

Collingham Neighbourhood Plan



Consultation Statement

June 2026

Prepared to accompany the submission of the Collingham Neighbourhood Plan under Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012

Prepared by OpenPlan on behalf of Collingham Parish Council

Contents

1. Introduction and statutory purpose
 2. The Neighbourhood Plan area and plan-making process
 3. Consultation approach
 4. Early community engagement and evidence gathering
 5. Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation
 6. Summary of representations received
 7. How the issues and concerns were considered and addressed
 8. Conclusion
- Appendix A1: Consultation activities
- Appendix A2: Consultation Photos
- Appendix B: Organisations consulted at Regulation 14 stage
- Appendix C1: Regulation 14 response and action schedule
- Appendix C2: Report and Recommendations regarding Regulation 14 responses and actions

1. Introduction and statutory purpose

This Consultation Statement has been prepared by OpenPlan on behalf of Collingham Parish Council, the qualifying body for the Collingham Neighbourhood Plan. It accompanies the submission of the Collingham Neighbourhood Plan to Newark and Sherwood District Council, the Local Planning Authority, under Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Regulation 15 requires a Consultation Statement to accompany a submitted neighbourhood plan. In practical terms, the statement must identify who was consulted, explain how they were consulted, summarise the main issues and concerns raised, and describe how those issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the submitted plan.

This Statement should be read alongside the Submission Draft Collingham Neighbourhood Plan, the Basic Conditions Statement, the evidence base and the full Regulation 14 representations.

Regulation 15 compliance summary

Regulation 15 requirement	Where addressed in this Statement
Details of the persons and bodies consulted	Sections 4, 5 and 6; Appendix B and Appendices C1 and C2 identify the community, statutory bodies, neighbouring parishes and other organisations consulted, and the bodies/respondents who made representations.
Explanation of how they were consulted	Sections 3, 4 and 5 and Appendices A1 and A2 describe and illustrate surveys, community events, focus groups, publicity through Fleet magazine, notice boards, Facebook, the Parish Council website and direct Regulation 14 consultation.
Summary of main issues and concerns raised	Section 6 and Appendices C1 and C2 summarise the principal issues raised by Newark and Sherwood District Council, National Highways, Network Rail, land/site promoters and residents.
Description of how issues were considered and addressed	Section 7 and Appendices C1 and C2 explain how the issues were assessed and how the Submission Draft was amended or why no change was made.

2. The Neighbourhood Plan area and plan-making process

The Collingham Neighbourhood Plan relates to the whole of Collingham Parish, including Collingham Village, Brough, Danethorpe and Danethorpe Hills. The Neighbourhood Area was formally designated by Newark and Sherwood District Council on 12 October 2020.

The Plan has been prepared by and for the local community through Collingham Parish Council and a Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. The Submission Draft states that the Plan has been informed by surveys and questionnaires, community engagement events, focus groups, informal engagement with residents and groups, and evidence relating to housing, design, heritage, green infrastructure, flood risk, transport, community facilities and the local economy.

The Plan period is 2025-2036. The Plan is intended to provide local planning policies for the designated Neighbourhood Area and, if successful at examination and referendum, to form part of the statutory development plan for the area.

3. Consultation approach

The consultation approach was designed to combine broad community engagement with more focused topic-based work and formal statutory consultation. Engagement took place over several stages, including early awareness raising, surveys, community events, focus-group work, policy consultation and the formal Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation.

The approach sought to reach:

- residents across Collingham Parish, including those in Collingham Village and the surrounding rural parts of the parish;
- local businesses and organisations;
- statutory consultees and infrastructure/service providers whose interests could be affected by the Plan;
- neighbouring parish councils; and
- landowners, site promoters and other parties with an interest in development in or near the Neighbourhood Area.

The main engagement methods used during the plan-making process included:

- public and community events;
- household, business and estate-agent surveys;
- community focus groups covering key policy themes;
- articles and notices in Fleet magazine;
- website, Facebook and notice-board publicity;
- direct consultation with statutory and other consultation bodies at Regulation 14 stage; and
- formal review of all representations received before preparing the Submission Draft.

4. Early community engagement and evidence gathering

Early engagement was used to raise awareness of the Neighbourhood Plan, identify local priorities and build the evidence base. A survey questionnaire was circulated to every household, businesses and local estate agents. It received 253 household responses, 18 business responses and five estate-agent responses.

The survey and early engagement identified several themes that subsequently shaped the Plan, including sustainable development and climate change, housing mix and affordability, design and heritage, access and transport, community facilities, green spaces, local services, business needs and the character of Collingham.

Focus groups then examined key topics and helped translate community priorities into objectives and draft policies. The topics were:

- Sustainability and Environmental Well-being;
- Design and Heritage;
- Accessibility, Transport and Communications;
- Community Amenities and Facilities;
- Future Housing Needs;
- Business and the Local Economy.

A summary of the recorded consultation activities and events is included in Appendix A1.

5. Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation

A formal Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation on the draft Collingham Neighbourhood Plan was undertaken between 2 February 2026 and 16 March 2026. This provided a six-week period for local residents, businesses, statutory consultees and other interested bodies to comment on the draft Plan before it was amended prior to submission to Newark and Sherwood District Council.

The Regulation 14 consultation was publicised through notice boards, Facebook, the Parish Council website and Fleet magazine. The February 2026 Fleet article told residents that the draft Neighbourhood Plan was out for

consultation and explained that the next stage involved checks and comments by the public, Newark and Sherwood District Council and statutory bodies over a six-week period.

The formal consultation included:

- publicity to people living, working and carrying on business in the Neighbourhood Area;
- consultation with Newark and Sherwood District Council as the Local Planning Authority;
- consultation with statutory bodies and other organisations whose interests could be affected;
- consultation with neighbouring parishes and parish meetings; and
- consideration of representations submitted online or directly in response to the consultation.

The organisations consulted at the Regulation 14 stage are listed in Appendix B.

6. Summary of representations received

All Regulation 14 responses were reviewed and analysed. Plan-specific comments were received from Newark and Sherwood District Council, National Highways, Network Rail, agents acting for C T Sheldon Ltd, and four online responses from residents or local interests. Several ‘standard’, no-comment or no-objection responses were also received from consultees including Historic England, Natural England, National Gas Transmission, The Coal Authority and Canal & River Trust.

The main points raised are summarised below. A fuller response and action schedule is provided in Appendices C1 and C2.

Respondent / category	Main issues and concerns
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Broadly positive about the effort and intent of the Plan, but raised a number of drafting, evidence, presentation and policy-conformity/justification points, especially concerning Policies E1, DH1, CF2, HE1 and parts of the Design Code.
National Highways	Confirmed that the Plan does not introduce new development sites or transport-related policies likely to affect the strategic road network and had no further comments.
Network Rail	Drew attention to the Cross Lane level crossing/diversion road work, supported the direction of Policy ATC2, and asked for early engagement and mitigation where development affects the railway or level crossings.
C T Sheldon Ltd / agents	Supported the draft Plan in general but promoted land bounded by the A1133, West Brook Lane and the Newark-Lincoln railway line for a small rural enterprise/employment hub.
Online response 1 / equestrian interest	Supported much of the Plan but sought stronger and more consistent recognition of equestrians, byways, multi-user routes, route continuity and suitable surfacing/planting/street furniture.
Online response 2	Raised concerns about full-fibre provision to existing properties, highway maintenance, policing, flood risk, green infrastructure, village identity and museum/history provision.
Online response 3	Supported the draft overall but considered that practical responses to flooding and High Street traffic/pedestrian issues should be stronger, and that arts, culture, creative activity and performance space should be recognised.
Online response 4	Strongly supported the Plan overall, highlighted local business and housing/community contributions, sought more support for small flexible workspace and promoted land east of the A1133 for mixed employment/housing development.

Respondent / category	Main issues and concerns
Standard / no comment / no objection responses	Historic England, Natural England, National Gas Transmission, The Coal Authority and Canal & River Trust either raised no objection, provided standard comments or had no substantive plan-specific comments requiring change.

7. How the issues and concerns were considered and addressed

The representations did not identify any fundamental flaw in the Plan's strategy. However, several responses identified amendments that would improve clarity, proportionality, evidence alignment and examination robustness. The Parish Council's approach was therefore to accept or largely accept technical and policy-drafting improvements, make proportionate amendments where justified, and avoid major post-Regulation-14 changes that would require new comparative evidence and /or further consultation.

The principal outcomes were:

- Straightforward drafting, numbering, figure/table, hyperlink, terminology, NPPF-reference, evidence-reference and SPD-title corrections were accepted and incorporated where appropriate.
- Policy SD1 was made more proportionate by referring to the spatial strategy and other relevant development plan policies and applying criteria according to the scale, nature and location of proposals.
- Policy E1 was substantially reworked to retain a strong climate-change direction while avoiding unsupported technical standards, duplication of Building Regulations or overly rigid EV/cycle requirements.
- Policy E2(b) was amended so that the Biodiversity Net Gain requirement clearly reflects statutory exemptions.
- Policy E3 was clarified so that detailed Public Right of Way expectations apply where development affects, creates, diverts or improves routes, rather than implying every proposal must alter the wider network.
- Policy E4 was refined to make the Lead Local Flood Authority role clearer and to focus on managing flood risk without imposing a single technical approach in every case.
- Policy DH1 was revised to support the Collingham Local Centre in a way that aligns with the wider development plan, the sequential approach and impact considerations.
- Policy CF2 was amended to distinguish Main Open Areas from ordinary replaceable open-space typologies.
- Policy HE1 and HE2 were revised to make housing mix and affordable housing wording more proportionate and better linked to evidence and wider development plan policy.
- Policy ATC5 was recast to focus on relevant development and feasible, proportionate high-speed digital connectivity rather than imposing an absolute requirement on all development.
- The Plan remained non-allocating in relation to new employment or mixed-use sites because this was the Parish Council's preferred approach, and late inclusion of promoted sites would require comparative site assessment, deliverability work, technical review and further consultation.
- Some matters raised by residents, such as community safety, existing-property broadband, museum/history provision, arts and culture and detailed equestrian-management issues, were treated as better suited to supporting text, community aspirations or implementation activity rather than development-management policy.

Appendices C1 and C2 record how each representation was considered and whether changes were made or no direct policy change was required (it is phrased as recommendations, all of which were agreed)

8. Conclusion

This Consultation Statement demonstrates that Collingham Parish Council has undertaken proportionate and meaningful consultation during the preparation of the Collingham Neighbourhood Plan. The process included early community engagement, survey work, focus-group activity, community events, publicity through local communication channels and a formal Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation lasting six weeks.

The Statement identifies who was consulted, explains how consultation was undertaken, summarises the main issues and concerns raised and describes how those issues and concerns were considered and, where relevant, addressed in the Submission Draft Plan.

It is therefore considered that the Consultation Statement satisfies the requirements of Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 and it is submitted to accompany the formal submission of the Collingham Neighbourhood Plan to Newark and Sherwood District Council.

Appendix A1: Consultation activities

The following table summarises the consultation activities and evidence.

Date	Event / activity	How residents / consultees were involved
	Launch of Neighbourhood Plan project	Presentation at Memorial Hall to introduce the Neighbourhood Plan project and begin public awareness work.
February 2023	Resident survey	Survey material was prepared to collect resident views to inform the Neighbourhood Plan.
November 2023	Further surveys	More focused surveys targeting businesses, residents and school pupils
April 2024	Platinum Field Opening Event	Neighbourhood Plan surveys and aspirations discussed with residents
April 2024	Community Fair	Neighbourhood Plan surveys and aspirations discussed with residents
December 2024	Focus Group WhatsApp community launched, with groups covering Housing, Local Economy & Business, Sustainability & Environmental Wellbeing, Design & Heritage, Community Services & Facilities/Amenities, Accessibility and Transport & Communications	Focus Groups assessed and researched evidence base
January 2025	Focus group feedback considered and translated into draft policies/objectives	Feedback from focus groups was examined and transformed into policies and objectives.
January 2025	AECOM Design Code site visit	Fleet February 2025 article reports the AECOM desktop study and village walkabout.
Feb / Mar 2025	Publicity for Neighbourhood Plan consultation sessions	Residents were told about consultation sessions and invited to attend to submit comments on draft policies including environment, highways, housing and community facilities.
March 2025	Drop-in / consultation events on draft Plan policies	Residents received a letter and were able to attend consultation sessions and comment on the Plan's draft policies. Several venues around the village, including Gusto House and the Youth & Community Centre

Date	Event / activity	How residents / consultees were involved
Mar / Apr 2025	Consultation feedback considered	The Parish Council reported that residents' suggestions from the Neighbourhood Plan consultations had been noted and, where possible, included in the relevant documentation.
5 April 2025	Community Fair attendance	Neighbourhood Plan progress discussed with residents
Apr / May 2025	Draft Plan nearly complete	Residents were informed that the draft Plan, shaped by local voices and priorities, was nearly complete and would shortly be submitted to NSDC, with further public engagement before referendum.
September 2025	Collingham Show	Engaged with residents on progress
January 2026	Regulation 14 consultation arrangements confirmed	Consultation commenced on 2 February 2026 and close on 16 March 2026, with publicity via notice boards, Facebook, website and the Fleet.
2 Feb – 16 Mar 2026	Regulation 14 pre-submission public consultation	Formal six-week consultation with the local community, NSDC as statutory consultee and relevant consultation bodies; publicity through notice boards, Facebook, website and Fleet magazine.
February 2026	Fleet article: draft Plan out for consultation	Residents were told the draft Neighbourhood Plan was out for consultation and that the next stage involved checks and comments by the public, NSDC and statutory bodies for six weeks. Fleet February 2026 article summarised what neighbourhood plans do and thanks focus group and committee participants.
May 2026	Fleet article: Plan nearing completion	Residents were thanked for time, feedback and support given throughout the process and told that the Neighbourhood Plan was nearing completion.

