proposed Local Green Spaces is supported in principle, under the provisions of the NPPF. However, it is felt that in designating this area as a LGS it reinforces this area as a green buffer between the main part of the built form and the wider countryside.</p>	<p>The community have repeatedly expressed the desire to protect these valued spaces, hence the designation as 'Local Green Spaces', but the community have also expressed a 69% majority view in favour of site NP18 development on the northern boundary of 'The Green', providing that it is sensitive to the character and setting of the surrounding rural area.</p>	Noted.
<p>Chapter 19/Policy 8: This section should both reference and take account of Bassetlaw District Council's Green Infrastructure Study (2010) and Nottinghamshire County Council's Rights of Way Management Plan 2018.</p>	Policy 8 has been amended to include the items referred to in the consultee comments.	Policy 8 amended.

STATUTORY CONSULTEES FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
<p>Site Allocations</p> <p>Proposals Map 13: An equivalent version of this map for Mattersey Thorpe should also be included in the MNP.</p> <p>Policy 9: It is considered that criterion a and b of Section 1 largely say the same thing.</p> <p>Policies 10, 11, 12, 13, 15 and 16: The council supports these proposed allocations.</p> <p>Policy 14: The Planning Policy Team raises an objection to the proposed allocation of land north of Newall Drive at Mattersey Thorpe for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In applying the site assessment criteria, as has consistently been done in our own Land Availability Assessment, we would regard this site as being distinctly separate from the existing continuous built form. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Idle Pastures, to the east of the site, is considered to be an individual building that is clearly detached from the continuous built-up area of the settlement; ○ The properties Idleside, Marlenter and the buildings beyond, to the west of the site, are considered to be gardens, and agricultural buildings/associated land on the edge of the settlement where land relates more to the surrounding countryside than to the built-up area of the settlement. • Map 9a suggests that the view southwards is an important view that should be preserved. However, it is considered that the view to the north, across the Idle Valley is of greater significance. On the basis of Draft Policy 1 of this plan, development of this site would not conserve and reinforce the open rural character of Policy Zone IL07. Views towards the church at Everton should be preserved. 	<p>Agreed - Mattersey Thorpe sites (Map 19) has been added on page 64, prior to the site-specific details.</p> <p>Agreed - Section 1a has been deleted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted, but the Steering Group disagree and wish to retain the site within the plan for the reasons outlined below.</p> <p>Idle Pastures is currently separated by a plot of land, but the buildings follow the same western boundary (Wavell Crescent) and eastern boundary -agricultural field. The plan compilation identified the intervening plot on Wavell Crescent, for development at an early stage of consultation, (which had community approval), but was removed following site assessment consultee feedback that the site was within a Flood Zone. That site was at the top of Wavell Crescent, the highest point in the parish and level with Mattersey Church spire !</p> <p>The properties are residential dwellings with large gardens, similar to many properties with large gardens within the parish. It is unclear how BDC draws the distinction between a 'house with garden' or a "garden with house". This feels like an arbitrary distinction.</p> <p>Map 9a (p.28) does NOT suggest the view southward is an important view ie View 09 is the view northwards across the Idle Valley towards Everton as suggested by the consultee; View 31 is the view eastwards across 'The Green'; Views 32 & 33 are views westwards overlooking the playing field. The community have also expressed a 69% majority view in favour of site NP18 development within Policy 14, providing that it is sensitive to the character and setting of the surrounding rural area and does not obstruct the northern view of the Idle Valley and Everton as seen from 'The Green'.</p>	<p>Map 19 added</p> <p>Policy 9 amended.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Site retained within the plan.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>Conclusion</p> <p>In summary, the council welcomes the positive approach to new development adopted by the Draft Mattersey Neighbourhood Plan. The Council's Planning Policy Team will be happy to discuss any of the identified issues with the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group should it be pertinent to do so.</p>	<p>Noted, with thanks.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

