

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Noel Bell				<p>Whilst I have no specific comments to raise at this point in time, the recognition of the strong links that Bassetlaw has with South Yorkshire (notably the Doncaster-Rotherham-Sheffield conurbation) is welcomed, in particular the clear synergies that exist in terms of economic growth, skills, transport and housing provision. It is also noted that each of the options presented has to some degree the potential requirement for the creation of urban extensions. If it is concluded from the current consultation that strategic sites are an appropriate method of ensuring housing and employment land delivery, we would appreciate the opportunity to make representation upon the specific sites identifies as part of subsequent drafts of the Core Strategy. This request also extends to engagement in wider-work surrounding the site allocations DPD.</p>
Mrs Sally Gill				<p>In summary the Core Strategy Issues and Options report is a strategic overview of options for future residential and employment development over the next 15 years. Whilst the study is at a strategic level and is not intended to be site specific, significant residential and employment allocations appear inevitable conclusions for Worksop and Retford. What is clearly missing is a supporting transport study which is needed to identify the cumulative transport implications of residential and employment growth options within the District in order to identify the likely transport infrastructure requirements and constraints. There is a danger that a preferred option will be chosen which subsequently cannot be delivered if transport infrastructure shortcomings cannot be mitigated or are too expensive to be delivered. In this regard the document should incorporate, or at the very least refer to, Chapter 5 of the DfT's Guidance on Transport Assessment which is headed "The link with the development plan making process", which in essence requires LPA's to ensure that their proposals are based on a sound and credible evidence base. To this end they will need to produce/commission their own transport models to test all of the options under consideration. Cross reference is also made to para 4.56 (formerly para 4.24) of PPS12. This is an important issue to get across (and to all other LPA's) as the County Council cannot be relied upon to undertake these on their behalf as we have neither the resources nor facilities to do so.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
GOEM	GOEM			<p>Thank you for your letter received 17 September 2009 seeking the views of the Government Office for the East Midlands (GOEM) on Bassetlaw's Issues and Options consultation document (September 2009). We have the following informal comments to make regarding your non-statutory consultation report, which is the first public stage of the process and includes the statutorily required Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. We suggest that you consider these comments and address them in preparing your intended Preferred Options consultation document, programmed for January/February 2010. As you know, the Core Strategy for Bassetlaw is also required to take into account policy on Local Development Frameworks set out in PPS12 (Local Spatial Planning June 2008) and guidance contained in the accompanying Plan Making Manual. It is also required to satisfy the statutory requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations (as amended). We also advise you to look at the latest PINS 'Examining Development Plan Documents: Learning from Experience' September 2009 document, available at: http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk/pins/appeals/local_dev/index.htm This document is particularly helpful in preparing your Core Strategy. For example, paragraph 9 which states "too many core strategies resemble local plans in that they seek to address a full range of topic areas irrespective of whether these topic areas contain critical issues that relate to the way the area is intended to develop". You should also have particular regard to the latest PINS 'Examining Development Planning Documents: Soundness Guidance' (August 2009 2 nd Edition), available at: HTTP://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk/pins/appeals/local_dev/ldf_testing_soundnessaug09.pdf You are also advised to look at Core Strategies that have been found sound following examination, especially more recent ones. Although it is important to note that the Planning Inspectorate do not recommend Core Strategies as models to be copied these give a good idea of what has worked elsewhere and what to avoid. SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SCOPING REPORT As advised by PPS12 paras 4.39 to 4.43, the "sustainability appraisal" required by S19(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 should be an appraisal of the economic, social and environmental sustainability of the plan. Such assessments should feed into and be summarised in the sustainability appraisal. It must be proportionate to the plan in question. The Sustainability Appraisal should perform a key role in providing a sound evidence base for the plan and form an integrated part of the plan preparation process. In particular Sustainability Assessment should inform the evaluation of alternatives and should provide a powerful means of proving to decision makers, and the public, that the plan is the most appropriate given reasonable alternatives. CORE STRATEGY ISSUES & OPTIONS CONSULTATION DOCUMENT Para 1.1 refers to this being the first formal consultation stage,</p>
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 1	Need facilities in the smaller settlements e.g. shops, transport and jobs.
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 1	Retford is falling behind in comparison to Worksop in development in all areas - This must not be allowed to happen.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Simon Miller	Persimmon Homes		Question 1	<p>The Local Development Scheme sets out in table 3.1 that the Core Strategy will be adopted in April 2011. If this is achieved then the Core Strategy will meet the very minimum time requirement for a Core Strategy as required by PPS12 (para 4.13) that requires the time horizon of the core strategy should be at least 15 years from the date of adoption. Our experience of participating in a number of core strategies is that the timescale set is too optimistic and there is a very real possibility of the core strategy reaching the date of adoption and not being conformity with the advice in PPS12. It is also a certainty that there will be either a new Regional Spatial Strategy by 2011 or potentially a different regime altogether for the planning of housing. In such circumstances there is a very strong and logical argument that the timescale of the core strategy should be extended to 2031 so as to be in line with the emerging RSS but also to give added certainty to the strategy. A longer timescale means that changes to matters such as the overall level of housing required may be accommodated not by a review of the strategy but by the review of the rates at which development or allocations are brought forward. An extension of the time frame to 2031 would also provide a strong signal to future investors that the Council was planning for the longer term and was committed to the proposed strategy. This submission is based upon an assessment of both the opportunities for accommodating development within the district but also an analysis of the differing pressures that are not just impacting on the district at the present time but those that are likely to merge or become more pertinent in the future. There is a clear and unambiguous need to at least produce a Core strategy that is capable of accommodating changes in the housing requirement, most importantly the ability to guide higher levels of development should they be required. The demographic evidence is that there is likely to be continued pressure on the housing stock in the district both from local need and demand and from migration. Analysis of the age structure of the population and levels of future workers suggest that migration at least to an extent should be welcomed as a way of maintaining a balanced community and to support future employment prospects. As well as the demographic drivers for distribution there is also the ability of locations to accommodate new development, such as the flood issues at Retford, and the positive impact that development can have in locations such as Harworth. Considering these issues together it is important that the Core Strategy selects an option which can accommodate the future projected levels of housing requirement and that the distribution reflects both the demographic requirements but also the economic and environmental implications of development. In particular this means accommodating much of the growth in the larger settlements and supports the upgrading of Harworth to a location that can accept significant levels of development. Harworth/Bircotes in particular needs careful consideration for while there are draft proposals for the coal mine these are</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Stephen Gaines	Peel Airports Limited		Question 1	<p>The document acknowledges there is an urgent need for the District to address issues certain pockets of deprivation, including former coal mining areas, and to provide access to jobs and training in the knowledge sector, and good quality office accommodation. Towns on the western edge of Bassetlaw: Worksop, Haworth/Bircotes, Carlton-in-Lindrick and Langold have significant regeneration potential with ready access to the strategic road network (A1(M), M18, M180) and the Doncaster, Rotherham Sheffield conurbation. Importantly, the general area is within relatively easy access to Robin Hood Airport Doncaster Sheffield (RHADS). RHADS is a strength on which the District can build in order to address some of its economic weaknesses. RHADS is the UK's newest purpose built airport, situated on the site of the former RAF Finningley. Situated just 7 miles from Doncaster, 25 miles from Sheffield and less than 14 miles from Worksop and other towns and villages on the western edge of Bassetlaw, RHADS currently handles around 1 million passengers per annum and recently celebrated its 4 millionth passenger. It serves over 35 destinations across the globe. RHADS is a principal gateway into the region and is engaged in working with the Regional Development Agency for Yorkshire and the Humber (Yorkshire Forward) and the East Midlands (EMDA) and sub regional delivery organisations, the business community and the Chambers of Commerce to maximise the economic benefits it will bring. Aviation is a significant sector in the drive to develop a knowledge based economy in the UK. Airports have a catalytic effect on economic growth in sectors that can exploit increased passenger and freight traffic and promote aviation related businesses in their localities. The Airport's role as an economic driver assumes even greater significance because of its location within an area in particular need for regeneration in South Yorkshire and North Nottinghamshire, including parts of Bassetlaw. Both Worksop and Retford operate as main centres for services and facilities for their surrounding areas. The Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands classifies Worksop as a Sub-Regional Centre, lying within the wider Northern Sub-Area where regeneration is identified as a priority. RHADS published for consultation its draft Airport Master Plan to 2030 in 2008 which sets out its expansion plans for both operational and airport related development. Responses to the consultation exercise are currently being prepared before the Master Plan is finalised later this year. The Master Plan forecasts that with improved surface access in place in the form of the Finningley and Rossington Regeneration Route Scheme (FARRRS) linking the Airport to the M18, RHADS could be handling up to 10.8 mppa and 120,000 tonnes of cargo per annum (and possibly more if a Transshipment Hub is built post-2016) by 2030. International inbound tourism is a major growth sector and will become increasingly so. RHADS with its existing and increasing connectivity to major European capitals, business centres and hub airports, as well as destinations further afield, can</p>
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 1	

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Peter Frampton			Question 1	<p>The Sustainable Community Strategy sets out a range of aspirations (p11). Including: - 'Our residents will have pride in the District and reach their full potential We will understand the needs of our communities, young and old, and shape services to meet these needs' An explanation is given for the delays in beginning consultation on the Core Strategy Issues and Options for two reasons. Firstly to ensure that a satisfactory evidence base was in place to support proposed policies and secondly to ensure that the LDF was not advanced before the content of the emerging East Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy was sufficiently advanced. It is submitted that the Issues and Options Document has failed to properly respond to the RSS in not recognising the need to regenerate communities that have been affected by the structural decline in the mining industry. At paragraph 4.5 the Issues and Options Document states: - 'At present, however the Bassetlaw economy is still re-structuring. Its key characteristic is a high level of industrial (manufacturing) units, along with storage and distribution warehouse.' The Document should recognise the impact of a declining coal mining industry, and properly respond to the strategic policies with in the RSS. The Northern Sub Regional Strategy as set out in the RSS has objectives to: - 'To provide jobs and services in and around other settlements that are accessible to a wider area or service particular concentrations of need and to support regeneration of settlements, through development, within a clear framework of need. To promote environmental enhancement as a fundamental part of the Sub-Areas.' Paragraph 4.3.8 states: - 'Policy 3 identifies the Sub Regional Centres of Mansfield - Ashfield, Chesterfield Newark and Worksop and indicates that the development needs of other settlements should provided for, in some cases incorporating the growth of settlements. The larger number of smaller towns and larger villages that once functioned as centres for previously mining - dependent communities need to maintain their role or require regeneration or both (emphasis added).' Paragraph 4.3.9 states (in part) 'Many of these settlements are well placed to offer good opportunities for development, through their accessibility to the regional and national transport network.... Taking up opportunities will also enhance the regeneration of the surrounding areas and the Sub-Area (emphasis added).' The strategic objective within the RSS is not tantamount to a policy of 'management retreat' from mining - dependent communities. Au contraire the strategic objective - supported by the Bassetlaw Sustainable Community Strategy is to plan positively for regeneration and maintain sustainable communities The Core Strategy should hence recognise the importance of Welbeck Colliery especially to communities such as Meden Vale and Warsop. The fact that these communities are not within the administrative area of Bassetlaw should not undermine the significance of Welbeck Colliery within a surrounding hinterland of communities - including communities within Bassetlaw. Welbeck Colliery has provided employment to up to 1500 people within</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways		Question 1	Although the Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Document displays an image of the Chesterfield Canal (a number of times), the document only makes one reference to the canal in the text. The inland waterways of the District which form part of the British Waterways network, namely the Chesterfield Canal and the River Trent, are one of its strengths. The waterways are valuable community resources that 'cut across policy themes and support a range of Government agendas, including: Sustainable communities Housing growth and renewal Urban renaissance Place-making and place-shaping Rural development and diversification Visitor economy and sustainable tourism Sustainable transport Health and well-being Climate change, carbon reduction and environmental sustainability; and Social inclusion and cohesion (TCPA Policy Advice Note: Inland Waterways: Unlocking the potential and securing the future of inland waterways through the planning system (2009)). We refer you to the TCPA Policy Advice Note: Inland Waterways: Unlocking the potential and securing the future of inland waterways through the planning system (2009) which identifies the key policy challenges and issues that need to be tackled in order to fully unlock the economic, social and environmental benefits of the inland waterways and secure their long-term sustainability as a national asset. On page 27 there is a list of questions that need to be addressed to 'Waterway Proof' LDF policies. The following should also be noted: 1. The Trent Vale Project. This seeks to conserve and enhance the natural, built and cultural heritage of Trent Vale and includes the Trent Vale in Bassetlaw. It is a £2.7m, three year scheme commencing in 2009 and supported by the Heritage Lottery Fund. The key aspects of the scheme are to deliver projects which improve accessibility and reconnect people with their local landscape and the River Trent. 2. The River Trent is a commercial waterway through Bassetlaw. 'Tidal rivers or commercial waterways are particularly suitable for short-hauls, for the movements of high-volume, low-value products which are not unduly time sensitive, and for addressing niche market good where water carriage can provide a cost-effective alternative to the local road network, as outlined in PPG 13: Transport'. (TCPA Policy Advice Note: Inland Waterways: Unlocking the potential and securing the future of inland waterways through the planning system (2009)).