**COLLINGHAM
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
DROP-IN CONSULTATIONS**



Sat 18th Jan	10am-12pm	Gusto House
Sat 1st Feb	10am-12pm	YCC, Low Street
Thu 13th Feb	6.30pm-8.30pm	Phoenix Hall
Wed 5th Mar	6.30pm-8.30pm	Memorial Hall
Sat 15th Mar	10am-12pm	YCC, Low Street
Sat 5th Apr	10.30am-1pm	Memorial Hall

FREE TEA, COFFEE & BISCUITS



Appendix B: Organisations consulted at Regulation 14 stage

The following organisations are identified in the consultation records as having been consulted at the Pre-Submission (Regulation 14) consultation stage.

Organisation	Organisation	Organisation	Organisation
Anglian Water	Besthorpe Parish Meeting	BT Group plc	Canal & River Trust
Carlton-on-Trent Parish Council	Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Team	Church of England	Collingham Parish Council
CPRE	Cromwell Parish Meeting	Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group	East Midlands Mayor
EE	Environment Agency	Eon UK PLC	Equality & Human Rights Commission
Friends, Families and Travellers	Gypsy Council (FFT)	Head of Planning and Local Authority Liaison	Historic England
Homes England	Lincolnshire County Council	Marine Management Organisation	Mining Remediation Authority
National Gas	National Grid UK	National Gypsy Council	Natural England
National Highways	Network Rail	Newark and Sherwood CVS	NHS
Norton Disney Parish Council	Norton Disney PC	Nottinghamshire County Council	Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Ofcom	Severn Trent Water	South Scarle Parish Council
Sport England	Stapleford PC	Sutton-on-Trent Parish Council	Swinderby Parish Council
The Environment Agency	The Georgian Group	The Homes and Communities Agency	The Woodland Trust
Three	Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board	Vodafone and O2	Winthorpe with Langford Parish Council

In addition, Holme Parish Meeting was identified as a body that would normally have required consultation but there was no Parish Meeting at the time.

Appendix C1: Regulation 14 response and action schedule

This table summarises the main Regulation 14 representations, how they were considered and how they were addressed in the Submission Draft. It should be read alongside the full representations and the detailed policy-revision material held by the Parish Council.

Respondent / category	Main issues raised	Consideration	How addressed in the Submission Draft
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Raised a sizeable set of presentational, evidence, drafting and policy issues. Key concerns included rigid or insufficiently justified wording and the need to revise Policies SD1, E1, E2(b), E3, E4, DH1, CF2, HE1, HE2, ATC5 and parts of the Design Code.	Mostly accept. Technical corrections and policy revisions were considered necessary to improve clarity, proportionality, evidence fit and examination robustness.	Plan amended. Straightforward corrections made; vulnerable policy wording softened or reworked; Design Code reviewed to distinguish requirements from guidance and align better with district guidance.
National Highways	Confirmed the Plan does not introduce new development sites or transport policies likely to affect the strategic road network and considered the contents a matter for local determination.	No action necessary. The response was recorded as a no-objection/no-comment representation based on the Plan remaining non-allocating.	No policy change. If future site allocations or stronger transport proposals affecting the A46/A1 corridor were introduced, re-consultation would be prudent.
Network Rail	Highlighted work to close Cross Lane level crossing and provide a diversionary road; supported Policy ATC2; asked for early engagement and developer-funded mitigation where future development affects railway assets or level crossings.	Accept in part. Policy framework did not require substantial change, but supporting text should record Network Rail's safety and engagement concerns.	Supporting text updated to acknowledge the Cross Lane level crossing/diversion road scheme and early engagement/mitigation requirements for proposals adjoining the operational railway or affecting level crossings.
C T Sheldon Ltd / agents	Promoted land bounded by the A1133, West Brook Lane and the Newark-Lincoln railway line for a small rural enterprise/employment hub, arguing that demand exists for flexible employment units and the site is sustainable and deliverable.	Do not accept allocation at this stage. The idea was not dismissed in principle, but adding a new allocation after Regulation 14 would require comparative site assessment, deliverability work, technical review and likely further consultation.	No allocation made. Criteria-based Policy HE3 retained and supporting text may recognise demand for small flexible business space without endorsing a specific site.
Online response 1 / British Horse Society or equestrian interest	Sought stronger and more consistent references to equestrians, multi-user routes, byways, route continuity, surfacing, planting, gates, street furniture and equestrian tourism.	Accept in part. The response identified useful inconsistencies, but some detailed suggestions were too specific or outside what should be controlled through neighbourhood plan policy.	Plan/supporting text amended where appropriate to include byways and consistent walking/cycling/equestrian language, and to clarify that surfacing, planting, boundaries and street furniture should be suitable for lawful users. Detailed product/maintenance requirements not added.

Respondent / category	Main issues raised	Consideration	How addressed in the Submission Draft
Online response 2	Raised concerns about existing-property broadband, highway maintenance, rural policing, flood risk, effects of past development on flooding/green infrastructure, loss of village identity and museum/history provision.	Mostly no direct policy change. Many points are outside direct land-use policy control or relate to community projects rather than development management. Flood and green infrastructure concerns were relevant to policy clarity.	No major policy change. Flood risk, biodiversity and green infrastructure policies retained and strengthened as appropriate. Other matters may be considered through community aspirations or implementation projects.
Online response 3	Praised the draft overall but considered its practical response to flooding and High Street traffic/pedestrian issues too weak, and sought recognition of arts, culture, creative activity and public performance space.	Accept in part. Flooding and High Street movement/public realm priorities could be made clearer in supporting text/implementation. Arts and culture are important but not suited to a new development-management policy without stronger evidence.	Supporting/implementation text strengthened where appropriate on High Street safety/public realm and flood-mitigation partnership work. Arts/culture recognised through supporting text or community aspirations rather than a new policy.
Online response 4	Strongly supported the Plan, highlighted local business/housing/community contributions, sought clearer support for small flexible workspace and promoted land east of the A1133 for a mixed employment-and-housing scheme.	Accept workspace point in part; do not accept allocation. Similar reasoning to C T Sheldon representation: late allocation would need robust comparative assessment and further consultation, especially given rail/level crossing sensitivities.	No allocation made. Supporting text to HE3 may more clearly recognise evidence of demand for small flexible workspace. Criteria-based employment policy retained.
Historic England, Natural England, National Gas Transmission, The Coal Authority, Canal & River Trust and similar standard/no-comment respondents	Provided standard responses, no objection or no substantive plan-specific comments requiring policy change.	Record responses. No issue requiring Plan amendment was identified from these representations.	No change necessary, subject to keeping standard consultee comments on file as part of the consultation record.

Appendix C2: Report and Recommendations regarding Consideration of Responses and Representations Received During the Pre-Submission Consultation on the Draft Collingham Neighbourhood Plan



Consideration of Responses and Representations Received During the Pre-Submission Consultation on the Draft Collingham Neighbourhood Plan

Prepared by Steve Kemp [BA, DipTP, MRTPI] , OpenPlan

1. Overview

- 1.1 I have now read and analysed all the responses to consultation on the “Pre-Submission “ draft of the Neighbourhood Plan. Those which made “plan-specific” comments were submitted by:
- Newark and Sherwood District Council;
 - National Highways;
 - Network Rail;
 - agents acting for C T Sheldon, and
 - four online responses from residents.

There were also several “standard”, “no comment” or “no objection” responses from some of the organisations that were consulted at this stage, including:

- Historic England;
- Natural England;
- National Gas Transmission;
- The Coal Authority;
- Canal and River Trust.

This report focuses on the plan-specific comments, providing summaries and my recommendations regarding amendments that you may wish to make before formally submitting the Collingham Neighbourhood Plan to the Local Planning Authority.

- 1.2 Overall, the representations have not identified any fundamental flaw in the Neighbourhood Plan’s strategy.

The response that seeks the most substantial changes is that from Newark and Sherwood District Council, which identifies quite a sizeable number of drafting, evidence and conformity issues that need to be given careful consideration. Most are fixable.

There are two site-promotion representations, which are a little more problematic, not because they are unreasonable to raise, but because adding a new allocation now would take the Plan into a different and riskier territory unless supported by proper comparative evidence, site assessment and likely further consultation.

- 1.3 Current government guidance also stresses that neighbourhood plan policies should be clear, precise, evidence-based, locally distinctive and deliverable, and should not simply duplicate or overreach beyond higher-tier policy.

2. Summary of responses and recommended actions

2.1 Newark and Sherwood District Council

Summary:

The District Council is broadly positive about the effort and intent behind the Plan, and says that most issues are minor and capable of positive resolution. However, it also raises a significant set of drafting, evidence and policy-conformity points, and warns that a revised national framework may affect the Plan depending on when it reaches Regulation 15/16 stage (submission to the Local Planning Authority). Its comments fall into four broad groups:

- presentational corrections;
- outdated or inaccurate references and evidence;
- policy wording that may be too rigid,
- unclear or insufficiently justified; and
- more substantial concerns about a few policies, particularly E1, DH1, CF2, HE1 and parts of the Design Code.

2.2 Recommended action:

Accept the great majority of NSDC's comments. In practice I would divide them into the following categories.

First, make all straightforward corrections without hesitation. That includes numbering errors, table and figure references, missing keys, broken hyperlinks, terminology corrections, inaccurate NPPF paragraph references, outdated census/ONS references, SPD titles, and similar presentational points. These are easily addressed and will materially improve the document, ready for independent examination.

Second, revise the policies that the District Council has identified as potentially too rigid or not sufficiently justified. In particular:

- **Policy SD1** should be made more proportionate by referring to the spatial strategy and other relevant development plan policies, and by making clear that criteria apply *as appropriate*, rather than implying every criterion must always be met.
- **Policy E1** should be substantially reworked. The safest course is to retain a strong climate-change direction, but avoid binding standards that may sit outside neighbourhood plan powers or duplicate building regulations and other regimes. The policy should encourage energy hierarchy principles, low-carbon design and renewable energy where appropriate, but the more prescriptive performance requirements, BREEAM-style expectations and some charging requirements should either be justified more carefully, softened, or moved into supporting text/design guidance.
- **Policy E2(b)** should be updated so that the 10% biodiversity net gain wording clearly excludes development that is legally exempt.
- **Policy E3** should be clarified so that detailed width/surface/accessibility expectations apply where development creates, diverts or materially affects a route, rather than implying all existing PROWs can be altered by every proposal. Some detailed requirements may be better expressed as expectations or guidance rather than absolute policy tests.
- **Policy E4** should be checked with the Lead Local Flood Authority, especially on run-off wording and the respective roles of the LLFA and Environment Agency.
- **Policy DH1** needs one of the more important amendments. To protect the village centre/local centre role, the policy should do so in a way that aligns with the existing development plan approach, including the sequential/impact framework, rather than by an over-broad "undermining" test.
- **Policy CF2** should be amended to remove the present treatment of *Main Open Areas*. The District Council is right that these are not the same as ordinary open spaces and have a different policy function in defining settlement form and structure. They should not be treated as if they are simply replaceable open-space typologies.

- **Policy HE1** should be revised quite substantially, to: clarify the threshold to which the housing mix applies; make the indicative mix genuinely indicative and broad rather than overly prescriptive; remove the proposed approach to withdrawing permitted development rights from smaller homes; tie countryside housing wording back to the relevant district-wide policy; and delete the “Nationally Described Space Standards” requirement unless there is a properly evidenced and legally secure basis for retaining it.
- **Policy HE2** should amend the rural exception wording, since exception sites are not, by definition, within the built-up area, and it should qualify any enabling market housing more tightly.
- **Policy ATC5** should be recast so it focuses on prioritising high-speed digital connectivity for relevant development, rather than imposing an absolute requirement on “all development,” which is considered too wide.

Third, the **Design Code** should be reviewed in the light of the District Council’s comments, which suggest that parts of it are currently too absolute, too numerical without clear evidence, or not well aligned with the district parking/cycle parking SPD. The most important actions are to distinguish clearly between code requirements and contextual guidance, remove or soften arbitrary-looking thresholds unless they can be evidenced, and align parking/cycle parking provisions with district guidance.

Finally, I recommend accepting the offer of a **meeting with the District Council’s officers** once all the Regulation 14 responses have been considered. That seems the most practical way to resolve the remaining points efficiently.