STATUTORY CONSULTEES FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
<p>Michael Tagg, Conservation Officer Bassetlaw District Council</p>		
<p>Paragraph 27 Mattersey village is split between the distinctive historic core along Main Street and Abbey Road, with modern elements along Retford Road, Job Lane, Priory Close and Thorpe Road. A Conservation Area was designated on the 16th June 2010, encompassing the village's historic core. A Designation Statement was produced by BDC following the designation. An extract from the description of Mattersey village is included at Appendix E..</p>	<p>Suggested wording in red accepted - plan amended as a result.</p>	<p>Para 27 amended.</p>
<p>Paragraph 29 There are 25 listed buildings and 1 scheduled ancient monument in the parish. The significance of these 'designated heritage assets' is discussed on Historic England's website ...</p>	<p>Suggested wording in red accepted - plan amended as a result.</p>	<p>Para 29 amended.</p>
<p>Page 31 . Table . Settlement Pattern Thorpe Road, part of Main Street and Abbey Road run parallel to the river. Retford Road, Everton Road and part of Main Street run perpendicular. Development is mostly contained within these streets. The lines of the streets are clearly discernible with the front of buildings either facing or being gable-end onto the street. Late-20th century housing developments in the form of cul-de-sacs are not reflective of the overall character.</p>	<p>Suggested wording in red accepted - plan amended as a result.</p>	<p>Page 31 amended.</p>
<p>"The houses on Retford Road present a hard-fronted edge to the village with the road and house frontages facing the open countryside. Priory Close provides a more usual soft transition to the open countryside with rear gardens that fade into the wider landscape setting." - <i>This make very little sense! Both roads are 20th century suburban layouts which do not reflect the pre-20th century rural character of the historic core of the village, but are at least of a regular size and orientation. Perhaps reconsider the wording of this paragraph?????</i></p>	<p>Page 31 Table - Settlement Pattern, 2nd paragraph reworded to reflect consultee comments.</p>	<p>Page 31 amended.</p>
<p>Page 32 . Table . Conservation Area "The street scene is largely intact with clusters of good buildings along with listed structures. The form of the Conservation Area is a key resource for designers looking to embed local character." <i>Again this paragraph makes little sense. Perhaps replace with something like: Within the Conservation Area, traditional building forms and plot layouts contribute to the distinctive character of this part of the village. Historic buildings, plots and materials within this area provide a palette which should inform future development in the Conservation Area and in its immediate surroundings.</i></p>	<p>Page 32 Table - Conservation Area. Suggested wording in red accepted - plan amended as a result.</p>	<p>Page 32 amended.</p>

STATUTORY CONSULTEES FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
<p>Page 32 - Streets and Spaces "... are located at the edge of the village..."</p> <p>Page 33 . Plots Historic plots within the village are generally rectangular in shape and orientated perpendicular to the road. The larger plots are along Main Street, with a mix of small and large buildings. Most historic buildings are sited close to the road, although a number of plots feature buildings set well back.</p> <p>Regular plots with front gardens and on-site parking should be encouraged. New development should seek to reflect traditional plot layouts in the village, being regular in their form and orientation.</p> <p>New buildings should reflect the traditional layout of buildings within the village, either being sited parallel or perpendicular to the road, whilst retaining, where possible, an active edge to the street with windows (and doors where appropriate) overlooking the frontage.</p> <p>Page 33 - Boundaries and Landscape The predominant boundary treatment within Mattersey is red brick walls with brick, tile or stone copings. Boundary hedges are also common. New development should be encouraged to include traditional red brick walls around boundaries, of an appropriate design, scale and brick bond, to help reinforce this element of local character. Existing boundary treatments should be maintained and the removal of walls and hedge to allow for more parking should where possible be resisted</p> <p>Page 33 - Buildings and Materials The majority of historic buildings within Mattersey are constructed from local red brick, with non-interlocking natural red clay pantiles used on the roofs. A number of buildings are also rendered, although much of the render dates to the 20th century. A small number of buildings have a Magnesian Limestone facing. Natural slate and plain clay tiles are also found, especially on earlier 20th century buildings. Traditional brick bonds, such as Flemish, English garden wall or Flemish stretcher, are found throughout the Conservation Area. Stretcher bond is used on buildings dating to the mid-20th century onwards. Timber windows and doors are found throughout the historic core. Traditional window lintels, such as true brick arches or natural stone, in addition to verge/eaves corbelling, are also commonplace.</p> <p>Pages 34, 35 & 36 Please reconsider these pages based on my comments relating to Pages 31-33.</p>	<p>Page 32 Table - Streets and Spaces. Suggested wording in red accepted - plan amended as a result.</p> <p>Page 33 Plots. Suggested wording in red accepted and replaces the 3 paragraphs in the plan, as a result.</p> <p>Page 33 Boundaries and Landscapes. Suggested wording in red accepted and replaces the paragraph in the plan, as a result.</p> <p>Page 33 Buildings and Materials. Suggested wording in red accepted and replaces the paragraph in the plan, as a result.</p> <p>Page 36 Buildings and Materials. "multi-grain red brick and red clay pantiles" replaced with "traditional red brick and non-interlocking natural red clay pantiles" in the plan.</p>	<p>Page 32 amended.</p> <p>Page 33 amended.</p> <p>Page 33 amended.</p> <p>Page 33 amended.</p> <p>Page 33 amended.</p> <p>Page 36 amended.</p>