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 1	The District can make use of and enhance existing leisure assets, such as the Chesterfield canal, to derive both economic and leisure-based benefits and opportunities for attractive, desirable residential development.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 1	The District can make use of and enhance existing leisure assets, such as the Chesterfield canal, to derive both economic and leisure-based benefits and opportunities for attractive, desirable residential development.
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 1	The District has good accessibility by rail and road, towns that retain elements of historic and locally-characteristic built fabric and large areas of unspoilt countryside. It also has major metropolitan areas close by that have more mixed impacts in terms of commuting and local economic development. It has relatively poor quality employment sites and limited retail choice.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Steve Bolton			Question 1	As usefully referred to in the document, the East Midlands Regional Plan March 2009 (the 'RSS') provides the overarching strategic policy context for development in the East Midlands region. In particular the Northern Sub-regional strategy (SRS) provides additional direction and guidance to Local Development Frameworks on issues of sub-regional importance in the Northern Sub-area, setting out a context for sustainable regeneration that also takes into account the impact of policies in adjoining regions and the Northern Way, which includes your area. Policy 3 of the RSS sets out the proposed distribution of new development in the Region, with Worksop identified as a Sub-regional centre in which appropriate development of a lesser scale than in the Growth towns should be located. Other settlements in your area are identified as being of a lower order in the settlement hierarchy. The development needs of these and rural areas should be provided for and the policy sets out the matters which new development in these areas should contribute to. In the context of the RSS including the above considerations, we would like to offer the following observations on your document: 1. Paragraph 2.1 - Reference to the Nottinghamshire Structure Plan would now seem to be unnecessary bearing in mind that the RSS now provides the overarching strategic planning policy context. 2. Spatial Strategy for Bassetlaw: Policy 3 and Policy Northern SRS1 of the RSS are relevant here. Both Option 1 (Table 5.1) and Option 2 in your document show Retford as having a similar status to Worksop whilst Option 1 also shows Harworth Bircotes as having similar status. Retford is categorised as an 'other urban area' in Policy Northern SRS 1. The 'other urban areas' are suitable for development due to urban capacity, Sub-area regeneration needs or the need to support the present role of the settlement in servicing the surrounding area. The scale of development will need to be related to the existing level of infrastructure, range of community facilities and job opportunities, availability of public transport, and existing character. The key will be to justify the levels of development proposed. You will be aware that Harworth Bircotes is not identified as an 'other urban area' below the Sub Regional centre level, unlike Retford. In accordance with Policy Northern SRS 1, new development should therefore be restricted to small scale development targeted to meet local needs, but account needs to be taken of Northern SRS Policy 3. As with Option 1, Option 3 (Table 5.4) does not seem to be in accordance with the RSS framework, some further explanation is needed to define what the option means in terms of specific settlements and the settlement hierarchy. Subject to the above, of the three options presented, Option 2 would appear to be more compatible with the RSS in terms of its categorisation of Worksop and Retford as being at the top of the settlement hierarchy in this part of the Region. However, a sequential approach to development which only favours development in the largest settlements could compromise the regeneration of the
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 1	Its strengths relate to its strategic location and good communication links to other areas. The growth of Robin Hood Airport adds another dimension to the strategic growth and regeneration in this area. One of the weaknesses is the decline of the coal industry and the need to seek regeneration projects and employment growth in key areas.
Mr Chris Telford	Associate Director CGMS		Question 1	A key issue is the need to sustain and build upon the vitality and viability of the district's rural service centres. In this respect, regard should be had for Everton as a significant village which provides essential services to existing residents in the village itself and the surrounding countryside.
Ms Janet Hodson	JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd		Question 1	

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Ms Janet Hodson	JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd		Question 1	<p>Strengths Location Availability of land near excellent transport links Workforce Facilities/infrastructure Build on existing business cluster on Eastern side of Worksop Work towards making Worksop a self-supporting settlement rather than being a satellite of Sheffield. Weaknesses Needs a better quality employment offer Needs a better corresponding housing offer to support planned economic growth.</p>
Ms Caroline Harrison	Planning and Biodiversity Officer Natural England		Question 1	<p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. We are working towards the delivery of four strategic outcomes: A healthy natural environment; People are inspired to value and conserve the natural environment; Sustainable use of the natural environment; A secure environmental future. Natural England has the following comments to make regarding the key decisions set out in the document. Bassetlaw's Vision and Priorities We would support the Council in creating a vision that provides sustainable communities with a high quality of life for the people who live in them. To achieve this Natural England considers there must be an investment in the natural environment, and appropriate services including green infrastructure. We believe the environment has valuable contributions to make to housing and planning; health and well-being and has an important role to play in addressing the Council's priorities for the District. The natural environment should not be seen as a barrier when actually it can provide the solution to many of the problems confronting us in modern day life. Sustainable Communities Policies should promote the principles of sustainable development as set out in PPS1, including encouraging sustainable construction methods, sustainable drainage systems, the use of local construction materials and techniques, energy efficient design and renewable energy in appropriate forms and locations. New development should make the best use of existing infrastructure and opportunities for work, services and leisure should be provided close by thus reducing the need to travel. Sustainable Travel Natural England also believes a key consideration to achieve truly sustainable development should be the location of development in relation to current transport infrastructure. We consider it imperative to incorporate infrastructure into scheme design that encourages the use of more sustainable modes of transport. In order to encourage modal shift to more sustainable options there should be ease of access to an efficient and effective, integrated public transport system and a network of improved attractive pedestrian and cycle routes should be incorporated into the design of new development.</p>
Mr David Barker			Question 1	<p>A key issue is the need to sustain and build upon the vitality and viability of the district's town centres, and to maximise the potential use of public transport infrastructure. In this respect, regard should be had for Retford as a medium-sized town which functions as a long-established retail and service centre.</p>
Environment Agency	Environment Agency		Question 1	<p>The district produces more waste than any other Local Authority in Nottinghamshire and although the district is improving its recycling rates, it is still one of the worst performers (Defra statistics for 2007/08). It is therefore important that the emerging Core Strategy includes policies and objectives to ensure compliance with the 'waste hierarchy' during demolition, construction/renovation and use of new/existing developments.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 1	<p>The District has a large rural component and has a diverse range of natural habitats and species. Notable are areas of calcareous woodland and grassland on the magnesian limestone (a globally rare habitat); dwarf shrub heathland, acid grassland and oak-birch woodland on the Sandstone areas, which includes part of the Sherwood Forest; neutral grasslands and mixed ash woodlands on the Mercia mudstones; wetlands and remnant fens in along the river valleys; and part of the Humberhead Levels in the northern part of the District. In terms of weaknesses that need to be addressed, there needs to be a greater recognition of the natural heritage found in the District and the contribution it makes to the county and regional biodiversity. There has been the a lack of strategic spatial approach to allocating development with regard to natural resources, often driven by the desire (and it is acknowledged by government policy) to redevelop previously developed land. Even recently Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) have been lost to development (e.g. SINCs on magnesian limestone at Steetley) and there needs to be better protection of these sites within a spatial approach to planning to avoid direct loss and fragmentation, and to ensure that they are the stepping stones within a Green Infrastructure Strategy. Six rivers drain across the District (Trent, Idle, Meden, Maun, Poulter and Ryton) and consideration needs to be given to the function of natural floodplains, many of which have been lost, especially along the River Idle.</p>
Magnus Educational Centre			Question 1	<p>A key issue is the need to sustain and build upon the vitality and viability of the district's rural service centres. In this respect, regard should be had for Everton as a significant village which provides essential services to existing residents in the village itself and the surrounding countryside.</p>
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 1	<p>Its strengths relate to its strategic location and good communication links to other areas. The growth of Robin Hood Airport adds another dimension to the strategic growth and regeneration in this area. One of the weaknesses is the decline of the coal industry and the need to seek regeneration projects and employment growth in key areas.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 1	<p>There is a growing recognition that the historic environment is not simply a range of heritage assets that have been formally identified as being of significance and therefore designated, but rather it is the way that historic buildings, streetscapes, landscapes, open spaces and archaeology collectively create local distinctiveness and sense of place. Therefore, the historic environment should play a critical role in sustainable development at the heart of all spatial planning work. This approach reflects the draft PPS 15; as you may be aware, there is now an intention to merge PPG15 and PPG16 into one Planning Policy Statement (PPS15), with consultation on the draft document ongoing until the end of October 2009. The draft PPS is consistent with our obligations as a signatory to a number of international conventions, including the European Landscape Convention, and brings heritage in line with wider changes to planning legislation and English Heritage's best practice. A key paragraph (HE3.1) from that consultation document regarding the approach to local planning is as follows:</p> <p>"Having assessed the evidence, local planning authorities should, where appropriate, set out a positive, proactive, strategy for the conservation, enhancement and enjoyment of the historic environment in their area. They should particularly focus on the local distinctiveness of the historic environment and how this can be used to promote a sense of place. They should include consideration of how best to conserve individual, groups or types of heritage assets that are most at risk of loss through neglect, decay or other pressures." This and other sections of the draft PPS underline the importance of the historic environment to the plan-making process. The PPS also deals with setting, promotes the enhancement of the historic environment and recognises its role in regeneration and place-making (sense of place and local character). The RSS policies should also be taken into account in the management of the historic environment. Following the publication of the East Midlands Regional Plan, March 2009, the relevant policies include 26, 27 and paragraph 4.3.39 sets out the sub-regional priorities for natural and cultural resources. This highlights the importance of the historic market towns and Sherwood Forest, which is of cultural as well as biodiversity importance.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Richard Troop	R Troop & Son	Mr Jon Phipps	Question 1	<p>Strengths on which the District can build: Communication links - A1, Robin Hood Airport, East Coast mainline access to Capital City (under 90 mins), access to Sheffield, Nottingham, Lincoln, York, Leeds (circa 60 mins) - for cultural opportunities. Access to Peak Park, N.Yorks Moors, Lincs Wolds (circa 60 mins). Adjacency to Bawtry and its strong retail and leisure offer. Strong equine traditions/leisure offer - oldest British flat race in UK: St Leger, race training stables at Wiseton, Scrooby, Carbourton, professional eventing yards at Sutton cum Lound, Mattersy, Lound, point to point and 3 day eventing fixtures within the district. Strong rural calendar of events generally. High visual amenity of some rural areas Nascent ability to attract the Knowledge Economy and higher order socio-economic groupings Potential ability to attract "Family Builders" and weaknesses that it should address Local Economy struggling to restructure (4.5 refers) Poor local skills levels (section 4.5 refers) Poor qualification levels (section 4.5 refers) Low level office space demand (section 4.5 refers) Slow growth in creative/innovative industries (section 4.5 refers) Sub-national average school performance/educational attainment at GCSE and A level Poor retention of younger qualified residents/skewed population balance towards older households (section 4.9 refers with non-standard analysis as to why population balance should be elderly). Narrow retail/leisure offer in Major Centres of Retford, Harworth and Worksop with quality of current offer unlikely to attract/sustain the Knowledge Economy. Low quality housing offer/very low value housing market in Worksop and Harworth. Requirement to identify Housing Renewal areas in worst concentrations of pre 1919 and inter war offer. Assumed to be majorly private sector landlord stock, the district does not appear to be undertaking enforcement action or issuing s215 notices. In the worst cases around Manton, application to Sec of State will be necessary to undertake clearance activity. Climate Change/Flooding/range of settlements dependant on oil for energy usage.</p>
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 1	<p>Bassetlaw's strengths include a very strong cultural heritage resource with a high number of designated listed and local interest buildings and archaeological sites. Clumber park is the most visited National Trust site in the region and serves both local and wider visits. The strength of tourism opportunity for enhancing the local economy, especially in the western regeneration area is very high. In particular the cultural heritage of Worksop should be a focus for inward investment and local pride.</p>
Mr Philip CABLE			Question 1	<p>The essential weakness of the current planning is the huge inconsistencies and lack of clarity perceived in the decisions that have been made during the past 3 years, particularly in rural communities.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
				<p>Whilst it is acknowledged that a vision for the district is not presented within the Options Document, the Agency would anticipate that any forthcoming vision would be in line with that for the Sustainable Community Strategy. The Agency would welcome reference to sustainable transport provision and the contribution it can make to reducing the impact of growth on climate change, enabling economic growth and improving the quality of life for residents. This would reflect key goals of Delivering a Sustainable Transport System, which sets out Central Government's framework for transport (DfT, Novemebr 2008). In terms of the supporting objectives to the Vision, the Highways Agency would welcome the inclusion of objectives which aim to reduce the need to travel and seek to reduce reliance on the private car by encouraging greater use of public transport, walking and cycling. It is expected that the objectives to deliver the vision would also reflect the key role that transport plays in terms of sustainability, accessibility, access to jobs and training, and addressing safety and health issues. the Agency welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Core Strategy for the District and is keen to work with the authority as the Strategy progresses. The comments provided above refer to potential strengths and risks in relation to the spatial options proposed. It is important that the authority develops a robust transport evidence base to underpin consideration of spatial option and a preferred option. This will allow a more informed opinion of the potential impacts of growth on transport and assist in identifying the mitigating transport measures which may be required to support the Core Strategy. In the absence of such an evidence base, it is not possible for the Agency to fully endorse any of the spatial options put forward. It is acknowledged that there is not a transport model in place which covers the District. However the Agency is working with the East Midlands Regional Development Agency (emra) to expand the coverage of its PTOLEMY land use and transport model to incorporate the whole of the East Midlands, and this may be a tool the authority could utilise as part of the process of developing a transport evidnece base.</p>
Mr Owen Walters	Highways Agency		Question 1	
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 1	No comment.