NOTE: A detailed review of the policies on which NSDC has been carried out and a set of recommended revised policies is attached for consideration as an Appendix to this report .

2.3 National Highways

Summary:

National Highways says that, because the Plan does not introduce new development sites or transport-related policies likely to affect the strategic road network, it has no further comments and considers the contents to be a matter for local determination.

Recommended action:

No action necessary at this stage. Record the response as a no-objection representation. The only caveat is practical rather than formal: if the Parish Council were now to introduce a new site allocation or materially stronger transport proposals with implications for the A46/A1 corridor, it would be prudent to re-consult National Highways because their present response is plainly based on the Plan in its current non-allocating form. That is an inference from their letter, rather than something they spell out.

2.4 Network Rail

Summary:

Network Rail draws attention to work to close Cross Lane level crossing and provide a diversionary road; supports the direction of Policy ATC2 on public transport connectivity; is willing to work with the Parish and District Councils on access and connectivity improvements at Collingham station; and asks that any future windfall, infill or employment development near the railway or a level crossing be subject to early engagement and, where necessary, mitigation funded by the developer.

Recommended action:

Accept in part and amend supporting text. The policy framework does not need any substantial revision, but I recommend:

- updating the evidence/supporting text to acknowledge the Cross Lane level crossing/diversion road scheme, phrased carefully so it does not become date-sensitive too quickly;
- adding a short supporting-text reference, probably under ATC1/ATC2/E3 or implementation text, stating that proposals adjoining the operational railway or affecting level crossings should engage Network Rail early and address safety/mitigation where relevant;

- keeping a note that any later site allocation near the railway would require direct discussion with Network Rail.

2.5 C T Sheldon Ltd

Summary:

This representation supports the draft Plan in general but asks the Parish Council to allocate land bounded by the A1133, West Brook Lane and the Newark–Lincoln railway line for a small rural enterprise/employment hub. The submission argues that there is demand for small flexible employment units, that the site is well-related to the village, sustainably accessible, capable of being landscaped with on-site BNG, and suitable for phased growth. It also accepts that the site lies outside the settlement envelope and seeks to justify it as a special case.

Recommended action:

My advice is not to add this as a formal allocation at this stage. That is not because the idea is necessarily unsound; it is because introducing a new allocation after Regulation 14, when the draft Plan currently says there are no further allocated employment sites, would require a much fuller evidence base and a properly comparative assessment against alternatives. The present policy HE3 already supports small-scale employment uses outside existing or allocated employment areas where they are well related to the settlement and have acceptable impacts.

The most prudent course is, therefore:

- note the representation and thank the representor;
- make no allocation now;
- retain a criteria-based approach through HE3 – with some amendment of wording if necessary;
- possibly strengthen supporting text under HE3 to recognise the consultation evidence of demand for small flexible business space, without endorsing a specific site.

If the Parish Council is minded to allocate the site, that would need to be treated as a more substantial post-Regulation-14 change and should only proceed after site assessment, deliverability work, transport/highway/rail/flood/ecology review, likely screening review, and probably a further focused round of consultation. Given that another respondent also promotes a different edge-of-village site, there is currently no fair or robust basis at present for choosing one promoted site over another. Guidance emphasises that neighbourhood plan policies and allocations need to be evidence-based and deliverable.

2.6 Online response 1 (British Horse Society / equestrian interest)

Summary:

This respondent supports the Vision and Objectives and most of the policy direction, but asks for stronger and more consistent inclusion of equestrians and multi-user routes in SD1, E1, E2(a), E3, DH1, ATC1, ATC3, CF2 and HE3. The main themes are: clearer meaning of “enhancement” for PRoW; inclusion of byways as well as bridleways; better route continuity; avoiding surfacing changes that disadvantage riders; careful treatment of planting, gates and street furniture; and recognising equestrian tourism and equestrian use as part of wider active-travel/multi-user provision.

Recommended action:

Accept in part. Rewriting the Plan around equestrian issues is not recommended, because it already includes equine routes in ATC1 and refers to bridleways elsewhere. But the response does usefully expose some inconsistencies and some opportunities for clearer drafting.

The most worthwhile amendments would be:

- add “byways” where the Plan currently lists relevant route types if omission appears accidental;
- make sure references to walking/cycling/equestrian access are used consistently across E2, E3 and ATC1;
- in supporting text, clarify that surfacing, planting, street furniture and boundary treatments on routes should be appropriate to the lawful users of the route and should not unnecessarily prejudice equestrian use where that use exists or is intended.

I would **not** recommend adopting some of the more detailed suggestions as policy requirements. In particular, I would not insert route-surface product preferences, nor a requirement that renewable-energy proposals must provide new bridleways, nor detailed text about maintenance charges for residents. Those points are either too detailed, too tenuously related to the development in question, or outside what is sensible to control through neighbourhood plan policy. So this is a 'partial-accept / no-action-on-detail' response. Current guidance favours clear, locally justified and deliverable policy wording rather than over-detailed standards unless well evidenced.

2.7 Online response 2

Summary:

This respondent raises concerns about full-fibre provision to existing properties, poor highway maintenance, rural policing, flood risk, the impact of some previous developments on flooding and green infrastructure, loss of village identity, and lack of a stronger museum/history offer.

Recommended action:

This response should mostly be recorded as raising wider community concerns rather than points that require major policy amendment. My recommendations are:

- **no substantive policy change** in response to the comments on policing, existing-property broadband, highway maintenance, or museum expansion, because these are either outside the direct scope of land-use planning or not matters that a neighbourhood plan can effectively require through policy;
- however, consider whether some of these issues should be captured in a short **Community Aspirations / Implementation / Projects** section if the Parish Council wants the Plan to reflect them more visibly. The draft itself already acknowledges that some matters sit outside direct planning policy and are better dealt with as community aspirations.
- on the flood risk / green infrastructure concerns, I would **not** introduce site- or developer-specific text aimed at named existing development unless there is robust evidence and a clear planning reason to do so. The better response is to ensure the final flood risk, biodiversity and green infrastructure policies are strong, clear and defensible.

2.8 Online response 3

Summary: This respondent praises the draft overall but says the Plan's practical response to flooding and High Street traffic/pedestrian issues is too weak, and also criticises the absence of any meaningful recognition of arts, culture, creative activity or a suitable public performance space.

Recommended action:

Accept in part. I would not fundamentally redraft the transport and flood policies solely because of this representation, but the point is well made that the Plan could be more explicit about what it is trying to achieve on High Street movement/public realm and on flood mitigation. That could be addressed by:

- strengthening supporting text and perhaps implementation wording around High Street safety/public realm priorities and flood-mitigation partnership work; and
- considering one short additional paragraph in the community facilities, economy or implementation sections recognising the value of arts, culture and creative activity in village life and the local economy.

I would be cautious about trying to create a new development-management policy specifically for arts facilities unless there is stronger evidence and a clear land-use handle. A **community aspiration / implementation project** is probably the better home for that idea.

2.9 Online response 4

Summary:

This respondent is strongly supportive of the Plan overall, highlights the company's contribution to housing, community facilities, and argues that the Plan should more clearly support small flexible workspace and consider allocating land east of the A1133 between the railway crossing and the built-up area for a mixed employment-and-housing scheme.

Recommended action:

Again, my advice is **do not add a specific allocation now**. The point about demand for small, flexible workspace is useful and consistent with both the C T Sheldon representation and the Plan's own evidence base on small business demand. That part could legitimately be reflected a little more clearly in the supporting text to HE3. But the request for a specific mixed-use allocation should, in my view, be **not accepted at this stage**. The same reasons apply as with the Sheldon site: the draft Plan is not currently allocation-led in this respect; another site is also being promoted; Network Rail has flagged sensitivity around railway and level crossing impacts; and a late change of this kind would require much fuller evidence and likely further consultation.

3. Cross-cutting recommendations

The recommended overall course now is:

- A.** Make the straightforward drafting, numbering, evidence and reference corrections.
- B.** Substantially revise the small group of policies where NSDC has identified real conformity or justification risks, especially E1, DH1, CF2, HE1 and parts of ATC5/E3.
- C.** Keep the Plan non-allocating in relation to new employment or mixed-use sites unless the Parish Council is willing to do the extra evidence and consultation work that would be necessary to justify that shift.
- D.** Use the supporting text and Community Aspirations for matters that are important but do not meet the criteria for inclusion in/as land-use policies, such as arts/culture, existing-property broadband, community safety, museum/history expansion, and some of the more detailed equestrian-management points. The draft Plan already recognises that some issues belong in Community Aspirations rather than policy.
- E.** Accept the invitation to meet the District Council's officers once all the Regulation 14 responses have been considered and the Steering Group has settled its initial responses to the representations.
- F.** Prepare a full Regulation 14 response schedule that records, for each representation, the issue raised, the Parish Council's response, and whether the Plan is amended. At submission stage, the Consultation Statement must set out who was consulted, how they were consulted, summarise the main issues and concerns raised, and describe how those issues were considered and, where relevant, addressed. In practical terms, the responses could helpfully be classified like this:
 - **Accept / mostly accept:**
 - NSDC technical corrections and policy-drafting changes;
 - Network Rail station/rail-safety points.
 - **Accept in part:**
 - British Horse Society/equestrian response;
 - the arts/culture elements of online response 3;
 - the flexible workspace point in online response 4.
 - **No action necessary or no direct policy change:**
 - National Highways;
 - most of online response 2;
 - requests for new site allocations from C T Sheldon and the Gusto-related response, unless the Parish Council chooses to reopen site assessment and consultation.

Collingham Neighbourhood Plan: Appendix

Recommended Policy Revisions in Response to NSDC's Comments of the Regulation 14 Draft

Policy SD1 – Delivering Sustainable Development

Here is the **recommended policy text**, revised in response to NSDC's comments.

1. **Spatial context**

Development within the Collingham Neighbourhood Area will be supported where it accords with the spatial strategy and other relevant policies of the Newark and Sherwood Development Plan.

2. **Sustainable development considerations**

Support will be provided for development proposals where they positively address the following considerations, as appropriate to the scale, nature and location of the proposal:

- a) **Design quality** – the proposal is informed by the Collingham Design Code and respects local character, scale, materials and landscape setting;
- b) **Flood risk** – the proposal incorporates appropriate measures to manage surface-water and fluvial flood risk, consistent with Policy E4 and other relevant guidance, ensuring no increased risk on or off site;
- c) **Blue and green infrastructure** – the proposal protects and, where practicable, enhances Collingham's network of green spaces, watercourses, trees and public rights of way, supporting biodiversity, recreation and climate resilience;
- d) **Access and movement** – the layout enables safe, convenient and inclusive access for walking, cycling and public transport and seeks to minimise unnecessary reliance on private cars;
- e) **Community wellbeing** – the proposal contributes positively to community wellbeing through good design, access to open space and a healthy living environment;
- f) **Agricultural land** – the proposal avoids the unnecessary loss of best and most versatile agricultural land, unless there are overriding planning benefits that clearly justify that loss; and
- g) **Infrastructure and mitigation** – where the proposal generates a need for infrastructure, services or other mitigation, these are addressed in a manner proportionate to the development and consistent with relevant Development Plan policy and guidance.

Analysis of the recommended revisions

The table below explains how the current draft wording of Policy SD1 has been reviewed and revised in response to NSDC's specific comments.