STATUTORY CONSULTEES FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
<p>Page 39 . Policy 2 . Design Principles 2a: This is too prescriptive and actually doesn't reflect buildings in the historic core, which are mostly located close to the road edge. Perhaps reconsider, something like: reflect traditional plot sizes, building locations and building orientations.</p> <p>2d and 3e: <i>Avoid the use of "multi-grain red brick". Use "traditional red brick" instead.</i></p> <p>3a: Presenting an active edge to the street with windows (and doors where appropriate) overlooking the frontage.</p> <p>Page 41 . Policy 3 . Infill and Redevelopment in Mattersey Parish 1a: the scheme is in keeping with the character of the area, particularly in relation to historic development patterns, plot sizes, building forms and building layouts; and</p> <p>1b: the scheme does not detract from the setting of a listed building, the character, appearance or setting of the Conservation Area or the significance of a non-designated heritage asset; and</p> <p>1c: new boundary treatments reflect traditional boundary treatments of the area.</p> <p>2. Proposals that include smaller dwellings on infill sites that are within a safe walking distance of local amenities will be encouraged, subject to an appropriate design, layout, siting and materials.</p>	<p>Policy 2 : Suggested wording in red accepted and replaces the paragraph in the plan, as a result. Policy 2 has been reworked to more logically categorise design principles into those which are common to both settlements, followed by Mattersey Thorpe settlement specific, then Mattersey village-specific. Item 2a has become item 4a.</p> <p>Suggested wording in red accepted - plan amended as a result.</p> <p>Suggested wording in red accepted - plan amended as a result. Item 3a has become item 5a.</p> <p>Suggested wording in red accepted - plan amended as a result</p> <p>Suggested wording in red accepted - plan amended as a result</p> <p>Suggested wording in red accepted - plan amended as a result</p> <p>Suggested wording in red accepted - plan amended as a result</p>	<p>Policy 2 page 40 amended.</p> <p>Policy 2 page 40 amended.</p> <p>Policy 2 page 40 amended.</p> <p>Policy 3 page 42 amended.</p> <p>Policy 3 page 42 amended.</p> <p>Policy 3 page 42 amended.</p> <p>Policy 3 page 42 amended.</p>
<p>Page 42 . Policy 4 . Development Affecting Heritage Assets "1. Applications for development will only be supported within the Mattersey Conservation Area where the proposals are of a high design quality and where such development meets the following criteria:</p> <p>a) it is in keeping with the character of the area particularly in relation to historic development patterns, plot sizes, building forms and building orientations; and</p> <p>b) the design preserves and where possible enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of nearby Listed Buildings and</p> <p>c) the materials used should be in keeping with the character of surrounding development, particularly with respect to the use of traditional red brick and non-interlocking natural red clay pantiles.</p>	<p>Suggested wording in red accepted - plan amended as a result</p> <p>Suggested wording in red accepted - plan amended as a result</p> <p>Suggested wording in red accepted - plan amended as a result</p>	<p>Policy 4 page 44, item 1a amended.</p> <p>Policy 4 page 44, item 1b amended.</p> <p>Policy 4 page 44, item 1c amended.</p>

STATUTORY CONSULTEES FEEDBACK	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE	ACTION FOR THE PLAN
<p>2. Where applicable, development adjacent to the Conservation Area should not detract from its setting. Care should be taken to ensure that building forms, materials and boundary treatments reflect the local vernacular.</p> <p>3. The effect of a proposal on the significance of non-designated heritage assets, including their setting, will be taken into consideration when determining planning applications. Applications that are considered to be harmful to the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, especially full demolition, will require a clear and convincing justification.</p> <p>Page 60 . Map 18 This should be land "west" of Main Street, and not east.</p> <p>Page 61 . Policy 13 . Land west of Main Street</p> <p>"1. Permission will be granted for residential development on the site shown on Map 18 where the applicant can demonstrate;</p> <p>a) a high design quality that responds positively to its immediate setting with ascale, appearance, layout, building orientation, boundary treatment and means of access that does not harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and</p> <p>b) is in keeping with the character of the Conservation Area in relation to materials used (traditional red brick and non-interlocking natural red clay pantiles or natural slate); and</p> <p>c) the layout allows for gaps between the houses to afford views of the church - <i>Remove this sentence. Leaving large gaps between buildings would fail to preserve the Conservation Area's character, as the site would appear more like a suburban cul]de]sac. In addition, it is unlikely the church would be visible from most of the site anyway. Planned views of the church are along main roads or elevated vantage points. This site is neither.</i></p> <p>Page 74 The site is within the Conservation Area and is in an area of archaeological interest.</p> <p>I trust these comments are of use. I will respond to the character appraisal and site allocation report separately.</p>	<p>Suggested wording in red accepted - plan amended as a result</p> <p>Suggested wording in red accepted - plan amended as a result</p> <p>Correction made.</p> <p>Correction made.</p> <p>Suggested wording in red accepted - plan amended as a result</p> <p>Suggested wording in red accepted - plan amended as a result</p> <p>Sentence removed, as per consultee comments</p> <p>Site Constraints amended to reflect consultee comments</p>	<p>Policy 4 page 44, item 2 amended.</p> <p>Policy 4 page 44, item 3 amended.</p> <p>Map 18 corrected</p> <p>Policy 13, page 63 corrected</p> <p>Policy 13, page 63 corrected</p> <p>Policy 13, page 63 corrected</p> <p>Policy 13, page 63 corrected</p> <p>Policy 13, page 63 corrected</p> <p>Site 22 constraints, page 90 amended.</p>