				<p>Part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy is the Bassetlaw District Council commissioned Employment Land Capacity Study (ELCS) of August 2009 which at paragraph 4.2 identifies the competitive advantages of Bassetlaw that could help shape its future economic role, including: Good transport accessibility, particularly in relation to the A1 corridor; and Strong recent growth in transport and communications and the distribution, hotel and catering sectors. The report identified weaknesses and potential threats, including: A small economic base from which to generate growth; Competition from nearby economic centres (Sheffield and Doncaster) and low levels of inward investment. There is a lack of high quality large scale employment sites may have impacted on demand from major occupiers and contributed to the success of competing economic centres</p>
Mr Andy Kitchen	Pegasus Planning Group LLP		Question 1	

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 1	Clear hierarchy of settlements on which to base the distribution of the new development - including appropriate levels of service provision and enhancement of public transport connections. Undesignated (i.e. not National Park or AONB) but nonetheless valued landscapes of quality - including those based upon the historic estates such as those at Clumber, Thoresby and Welbeck. Also the wider relationship with Sherwood Forest which is well-known nationally. Unique heritage features ranging from the expansive historic estates to important examples of local history such as that at Mr. Straw's House. Opportunities to regenerate existing settlements - including through the utilisation of brownfield land.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 2	Improve public transport services. More buses and open up Misterton railway station.
Peter Frampton			Question 2	The Core Strategy should recognise the need for regeneration of previously mining -dependent communities - and the need to maintain the role of such settlements, especially in promoting regeneration of Welbeck Colliery
Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways		Question 2	One of the key aspirations of the Bassetlaw Sustainable Community Strategy is that "by 2020 Bassetlaw will have a national reputation as a place to live and work and as a tourist destination". 'Inland waterways are: Important tourism visitor destinations and attractions in their own right (attracting day-trippers, overnight stays, domestic and foreign visitors, and weekend and short breaks), as well as providing links to key markets, other visitor destinations and attractions (such as waterside parks, pubs, galleries and museums); The essential infrastructure upon which a wide range of leisure marine businesses are dependent and; A supporting factor in rural regeneration and diversification through tourism and recreation' (TCPA Policy Advice Note: Inland Waterways: Unlocking the potential and securing the future of inland waterways through the planning system (2009)). A policy framework which is supportive of unlocking the social, environmental and economic potential of the waterways could assist with achieving this key aspiration.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 2	Maximising the benefits (employment/economic, leisure and residential) that can be derived from existing leisure assets, such as the Chesterfield canal at Misterton, through high quality, mixed use development which complements and reinforces attractive, historic urban form and creates interesting, distinctive and connected new places to live, work and play.
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 2	Improvements in the standard of new build design generally, particularly close-grain urban design, to complement and reinforce the original urban grain in or near town centres and to create interesting, distinctive and connected new places elsewhere.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 2	Sustainable development, consistent with Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and the general Core Strategy principles and objectives. This needs to be linked to areas of need, communication links and providing a range of housing and employment types that will be a catalyst to sustainable growth in the District.
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 2	We would like to see a thriving and successful District with a rich natural environment that is both attractive to its residents and attracts tourists.
Mrs Janet Hodson			Question 2	More and better homes and improved employment offer in the main settlement of Worksop.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 2	Sustainable development, consistent with Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and the general Core Strategy principles and objectives. This needs to be linked to areas of need, communication links and providing a range of housing and employment types that will be a catalyst to sustainable growth in the District.
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 2	It is important that those assets which are of historic significance are identified, i.e. listed buildings, conservation areas as well as scheduled monuments and registered historic parks and gardens, which may also be of importance for wildlife as identified on page 102; conversely, ancient woodlands usually contain archaeological features. There will also be regionally and locally important heritage assets that you should be aware of. There could also be areas of nationally important archaeology that are not scheduled. You should also be aware of nationally and locally identified 'Heritage at Risk'. There are 15 entries on the 2009 national register. For further advice on these matters, please contact the County Sites and Monuments Record.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Richard Troop	R Troop & Son	Mr Jon Phipps	Question 2	<p>DISTRICT ISSUE: Reduction of deprivation in Worksop/Harworth/other settlements (enhancing asset values) How to change Tackling low demand and stigmatisation through demolition and rebuild of worst quality stock with mixed tenure replacement housing of high visual amenity and performance. "Bolt-on" new developments will not mask poor quality residential offer in deprived settlement centres fettering the ability to deliver long-term change. With weaker housing markets post credit crunch, volume house builders may not "risk" investment unless place shaping activity is radical/extensive in deprived settlements. DISTRICT ISSUE: Low capacity of district in terms of statutory enforcement activity (safeguarding asset values) How to Change Encouraging the public or private sector to invest in deprived areas requires long term commitment from the authority. Failing to undertake enforcement action (planning enforcement or private sector renewal enforcement) reduces the long term sustainability of place shaping interventions. The authority is particularly weak in this regard. LOCAL ISSUE: Cessation/reduction in external car users from other settlements using high quality services offered by Everton Village. Ø High performing village primary school sees school role pupils from Gringley, Beckingham, Walkeringham, Clayworth, Misson, Misterton, Bawtry - increasing the number of cars in the village. It will not be possible for the Planning Policy Team to evidence this trend in reverse (Everton residents accessing other primary schools). Ø Extraordinary leisure facilities provided by endowment from the Everton Metcalf Trust with associated sinking fund/revenue stream: tennis club, parking for 40 cars, changing rooms/toilets/pavilion, cricket pitch (with coaching, "nets", artificial wicket, tea rooms, "winning" local team), football pitch, bowling green, play park, full size billiard table - leisure facilities in Everton see an influx of non-residents at weekends and on summer evenings. Additional car users. Ø Extraordinary leisure facilities have a knock-on effect to the pubs in Everton with two establishments still supported/in business. Without "nonresident" support, Everton could not sustain two pubs. Additional car users. Ø High performing hairdressers and separate beauticians draws in wide ranging client base from a range of other settlements. Additional car users. Ø High Community Capacity sees a very good number of classes/groups enabled at the village hall when compared to other settlements. Probably additional car users. How to Change Recognising Everton as a Local Service Centre as opposed to a Rural Service Centre in the Bassetlaw Settlement Hierarchy. This will allow housing allocation to occur allowing excess capacity of high quality services to be "mopped up" by local pedestrian residents as opposed to car users from external settlements reducing traffic in the village.</p>
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 2	<p>Conservation area designation helps to protect key local heritage value. The core strategy could recognise that there is a relatively low level of designated conservation areas by comparison to neighbouring districts of similar size (e.g. N&SDC - see table below re. Q62).</p>
Mr Philip CABLE			Question 2	<p>Introduce policies that deal with 'other villages' identifies on page 23 e.g. There needs to be a housing density that reflects the character and existing village design.</p>
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 2	<p>A STOP TO THE FURTHER INDUSTRIALISATION OF THE TRENT VALLEY IN ORDER TO PRESERVE IT'S AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL CHARACTER</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Andy Kitchen	Pegasus Planning Group LLP		Question 2	A key potential area for change is for Bassetlaw to capitalise on opportunities for future employment and economic growth. The Bassetlaw ELCS identifies a strong level of growth in wholesaling employment and that the area has opportunities for further growth in this sector in the future enabling it to close the gap on the regional average (paragraph 4.12). It goes on to state in this paragraph that the good transport links of the area, in particular the A1(M), could also provide opportunities for growth in the sector. With regard to inward investment, paragraph 2.46 of the study identifies that inward investment success in recent years is poor, partly reflecting the District's proximity to larger or better economic centres such as Sheffield and Doncaster, but also limited by the supply of good quality sites and premises. A positive change would be to improve the amount of inward investment that is attracted to the District by identifying appropriate and allocating appropriate sites. This may ultimately help improve the poor supply of modern/new high quality employment premises as there is a disproportionately high level of secondary and tertiary accommodation currently available.
Mr Michael Smith	Government Office for the East Midlands		Question 2	While Section 4 'A Vision for Bassetlaw' makes some references to surrounding areas in the Spatial Portrait the rest of the document makes relatively little reference to areas adjoining Bassetlaw. Cross-boundary considerations will need to be taken into account and reflected as necessary in the final Core Strategy. PPS12 para 4.17 provides advice about this in the context of joint working.
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 2	Improvements to the range of activities at Clumber Park - in particular opportunities for appropriate business development related to the history and features of the Estate so that, for example, under-used/vacant historic buildings can be brought back into active use; woodland areas are appropriately managed and utilised as a resource; visitor enjoyment is improved through better interpretation and in particular that educational visits are supported by appropriate learning facilities. In respect of Mr. Straw's House there should be formal recognition of the importance of this Edwardian property and its wider surroundings which together are both evocative and an enthralling experience. The characteristics of this experience have been eroded by unsympathetic development in the immediate area. In addition to ensuring appropriate safeguarding of the settings of such assets through appropriate historic building policies, consideration should also be given to the designation of Conservation Area status - the Core Strategy should acknowledge the desirability of this and identify the need for a review to determine whether or not a Conservation Area should be established and its extent.