Policy SD1: Delivering Sustainable Development

Existing wording	Proposed new wording	Reason for change
Introduction 6.7 “The aim of this policy is to ensure that all development in Collingham contributes positively to environmental, social, and economic sustainability and aligns with the strategic policies of the Newark & Sherwood Local Plan.”	“The aim of this policy is to ensure that development in Collingham contributes positively to environmental, social and economic sustainability and aligns with the spatial strategy and other relevant policies of the Newark and Sherwood Development Plan.”	This aligns the introductory framing with NSDC's preferred wording and with the revised policy language.
1. Spatial context “Development within the Collingham Neighbourhood Area will be	1. Spatial context “Development within the Collingham Neighbourhood Area will be supported where it accords with the	This adopts NSDC's suggested wording almost exactly. It is more precise than “strategic

Existing wording	Proposed new wording	Reason for change
supported where it accords with the strategic settlement hierarchy and other relevant policies of the Newark & Sherwood Development Plan.”	spatial strategy and other relevant policies of the Newark and Sherwood Development Plan.”	settlement hierarchy” because it captures the wider spatial strategy, not just the hierarchy.
2. Opening sentence “Proposals for development will be supported where they demonstrate that all of the following requirements are met:”	2. Sustainable development considerations “Support will be provided for development proposals where they positively address the following considerations, as appropriate to the scale, nature and location of the proposal:”	This is the key change. It answers NSDC’s point that not all criteria will always be relevant and that the current wording is too rigid.
2(a) “Design quality – “The proposal complies with the Collingham Design Codes and respects local character, scale, materials, and the landscape setting; and”	“a) Design quality – the proposal is informed by the Collingham Design Code and respects local character, scale, materials and landscape setting;”	“Complies with” is slightly rigid in a broad umbrella policy. “Is informed by” sits better with the more proportionate structure of SD1 while still giving the Design Code weight.
2(b) “Flood risk – The scheme incorporates appropriate measures to manage surface- and fluvial-flood risk, consistent with Policy E1 – Flood Risk and other applicable guidance, ensuring no increased risk on or off-site; and”	“b) Flood risk – the proposal incorporates appropriate measures to manage surface-water and fluvial flood risk, consistent with Policy E4 and other relevant guidance, ensuring no increased risk on or off site;”	This corrects the cross-reference to the flood-risk policy, which is E4 , not E1, and slightly tidies the wording.
2(c) “Blue-Green Infrastructure – The development protects and, where practicable, enhances Collingham’s integrated network of green spaces, watercourses, trees, and public rights of way, supporting biodiversity, recreation, and climate resilience; and”	“c) Blue and green infrastructure – the proposal protects and, where practicable, enhances Collingham’s network of green spaces, watercourses, trees and public rights of way, supporting biodiversity, recreation and climate resilience;”	Minor drafting tidy-up only.
2(d) “Access and movement – The layout enables safe, convenient, and inclusive active-travel and public-transport access and seeks to minimise reliance on private cars; and”	“d) Access and movement – the layout enables safe, convenient and inclusive access for walking, cycling and public transport and seeks to minimise unnecessary reliance on private cars;”	Slightly clearer and more natural phrasing.
2(e) “Community wellbeing – The proposal contributes to the social wellbeing of residents through good design, access to open space, and a healthy living environment; and”	“e) Community wellbeing – the proposal contributes positively to community wellbeing through good design, access to open space and a healthy living environment;”	Minor drafting improvement only.
2(f) “Agricultural land – Development avoids the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1–3a) unless there are overriding planning benefits that outweigh this loss; and”	“f) Agricultural land – the proposal avoids the unnecessary loss of best and most versatile agricultural land, unless there are overriding planning benefits that clearly justify that loss;”	Slightly more measured and decision-focused wording.
2(g) “Developer contributions – Where a need for infrastructure or community facilities arises, the development provides for these on-site wherever practicable, consistent with the District Council’s Planning Obligations SPD.”	“g) Infrastructure and mitigation – where the proposal generates a need for infrastructure, services or other mitigation, these are addressed in a manner proportionate to the development and consistent with relevant Development Plan policy and guidance.”	This makes the final limb less legalistic and avoids over-specifying on-site provision in all cases. It also better reflects the umbrella nature of SD1.

Policy E1 – Climate Change & Carbon Emissions

Here is the **recommended policy text**, revised in response to NSDC's comments.

1. **Energy hierarchy and low-carbon design**

Development proposals that, where appropriate to their scale, type and location, seek to reduce carbon emissions and support climate-change mitigation will be supported. In doing so, proposals should have regard to the following energy hierarchy:

- a) reducing energy demand through siting, orientation, layout, fabric-first measures and passive design;
- b) improving energy efficiency through the choice of materials, building fabric and building services; and
- c) incorporating renewable and low-carbon energy technologies where these are appropriate to the proposal and compatible with other relevant Development Plan policies.

2. **Supporting higher environmental performance**

Proposals that go beyond minimum regulatory requirements in order to reduce operational carbon emissions, improve energy efficiency, or achieve recognised standards of environmental performance will be supported, provided that they are appropriate to the scale and nature of the development and do not conflict with other relevant Development Plan policies.

3. **Electric vehicle charging and cycle provision**

Where appropriate to the scale and nature of the development, proposals should incorporate electric vehicle charging infrastructure and secure cycle parking/storage in accordance with the latest relevant Building Regulations, the Newark and Sherwood Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards and Design Guide SPD, and any other relevant local or national guidance.

4. **Renewable and low-carbon energy generation**

Proposals for renewable or low-carbon energy generation will be supported where they do not result in unacceptable adverse effects on:

- a) landscape character or the settlement setting;
- b) the significance or setting of heritage assets;
- c) residential amenity;
- d) biodiversity or the green infrastructure network; or
- e) highway safety.

Where relevant, proposals should also have regard to the NSDC Wind Energy SPD and any other relevant local or national guidance.

Analysis of the recommended revisions

The table below explains how the current draft wording of Policy E1 has been reviewed and revised in response to NSDC's specific comments.

Policy E1: Climate Change & Carbon Emissions

Existing wording	Proposed new wording	Reason for change
1. Energy efficiency and the Energy Hierarchy "Development proposals will be supported where they demonstrate how the design has applied the Energy Hierarchy by: a) Reducing energy demand through orientation, layout, fabric-first measures, and passive design; b) Improving energy efficiency through high-performance materials and systems; and c) Using low-carbon and renewable energy technologies where compatible with other development plan policies. Supporting note: The Energy Hierarchy is defined in the Newark & Sherwood Local Plan and associated guidance."	1. Energy hierarchy and low-carbon design "Development proposals that, where appropriate to their scale, type and location, seek to reduce carbon emissions and support climate-change mitigation will be supported. In doing so, proposals should have regard to the following energy hierarchy: a) reducing energy demand through siting, orientation, layout, fabric-first measures and passive design; b) improving energy efficiency through the choice of materials, building fabric and building services; and c) incorporating renewable and low-carbon energy technologies where these are appropriate to the proposal and compatible	This changes the policy from a requirement to demonstrate application of the energy hierarchy to a more proportionate policy that encourages proposals to follow it, which is exactly what NSDC recommends. It also removes the unsupported statement that the Energy Hierarchy is defined in the Newark and Sherwood Development Plan, which NSDC directly questioned.

Existing wording	Proposed new wording	Reason for change
2. Building performance standards “a) Residential development New-build dwellings should demonstrate very high energy performance, meeting or exceeding the prevailing Building Regulations and relevant Local Plan requirements. Proposals that achieve net-zero operational carbon through fabric-first design and on-site renewable energy will be supported. b) Non-residential development Non-residential development proposals are encouraged to achieve accredited environmental performance standards such as BREEAM ‘Very Good’ or above, where practicable and proportionate to the scale and nature of the development.”	with other relevant Development Plan policies.” 2. Supporting higher environmental performance “Proposals that go beyond minimum regulatory requirements in order to reduce operational carbon emissions, improve energy efficiency, or achieve recognised standards of environmental performance will be supported, provided that they are appropriate to the scale and nature of the development and do not conflict with other relevant Development Plan policies.”	This removes the most vulnerable part of the current policy: wording that appears to set independent energy-performance standards through the neighbourhood plan. NSDC’s concern is that there may be no proper statutory basis for a neighbourhood plan to impose such standards, and that the lower end of the current wording duplicates Building Regulations. It also avoids anchoring the policy too heavily to BREEAM or other specific standards that may date quickly or become problematic under changing national policy.
3. Electric vehicle and cycle charging infrastructure “a) Residential development must provide: i. A minimum of one EV charging point per dwelling; and ii. Secure, covered cycle storage, in addition to any garage provision. iii. At least one electric cycle charging socket per dwelling (internal or external). b) Non-residential development must provide: i. A minimum of one EV charging point per 10 parking spaces (or part thereof); and ii. Secure cycle parking, with electric cycle charging facilities proportionate to the scale and use of the building.”	3. Electric vehicle charging and cycle provision “Where appropriate to the scale and nature of the development, proposals should incorporate electric vehicle charging infrastructure and secure cycle parking/storage in accordance with the latest relevant Building Regulations, the Newark and Sherwood Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards and Design Guide SPD, and any other relevant local or national guidance.”	NSDC says the current paragraph 3 goes significantly beyond the district SPD and lacks a clearly stated policy basis. This revision keeps the policy direction, but shifts it from a rigid locally set standard to a proportionate requirement aligned with the Council’s adopted SPD and other relevant guidance.
4. Low-carbon and renewable-energy proposals “Proposals for renewable or low-carbon energy generation will be supported where they meet all of the following criteria: a) They do not result in unacceptable adverse effects on landscape character or the settlement setting, having regard to the relevant Development Plan policies; b) They conserve or enhance the significance and setting of heritage assets; c) The scale and appearance of tall structures is appropriately assessed and mitigated; d) They do not result in unacceptable impacts on highway safety; and e) They demonstrate compliance with the NSDC Wind Energy SPD and any other relevant national or district guidance.”	4. Renewable and low-carbon energy generation “Proposals for renewable or low-carbon energy generation will be supported where they do not result in unacceptable adverse effects on: a) landscape character or the settlement setting; b) the significance or setting of heritage assets; c) residential amenity; d) biodiversity or the green infrastructure network; or e) highway safety. Where relevant, proposals should also have regard to the NSDC Wind Energy SPD and any other relevant local or national guidance.”	This retains the substance of the current policy, but slightly improves it by making the wording cleaner and more rounded. I have added residential amenity and biodiversity/green infrastructure, which sit naturally within a climate/energy policy and help avoid an overly narrow assessment framework. The change from “demonstrate compliance” to “have regard to” is also more proportionate and consistent with the overall softening needed in E1.
Explanatory notes 6.16–6.18 “This policy encourages designs that minimise carbon emissions through layout, passive design, and renewable technologies where appropriate... Requirements for EV points and cycle parking support district-wide sustainable transport objectives...” etc.	Replace with: “This policy supports development that helps to address climate change in a way that is proportionate, locally relevant and consistent with the wider Development Plan. It encourages applicants to follow a simple energy hierarchy: first reduce energy demand through good design, then improve efficiency, and then incorporate renewable or low-carbon technologies where appropriate. The policy does not seek to duplicate or replace Building Regulations, nor to	The explanation needs to reflect the new approach: supportive, proportionate, non-duplicative, and clearly tied to the district SPD rather than trying to invent separate local technical standards through the neighbourhood plan. This directly addresses the main thrust of NSDC’s concerns.

Existing wording	Proposed new wording	Reason for change
	impose separate technical standards that are more appropriately dealt with through national legislation or district-wide policy. Instead, it supports development that responds positively to climate-change mitigation and adaptation, and gives positive support to schemes that voluntarily achieve higher standards of environmental performance. The provision of electric vehicle charging and cycle parking/storage should be addressed in a manner proportionate to the scale and type of development, having regard in particular to the Newark and Sherwood Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards and Design Guide SPD. Proposals for renewable and low-carbon energy generation should be assessed against the full range of relevant planning considerations, including landscape, heritage, biodiversity, amenity and highway safety.”	

Policy E3 – Public Rights of Way & Wildlife Corridors

Here is the **recommended policy text**, revised in response to NSDC's comments.

1. Protection and integration of Public Rights of Way

Development proposals that affect an existing Public Right of Way, or that create new or diverted routes, will be supported where they:

- a) retain, protect or appropriately incorporate the route and maintain its continuity and character;
- b) integrate Public Rights of Way as part of multifunctional green infrastructure, contributing to access, biodiversity, landscape quality and recreation; and
- c) provide improvements to connectivity, accessibility, safety or surface condition where these are proportionate to the scale and nature of the development.

2. Design principles for new, diverted or improved routes

Where a development proposal creates a new Public Right of Way, diverts an existing route, or includes improvements to a route as part of the development, the route should, where appropriate:

- a) provide sufficient width for its intended users and for ongoing maintenance;
- b) include verges, vegetated margins or naturalised edges that help the route contribute to biodiversity and the wider green infrastructure network; and
- c) use surfaces and gradients suitable for the intended users, taking account of accessibility, local character and the sensitivity of rural or heritage settings.

3. Alignment and design of new or diverted PROWs

Where development creates new Public Rights of Way or diverts existing ones, proposals should, where possible:

- a) align routes through green spaces, landscape corridors or open-space areas, rather than estate roads, unless no reasonable alternative exists;
- b) maximise natural surveillance, connectivity to other paths, and integration with blue and green infrastructure;
- c) provide planting, trees or hedgerows, where appropriate, consistent with the Collingham Design Code (2025), to enhance amenity and ecological value; and
- d) set out appropriate arrangements for the long-term management and maintenance of routes within the development.

Analysis of the recommended revisions

The table below explains how the current draft wording of Policy E3 has been reviewed and revised in response to NSDC's specific comments.

Policy E3: Public Rights of Way & Wildlife Corridors

Existing wording	Proposed new wording	Reason for change
Introduction / purpose: "This policy seeks to conserve and enhance the multifunctional use and extent of PROWs, ensuring they function as safe, accessible movement routes and effective wildlife corridors within Collingham's Green Infrastructure network."	"This policy seeks to conserve and enhance the role of Public Rights of Way within development proposals, recognising their importance for access, recreation, landscape character and biodiversity as part of Collingham's wider Green Infrastructure network."	This slight recast better aligns the policy with development management. It makes clear that the policy is about how development proposals should respond to PROWs, rather than implying that the neighbourhood plan is imposing a technical management regime over the whole existing network.
1. Protection and enhancement of Public Rights of Way "Development proposals will be supported where they: a) retain existing Public Rights of Way, including footpaths, cycle routes and bridleways, and maintain their continuity and character; b) incorporate PROWs as multifunctional	1. Protection and integration of Public Rights of Way "Development proposals that affect an existing Public Right of Way, or that create new or diverted routes, will be supported where they: a) retain, protect or appropriately incorporate the route and maintain its continuity and character; b)	This makes the policy more precise by linking it to development that affects an existing PROW or creates a new/diverted one. That avoids suggesting every proposal must somehow deal with existing routes it does not touch.

Existing wording	Proposed new wording	Reason for change
green infrastructure, contributing to access, biodiversity, landscape quality and recreation; and c) deliver improvements to surface quality, accessibility, connectivity, or safety where proportionate to the scale and nature of the development.”	integrate Public Rights of Way as part of multifunctional green infrastructure, contributing to access, biodiversity, landscape quality and recreation; and c) provide improvements to connectivity, accessibility, safety or surface condition where these are proportionate to the scale and nature of the development.”	
2. Width, accessibility and biodiversity value “Development proposals must demonstrate that existing or proposed PROWs: a) Provide sufficient width to accommodate safe and inclusive access for all users and appropriate maintenance requirements; b) Include vegetated margins or naturalised edges that contribute to the functioning of the route as a wildlife corridor; and c) Use surfaces and gradients consistent with inclusive-access standards, except where this would harm the character of rural or heritage settings.”	2. Design principles for new, diverted or improved routes “Where a development proposal creates a new Public Right of Way, diverts an existing route, or includes improvements to a route as part of the development, the route should, where appropriate: a) provide sufficient width for its intended users and for ongoing maintenance; b) include verges, vegetated margins or naturalised edges that help the route contribute to biodiversity and the wider green infrastructure network; and c) use surfaces and gradients suitable for the intended users, taking account of accessibility, local character and the sensitivity of rural or heritage settings.”	This is the main change needed. It removes the reference to existing PROWs in this paragraph, as NSDC suggests, and changes the paragraph from a rigid technical requirement to a more proportionate set of design principles applying when development actually creates, diverts or improves a route. That answers NSDC’s concern that the policy basis should otherwise be explained or the requirements expressed as aspirations.
3. Alignment and design of new or diverted PROWs “Where development creates new PROWs or diverts existing ones, proposals should: a) Prioritise alignments that run through green spaces, landscape corridors or open-space areas, and avoid estate roads unless no reasonable alternative exists; b) Align routes to maximise natural surveillance, connectivity to other paths, and integration with Blue and Green Infrastructure; c) Provide planting, trees or hedgerows consistent with the Collingham Design Code (2025) to enhance amenity and ecological value; and d) Set out arrangements for long-term management and maintenance of PROWs within the development.”	3. Alignment and design of new or diverted PROWs “Where development creates new Public Rights of Way or diverts existing ones, proposals should, where possible: a) align routes through green spaces, landscape corridors or open-space areas, rather than estate roads, unless no reasonable alternative exists; b) maximise natural surveillance, connectivity to other paths, and integration with blue and green infrastructure; c) provide planting, trees or hedgerows, where appropriate, consistent with the Collingham Design Code (2025), to enhance amenity and ecological value; and d) set out appropriate arrangements for the long-term management and maintenance of routes within the development.”	This directly picks up NSDC’s point that paragraph 3 should be softened to “should, where possible” . It also slightly tidies the wording so that it reads more like a development-management policy and less like an absolute technical code.
Explanatory notes 8.14–8.16 Current text says PROWs are important amenities and wildlife corridors and includes fairly specific wording about width, hard-surfaced width, maintenance and accessibility for a range of users.	Revise explanatory text to say: “This policy applies where development affects an existing Public Right of Way, or where new, diverted or improved routes are proposed as part of development. It is not intended to require every development proposal to alter or upgrade the wider PROW network. The policy supports development that protects route continuity and, where opportunities arise through development, secures proportionate improvements to accessibility, connectivity, biodiversity value and long-term management. Expectations relating to width, surfacing, planting and accessibility should be applied proportionately, having regard to the users of the route, the location, local character and any relevant highway or rights-of-way guidance.”	This explanatory change is important because it supplies the policy basis that NSDC felt was missing. It also clearly states that the detailed expectations are to be applied proportionately , which should make the policy more defensible.

Policy E4 – Flood Risk

Here is the **recommended policy text**, revised in response to NSDC's comments.

1. **Location and flood risk assessment**

- a) Development proposals must follow the sequential approach set out in national policy and the Newark and Sherwood Development Plan, directing development to areas of lowest flood risk wherever feasible.
- b) Proposals located within Flood Zones 2 or 3, or in areas identified as being at risk from surface-water flooding, must be accompanied by a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) that:
 - i. demonstrates that the development will be safe for its lifetime, taking account of all potential sources of flooding and climate-change allowances;
 - ii. does not increase flood risk elsewhere; and
 - iii. incorporates appropriate flood-resistance and flood-resilience measures, having regard to national guidance and to the advice of relevant risk-management bodies, where applicable.

2. **Extensions and changes of use in higher-risk areas**

Alterations, extensions or changes of use within Flood Zones 2 or 3 will be supported where the FRA demonstrates that:

- a) the development maintains or improves the safety of occupants;
- b) appropriate flood-resilient construction and design measures are included; and
- c) the proposal will not lead to increased flood risk on or off site.

3. **Surface water management**

- a) Development proposals must demonstrate that surface-water run-off will be managed so as not to increase flood risk on or off site. Surface-water discharge rates and volumes should, where feasible and appropriate, be limited to greenfield run-off rates, unless an alternative approach is agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority and is supported by site-specific evidence.
- b) Proposals must demonstrate, using relevant national and local flood-risk evidence, that they do not increase surface-water flood risk within the site or elsewhere.

4. **Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)**

- a) All major development, and other development where relevant to flood and drainage considerations, must incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) unless demonstrated to be inappropriate.
- b) SuDS should be designed to provide multiple benefits, including:
 - effective surface-water management;
 - biodiversity enhancement and habitat creation;
 - improved public amenity and landscape value; and
 - contribution to the blue and green infrastructure network.
- c) SuDS should be designed with reference to the Non-Statutory Technical Standards, the guidance of the Lead Local Flood Authority, and the Collingham Design Code (2025), where relevant.

Analysis of the recommended revisions

The table below explains how the current draft wording of Policy E4 has been reviewed and revised in response to NSDC's specific comments.

Policy E4: Flood Risk

Existing wording	Proposed new wording	Reason for change
Policy purpose / framing: current policy presents a strong but fairly rigid framework on flood location, FRA content, surface-water run-off and SuDS.	No formal title change, but recast internal wording to be more clearly aligned with the roles of the LLFA and other relevant bodies.	The main issue here is not the policy objective, which is sound, but the allocation of technical responsibility and the degree of rigidity in the surface-water wording.
1(a) Location and flood risk assessment “Development proposals must follow the sequential approach set out in national policy and the Newark & Sherwood Local Plan, locating development in areas of lowest flood risk wherever feasible.”	Retain, with slight editing: “Development proposals must follow the sequential approach set out in national policy and the Newark and Sherwood Development Plan, directing development to areas of lowest flood risk wherever feasible.”	Only a modest tidy-up is needed here. “Development Plan” is slightly broader and neater than “Local Plan”.
1(b)(iii) “Incorporates appropriate resistance and resilience measures consistent with national and Environment Agency guidance.”	Replace with: “incorporates appropriate flood-resistance and flood-resilience measures, having regard to national guidance and to the advice of relevant risk-management bodies, where applicable.”	This avoids over-specifying the Environment Agency in a way that may blur responsibilities, while still allowing EA advice to be relevant where fluvial flooding or other matters within its remit arise.
2. Extensions and changes of use in higher-risk areas “Alterations, extensions or changes of use within Flood Zones 2 or 3 will be supported where the FRA demonstrates that: a) The development maintains or improves the safety of the occupants; b) Appropriate flood-resilient construction and design measures are included; and c) The proposal will not lead to increased flood risk on or off site.”	Retain, with no substantive change	This part is broadly sound and does not appear to be the focus of NSDC’s objection.
3(a) Surface water management “Development proposals must ensure that surface-water run-off rates and volumes do not exceed the existing greenfield run-off rate, unless otherwise agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA).”	Replace with: “Development proposals must demonstrate that surface-water run-off will be managed so as not to increase flood risk on or off site. Surface-water discharge rates and volumes should, where feasible and appropriate, be limited to greenfield run-off rates, unless an alternative approach is agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority and is supported by site-specific evidence.”	This is the key change. It keeps the ambition of controlling run-off, but makes the policy less mechanically absolute and more clearly rooted in discussion with the LLFA , as NSDC suggests. It also reflects the reality that greenfield rates are often the target, but site conditions may require a more nuanced approach.
3(b) Surface water flooding evidence “Proposals must demonstrate that they do not increase surface-water flood risk within areas mapped by the Environment Agency as susceptible to surface-water flooding.”	Replace with: “Proposals must demonstrate, using relevant national and local flood-risk evidence, that they do not increase surface-water flood risk within the site or elsewhere.”	This directly addresses NSDC’s concern. It removes the rather narrow and slightly awkward dependence on Environment Agency mapping in a surface-water context and instead refers more generally to relevant national and local flood-risk evidence , which can include EA mapping, LLFA evidence and any site-specific information as appropriate.
4(a) SuDS requirement “All major development and all other development where relevant must incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) unless demonstrated to be inappropriate.”	Retain, with slight editing: “All major development, and other development where relevant to flood and drainage considerations, must incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) unless demonstrated to be inappropriate.”	This is essentially sound and already proportionate.
4(b) Multi-functional SuDS current wording lists multiple benefits: effective surface-water management, biodiversity, amenity and blue-green infrastructure contribution.	No substantive change	This part is strong and should stay.

Existing wording	Proposed new wording	Reason for change
4(c) SuDS design references “SuDS should be designed with reference to the Non-Statutory Technical Standards, LLFA guidance, and the Collingham Design Code (2025).”	Retain, with slight editing: “SuDS should be designed with reference to the Non-Statutory Technical Standards, the guidance of the Lead Local Flood Authority, and the Collingham Design Code (2025), where relevant.”	This usefully reinforces the LLFA’s role and makes the line of responsibility clearer.
Explanatory notes 8.21–8.23 current explanatory text already says the County Council, as LLFA, will be the central point of reference for FRAs, while also referring to Environment Agency flood mapping.	Revise explanatory text to make clear: that surface-water drainage and run-off matters should be addressed in consultation with the LLFA; that relevant mapping and evidence may come from more than one source; and that the policy is concerned with outcomes — safety and no increased flood risk — rather than with imposing a single technical solution in every case.	The explanatory text should now explicitly answer the concern raised by NSDC and show that the policy is intended to operate through the appropriate technical authority.

Policy DH1 – Sense of Place

Here is the **recommended policy text**, revised in response to NSDC's comments.

1. Design quality and local character

Development proposals will be supported where they:

- a) respond positively to the local context, including settlement character, built form, landscape setting and the historic environment;
- b) deliver high-quality design that is functional, inclusive, visually coherent and adaptable over time;
- c) make efficient use of land and resources through layout, orientation, materials and construction methods, where appropriate to the scale and nature of the proposal; and
- d) contribute to the well-being of residents and users by providing safe, attractive, accessible and healthy environments.

2. Local Centre focus

Development proposals for uses within Class E. Commercial, Business and Service of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) should support and reinforce the role of the Collingham Local Centre as the principal focus for retail, commercial and community activity, having regard to the sequential approach and impact considerations set out in national policy and the Newark and Sherwood Development Plan.

Proposals located outside the Local Centre will be supported where they are consistent with those national and Development Plan policy tests and do not give rise to significant adverse impacts on the vitality or viability of the Local Centre.

Policy Co/LC/1 Collingham - Local Centre To promote the strength of Collingham as a Principal Village, a Local Centre has been defined on the Policies Map. Development of retail and other town centre uses within the Local Centre will be considered against the general policy requirements in the Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies in Chapter 7, with particular reference to DM Policy 11 Retail and Town Centre Uses.

3. Use of the Collingham Design Code

Development proposals should demonstrate how they have been informed by the Collingham Design Code (2025), where relevant to the type, scale and location of development proposed.

Proposals that depart from specific provisions of the Design Code may be supported where a clear design-led justification demonstrates that an equal or higher standard of design quality, character and placemaking would be achieved.

4. Design statements

Where a Design and Access Statement is required, or where design issues are central to the proposal, applicants should explain how:

- a) the proposal has been informed by the Collingham Design Code, where relevant;
- b) the design responds to local character and site context; and
- c) a high-quality, sustainable and inclusive design outcome has been achieved.

Analysis of the recommended revisions

The table below explains how the current draft wording of Policy DH1 has been reviewed and revised in response to NSDC's specific comments.

Policy DH1: Sense of Place

Existing wording	Proposed new wording	Reason for change
Introduction / purpose: "Policy DH1 seeks to ensure that all development in Collingham responds positively to local character, supports the role of the High Street and Village Centre, and delivers high-quality, inclusive and sustainable design in line with the Collingham Design Code."	"Policy DH1 seeks to ensure that development in Collingham responds positively to local character and delivers high-quality, inclusive and sustainable design in line with the Collingham Design Code. It also supports the role of the Collingham Local Centre as the main focus for retail,	This introduces the term Local Centre , which NSDC says should be used for consistency with the Development Plan. It also avoids setting up a centre policy in overly broad terms that may cut across existing retail-centre policy tests.