Environment Agency	Environment Agency		Question 2	The district produces more waste than any other Local Authority in Nottinghamshire and although the district is improving its recycling rates, it is still one of the worst performers (Defra statistics for 2007/08). It is therefore important that the emerging Core Strategy includes policies and objectives to ensure compliance with the 'waste hierarchy' during demolition, construction/renovation and use of new/existing developments.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 3	More affordable housing in rural areas
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 3	Raising the profile of Bassetlaw in general

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Miss Rachael Bust	Deputy Head of Planning and Local Authority Liaison Coal Authority		Question 3	<p>The Coal Authority was established by Parliament in 1994 to undertake specific statutory responsibilities associated with the licensing of coal mining operations in Britain; handle subsidence claims which are not the responsibility of licensed coalmine operators; deal with property and historic liability issues and provide information on coal mining. The Coal Authority set up a new Planning and Local Authority Liaison Department in 2008 to re-engage with the three planning systems across England, Scotland and Wales. The main areas of planning interest to The Coal Authority in terms of policy making relate to: the safeguarding of coal as a mineral in accordance with the advice contained in MPS1 and MPG3 in England; and ensuring that future development is undertaken safely and reduce the future liability on the tax payer for subsidence and other mining related hazards claims arising from the legacy of coal mining in accordance with the advice in PPG14 and MPG3 in England. Coal Mining Legacy As you will be aware, the Bassetlaw District area has been subjected to coal mining which will have left a legacy. Whilst most past mining is generally benign in nature potential public safety and stability problems can be triggered and uncovered by development activities. Problems can include collapses of mine entries and shallow coal mine workings, emissions of mine gases, incidents of spontaneous combustion, and the discharge of water from abandoned coal mines. These surface hazards can be found in any coal mining area where coal exists near to the surface, including existing residential areas. The new Planning Department at The Coal Authority was created in 2008 to lead the work on defining areas where these legacy issues may occur. Within the Bassetlaw District area the main coal mining legacy issues which need to be identified are mine entries and fissures concentrated in the west of the District. The Coal Authority has records of over 171,000 coal mine entries across the coalfields, although there are thought to be many more unrecorded. Shallow coal which is present near the surface can give rise to stability, gas and potential spontaneous combustion problems. It is estimated that as many as 2 million properties of the 7.7 million properties across the coalfields may lie in areas with the potential to be affected by these problems. In our view, the planning processes in coalfield areas need to take account of the coal mining legacy issues. The principal source of guidance is PPG14, which despite its age still contains the science and best practice on how to safely treat unstable ground. Within the wider Nottinghamshire County area there approximately 2,000 recorded mine entries and around 11 coal mining related hazards. Mine entries may be located in built up areas, often under buildings where the owners and occupiers have no knowledge of their presence unless they have received a mining report during the property transaction. Mine entries can also be present in open space and areas of green infrastructure, potentially just under the surface of grassed areas. Mine entries and mining legacy</p>
Mr Stephen Gaines	Peel Airports Limited		Question 3	<p>To build on the strength of RHADS both as a driver of economic growth for the region and a catalyst for more localised development; and to support surface access improvements to ensure local communities, particularly in deprived areas, can take advantage of business and job opportunities arising at the Airport.</p>
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 3	<p>Those presented in S.3 and the RSS (Northern Sub-region - para. 4.3.7) are appropriate. Sustainable development principles should be paramount. Nottinghamshire County Council Q3</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Chris Telford	Associate Director CGMS		Question 3	<p>Option 1: Housing Distribution of the Core Strategy Issues and Options document would provide for the distribution of residential development based on a hierarchy of settlements, and in principle, Option 1 is supported. However, it is considered that the distinction between villages defined as Local Service Centres and Rural Service Centres is arbitrary and unnecessary, and should be removed. Under Option 1 as it stands, the only provision for residential development within the Rural Service Centres would be "infill development within identified settlement boundaries". Contrary to this, it is considered that the planned provision of land for residential development should extend beyond the Core Service Centres and Local Service Centres, to also include proportionate provision within the Rural Service Centres. It is considered that the Core Strategy should make specific provision for sustainable smaller-scale residential development within Rural Service Centres, like Everton, proportionate to their scale and relative sustainability. Such development would help to meet local housing needs (particularly affordable housing), and maintain the viability of existing local services and facilities, thus being advantageous to the community as a whole, and the sustainability of rural life. Within the settlement hierarchy, a criteria based approach should be used to determine the acceptable scale of development for each settlement. The potential of settlements to take further development should be judged on the basis of their environmental capacity and the availability of suitable sites, as well as on their relative sustainability. It is considered that in making provision for development within Rural Service Centres, suitably located sites within or immediately adjacent to the principal built up areas should be included within settlement envelopes (and may also constitute future potential site allocations). While it is recognised that allocation of specific sites for development will require representations to be made on your Site Allocations DPD in due course, it is also considered that: The subject site, which currently lies outside the Everton settlement envelope, is readily accessible from the existing highway network, and has potential to be developed for a small number of houses e.g up to six modest semi-detached dwellings, which would sit comfortably adjacent to the existing development on Croft Way (effectively completing the street frontage), and which would avoid any adverse impacts on the characteristics of the settlement and the surrounding countryside. Development of the subject site for a small number of modest dwellings would also have the potential to meet the local need for rural affordable housing.</p>
Mr Chris Telford	Associate Director CGMS		Question 3	<p>Key objectives should include social and economic regeneration of rural areas and the more significant rural settlements. Such places have a vital role in ensuring a sustainable future for the district as a whole.</p>
Peter Frampton			Question 3	<p>Greater emphasis should be made on the need for regeneration on those parts of the District - and adjoining settlements - where deprivation arises from the decline in the coal mining industry</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways		Question 3	' The inland waterways are a multi-functional resource. Apart from their traditional role as a system for travel or transport they serve a variety of roles, including: An agent of or catalyst for regeneration A contributor to water supply and transfer, drainage and flood management A tourism, cultural, sport, leisure and recreation resource A heritage landscape, open space and ecological resource Sustainable modes of transport; and Routes for telecommunications (TCPA Policy Advice Note: Inland Waterways: Unlocking the potential and securing the future of inland waterways through the planning system (2009)). Given their potential to support a range of government agendas an objective should be to unlock the social, economic and environmental potential of the multifunctional waterways so that they can fulfil their potential in Bassetlaw.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 3	Improvements in the standard of new build design generally. Improved employment opportunities in rural areas, focussed on Local Service Centres, to reduce out-commuting.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 3	Improvements in the standard of new build design generally. Improved employment opportunities in rural areas, focussed on Local Service Centres, to reduce out-commuting.
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 3	Improvements in the standard of new build design generally, particularly close-grain urban design, to complement and reinforce the original urban grain in or near town centres and to create interesting, distinctive and connected new places elsewhere. Improvements in the quality and attractiveness of the employment site portfolio and the range of retail offer, at least matching the sub-regional average, to increase local economic development and reduce out-commuting and loss of trade.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 3	To regenerate the employment base linked to mixed use development and new opportunities. Strategic economic development needs to be identified and targeted. The A1 corridor which runs centrally through the District, with a good link to Robin Hood Airport, is crucial. This will enable the implementation of the growth and regeneration of the Haworth and Bircotes area in accordance with the Regional Spatial Strategy.
Mr Chris Telford	Associate Director CGMS		Question 3	Key objectives should include social, economic and environmental regeneration of rural areas and the more significant rural settlements. Such places have a vital role in ensuring a sustainable future for the district as a whole.
Mr David Barker			Question 3	Key objectives should include regeneration of the towns, protection of the surrounding countryside, and sustainable development - including minimising the need to travel for services, recreational and employment opportunities.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 3	Sustainable development combined with protection and enhancement of the natural environment, as set out in PPS1 and The East Midlands Regional Plan (2009), are the two key objectives to achieve for the District. Therefore, the Core strategy needs to address: High standards of sustainable development through the adoption of best practice guidelines and methods (e.g. Code for Sustainable Homes, BREEAM, SUDS); Identify a network of extant and potential natural green spaces through a Green Infrastructure Study to protect the biodiversity of the District and provide resilience for climate change; Identify potential locations for renewable energy; Protect and enhance the character of the District through a Landscape Character assessment that can inform location and design of developments; Have criteria-based strategies that are used to screen potential sites for development (as in the SHLAA) and inform spatial strategies for locating development.
Magnus Educational Centre			Question 3	Key objectives should include social and economic regeneration of rural areas and the more significant rural settlements. Such places have a vital role in ensuring a sustainable future for the district as a whole.
Mr Walker Dormer Tools Walker Dormer Tools	Ian Baseley Associates		Question 3	At paragraph 4.4, the Council recognises that the western edge of Bassetlaw, in particular Worksop, has significant regeneration potential. Paragraph 4.5 explains that there is a high level of out-commuting in Bassetlaw for higher wage jobs and that those employment opportunities that do exist in the District are generally at the lower end of the pay scale. Whilst it is appropriate for the Council to formulate policies which seek to promote and encourage the regeneration of the western edge of the District, including employment creating policies, the Council need to ensure that such an approach is based on securing mixed-use development which is recognised in national planning policy guidance to be a more sustainable form of development. In particular, the Sandy Lane Industrial Estate together with the adjoining Dukeries Industrial Estate (Claylands Avenue) comprises over 100 hectares of land which, in present Local Plan terms, is allocated solely as employment land. This excludes substantial areas of other adjoining land allocated for employment use. This approach is akin to zonal planning and not to mixed-use development. If the Council is to be successful in attracting new businesses to the area with the associated higher paid jobs, there will also be a need to provide high quality housing to support the expanded workforce. Failure to do this will result in people working in the District, but living outside of Bassetlaw. The regeneration of this part of Worksop must therefore be based on a mixed-use approach to development at a strategic level, including high quality residential development, and an understanding that many different types of land uses that do not fall within the traditional B1, B2 and B8 Use Classes can also provide significant levels of employment. This policy approach should feed into the core objectives of the LDF.
Mrs Janet Hodson			Question 3	Greater urban concentration in the Principal Settlement Worksop (as identified in the RSS) of the District.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 3	To regenerate the employment base linked to mixed use development and new opportunities. Strategic economic development needs to be identified and targeted. The A1 corridor which runs centrally through the District, with a good link to Robin Hood Airport, is crucial. This will enable the implementation of the growth and regeneration of the Haworth and Bircotes area in accordance with the Regional Spatial Strategy.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 3	As well as the LCA, you should also be aware of the Nottinghamshire Historic Landscape Characterisation, although as one of the first to be carried out, it is in need of some updating. However, the Mature Landscape Areas also provide information on the survival of historic landscapes. Again we advise you to consult the County Council about these data sources. Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans and other townscape assessments and urban characterization studies, such as Extensive Urban Surveys, which should be on the county HER, should also inform both the development of the strategy and its delivery. English Heritage promotes characterisation techniques which can be employed to better understand the character of places and help to ensure that LDFs are sound and locally distinctive. More information can be found online at www.englishheritage.org.uk/characterisation and the English Heritage regional office for the East Midlands would be happy to advise on possible approaches. In addition, guidance on characterisation and its use in spatial planning is being developed by English Heritage.
Adams	John Martin & Associates		Question 3	My client would respond by stating that the Core Strategy should be seeking to achieve the regional objectives for the District of Bassetlaw as set out in the East Midlands Regional Plan 2009 (RSS8). The Regional Plan seeks, inter alia, to promote the regeneration of smaller settlements in a way that promotes a more sustainable pattern of development. Policy 13a of the East Midlands Regional Plan March 2009 seeks for the delivery of a minimum of 7,000 dwellings in the Bassetlaw District during the period 2006 - 2026. In addition, Policy 14 of the Regional Plan seeks for the provision of a minimum of 10,000 affordable dwellings in the Northern HMA within the Plan period.
Mr Richard Troop	R Troop & Son	Mr Jon Phipps	Question 3	HIGHER VALUE EMPLOYMENT OFFER HIGHER HOUSEHOLD INCOME HIGHER HOUSEHOLD SPEND CAPABILITY HIGHER ORDER SKILL SETS HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT GRADUATE RETENTION USE OF ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCES/REDUCTION PER CAPITA CO2 EMISSIONS REDUCTION IN DEPRIVATION THROUGH MASTER PLANNING AND NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL ACTIVITY INCLUDING CLEARANCE AND MIXED TENURE REDEVELOPMENT QUALITY AFFORDABLE HOUSING OFFER ADJACENT TO EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES
Mr. David Wright	Clerk to the Council Everton Parish Council		Question 3	As younger generations move out of the village to find work in the towns and cities Everton could become an 'old people's' village of affluent elderly - thus, the village school would close. It will be more important to ensure that villages like Everton are more 'self contained' to support the needs of this aging population. The LDF needs to be flexible to allow this to happen. There are specific aspirations for the future of Everton that are expressed in the Everton Parish Plan, these being: Maintaining the character of the village and strictly limit future expansion. Support the school and local businesses Limited development of affordable housing Improved facilities for all young people New community facilities to offset disadvantages of rural isolation e.g. shop/post office, healthcare and further education. Improved opportunities for sport and recreation activities Conservation of the village through adequate control over future housing development especially in extensions and infill buildings
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 3	The Core Strategy should seek to address the low levels of designated conservation area (designating conservation areas is a legal duty for the authority).

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Philip CABLE			Question 3	The district requires a transparent and balanced policy for rural communities that reflect the major differences between them and the towns.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 3	No comment.
Mr Andy Kitchen	Pegasus Planning Group LLP		Question 3	As noted above, to increase the amount of inward investment by identifying good quality sites that would be attractive to potential inward investors. To also provide sites capable of accommodating major expansion requirements of districts existing occupiers preventing the risk of migration to better quality more suitable sites in competing economic centres.
Mr Michael Smith	Government Office for the East Midlands		Question 3	With reference to para 4.11 and appreciating the reasons you give for not setting down your (draft) vision and objectives at this stage, the lack of draft vision and objectives means that we cannot assess whether they will be sufficiently spatial in planning terms or locally distinctive. You will need to demonstrate very clearly how the responses you receive to your Issues & Options will shape or change your vision in the next document, to avoid an Inspector subsequently viewing the lack of vision at this stage as a sign that you currently have no vision for the area (noting you confirm at para 4.11 that the Council has a view on how Bassetlaw should change in future years but do not feel that it is appropriate to set it down at this stage, and similarly you have not set out the objectives that will drive delivery of this vision). Para 3.10 acknowledges the need to have regard to the vision set out in RSS at 4.3.6 for the Northern Sub-area although it does not mention the Sub-area objectives at 4.3.7.