Existing wording	Proposed new wording	Reason for change
	commercial and community activity, in a manner consistent with the wider Development Plan.”	
1. Design quality and local character “Development proposals will be supported where it is demonstrated that they: a) respond positively to the local context, including settlement character, built form, landscape setting, and the historic environment; b) deliver high-quality design that is functional, inclusive, visually coherent, and adaptable over time; c) achieve energy-efficient and resource-efficient design through layout, orientation, materials and construction methods; and d) contribute to the well-being of residents by providing safe, attractive, accessible and healthy living environments.”	1. Design quality and local character “Development proposals will be supported where they: a) respond positively to the local context, including settlement character, built form, landscape setting and the historic environment; b) deliver high-quality design that is functional, inclusive, visually coherent and adaptable over time; c) make efficient use of land and resources through layout, orientation, materials and construction methods, where appropriate to the scale and nature of the proposal; and d) contribute to the well-being of residents and users by providing safe, attractive, accessible and healthy environments.”	Only modest drafting refinement is needed here. I have removed “it is demonstrated that” because it is unnecessary and slightly clumsy. I have also softened the energy/resource wording so it does not read like a technical performance standard. The substance is retained.
2. High Street and Village Centre focus “Development should: a) support and reinforce the primacy of the High Street and Village Centre as the focus for retail, commercial and community activity; and b) avoid creating dispersed clusters of commercial activity that would undermine the role, vitality or viability of the High Street and Village Centre.”	2. Local Centre focus “Development proposals for main town centre uses should support and reinforce the role of the Collingham Local Centre as the principal focus for retail, commercial and community activity, having regard to the sequential approach and impact considerations set out in national policy and the Newark and Sherwood Development Plan. Proposals located outside the Local Centre will be supported where they are consistent with those national and Development Plan policy tests and do not give rise to significant adverse impacts on the vitality or viability of the Local Centre.”	This is the key change. It directly addresses NSDC’s concern that the current wording is too absolute and does not reflect the reality that some proposals for main town centre uses may be justified outside the centre if sequentially preferable sites are unavailable and impacts are not significantly adverse. It also replaces “Village Centre” with Local Centre .
3. Use of the Collingham Design Code “a) All development proposals must demonstrate how they have been informed by and accord with the Collingham Design Code (2025). b) Proposals that depart from specific provisions of the Design Code will be supported only where a design-led justification demonstrates that an equal or higher standard of design quality, character and placemaking will be achieved.”	3. Use of the Collingham Design Code “a) Development proposals should demonstrate how they have been informed by the Collingham Design Code (2025), where relevant to the type, scale and location of development proposed. b) Proposals that depart from specific provisions of the Design Code may be supported where a clear design-led justification demonstrates that an equal or higher standard of design quality, character and placemaking would be achieved.”	This change makes the wording slightly more proportionate. “All development proposals must demonstrate...” is a little rigid, especially for very minor forms of development. “Where relevant” makes the policy easier to apply sensibly, while still giving the Design Code strong weight.
4. Design statements “Where a Design and Access Statement is required, or for other proposals where design matters are significant, applicants should provide a design statement explaining how: a) the proposal has been shaped by the Collingham Design Code; b) the design responds to local character and site context; and c) high-quality, sustainable and inclusive design has been achieved.”	4. Design statements “Where a Design and Access Statement is required, or where design issues are central to the proposal, applicants should explain how: a) the proposal has been informed by the Collingham Design Code, where relevant; b) the design responds to local character and site context; and c) a high-quality, sustainable and inclusive design outcome has been achieved.”	This is mostly a drafting tidy-up, improving readability and consistency with the revised wording above.
Explanatory text 9.2–9.4 “Guidance in both the National Planning Policy Framework ... This policy sets out the aspirations of the community...” etc.	Revise explanatory text to add: “The Collingham Local Centre is identified in the wider Development Plan as the main focus for retail, commercial and community activity. This policy supports that role, but does not seek to displace or duplicate the application of national and Development Plan policy	The explanatory text needs to make clear that the neighbourhood plan is supporting the Local Centre, not trying to create an alternative retail-centre policy regime. That is the essence of NSDC’s objection.

Existing wording	Proposed new wording	Reason for change
	relating to the sequential approach and impact assessment for main town centre uses. The purpose of the policy is therefore to reinforce the importance of the Local Centre in a way that is consistent with the wider planning policy framework. The Collingham Design Code remains a key material guide to achieving development that is locally distinctive, well designed and responsive to context.”	

Policy ATC3 – Highways Impact

Here is the **recommended policy text**, revised in response to NSDC's comments.

1. **Transport impacts and mitigation**

Development proposals will be supported where they demonstrate that they:

- a) provide safe and suitable access for all users, including pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users and vehicles;
- b) do not result in unacceptable residual cumulative impacts on the safety, capacity or operation of the highway network; and
- c) include appropriate measures to avoid, minimise or mitigate transport impacts arising directly from the development.

2. **Mitigation and contributions**

Where necessary to make development acceptable in planning terms, appropriate mitigation measures or developer contributions may be sought for highways, access and movement improvements related to the impacts of the proposal.

Such measures may include improvements to junctions, traffic management, public transport access, pedestrian and cycle connections, or safety enhancements.

Analysis of the recommended revisions

The table below explains how the current draft wording of Policy ATC3 has been reviewed and revised in response to NSDC's specific comments.

Policy ATC3: Highways Impact

Existing wording	Proposed new wording	Reason for change
Policy purpose / introduction: “Policy ATC3 seeks to ensure that development provides safe and suitable access for all users and mitigates any unacceptable impacts on the highways and movement network in Collingham.”	Retain with no substantive change	The purpose of the policy is sound and does not need altering.
1. Transport impacts and mitigation “Development proposals will be supported where they demonstrate that they: a) provide safe and suitable access for all users, including pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users and vehicles; b) do not result in unacceptable residual cumulative impacts on the safety, capacity or operation of the highway network; and c) include measures to avoid, minimise or mitigate any transport impacts directly arising from the development.”	Retain with slight editing: “Development proposals will be supported where they demonstrate that they: a) provide safe and suitable access for all users, including pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users and vehicles; b) do not result in unacceptable residual cumulative impacts on the safety, capacity or operation of the highway network; and c) include appropriate measures to avoid, minimise or mitigate transport impacts arising directly from the development.”	Only minor tightening is needed here. The main body of the policy is already well framed.
2. Developer contributions “Where a proposal generates transport impacts that cannot be fully addressed within the site, proportionate mitigation measures or developer contributions will be sought to ensure the development is acceptable in planning terms. Such measures must be: a) necessary to make the development acceptable; b) directly related to the development; and c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind, in accordance with the CIL Regulation 122 tests and the NSDC Developer Contributions and Planning Obligations SPD. Mitigation may include improvements to junctions, traffic management, public transport access, pedestrian and cycle connections, or safety enhancements.”	Replace with: “Where necessary to make development acceptable in planning terms, appropriate mitigation measures or developer contributions may be sought for highways, access and movement improvements related to the impacts of the proposal. Such measures may include improvements to junctions, traffic management, public transport access, pedestrian and cycle connections, or safety enhancements.”	This is the key change. It removes the detailed repetition of the legal planning-obligations tests and SPD wording, which NSDC says duplicates established practice and risks dating the policy. The revised wording keeps the principle, but expresses it more cleanly and at the right level.
Explanatory text 10.11 and following “The policy requires contributions to be sought from developers... The contributions are essential...” and “The District Council’s Planning Obligations SPD and Nottinghamshire County Council highway guidance provide further detail...”	Revise explanatory text to say: “The purpose of the policy is to ensure that development does not give rise to unacceptable impacts on the highway and movement network, and that suitable mitigation is secured where needed. The detailed operation of planning obligations and developer contributions is addressed through national policy and legislation, the District Council’s Planning Obligations SPD, and the requirements of the Highway Authority. This policy therefore does not repeat those detailed tests, but recognises that appropriate mitigation or contributions may be required where necessary to make development acceptable in planning terms.”	This makes the supporting text consistent with the simplified policy wording and directly answers NSDC’s criticism.

Policy ATC4 – Parking Standards

Here is the **recommended policy text**, revised in response to NSDC’s comments.

1. Assessing parking need for non-residential development

Non-residential development proposals will be supported where they demonstrate that the level of parking provision is:

- a) proportionate to the type, scale and operational needs of the development;
- b) informed by the site’s accessibility, including proximity to the village centre, public transport services, walking and cycling routes;

- c) reflective of the anticipated number of employees and visitors, including at peak times; and
 - d) consistent with the relevant standards and principles of the Highway Authority and with any applicable supplementary guidance.
2. **Parking design and layout**
 Parking associated with development should be designed to:
- a) integrate with local character, using materials, boundary treatments and layouts consistent with the Collingham Design Code (2025);
 - b) avoid harmful visual impacts on the streetscape and neighbouring properties;
 - c) reflect the relevant design principles in the Newark and Sherwood Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards and Design Guide SPD (2021), including support for well-integrated on-plot or forecourt parking where appropriate to the development and its context;
 - d) avoid, where possible, parking arrangements that would result in poorly overlooked or visually intrusive rear parking courts; and
 - e) be contained within the site and managed so as to prevent unacceptable overspill parking onto surrounding streets.
3. **Accessibility and active travel**
 Parking and servicing layouts should:
- a) maintain or enhance safe and direct access for pedestrians, cyclists and disabled users; and
 - b) integrate with wider active-travel and public realm improvements in accordance with Policies ATC1 and DH2.

Analysis of the recommended revisions

The table below explains how the current draft wording of Policy ATC4 has been reviewed and revised in response to NSDC's specific comments.

Existing wording	Proposed new wording	Reason for change
Introduction 10.12 "This policy seeks to ensure that that non-residential development in Collingham provides well-designed, appropriately located parking that meets operational needs without harming local character or causing overspill onto neighbouring streets, unattractive street scenes and increased highway safety issues."	"This policy seeks to ensure that non-residential development in Collingham provides well-designed, appropriately located parking that meets operational needs without harming local character, causing overspill onto neighbouring streets, or creating avoidable highway safety or streetscape problems. Parking design should also have regard to the relevant principles in the Newark and Sherwood Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards and Design Guide SPD (2021), where applicable."	This keeps the purpose of the policy but brings the SPD into the introduction, as NSDC recommends.
1. Assessing parking need for non-residential development "Non-residential development proposals will be supported where they demonstrate that the level of parking provision is: a) Proportionate to the type, scale and operational needs of the development; b) Informed by the site's accessibility, including proximity to the village centre, public transport services, walking and cycling routes; c) Reflective of the anticipated number of employees and visitors, including at peak times; and d) Consistent with relevant highway authority parking standards and good-practice guidance."	Retain with slight editing: "Non-residential development proposals will be supported where they demonstrate that the level of parking provision is: a) proportionate to the type, scale and operational needs of the development; b) informed by the site's accessibility, including proximity to the village centre, public transport services, walking and cycling routes; c) reflective of the anticipated number of employees and visitors, including at peak times; and d) consistent with the relevant standards and principles of the Highway Authority and with any applicable supplementary guidance."	This keeps the substance but broadens the final limb slightly so the SPD can be brought in explicitly through the explanation and paragraph 2.
2. Parking design and layout "Parking associated with development must: a) Be designed to integrate with local character, using materials, boundary treatments and layouts consistent with the Collingham Design Code (2025); b) Avoid harmful visual impacts on streetscape and neighbouring properties; c) Include a mixture of parking types (such as on-plot, courtyard, screened forecourt, or well-integrated on-street parking) where appropriate to the development and its context; and d) Be contained within the site and managed to prevent unacceptable	Replace with: "Parking associated with development should be designed to: a) integrate with local character, using materials, boundary treatments and layouts consistent with the Collingham Design Code (2025); b) avoid harmful visual impacts on the streetscape and neighbouring properties; c) reflect the relevant design principles in the Newark and Sherwood Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards and Design Guide SPD (2021), including support for well-integrated on-plot or forecourt	This is the main change. It directly answers NSDC's objection by: first, referring expressly to the SPD; second, aligning the policy with the SPD's preference for on-plot/visible parking solutions; and third, moving away from the current neutral reference to a "mixture of parking types," which could be read as giving equal support to parking courts. I have also

overspill parking onto surrounding streets.”	parking where appropriate to the development and its context; d) avoid, where possible, parking arrangements that would result in poorly overlooked or visually intrusive rear parking courts; and e) be contained within the site and managed so as to prevent unacceptable overspill parking onto surrounding streets.”	softened “must” to “should” because the detailed design of parking often needs to respond to context.
3. Accessibility and active travel “Parking and servicing layouts should: a) Maintain or enhance safe and direct access for pedestrians, cyclists and disabled users; and b) Integrate with wider active-travel and public realm improvements in accordance with Policies ATC1 and DH2.”	Retain with no substantive change	This part is sound and already well aligned with the wider movement/public realm policies.
Explanatory notes 10.13–10.15 “The policy sets parking standards for non-residential development proposals which have been adapted from national guidance in the NPPF... The Collingham Design Code provides detailed guidance on materials, boundary treatments, soft landscaping and the integration of parking courts or shared surfaces. The Local Highways Authority’s parking standards should be the baseline for assessing parking levels.”	Revise explanatory text to say: “Parking provision should reflect the operational needs of each proposal while supporting good design, active travel and highway safety. In assessing parking levels and parking design, regard should be had not only to highway authority standards but also to the Newark and Sherwood Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards and Design Guide SPD (2021), where applicable. That SPD supports a range of parking solutions but indicates a preference for on-plot parking arrangements, particularly where users can see their vehicles from within the property, and discourages poorly overlooked rear parking courts. This policy therefore seeks to ensure that parking is both functional and well integrated into the character and layout of development in Collingham.”	The explanatory text now does the real work of showing how the policy is intended to align with the SPD, which is exactly what NSDC asked for.

Policy ATC5: High Speed Digital Connectivity

Here is the **recommended policy text**, revised in response to NSDC's comments.

1. **Prioritising high-speed digital connectivity**

Development proposals that create new dwellings, new commercial floorspace or other forms of development where digital connectivity is likely to be material to the use of the site should prioritise the provision of gigabit-capable broadband, including full-fibre connections where feasible, in line with national policy and relevant provider requirements. Where an immediate full-fibre connection is not feasible, proposals should demonstrate that they have had regard to the future provision of high-quality digital connectivity, including the use of appropriate passive infrastructure where this is practical and proportionate.

2. **Passive infrastructure and site design**

Where practical and proportionate to the scale and nature of the development, proposals should make provision for ducting, cabling routes, connection points and other passive infrastructure that would facilitate the delivery or future upgrading of digital services.

Proposals may also incorporate measures that assist mobile connectivity where appropriate to the development proposed.

3. **Supporting information**

Where digital connectivity is a material consideration for the proposal, the application should explain, within the supporting material, how digital infrastructure has been taken into account, including any known delivery constraints and any proposed measures to address them.

Analysis of the recommended revisions

The table below explains how the current draft wording of Policy ATC5 has been reviewed and revised in response to NSDC's specific comments.

Policy ATC5: High Speed Digital Connectivity

Existing wording	Proposed new wording	Reason for change
Introduction / purpose: "Policy ATC5 seeks to ensure that all new development in Collingham is served by reliable, high-speed digital infrastructure that supports home working, business activity, education and access to services."	"Policy ATC5 seeks to support the provision of reliable, high-quality digital infrastructure in Collingham, recognising its importance for home working, business activity, education and access to services."	This shifts the tone from an absolute requirement applying to all new development to a more proportionate supportive policy, which is closer to the approach NSDC recommends.
1. Provision of high-speed broadband "All new development must provide gigabit-capable broadband (full-fibre or the fastest available technology), with connections installed and operational prior to first occupation, unless it is demonstrated through proportionate evidence that: a) A connection cannot be physically delivered due to limitations in existing network infrastructure; and b) No reasonable alternative technology or	1. Prioritising high-speed digital connectivity "Development proposals that create new dwellings, new commercial floorspace or other forms of development where digital connectivity is likely to be material to the use of the site should prioritise the provision of gigabit-capable broadband, including full-fibre connections where feasible, in line with national policy and relevant provider requirements. Where an	This is the key change. It removes the over-broad phrase " all new development ", which NSDC rightly says could catch very minor development, and changes the policy from an absolute requirement to a prioritisation approach. It also keeps the useful fallback about future-proofing, but softens it from "must include" to a proportionate expectation.

Existing wording	Proposed new wording	Reason for change
delivery route is available. In such cases, the development must include ducting, chambers and other passive infrastructure to enable future connection when network upgrades occur.”	immediate full-fibre connection is not feasible, proposals should demonstrate that they have had regard to the future provision of high-quality digital connectivity, including the use of appropriate passive infrastructure where this is practical and proportionate.”	
2. Ducting and on-site infrastructure “Development proposals must incorporate: a) Ducting and cabling routes to each dwelling or commercial unit to enable immediate or future fibre connection; b) External connection points, equipment space and infrastructure consistent with national broadband installation guidance; and c) Provision for mobile network enhancement, where appropriate, such as internal cabling to support indoor signal boosters or 5G-ready infrastructure.”	2. Passive infrastructure and site design “Where practical and proportionate to the scale and nature of the development, proposals should make provision for ducting, cabling routes, connection points and other passive infrastructure that would facilitate the delivery or future upgrading of digital services. Proposals may also incorporate measures that assist mobile connectivity where appropriate to the development proposed.”	This responds directly to NSDC’s concern that the current wording is too firm and insufficiently proportionate. It keeps the principle, but avoids making detailed infrastructure expectations mandatory in every case.
3. Application requirements “Planning applications should include a brief digital infrastructure statement confirming: a) How gigabit-capable broadband will be delivered; b) The network provider(s) engaged; and c) Any constraints and proposed mitigation.”	3. Supporting information “Where digital connectivity is a material consideration for the proposal, the application should explain, within the supporting material, how digital infrastructure has been taken into account, including any known delivery constraints and any proposed measures to address them.”	NSDC’s point here is well made. There is no obvious need to insist on a separate named Digital Infrastructure Statement if the same information can be provided in a proportionate way within the application material.
Explanatory note “Reliable digital connectivity is essential for supporting home-based work, small businesses, education, access to online services and reducing the need to travel. Full-fibre or gigabit-capable networks are now the national standard for new development. Passive infrastructure...”	Replace with: “Reliable digital connectivity is increasingly important to the functioning and sustainability of rural communities, including for home working, business development, education and access to services. This policy therefore supports the prioritisation of high-quality digital infrastructure in forms of development where such provision is likely to be material. The policy is not intended to impose a rigid requirement on every form of development, nor to require a separate specialist statement in every case. Instead, it seeks a proportionate approach in which applicants address digital connectivity where relevant and make reasonable provision for future upgrades where feasible.”	The explanation should now clearly reflect the more proportionate and flexible policy approach.

Policy CF2 – Local Green and Open Spaces

Here is the **recommended policy text**, revised in response to NSDC's comments.

1. Provision of green and open space in new development

Development proposals will be supported where they:

- a) provide green and open space in accordance with the quantity, quality and accessibility standards set out in the NSDC Developer Contributions and Planning Obligations SPD (as updated), proportionate to the scale and type of the development; and
- b) integrate these spaces into the wider blue and green infrastructure network through layout, landscaping, planting and appropriate walking and cycling connections.

Where it is demonstrated through proportionate evidence that on-site provision is not feasible or appropriate, financial contributions toward equivalent off-site provision may be acceptable, in accordance with the SPD and relevant CIL Regulation 122 tests.

2. Protection of existing green and open spaces

Development proposals that would result in the loss of existing green and open spaces, including allotments, sports fields, play areas and amenity greens, will not be supported unless one of the following criteria is met:

- a) evidence demonstrates that the space is no longer needed to meet current or future community needs; or
- b) the loss is replaced by provision of equivalent or better quality, quantity, accessibility and functionality, secured in advance of the development and located within Collingham Parish or otherwise easily accessible to the community it serves.

3. Quality and design of replacement or enhanced spaces

Replacement or enhanced green spaces should, where appropriate:

- a) be designed to support recreation, community use, biodiversity and landscape value;
- b) provide safe and inclusive access for all users; and
- c) be informed by the Collingham Design Code (2025) and relevant open space standards.

Analysis of the recommended revisions

The table below explains how the current draft wording of Policy CF2 has been reviewed and revised in response to NSDC's specific comments.

Policy CF2 – Local Green and Open Spaces

Existing wording	Proposed new wording	Reason for change
Introduction 11.6–11.7 “Green and open spaces in residential areas are important... The plan seeks to protect and improve green and open spaces in Collingham...” and “There has been an accumulating deficit in green and open space provision...”	Retain with minor editing only	These paragraphs are sound and can remain, subject only to tidying if desired.
Introduction 11.9 “It has been noted through consultation responses that the fields in the centre of the village, which, along with Dale Field and Collingham Football Club, are noted as Main Open Areas in the Newark and Sherwood A&DM DPD. These, along with the play parks, are of significant value to the local community and provide a valuable biodiversity and community resource in the heart of the village, warranting designation as Local Green Spaces...”	Replace with: “Consultation responses highlighted the importance of Collingham’s green and open spaces, including play areas, allotments, sports facilities and amenity greens, to recreation, wellbeing, biodiversity and local character. This policy is intended to protect and improve such spaces where they serve community, recreational, landscape or biodiversity functions. It does not replace or duplicate the separate Development Plan policy approach to Main Open Areas.”	This is an important change. It removes the problematic claim that Main Open Areas should effectively be treated within this policy as Local Green Spaces or ordinary open spaces. That directly answers NSDC’s concern.

1. Provision of green and open space in new development “Development proposals will be supported where they: a) Provide green and open space... and b) Integrate these spaces into the wider Blue and Green Infrastructure network...”	Retain with light editing: “Development proposals will be supported where they: a) provide green and open space in accordance with the quantity, quality and accessibility standards set out in the NSDC Developer Contributions and Planning Obligations SPD (as updated), proportionate to the scale and type of the development; and b) integrate these spaces into the wider blue and green infrastructure network through layout, landscaping, planting and appropriate walking and cycling connections.”	Only minor wording improvement is needed here. The substance is sound.
2. Protection of existing green and open spaces “Development proposals that would result in the loss of existing green and open spaces—including allotments, sports fields, play areas, amenity greens and the Main Open Areas defined in the Newark and Sherwood A&DM DPD—will not be supported...”	Replace with: “Development proposals that would result in the loss of existing green and open spaces, including allotments, sports fields, play areas and amenity greens, will not be supported unless one of the following criteria is met: a) evidence demonstrates that the space is no longer needed to meet current or future community needs; or b) the loss is replaced by provision of equivalent or better quality, quantity, accessibility and functionality, secured in advance of the development and located within Collingham Parish or otherwise easily accessible to the community it serves.”	This removes the reference to Main Open Areas, exactly as NSDC recommends. It also leaves the policy focused on spaces that are properly within the category of community/recreational green and open spaces.
3. Quality and design of replacement or enhanced spaces “Replacement or enhanced green spaces must: a) Be designed to support recreation, community use, biodiversity and landscape value; b) Provide safe, inclusive access for all users; and c) Align with the Collingham Design Code (2025) and relevant open space standards.”	Replace with: “Replacement or enhanced green spaces should, where appropriate: a) be designed to support recreation, community use, biodiversity and landscape value; b) provide safe and inclusive access for all users; and c) be informed by the Collingham Design Code (2025) and relevant open space standards.”	This responds directly to NSDC’s point that the wording should be softened to “should where appropriate” rather than “must”.
Explanatory note 11.10–11.12 Current text says the policy seeks to protect green/open spaces under NPPF paragraphs 106–108 and refers to future development addressing the shortfall and protecting play facilities.	Revise explanatory text to add: “Main Open Areas identified in the Newark and Sherwood Development Plan perform a different policy function relating to the form and structure of the settlement and are not dealt with through this policy. This policy instead focuses on green and open spaces that serve community, recreational, amenity, landscape or biodiversity purposes and that may be capable of replacement or enhancement in appropriate circumstances.”	The explanatory text needs to make the distinction explicit, so that the revised policy is clearly understood and does not accidentally cut across the Development Plan’s approach to Main Open Areas.

Policy HE1 – Housing Type and Density

Here is the **recommended policy text**, revised in response to NSDC’s comments.

1. Housing mix

- Residential development proposals of 10 or more dwellings, or on sites of 0.5 hectares or more, should provide a mix of dwelling types and sizes that responds to local housing needs, having particular regard to the **‘Desired Mix (2036)’** column in Table HE1 and to any updated local evidence.
- Proposals that contribute positively to the rebalancing of the parish’s housing stock, particularly through the provision of smaller homes (1–2 bedrooms), family housing (3 bedrooms), and homes suited to older people, will be supported.
- Table HE1 is intended to guide the overall direction of housing mix in a broad and proportionate way. Exact conformity with the indicative percentages will not be required, provided that the proposal has had appropriate regard to local housing needs, site context, design considerations, viability and any more up-to-date evidence.

2. **Viability and flexibility**
Where a proposal departs materially from the broad direction of the indicative mix and viability is relied upon as part of the justification, proportionate viability evidence may be required by the Local Planning Authority.
3. **Housing for older and disabled people**
Development proposals that include bungalows, accessible and adaptable homes, wheelchair-user dwellings, or specialist housing for older or disabled people will be supported, particularly where they contribute to addressing identified local needs.
4. **Self-build and custom-build housing**
On sites of 0.5 hectares or greater, proposals that include the provision of plots for self-build or custom-build housing will be supported, where compatible with good design and other relevant Development Plan policies.
5. **Rural exception housing**
Rural exception sites that provide affordable housing to meet identified local needs will be supported where they comply with national policy and the Newark and Sherwood Development Plan.
6. **Isolated homes in the countryside**
Proposals for isolated new homes in the open countryside will only be supported where they are consistent with national policy and with **Policy DM8** of the Newark and Sherwood Allocations and Development Management DPD.
7. **Housing density and design**
Residential development should make efficient use of land while respecting local character and context. Density should:
 - a) reflect the prevailing pattern, grain and character of development in the surrounding area;
 - b) support walkability, active travel and good access to services;
 - c) accord with the principles of **Core Policy 3** of the Amended Core Strategy and other relevant Development Plan policies; and
 - d) be informed by the Collingham Design Code (2025).