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 3	Addressing the causes and effects of climate change so that emissions are minimised and adaptation strategies implemented. Promoting a sequential approach to the location of new development so that existing centres are supported and the need to travel (especially by private car) is minimised. Safeguarding natural resources - including water and soil (in terms of both quantity and quality). Ensuring that the landscape character is used to inform decision making (both in terms of policy development and decisions on individual proposals) and that schemes are assessed in relation to how well they respect and reinforce landscape character. Protection and improvement of the bio-diversity resource of the District - including enabling species to adapt to those impacts of climate change that are now unavoidable. The protection, enhancement, linkage and multi-functional use of green infrastructure. Safeguarding and enhancing the historic environment, including positive use of heritage resources, for example through heritage-led regeneration.
Environment Agency	Environment Agency		Question 3	The district produces more waste than any other Local Authority in Nottinghamshire and although the district is improving its recycling rates, it is still one of the worst performers (Defra statistics for 2007/08). It is therefore important that the emerging Core Strategy includes policies and objectives to ensure compliance with the 'waste hierarchy' during demolition, construction/renovation and use of new/existing developments.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 4	Option 3
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 4	Option 1

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr B Simpson			Question 4	Local service centre states it provides four essential services and some key services. How can Elkesley be sustainable to these. Only 1 village shop, where residents' can't do a full shop. Local school not large enough. Village Hall and 1 pub. Bus services are very limited to Retford and Worksop (the last one is at approximately 18:30 hours). No doctor. So I think that we should be in the 'Rural Service Centre' and not the 'Local Service Centre'.
Miss Rachael Bust	Deputy Head of Planning and Local Authority Liaison Coal Authority		Question 4	Spatial and Housing Distribution Option 3 Test of Soundness Justified Effective Consistency With National Policy X Whilst The Coal Authority does not have a particular preference for any of the three Spatial and Housing Distribution Options, Option 3: Focusing development in the former coal mining areas of west Bassetlaw should be recognised as resulting in the greatest likelihood of new development occurring in areas of coal mining legacy. Within the Bassetlaw District area the main coal mining legacy issues which need to be identified are mine entries and fissures. Although an issue that must be fully considered and addressed if Option 3 becomes the Council's favoured strategic option, it is important to stress that land instability and mining legacy is not a complete constraint on development, rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable. Reason - In order to address the requirements of PPG14 regarding land stability.
Richard Walters	Hallam Land Management Ltd		Question 4	We would support Option 1. Given that Table 5.5 shows that Spatial Option 1 is the only option that accords with RSS and, if the Core Strategy is to be 'sound', it has to accord with the RSS, then there would seem to be no choice other than that of Option 1.
Miss Amy Steer	Planner North Kesteven D C		Question 4	Option 1 is most appropriate for future development in Bassetlaw District. This is the more sustainable approach by distributing appropriate levels of development in settlements that have a sustainable level of services and facilities.
Mr Simon Miller	Persimmon Homes		Question 4	For reasons set out in our response to question 11 an alternative strategy is suggested which still takes into account the settlement hierarchy but also specifically addresses the issues arising in the former coal mining areas of West Bassetlaw. In particular this takes into account the requirement to provide a range of housing choice in Harworth to assist the long term regeneration of this settlement and that this will require more than just the release of previously developed land around the existing coal mine. In essence the general approach to encourage further development in this settlement is supported but we do not consider that the results of the further scoping studies for Harworth Bircotes have reached the correct conclusion but instead are based upon an over reliance on one land owner and the options for development especially those related to undeveloped land are remote from the existing residential areas and will not achieve the objectives of regeneration of social integration of the new development into the existing community.
Mr Stephen Gaines	Peel Airports Limited		Question 4	Options 1 and 3 are supported. These options build upon the economic development opportunities arising from the growth of RHADS. Those areas identified as being in need of regeneration and access to jobs are within reasonable distance of RHADS and therefore are well placed to take advantage of any development opportunities arising from the Airport.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 4	<p>Option 1: Appears to have clear evidence to support it. The RSS allows for this approach. Table 5.2 appears to justify the settlements' roles, with the support of the 2009 Study. With regard to Harworth/Bircotes, its position in the hierarchy has been justified by regeneration, sustainable development, and the need to provide an overall scale of development. The evidence for this appears to be present, but needs to be made more explicit, and this approach is supported by the RSS, in particular in paras. 4.3.7 and 4.3.10. Option 2: While para 5.10 indicates that this option reflects the RSS, it does not give sufficient emphasis to the roles of smaller settlements, which is specifically mentioned in Policy Northern SRS 1. Neither does it give clear guidance for the scale of development that might be allowed for. Option 3: This option offers support for the principal areas in need of regeneration but it does not give sufficient opportunity for development in eastern areas where service centres serving more remote rural areas might warrant support. It contradicts the RSS policy which specifically mentions Retford. However, an approach which gives greater emphasis to the eastern part of the district, on the lines of the RSS Policy Northern SRS 1 would be a feasible option. For example this could be to provide for development giving support for service centres serving rural areas. Overall there is preference for Option 1 as it delivers more strategic objectives. However, Option 3, with modifications, could equally do so and thus provide a more 'tailored' approach than Option1.</p> <p>Nottinghamshire County Council</p>
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 4	<p>Strengths - Character, heritage and countryside. Previously developed land. Links to S Yorkshire. Strong community in some smaller settlements. Labour force (some currently commuting out). Communication - A1 and ECML links, River Trent, Robin Hood Airport. Worksop's market town role & influence. Weaknesses - transition in the economy, significant deprivation in some small areas. Weakness of retailing in Worksop. Nottinghamshire County Council</p>
Mr John R Holland			Question 4	<p>Option 1 seems to provide the best solution of the options given. The parity of Tuxford (which provides arguably provides all essential services and all key services [the village hall was burnt down and is in process of reconstruction, Tuxford school has a 6 th form, a railway station is a possibility with a current NCC study and whilst there are only 4 ATMs, a bank is proposed for the new village hall]). It would be churlish to suggest that Tuxford should grow to the size of Retford or Harworth, but clearly has the capacity to support greater development than e.g. Gringley. It has three industrial estates, which have a similar amount of area to those in Retford. My forthcoming response to the SHLAA provides further detail on these issues. A new planned settlement could be considered, but this would require care and tight control - Tickhill and Bawtry are examples of local medieval planned settlements. The danger with modern planned settlements is that they become nothing more than a large housing estate with only road access. Outlook of a settlement should also be taken into account - Tuxford looks as much towards Ollerton, Newark and Lincoln as to Retford and Worksop. In this respect Authority boundaries are arbitrary.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Craig Ball	Development Planner UK Coal Mining Ltd		Question 4	<p>In respect of Question 4 of the Consultation Document, UK COAL supports the principle of Option 1's approach, which is based on a settlement hierarchy. Compared to the other options, Option 1 seeks to distribute growth across the district with a rightful focus of larger proportions of growth and development to the larger settlements such as Worksop, Harworth and Retford. However in addition, Option 1 still recognises the need for growth and development in a Page 3 of 14 number of smaller settlements, something that is omitted from Options 2 and 3. UK COAL consider that this will facilitate truly sustainable growth which is in line with the requirements of National and Regional Policy, in particular PPS1, which emphasises that sustainable development is the core principle underpinning planning (paragraph 3) with two of the four aims of sustainable development requiring social progress recognising the needs of everyone and maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment (paragraph 4). PPS3 paragraph 37, when referring to the suitable locations of development states that 'there is a need to create and maintain sustainable, mixed and inclusive communities in all areas, both rural and urban'. In relation to delivering sustainable development, PPS1 recognises that urban and rural regeneration is important (paragraph 27). The settlement hierarchy approach will enable regeneration benefits that result from growth and development to be realised across the district in a range of settlements, from the large to the very small instead of just a couple of larger settlements as would be the case with Options 2 and 3. This can only be achieved through a hierarchical approach and is particularly important to be realised given the high levels of deprivation and regeneration need in various locations across the district. Worksop and Retford continue to be recognised as the principal settlements in the district due to their size and importance, however UK COAL welcome the recognition Bassetlaw Council has attributed to Harworth and Bircotes as a suitable location to accommodate increased levels of growth and development. Harworth and Bircotes is a mining settlement that has previously been reliant on the colliery and a number of factories for jobs and prosperity. For this reason, the settlement boasts a sizable centre with shops, services and facilities. Following the decline of the factories and the movement of the colliery to a care and maintenance regime, the settlement has declined and although has had some ability to evolve and attract some business due to its attractive location close to the A1, it is in desperate need of investment and regeneration to retain and enhance its role as a service centre. In addition, the housing stock and employment offer is extremely limited and needs diversifying and its centre needs reinforcing to enable its enhancement and ability to continue to serve the settlement and its surrounding service centres and villages. To achieve this and the needed regeneration, significant levels of growth and development are required as recognised by Bassetlaw Council. Harworth and</p>
Mr Nick Basley	Ian Basley Associates		Question 4	<p>Mr Pickering strongly supports a spatial strategy based on a settlement hierarchy (Option1) as being the most appropriate means by which to distribute future development across the District. This strategy would see the majority of development continue to be directed towards Worksop, Retford (and Harworth Bircotes), with proportionately lesser amounts provided in the local and rural service centres respectively. Such a strategy closely reflects the hierarchical approach set out in Policy 3 of the East Midlands Regional Plan (EMRP). Owing to the largely rural nature of the District, it is extremely important that the needs and interests of the local and rural service centres are not overlooked at the expense of the District's larger urban settlements. The needs of rural areas are often very different to other areas and the strategy needs to reflect this.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Chris Telford	Associate Director CGMS		Question 4	A key issue is the need to sustain and build upon the vitality and viability of the district's rural service centres. In this respect, regard should be had for Everton as a significant village which provides essential services to existing residents in the village itself and the surrounding countryside.
Mr Chris Telford	Associate Director CGMS		Question 4	To maximise the objectives of sustainable development while recognising social and economic needs relating to the historic settlement pattern of the district, an overall Spatial Strategy based on a settlement hierarchy (Spatial Strategy: Option 1) should be adopted. However, within this context regard should be had for the importance of all villages which provide a significant number of local services. It is considered that the distinction between Local Service Centres (four essential services etc) and Rural Service Centres (three essential services etc) is somewhat arbitrary and unnecessary, not least because smaller services can open or close overnight. It is therefore suggested that this distinction be removed from the Core Strategy. Spatial Strategy Option 2, which would focus development in the towns only is not supported as it is believed that this scale of development would be injurious to the character of the towns themselves and the surrounding countryside. It would also ignore the social and economic needs of more rural parts of the district - particularly those in the north and east.. Spatial Strategy: Option 3, which would focus development in the former coal mining areas of west Bassetlaw is also not supported, as it would ignore the social and economic needs of the east of the district and would not be reflective of general market demand.
Michael Meadows	Drivers Jonas	Michael Meadows	Question 4	Three spatial strategy options are considered in the Core Strategy Issues and Options for the distribution of growth across the district, to ensure a sustainable pattern of development. LIH supports this aim and considers Option 1: A spatial strategy based on settlement hierarchy to be the most appropriate to deliver growth over the period to 2026 and beyond. Spatial Option 1 seeks to spread development throughout the District, creating a balanced distribution of housing and economic growth. This approach is supported, with regard to national and regional policy guidance and the Council's existing evidence base, including the draft SHLAA, draft Employment Land Capacity Study and Services and Facilities Study.
Peter Frampton			Question 4	The RSS states at paragraph 4.3.10: - 'A sequential approach to development which only favours development in the largest settlements could compromise the regeneration of the Sub-Area as a whole and result in the smaller centres becoming increasingly unviable' Option 1, - A "Spatial Strategy based on a settlement hierarchy" and Option 2 - "A Spatial Strategy concentrating development in Major Centres" will have the effect feared within the RSS resulting in smaller settlements becoming unviable . It is not suggested that the Spatial Strategy should 'focus' development in the former coal mining areas of west Bassetlaw (option 3). Rather a more sensitive spatial strategy is required that can respond to the needs of different communities across the District, and in support of communities which adjoin the administrative area. Spatial planning for Bassetlaw should not be treated as an 'island'. Administrative boundaries have little relevance to the daily lives of communities. Welbeck Colliery served as a major source of employment to the local community in Bassetlaw as well as nearby communities in Mansfield District.
Edward Fisher			Question 4	Support Option 3

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 4	Option 1 because it most closely complies with national and regional policy, assists with regeneration, provides for appropriate levels of growth in more rural areas and reduces the need to travel for local services.
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 4	Option 1 because it most closely complies with national and regional policy, assists with regeneration and reduces the need to travel for local services.
William Davis			Question 4	William Davis Ltd do not support any of the three spatial options proposed within the Issues and Options Consultation. We consider that an alternative option should be considered which draws upon elements of Options 1 and 2 but provides a different steer on the distribution of development across the borough. Further detail on our proposed alternative option can be found in our response to Question 7 below.