Analysis of the recommended revisions

The table below explains how the current draft wording of Policy HE1 has been reviewed and revised in response to NSDC's specific comments.

Policy HE1 – Housing Type and Density

Existing wording	Proposed new wording	Reason for change
1. Housing mix “a) Development proposals should provide a mix of dwelling types and sizes that reflect local housing needs, having regard to the indicative mix set out in Table HE1 and any updated local evidence.”	1. Housing mix “a) Residential development proposals of 10 or more dwellings, or on sites of 0.5 hectares or more, should provide a mix of dwelling types and sizes that responds to local housing needs, having particular regard to the ‘Desired Mix (2036)’ column in Table HE1 and to any updated local evidence.”	This makes the policy more precise in two ways: it identifies the threshold at which the mix requirement applies, and it makes clear that the relevant column is the Desired Mix (2036) column. That directly answers NSDC's point under 1a.
1(b) “b) Proposals that deliver a mix contributing positively to the rebalancing of the parish's housing stock—particularly smaller homes (1–2 bedrooms) and family housing (3 bedrooms)—will be supported.”	Retain with minor editing: “b) Proposals that contribute positively to the rebalancing of the parish's housing stock, particularly through the provision of smaller homes (1–2 bedrooms), family housing (3 bedrooms), and homes suited to older people, will be supported.”	This keeps the useful broad direction of the policy while making it slightly more rounded and better aligned with the evidence base about ageing and smaller households.
1(c) “c) Where a proposal does not reflect the indicative mix, applicants must justify the variation with reference to site-specific circumstances, housing need, design considerations, or viability.”	Replace with: “c) Table HE1 is intended to guide the overall direction of housing mix in a broad and proportionate way. Exact conformity with the indicative percentages will not be required, provided that the proposal has had appropriate regard to local	This is one of the most important changes. NSDC is right that the current wording is too close to imposing a precise quota, despite calling the mix “indicative”. The revised wording makes the table genuinely indicative and

	housing needs, site context, design considerations, viability and any more up-to-date evidence.”	pragmatic , and avoids locking the Plan into a rigid percentage-based regime that may quickly date.
2. Viability testing “Where an alternative housing mix is proposed on viability grounds, the planning application must be accompanied by a proportionate, open-book viability assessment...” etc.	2. Viability and flexibility “Where a proposal departs materially from the broad direction of the indicative mix and viability is relied upon as part of the justification, proportionate viability evidence may be required by the Local Planning Authority.”	Because the revised policy is no longer quota-like, the present detailed viability wording is heavier than necessary. A shorter and more flexible form is better and avoids over-prescription.
3. Housing for older and disabled people “Development proposals that include: • Bungalows, • Accessible and adaptable homes (M4(2)), • Wheelchair-user dwellings (M4(3)), or • Specialist housing for older or disabled people, will be strongly supported...”	Retain with very slight editing: “3. Housing for older and disabled people Development proposals that include bungalows, accessible and adaptable homes, wheelchair-user dwellings, or specialist housing for older or disabled people will be supported, particularly where they contribute to addressing identified local needs.”	This retains an important part of the policy and avoids unnecessary technical detail unless the Parish Council specifically wants to keep the M4 references.
4. Self-build and custom-build housing “On sites of 0.5 hectares or greater, proposals that include the provision of plots for self-build or custom-build housing will be supported...”	No substantive change	This part does not appear to be the subject of NSDC criticism and can remain.
5. Managing future changes to small dwellings “Where proposals include 1- or 2-bedroom dwellings, the Local Planning Authority should consider the use of planning conditions to restrict certain permitted development rights...”	Delete entirely	This directly addresses NSDC’s objection. The District Council considers this inappropriate and potentially unreasonable, with a real risk that it would not be implemented. It is better removed.
6. Rural exception housing “Rural exception sites that provide Affordable Housing to meet identified local needs will be supported where they comply with national and Local Plan policies.”	Retain with very slight editing: “6. Rural exception housing Rural exception sites that provide affordable housing to meet identified local needs will be supported where they comply with national policy and the Newark and Sherwood Development Plan.”	Minor tightening only.
7. Isolated homes in the countryside “Proposals for isolated new homes in the open countryside will only be supported where they meet the criteria set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.”	Replace with: “7. Isolated homes in the countryside - Proposals for isolated new homes in the open countryside will only be supported where they are consistent with national policy and with Policy DM8 of the Newark and Sherwood Allocations and Development Management DPD.”	This responds directly to NSDC’s point that the wording should tie into Policy DM8 .
8. Housing density and design “All residential development must make efficient use of land while respecting local character and context. Density should: a) Reflect the prevailing pattern of development; b) Support walkability, active travel and good access to services; and c) Accord with the principles and guidance of the Collingham Design Code (2025).”	Replace with: “8. Housing density and design Residential development should make efficient use of land while respecting local character and context. Density should: a) reflect the prevailing pattern, grain and character of development in the surrounding area; b) support walkability, active travel and good access to services; c) accord with the principles of Core Policy 3 of the Amended Core Strategy and other relevant Development Plan policies; and d) be informed by the Collingham Design Code (2025).”	This retains the substance but adds the explicit Core Policy 3 reference that NSDC asked for. I have also made the wording a little more nuanced.
9. Nationally Described Space Standards “All new dwellings must meet or exceed the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS).”	Delete entirely	This implements NSDC’s recommendation. The District Council says the neighbourhood plan does not currently provide the justification needed for this requirement, and that it may raise Basic Conditions issues.
Explanatory notes 12.4–12.8 Existing text explains that the policy applies to developments of 10+ dwellings or 0.5ha+, refers to the AECOM HNA and District Wide HNA, and says the policy seeks to enforce appropriate housing densities.	Revise explanatory text to emphasise: the policy threshold; that the ‘Desired Mix (2036)’ column is a guide rather than a quota; that the policy is intended to operate broadly and pragmatically; that smaller homes, family homes and housing for older people	The explanatory text should now match the more proportionate and less prescriptive policy wording.

	are priorities; that density should respond to Core Policy 3 and the Design Code; and that the Plan does not seek to impose separate NDSS or permitted development restrictions.	
--	--	--

Policy HE2 – Affordable Housing

Here is the **recommended policy text**, revised in response to NSDC's comments.

1. **Affordable housing requirement**

Affordable housing should be provided in accordance with Core Policy 1 (Affordable Housing Provision) of the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy, relevant national policy, and any subsequent updated evidence issued by the Local Planning Authority.

Affordable housing should be integrated into proposals in a way that reflects up-to-date local housing needs, as indicated by neighbourhood-level evidence, district-level assessments, and the broad mix objectives set out in Policy HE1.

2. **Meeting local affordable housing needs**

Affordable housing provision within Collingham should prioritise the following types of homes where justified by need:

- a) family housing of 3 bedrooms or fewer;
- b) smaller homes of 1–2 bedrooms; and
- c) accessible and adaptable housing, including bungalows, and dwellings suitable for older or disabled people.

Proposals that deliver these forms of accommodation will be supported.

3. **Rural exception affordable housing**

Proposals for rural exception sites providing affordable housing to meet local needs will be supported where they:

- a) are located adjacent to, and well related to, the built-up area of Collingham;
- b) respect the scale, character and landscape setting of the village, having regard where relevant to the Collingham Conservation Area Appraisal and the Newark and Sherwood Landscape Character SPD;
- c) deliver a mix of dwelling types that responds to identified local need; and
- d) comply with Core Policy 2 (Rural Affordable Housing) and relevant national policy.

A **small proportion** of market housing may be supported as enabling development only where it is demonstrated that the scheme would not otherwise be deliverable, and only after other reasonable funding mechanisms have been explored and shown to be insufficient.

4. **Tenure mix**

Unless viability or updated local evidence indicates otherwise, affordable housing should aim to deliver:

- 60% social or affordable rented; and
- 40% affordable home ownership.

Alternative tenure mixes will be supported where they respond to up-to-date evidence of need or viability.

5. **Design quality and integration (“pepper-potting”)**

Affordable housing must be:

- a) tenure-blind in appearance;
- b) indistinguishable from market housing in design, materials and layout; and
- c) pepper-potted throughout the development in small clusters, rather than concentrated in single large blocks.

This should be demonstrated in the Design and Access Statement or an Affordable Housing Statement.

6. Viability and review mechanisms

Where a viability assessment indicates that full affordable housing provision cannot be achieved, the applicant must submit a transparent, open-book viability appraisal, independently reviewed by or on behalf of the Local Planning Authority.

Where reduced provision is accepted, planning permissions should include a review/clawback mechanism, in accordance with the NSDC Developer Contributions and Planning Obligations SPD, to secure additional contributions if viability improves.

Analysis of the recommended revisions

The table below explains how the current draft wording of Policy HE2 has been reviewed and revised in response to NSDC's specific comments.

Policy HE2 – Affordable Housing

Existing wording	Proposed new wording	Reason for change
1. Affordable Housing requirement "Affordable Housing should be provided in accordance with Core Policy 1 (Affordable Housing Provision) of the Newark & Sherwood Core Strategy, the national affordable housing threshold, and any subsequent updated evidence issued by the Local Planning Authority. Affordable Housing should be integrated into proposals in a way that reflects up-to-date local housing needs, as indicated by neighbourhood-level evidence, district-level assessments, and the mix set out in Policy HE1."	Retain with slight editing: "Affordable housing should be provided in accordance with Core Policy 1 (Affordable Housing Provision) of the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy, relevant national policy, and any subsequent updated evidence issued by the Local Planning Authority. Affordable housing should be integrated into proposals in a way that reflects up-to-date local housing needs, as indicated by neighbourhood-level evidence, district-level assessments, and the broad mix objectives set out in Policy HE1."	Only minor tidying is needed here, mainly consistency of naming and alignment with the more flexible revised HE1.
2. Meeting local affordable housing needs current wording prioritises smaller family housing, 1–2 bed homes, accessible homes and bungalows.	No substantive change	This part is sound and does not appear to be the focus of NSDC's objection.
3. Rural exception affordable housing "Proposals for rural exception sites providing Affordable Housing to meet local needs will be supported where they: a) Are located within or immediately adjacent to the built-up area of Collingham; b) Respect the scale, character and landscape setting of the village, informed by the Collingham Character Appraisal (2006) and Newark & Sherwood Landscape Character SPD; c) Deliver a mix of dwelling types that responds to an identified local need; and d) Comply with Core Policy 2 (Rural Affordable Housing) and NPPF rural-exception policy. A proportion of market housing may be supported where required to ensure viability, in line with national policy."	Replace with: "Proposals for rural exception sites providing affordable housing to meet local needs will be supported where they: a) are located adjacent to, and well related to, the built-up area of Collingham; b) respect the scale, character and landscape setting of the village, having regard where relevant to the Collingham Conservation Area Appraisal and the Newark and Sherwood Landscape Character SPD; c) deliver a mix of dwelling types that responds to identified local need; and d) comply with Core Policy 2 (Rural Affordable Housing) and relevant national policy. A small proportion of market housing may be supported as enabling development only where it is demonstrated that the scheme would not otherwise be deliverable, and only after other reasonable funding mechanisms have been explored and shown to be insufficient."	This is the key revision. It removes the incorrect suggestion that an exception site can be within the built-up area, corrects the heritage reference to the Collingham Conservation Area Appraisal, and tightens the enabling-market-housing wording in the way NSDC recommends.
4. Tenure mix "Unless viability or updated local evidence indicates otherwise, Affordable Housing should aim to deliver: • 60% social or	Retain with no substantive change	This part is reasonable and not directly challenged by NSDC here.

affordable rented • 40% affordable home ownership. Alternative tenure mixes will be supported where they respond to up-to-date evidence of need or viability.”		
5. Design quality and integration (“pepper-potting”) current wording on tenure-blind design and clustering.	Retain with slight editing only if desired	No direct issue raised by NSDC in this comment.
6. Viability and review mechanisms current wording requires open-book viability appraisal and review/clawback mechanism where reduced provision is accepted.	Retain with no substantive change	This part can remain. It is consistent with district practice and not the focus of the present objection.
Justification / explanatory text Current text says there are no allocated sites remaining, that affordable need remains, and that surveys suggest need for 12–15 affordable homes per annum; it also refers generally to affordable need and local unaffordability.	Revise explanatory text to add: “Rural exception sites are, by definition, sites outside but adjacent to settlements, brought forward primarily to meet local affordable housing needs. Where a scheme proposes a limited amount of market housing as enabling development, this should remain small in scale and should only be relied upon where it has been demonstrated that the scheme would not otherwise be deliverable and other funding options have been explored.”	The explanatory text should now make the exception-site concept clearer and reinforce the tightened approach to enabling development.