Mr Michael Lyus			Question 4	After having read the SHLAA and Core Strategy document I would like to inform you of my views about these docuemnts. My interest lies with the village of Tuxford and I believe that the village of Tuxford, would greatly benefit from Option 1 -A Spatial Strategy based on a settlement Hierarchy. Tuxford has a great location within Bassetlaw, located on the great North Road next to the A1 and close to Newark and Retford, both towns boasting train stations with high speed trains linking the area with London. Tuxford is also located close to Doncaster Airport. The village of Tuxford has a good selection of services, in particiular health services, a church, education and shopping. Making it an ideal vilaage for families to settle. I believe that Tuxford would greatly benefit from future growth, in particular detached housing allowing familites to take advantage of the facilities and services Tuxford has to offer. Tuxford has numerous employment opportunities close by from local power stations to Ashvale, Ollerton Road industrial estates. In summary, I believe that Tuxford is suitable and able to cope with future growth without any detrimental effect to the character of the village. If vany growth in the village will re-invigorate the village, create increased demand for convenience shopping in the village.
Mrs Anne Lyus			Question 4	After having read the SHLAA and Core Strategy document I would like to inform you of my views about these docuemnts. My interest lies with the village of Tuxford and I believe that the village of Tuxford, would greatly benefit from Option 1 -A Spatial Strategy based on a settlement Hierarchy. Tuxford has a great location within Bassetlaw, located on the great North Road next to the A1 and close to Newark and Retford, both towns boasting train stations with high speed trains linking the area with London. Tuxford is also located close to Doncaster Airport. The village of Tuxford has a good selection of services, in particiular health services, a church, education and shopping. Making it an ideal vilaage for families to settle. I believe that Tuxford would greatly benefit from future growth, in particular detached housing allowing familites to take advantage of the facilities and services Tuxford has to offer. Tuxford has numerous employment opportunities close by from local power stations to Ashvale, Ollerton Road industrial estates. In summary, I believe that Tuxford is suitable and able to cope with future growth without any detrimental effect to the character of the village. If vany growth in the village will re-invigorate the village, create increased demand for convenience shopping in the village.
Mr Ian Lord	Building Link Design		Question 4	Support Option 1. Provides a spread of development across the district to address both rural and urban needs.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Ian Lord	Building Link Design		Question 4	Support Option 1. Provides a spread of development across the district to address both rural and urban needs.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 4	We support, as a major Landowner linked to the Haworth and Bircotes area Option 3 and to an extent Option 1 as these are consistent with RSS policies and they will help deliver the employment and housing growth envisaged in this area. Being close to the A1 and with good links to Robin Hood Airport, this will be one of the key regeneration and development areas in the District and it should provide a wide range of employment opportunities.
Mr Chris Telford	Associate Director CGMS		Question 4	To maximise the objectives of sustainable development while recognising social and economic needs relating to the historic settlement pattern of the district, an overall Spatial Strategy based on a settlement hierarchy (Spatial Strategy: Option 1) should be adopted. However, within this context regard should be had for the importance of all villages which provide a significant number of local services. It is felt that the distinction between Local Service Centres (four essential services etc) and Rural Service Centres (three essential services etc) is somewhat arbitrary and unnecessary, not least because smaller services can open or close overnight. It is therefore suggested that this distinction be removed from the Core Strategy. Spatial Strategy Option 2, which would focus development in the towns only is not supported as it is believed that this scale of development would be injurious to the character of the towns themselves and the surrounding countryside. It would also ignore the social and economic needs of more rural parts of the district - particularly those in the north and east.. Spatial Strategy: Option 3, which would focus development in the former coal mining areas of west Bassetlaw is also not supported, as it would ignore the social and economic needs of the east of the district and would not be reflective of general market demand.
Mr David Barker			Question 4	To maximise the objectives of sustainable development while recognising social and economic needs relating to the historic settlement pattern of the district, an overall Spatial Strategy based on a settlement hierarchy (Spatial Strategy: Option 1) should be adopted. However, within this context regard should be had for Retford's status as a medium-sized town and retail and service centre of sub-regional significance as identified in the East Midlands Regional Plan, Policy Northern SRS2. It is therefore a highly sustainable location for residential development, and this should be reflected in its status in the hierarchy. Spatial Strategy: Option 3, which would focus development in the former coal mining areas of west Bassetlaw is definitely not supported, as it would ignore the social and economic needs of the east of the district and would not be reflective of general market demand. It should be considered that the eastern third of the district is relatively rural in nature, and Retford therefore has a key role to play in meeting the needs for associated employment, services and housing. This role should be fostered, to maintain the relative sustainability of the settlement as a whole and the surrounding rural hinterland.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Miss Claire Whittaker	Assistant Planner DPP		Question 4	In response to the above, we recommend the Council promote option 1 'a spatial strategy based on a settlement hierarchy' which proposes the distribution of development across Bassetlaw using a tiered hierarchy of grouped settlements. The promotion of spatial option 1 is consistent with national policy with planning policy 6 (PPS6) stating: local planning authorities should adopt a positive approach to planning for the future of all types of centres within their areas. Having regard to the regional spatial strategy and reflecting their community strategy, local planning authorities should, through the core strategy development plan document, set out a spatial vision and strategy for the network and hierarchy of centres, including local centres, within their area, setting out how the role of different centres will contribute to the overall spatial vision for their area. Spatial option 1 is also consistent with the RSS, which defines a hierarchy of settlements within the sub-region. Although the RSS directs significant levels of development to the larger areas of Worksop and Retford it also acknowledges that development needs of other settlements and rural areas should be provided for. In addition, Bassetlaw District Council's Services and Facilities Study (2009) also states the importance of providing a spread of development across the District to address both rural and urban needs.
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 4	Worksop has been identified as a sub-regional centre in The East Midlands Regional Plan (2009) so that needs to be taken into account when deciding on the spatial strategy for development. Whatever Option is finally selected it needs to be underpinned by the principles of sustainable development.
Magnus Educational Centre			Question 4	To maximise the objectives of sustainable development while recognising social and economic needs relating to the historic settlement pattern of the district, an overall Spatial Strategy based on a settlement hierarchy (Spatial Strategy: Option 1) should be adopted. However, within this context regard should be had for the importance of all villages which provide a significant number of local services. It is considered that the distinction between Local Service Centres (four essential services etc) and Rural Service Centres (three essential services etc) is somewhat arbitrary and unnecessary, not least because smaller services can open or close overnight. It is therefore suggested that this distinction be removed from the Core Strategy. Spatial Strategy Option 2, which would focus development in the towns only is not supported as it is believed that this scale of development would be injurious to the character of the towns themselves and the surrounding countryside. It would also ignore the social and economic needs of more rural parts of the district - particularly those in the north and east.. Spatial Strategy: Option 3, which would focus development in the former coal mining areas of west Bassetlaw is also not supported, as it would ignore the social and economic needs of the east of the district and would not be reflective of general market demand.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mrs Sophie Lucas			Question 4	<p>The Issues and Options (I&O) paper puts forward three spatial strategies for the delivery of growth across the District. In response to Question 4, SSL wish to support Option 1, which seeks to ensure that Worksop, alongside Retford and Haworth Bircotes, acts as the " ...focus for all new development in the District". The extent of Worksop, for the purpose of this spatial strategy, reflects that which is defined within the published RSS, and includes the settlements of Shireoaks and Rhodesia. Option 1 also seeks to ensure that Worksop as a 'Core Service Centre', provides for all " ...five essential services and facilities" , as identified by the Council's Service and Facility Study (September 2009). This Study states that Core Services Centres often form "... the largest settlements..." which are " ...Service Centres to the surrounding, smaller settlements, and are subject to regular travel from people within the District who need access certain services and facilities such as a supermarket or library" (Indigo emphasis). This Study also goes on to suggest that the settlements may comprise sustainable locations for future housing growth. SSL are supportive of the need to accommodate future housing growth through sustainable extensions as advocated by Option 1, and although the I&O does not identify specific locations for additional growth, it should be borne in mind that the existing SSL store at Highgrounds Road has a key role in meeting the Planning Policy Team Queens Buildings Potter Street Worksop Nottinghamshire S80 2AH By email and post future.plans@bassetlaw.gov.uk 22 October 2009 Our ref. SL/VH/482302 Page 2 of 3 bulk shopping needs of the western area of Worksop. Clearly, should any extension be proposed to the west of Worksop, the store would comprise the closest, existing main food shopping destination, and would be able to perform an importance role in ensuring that the needs of future residents are met in a sustainable manner.</p>
Mr Walker Dormer Tools Walker Dormer Tools	Ian Baseley Associates		Question 4	<p>A spatial strategy based on a settlement hierarchy (Option 1A) is supported as the most appropriate means by which to distribute development across the District. We wholeheartedly agree with the general support for this strategy from stakeholders who responded to the Council's Core Strategy Preferred Options (January 2006) who are in favour of a hierarchy of settlements based on their size and level of service provision for both urban and rural communities. The majority of development should be direct towards Worksop, Retford and Harworth Bircotes, with lesser amounts in the local and rural service centres. This adopts the hierarchical approach set out in Policy 3 of the East Midlands Regional Plan (EMRP).</p>
Mr Walker East Markham Walker East Markham	Ian Baseley associates		Question 4	<p>A spatial strategy based on a settlement hierarchy (Option 1A) is supported as the most appropriate means by which to distribute development across the District. We wholeheartedly agree with the general support for this strategy from stakeholders who responded to the Council's Core strategy Preferred Options (January 2006) who are in favour of a hierarchy of settlements based on their size and level of service provision for both urban and rural communities. The majority of development would be direct towards Worksop, Retford and Harworth Bircotes, with lesser amounts in the local and rural service centres. This adopts the hierarchical approach set out tin Policy 3 of the east Midlands Regional Plan (EMRP). It is extremely important in adopting this spatial strategy that the needs and interests of rural service centres are not overlooked at the expense of the District's larger urban settlements. The needs of rural areas are often very different to other areas and the strategy needs to reflect this.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mrs Janet Hodson			Question 4	None of the proposed spatial options. A further option should be developed to concentrate new housing / employment as an urban extension to Worksop reinforcing its role as identified in policies 7 and 19 of the RSS.
Mr Tom Garnett	Energy Review		Question 4	Spatial strategy should be based upon settlement hierarchy - this is specifically in line with RSS policy.
Ms Vicki Ingleby	Turley Associates		Question 4	On behalf of our client Nottinghamshire County Council, we support Option 1 - A Spatial Strategy based on a Settlement Hierarchy. This option provides the opportunity for the majority of new development to take place in suitable locations, with good access to infrastructure and services, without precluding development in smaller settlements.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 4	We support, as a major Landowner linked to the Haworth and Bircotes area Option 3 and to an extent Option 1 as these are consistent with RSS policies and they will help deliver the employment and housing growth envisaged in this area. Being close to the A1 and with good links to Robin Hood Airport, this will be one of the key regeneration and development areas in the District and it should provide a wide range of employment opportunities.
Mr PG Hills	Clerk to Tuxford Town Council Tuxford Parish Council		Question 4	Option 1 is supported but with an increased emphasis on misterton and tuxford because: - Appropriate amounts of development would be concentrated on the two larger and reasonably accessible villages in the rural east which have basic services. this would help to support their continued viability and their function in supporting the network of smaller rural settlements. - Development should be appropriately apportioned relative to the size and character of the settlements.
Adams	John Martin & Associates		Question 4	My client supports the spatial Option 1 , which is a Spatial Strategy based on a Settlement Hierarchy. This option is considered to be consistent with the principal priorities as set out in the East Midland Regional Plan 2009. As previously stated, Bassetlaw District is within the Northern Sub-area HMA. The Sub-Regional Strategy of the Regional Plan, as set out in paragraph 4.3.6, states that the Northern Sub-area will be an area containing vibrant towns and smaller centres which are easily accessible from major transport routes, which is rich in carefully protected natural and cultural assets and supporting a viable population and employment base within sustainable communities. The hierarchy has clearly emerged from detailed analysis of the sustainability criteria of each settlement, and an assessment of the level of services and facilities. Having assessed the Bassetlaw District Council Services and Facilities Study - one of the suite of background studies to support the development of the Local Development Framework - it is clear that the settlement of Elkesely is well-served by a village school, employment sites, a village shop and a reasonable Monday - Saturday public transport service to the surrounding settlements, together with Worksop and Retford. Elkesley is therefore a sustainable settlement within the District of Bassetlaw, that has a wide range of services and facilities, and which is well-placed to provide a function as a Second-Tier settlement to deliver development. The option to designate Elkesley as a Local Service Centre is therefore welcomed.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Richard Troop	R Troop & Son	Mr Jon Phipps	Question 4	<p>Option 1: Spatial Strategy based on a Settlement Hierarchy This option is supported by the respondents as providing the best reponse "to try and ensure that everyone has the best possible access to facilities, homes and jobs, while endeavouring to provide a spread of development across the district to address both rural and urban needs" (5.6 refers) However, the document fails to make an explicit link between the employment offer and the residential offer. The ability of district settlements to attract higher order skill sets and restructure the local economy through the quality of the residential offer is not highlighted - contrary to research findings (see later). The ability of settlements to deliver renewable energy sources is also not considered within the options document.</p> <p>Option 2: Spatial Strategy based concentrating development in Major Centres Option 2 is not supported by the respondents. 1. At pg20 the "Spatial Strategy for Bassetlaw" Section refers to the capability of Harworth to accommodate 4,360 new homes and 10,800 new jobs. There is no detail provided as to the type of employment anticipated although it is assumed that a proportion will be coal mining. 2. Throughout summer 2009, a number of exploration rigs were established from Harworth, along Youldholes Lane in Mattersey, Eel Pool Lane at Drakeholes and on to Gringley which sustains very large concentrations of coal. If large scale coal mining activity is to resume from Harworth, the cross-over with Option 1 and the identification of Gringley as a Local Service Centre likely to be allocated new housing, needs to be examined. 3. More explicit information is required as to the amount of gap funding required to deliver the long term infrastructure needs of an urban extension delivering 4,360 homes. Much of the land will be contaminated and with Bassetlaw now part of a Housing Market Area covering four authorities, public sector gap funding requirements must be shared/agreed jointly. That agreement will depend on gap funding requirements for a range of "non-Bassetlaw" settlements. Within the wider City Region context, it is noted that Harworth is close to Rossington, the Doncaster MBC proposed settlement for growth point status. The market for such a large amount of new housing may be tested. 4. It is not felt that the leisure, retail or education provision in Harworth and Worksop is of a standard to adequately attract the range of households needed to help Bassetlaw to restructure the Local Economy (4.5 refers). Whilst sustained intervention may provide success in the attraction of "family builders" required to reduce deprivation in these settlements, attraction of the "knowledge economy" is highly unlikely. 5. At 4.4 the "Vision for Bassetlaw" Section is explicit in stating: "workforce and affordable housing (compared to neighbouring areas) make Bassetlaw an area likely to prove attractive for new businesses. Employment generation and the demand for employment land is expected to increase considerably over the next 10 to 15 years" We feel it would be helpful for the Planning Policy Team to refer to the</p>
Mrs Jennifer Kirk	Clerk to Headon-cum-Upton, Grove and Stokeham Parish Council		Question 4	<p>Development is concentrated on regions where everyone has access to facilities. Villages such as Headon-cum-Upton, Grove and Stokeham (classed as 'other villages') would have provision for growth as affordable housing would be permitted, and not just farming development as would be the restriction of the other options.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mrs Claire Tomlinson			Question 4	<p>After having read the SHLAA and Core Strategy document I would like to express my views. My interest lies with the future development of the village of Tuxford, I feel that Tuxford would greatly benefit from Option 1 - A Spatial Strategy based on a settlement hierarchy. Tuxford has a fantastic location within Bassetlaw, based close to the A1 and close to Newark and Retford, both Towns boasting train stations with high speed trains linking the area with London. Tuxford village has a good selection of services and for families has a fantastic nursery, primary school and secondary school. I feel that Tuxford would greatly benefit from four bedroom detached housing allowing families to take advantage of the facilities and services Tuxford has to offer. There is a great sense of community in the village and people are proud to be a part of the village. From my personal experience I have friends who live in Tuxford and as they start to have families would like to stay in the village so their children can attend the schools, but there is a lack of detached family homes for them to choose from. As Tuxford has on its door step a number of areas of work like Ashvale, Ollerton Road Industrial Estate, employment opportunities such as these, makes it a great choice for families. In summary, I believe that Tuxford is suitable and able to cope with future growth. Growth would equally breathe new life into the village.</p>
Mr Andrew Laing			Question 4	<p>Options 2 and 3 propose to concentrate development in major centres (2) or the former coal mining areas of West Bassetlaw (3). Promotion of either option is not supported by national and regional Policy Guidance. For example PPS3 (Housing), paragraph 9 'Strategic Housing Policy Objectives' seeks to "provide everyone with an opportunity to live in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live". This would not be achieved if options 2 and 3 were implemented.</p> <p>The policy in PPS3 goes on to list what goals can achieve this, including the creation of sustainable, inclusive, mixed communities in all areas both urban and rural [our emphasis]. At a regional level, the adopted East Midlands Regional Plan - March 2009, Policy 3 'Distribution of New Development' emphasises the development needs of other settlements (outside of the Principle Urban Areas and Sub Regional Centres) and rural areas and this should also be provided for. In these areas, new development is encouraged where it contributes to the maintenance of the distinctive character and viability of rural communities, and assists in shortening journeys and facilitating access to jobs and services, strengthening rural enterprise. It also emphasises the need to make the best use of previously developed land and vacant and under-used buildings in urban and other sustainable locations. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK In addition, Policies SRS 1 and 2 of the East Midlands RSS, defines the hierarchy of settlements within the sub region. Whilst the primary role will be to develop principle settlements, the Policy recognises the importance of Town and Village Centres to meet local needs or to support regeneration and maintaining or improving the vitality of the centre and local facilities. Option 1 is the only strategy which can meet the above National and Regional Guidance. Development of options 2 and 3 would concentrate future development in the main centres, which would exclude other settlements meeting their housing needs, polarising development and creating housing strategies in town and village locations. This will affect the housing market and affordability of homes outside these preferred locations.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 4	Of the 3 spatial strategy options available, Option 1 is supported which promotes spatial strategy based upon a settlement hierarchy. It is considered that this would provide a more evenly distributed pattern of development rather than placing an over reliance solely upon major centres for the delivery of development and likewise without focussing too heavily upon former coal mining areas as suggested in Option 3.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 4	Of the options available, it is considered that Spatial Option 1 which is based upon the provision of a settlement hierarchy is the most appropriate approach to the delivery of new development. This particular option identifies Worksop as a Core Service Centre ie at the top of the settlement hierarchy and therefore the focus for the majority of new development. In sustainability terms, this approach seems the most sensible given the level of development directed to individual settlements will be based upon their position within the hierarchy.
		Miss Kate Helliwell	Question 4	We are of the opinion that Option 1 - A Spatial Strategy based on a Settlement Hierarchy is the most suitable option. This strategy focuses development on settlements which already provide the infrastructure to support further development such as highways and services.
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 4	This would avoid some of the issues associated with concentrating growth in the historic market towns as proposed in Option 2. Overall this option is preferred as it would promote appropriate levels of growth in the different types of settlements. However, in terms of distribution of growth, because of capacity issues (see below), it might be appropriate to concentrate a higher proportion of growth in Harworth Bircotes, but this needs further consideration. Option 2: Spatial Strategy of concentrating development in Worksop and Retford There needs to be consideration of the capacity of these settlements to accommodate major growth without adversely affecting their character as historic market towns. For example, would it result in pressure for major redevelopment in the town centre together with more car parking and traffic management measures? What is the landscape, natural and historic character of the areas around the towns? How well can a major urban extension be integrated into the rest of the town, both physically and socially? It also does not recognise the development and regeneration potential of development at Harworth Bircotes. Option 3: Spatial Strategy of focusing development in the former coal mining areas of west Bassetlaw This regeneration option could help to protect the historic character of Retford, although some development might be beneficial, but may put greater pressure on Worksop and its environs.
Mrs A Haddon	Clerk to Mattersey Parish Council Mattersey Parish Council		Question 4	We are of the opinion that Option 1 is the preferred strategy but with the towns of Misterton and Tuxford added. Option 2 is far too narrow and Option 3 is totally inappropriate, being a political fudge with no strategic basis. Misterton should be added as a settlement for growth since this would provide an additional impetus for the most remote part of the County. Additional land should be identified for business both manufacturing and office space. There should be a total stop to house building on existing employment land. Tuxford has an excellent road network and therefore could be developed as a transport/distribution hub with associated housing development.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 4	The Parish Council would like the District Council to consider Spatial Strategy Option 3 but with the inclusion of Retford in order to dilute the impact of developments throughout the region. This would also give a better balance for the region with access to the A1 from both east and west alleviating pressure on the highways system.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr. David Wright	Clerk to the Council Everton Parish Council		Question 4	RS clarified the impact on Everton through Spatial Strategy Options 2 and 3; under these options Everton wouldn't see any significant development other than those that would meet an identifiable need. Everton Parish Council Support Spatial Strategy Option 1 . Why is the level of housing and employment growth (in percentage terms) the same for Harworth Bircotes? Weighting future development towards delivering more jobs than houses would be a better approach to solve the deprivation issues in the settlement. RS confirmed that Option 1 does seek to deliver more employment in Harworth Bircotes than Retford to address these issues, however the proposed levels of housing and employment growth are an attempt to balance their affects on the larger settlements in the district.
Mr Philip CABLE			Question 4	Non of the 3 Spatial Strategy proposals make adequate provision for the rural communities to thrive, by cutting off natural growth the prosperity of rural communities will be deliberately curtailed.
Mr Owen Walters	Highways Agency		Question 4	In principle, the agency would support an approach to development which reduces the need to travel and reliance on the private car, whilst encouraging greater use of public transport, walking and cycling, as a preferred strategy to minimise the impact of growth on the strategic road network. In this respect development option 2 appears to provide the best opportunity to achieve this objective.
Mr Jeremy Johnson	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council		Question 4	Regeneration of former coal mining towns is an imperative that is consistent with Doncaster's strategy to promote regeneration through economic engagement. Both option 1 and 3 support regeneration of Harworth and Bircotes. Options 1 and 3 are supportable as new development at Harworth and Bircotes would be serviced by Doncaster town centre. Option 3 correctly identifies the large scale retail and leisure facilities available in Doncaster (paragraph 5.14). Option 2 is not supported as this would not support regeneration in Harworth/Bircotes. With out this, pressure would be placed on Doncaster to contribute its employment land and housing to support the needs of Harworth/Bircotes.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 4	Option 1

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Andy Kitchen	Pegasus Planning Group LLP		Question 4	<p>The Spatial Strategy for the District ought to focus development in major centres, but this should not be at the expense of unduly limiting development in other settlements, in areas in need of regeneration and in areas which present opportunities attractive to the market place. Accordingly, an amended Option 1 ought to be promoted which does not restrict developments in other locations to fulfilling only local need. None of the three options allow for the delivery of employment generating opportunities along the A1 corridor as highlighted in paragraph 5.48 of the Core Strategy Consultation and Question 15. As will be noted in the response to Question 15, the Spatial Strategy must appropriately allow for employment related development along the A1 corridor to capitalise on a specific area of demand (chiefly distribution and warehousing). This approach is strongly recommended in the Bassetlaw ELCS and is therefore underpinned by a credible evidence base. The recent A1 improvements significantly improve this section of the A1 improving M18 and A14 links which lead to the principle UK ports, therefore strengthen its viability as a B8. Many of the more substantial/high tech recycling requirements (as identified in the ECLS) and operations share the same locational criteria as B8 users, as they may have facilities serving the UK and import/export inputs and their outputs. Many of the UKs principle food manufactures are based in the East of England. The ELCS identifies this sector for growth and the A1 corridor is well placed to accommodate this type of demand. Much of the raw materials are locally produced reducing food miles and other elements imported. Bassetlaw is well placed to service the UK market due to its central location and the shelf life constraints of food. It is therefore recommended that the spatial strategy allows for employment development along the A1 corridor.</p>
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 4	<p>Generally Option 1 is supported, but there is a case to give some emphasis to the former mining settlements where there is both the need and opportunity for regeneration. Accordingly it is suggested that this Option is modified to include a specific emphasis on development in Langold and Carlton-in-Lindrick beyond that anticipated in this Option as drawn up at present. (A lesser focus on some of the Rural Service Centres [see comments below - Qs.9 and 14] could balance up this change in emphasis.)</p>
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 4	<p>Option 1 is the best in terms of impact on and protection of key historic conservation areas in the district.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 4	Of the other two options we would favour option 1. Option 3 is not considered to be an appropriate option to follow because it would not deliver a pattern of housing development that accords with the settlement hierarchy recommended in the EMPG, as it would follow a pattern of development that, whilst it may assist in the regeneration of former coal mining settlements, these are not necessarily best placed in terms of delivering a sustainable pattern of development with good access to services and facilities. Option 2 would allow the two major settlements (Worksop and Retford) to develop in a manner which reflects their Sub-regional and Service Centre roles, helping them to sustain and expand the existing services in these settlements, which serve the whole district. Option 2 would permit development in other settlements that would meet locally identified needs. This strategy is more likely to be deliverable than either of the other two options as it would permit houses in locations which are likely to be suitable, attractive and viable for development. Given the shortfall in housing development to meet the national and regional targets this is an important material consideration. Housing developments should be in locations that offer good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure; option 2 would deliver this. In delivering sustainable development, we consider that the focus of large-scale developments and growth in the existing regional and sub-regional centres of Worksop and Retford, with development elsewhere meeting the locally arising need at an appropriate, smaller scale and that this option has the best prospects for delivering housing targets in the short, medium and long term.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 5	Yes
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 5	Agree
Mr David Brown	Merry Vale Development		Question 5	We only agree in part with the proposed settlement hierarchy. Misterton and Tuxford should be elevated in status 'higher' than the other settlements listed because of the reasons set out in the response to question 4.
Richard Walters	Hallam Land Management Ltd		Question 5	We are in broad agreement with the settlement hierarchy shown in Table 5.1, however, we feel that viability issues would impact on the potential for Harworth Bircotes to grow into a Core Service Centre.
Mr Simon Miller	Persimmon Homes		Question 5	While option 1 is not supported for reasons set out in detail to our response to question 11 we do not object to the settlement hierarchy.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 5	That option would also still provide for growth in selected smaller towns and villages, although care should be taken to determine which of those settlements should accommodate housing and employment. The accessibility and function of those settlements, especially the smaller ones in relation to the larger and more viable ones, is a critical factor to consider when deciding on the roles each should take up and the growth associated with them. Similarly it should be recognised that some of these villages have a relationship to settlements outside Bassetlaw, such as Gainsborough. A study of accessibility to services across the district could be useful in this regard; the County Council has data and resources that may assist this work. NB Shirebrook & Rhodesia warrant separate consideration as part of the hierarchy. Just because they are included with Worksop in the Regional Plan is not a reason for them not to be considered at local level. The Services and facilities study included those settlements, but concentrated in the results on more rural settlements and did not include them in the final results, with no explanation given. Nottinghamshire County Council Q5
Mr Nick Basley	Ian Basley Associates		Question 5	Mr Pickering fully supports the inclusion of Beckingham as a local service centre and considers this properly reflects its size, population and level of provision of essential services and other facilities.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Michael Meadows	Drivers Jonas	Michael Meadows	Question 5	<p>Option 1 proposes a settlement hierarchy, which includes three Core Service Centres. LIH considers that the hierarchy should include an additional tier, which identifies Worksop as a Sub-Regional Centre (first tier), with Retford and Harworth Bircotes as additional Core Service Centres (second tier). Local Service Centres would make up the third tier and so on. This would support the split of housing growth proposed in Option 1: Housing distribution based on a settlement hierarchy, which directs the largest proportion of housing growth to Worksop. This would more accurately reflect regional planning policy and the settlement hierarchy identified in the East Midlands Plan (2009). Policy 3 sets a regional strategy for the distribution of new development and a hierarchy of settlements. Worksop is identified as a Sub-Regional Centre. Retford and Harworth Bircotes are not specifically identified and would fall under the category of other settlements. Policy 7 identifies the economic, social and environmental regeneration of the Northern Sub-area as a regional priority, which should be achieved by strengthening the role of the Sub-Regional Centres, including Worksop by providing new jobs, houses, services and facilities in and around their urban areas. Policy Northern SRS1 also identifies that "significant levels of growth will be provided for in and adjoining Sub-Regional Centres (including Worksop), which subject to levels of urban capacity, will require locations for urban extensions to be identified in Local Development Frameworks." The policy goes on to state that "Local Development Frameworks will identify and justify levels of development for other urban areas identified in the plan (including Retford) which are suitable for development, due to urban capacity, sub-area regeneration needs or the need to support the present role of the settlement in servicing the surrounding area. The scale of development will be related to the existing level of infrastructure, range of community facilities, job opportunities, availability of public transport and existing character of the settlement." Finally, the policy advises that outside the areas mentioned in the plan sufficient provision should be made to support the regeneration of settlements with special needs where these are identified in Local Development Frameworks. Harworth Bircotes falls into this category. The Harworth Bircotes Scoping Study identifies that development potential is constrained in the short-term by physical infrastructure capacity, such as roads and utilities. It is considered that there is potential for funding and viability issues to constrain the delivery of significant infrastructure provision in the future and, therefore, development potential in the longer-term, and that the Council should plan flexibly for this.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 5	No. I would place Worksop alone in the top level as a Sub-Regional Centre, leaving Retford and Harworth-Bircotes as Core Service Centres, in order to comply with regional policy.. I would reduce the number of Local Service Centres by making some settlements, in particular Beckingham, Gringley-on-the-Hill and Misson into Rural Service Centres. Those settlements are relatively small and lack a full range of basic services. Identifying them as Rural Service Centres will dilute the focus of growth and would risk weakening the potential for the nearest larger village, such as Misterton, to support the full range of basic services through the retention of existing services and potential for new or expanded services associated with new development. I would remove the classification of 'Other Villages' entirely, since in policy terms there will be little difference between how these settlements and open countryside are treated, so retaining the classification adds unnecessary complication. Overall, this results in a less flat hierarchy, which again complies with regional policy.
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 5	No I would place Worksop alone in the top level as a Sub-Regional Centre, leaving Retford and Harworth-Bircotes as Core Service Centres, in order to comply with regional policy, including the need to regenerate the former coalfield areas by focusing development at Worksop whilst also promoting Harworth-Bircotes. I would reduce the Local Service Centres by making Beckingham, Clarbrough and Hayton, Elkesley, Gringley-on-the-Hill, Misson, North Leverton, North and South Wheatley and Rampton into Rural Service Centres, because these are relatively small settlements that lack the full range of basic services and risk weakening the potential for the nearest large village to support the full range of basic services. I would remove the classification of 'Other Villages' entirely, since in policy terms there will be little difference between how these settlements and open countryside are treated, so retaining the classification adds unnecessary complication. Overall, this results in a less flat hierarchy, which again complies with regional policy.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
William Davis			Question 5	<p>As identified in our response to question 4 above, William Davis Ltd do not support Option 1 as a spatial strategy for growth in the district. However, should the council look to take this option forward we would oppose the Settlement Hierarchy proposed in table 5.1 of the Issues and Options document. We do not consider the hierarchy proposed to be consistent with regional planning policy. Policy 3 of the RSS establishes Worksop as a Sub-Regional Centre, with Policy Northern SRS 1 reiterating this stance. As a consequence Worksop is clearly recognised as the key settlement in the district and this fact should be recognised in the Settlement Hierarchy of the Core Strategy. William Davis therefore consider that Worksop should be allocated as a Sub-Regional Centre in the hierarchy separate from Retford. William Davis recognise that the Settlement Hierarchy proposed in the Issues and Options Document is guided by the recommendations of the Service and Facilities Study completed by the council in September 2009. Table 7.1 of the appendices to this study identify the services and facilities available in Retford and Worksop. The table clearly shows that Worksop has considerably more Services and Facilities than Retford. A rough calculation indicates that Worksop has 177 separate services and facilities available compared to 108 in Retford. This clear superiority in terms of the amount of services and facilities available gives further support to our argument that Worksop should be recognised separately as a Sub-Regional Centre at the top of the Settlement Hierarchy. William Davis Ltd also note that the Service and Facility study found Harworth Bircotes to function as a local service centre only. These findings should be reflected in the settlement hierarchy and we do not consider that Harworth should be considered as a Core Service Centre.</p>
Mr Ian Lord	Building Link Design		Question 5	Support proposed settlement hierarchy.
Mr Ian Lord	Building Link Design		Question 5	Support proposed settlement hierarchy.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 5	<p>The settlement hierarchy indicated on page 23 is generally supported. We have not undertaken a detailed analysis of the lower categories but we support the need for the Key Core Service Centres as being Worksop, Retford and Haworth/Bircotes. Although it is indicated at the bottom of the table that it is not currently identified as such in the RSS, the partial review of the RSS is currently underway and this would be consistent with Option 2 in section 7 of the Regional Plan relating to the Northern HMA. This is on page 51 of the June 2009 East Midlands Regional Plan Partial Review - Options Consultation. This would also be in general support of existing RSS policies and we refer particularly to the northern sub area priorities on page 30 of the RSS. See 2.4.21 which emphasises the need to look at settlements should be become the focus of economic activity otherwise their roles and functions may decline further with resulting social consequences. There is specific reference to the benefit economically from the opening of Robin Hood Airport and the A614 from Blyth, with the recently improved junction, is a very important link through the area to the Airport. Housing and employment development should be supported in this area. This would also be consistent with the priorities identified for the Northern HMA on page 40 of the RSS. This emphasises the need to promote the regeneration of smaller settlements in a way that promotes a more sustainable pattern of development and this would also improve the long term economic prospects of the HMA. Particular regard should be had of Policy 19 on page 50 of the RSS which relates to the regional priorities for regeneration. Development in the Haworth/Bircotes area would support the general principles and the areas of greatest identified need. Haworth/Bircotes is a good strategic location with available Brownfield land content and it should be developed in preference to other Greenfield sites throughout the District. To this there will need to be linked employment development and given its proximity to the A1 there may well be a logistics function including warehousing and distribution. The availability of the rail link to other major towns/cities in the area should be considered. This will help promote other sustainable forms of transportation links.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
		Ms Emma Cruickshank	Question 5	<p>In respect of Question 4 of the Consultation Document, UK COAL supports the principle of Option 1's approach, which is based on a settlement hierarchy. Compared to the other options, Option 1 seeks to distribute growth across the district with a rightful focus of larger proportions of growth and development to the larger settlements such as Worksop, Harworth and Retford. However in addition, Option 1 still recognises the need for growth and development in a Page 3 of 14 number of smaller settlements, something that is omitted from Options 2 and 3. UK COAL consider that this will facilitate truly sustainable growth which is in line with the requirements of National and Regional Policy, in particular PPS1, which emphasises that sustainable development is the core principle underpinning planning (paragraph 3) with two of the four aims of sustainable development requiring social progress recognising the needs of everyone and maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment (paragraph 4). PPS3 paragraph 37, when referring to the suitable locations of development states that 'there is a need to create and maintain sustainable, mixed and inclusive communities in all areas, both rural and urban'. In relation to delivering sustainable development, PPS1 recognises that urban and rural regeneration is important (paragraph 27). The settlement hierarchy approach will enable regeneration benefits that result from growth and development to be realised across the district in a range of settlements, from the large to the very small instead of just a couple of larger settlements as would be the case with Options 2 and 3. This can only be achieved through a hierarchical approach and is particularly important to be realised given the high levels of deprivation and regeneration need in various locations across the district. Worksop and Retford continue to be recognised as the principal settlements in the district due to their size and importance, however UK COAL welcome the recognition Bassetlaw Council has attributed to Harworth and Bircotes as a suitable location to accommodate increased levels of growth and development. Harworth and Bircotes is a mining settlement that has previously been reliant on the colliery and a number of factories for jobs and prosperity. For this reason, the settlement boasts a sizable centre with shops, services and facilities. Following the decline of the factories and the movement of the colliery to a care and maintenance regime, the settlement has declined and although has had some ability to evolve and attract some business due to its attractive location close to the A1, it is in desperate need of investment and regeneration to retain and enhance its role as a service centre. In addition, the housing stock and employment offer is extremely limited and needs diversifying and its centre needs reinforcing to enable its enhancement and ability to continue to serve the settlement and its surrounding service centres and villages. To achieve this and the needed regeneration, significant levels of growth and development are required as recognised by Bassetlaw Council. Harworth and</p>
Mr Chris Telford	Associate Director CGMS		Question 5	<p>In principal, the proposed settlement hierarchy is supported, but the relative scale and inherent sustainability of all the Core Service Centres, Local Service Centres and Rural Service Centres should be reflected in the relative distribution of all forms of development - particularly the strategy for housing distribution. The precise scale of development in each of those villages currently identified as Local Service Centres and Rural Service Centres should be determined on a criteria basis which considers the environmental and infrastructure capacity of those settlements, and the general availability of suitable sites which can accommodate development without adverse impacts on the surrounding landscapes and village character.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr David Barker			Question 5	In principal, the proposed settlement hierarchy is supported, but the relative scale and inherent sustainability of the Core Service Centres should be reflected in the relative distribution of all forms of development - particularly the strategy for housing distribution. The precise scale of development in each of the main towns should be determined on a criteria basis which considers the environmental and infrastructure capacity of those settlements, and the general availability of suitable sites which can accommodate development without adverse impacts on the surrounding landscapes.
Magnus Educational Centre			Question 5	In principal, the proposed settlement hierarchy is supported, but the relative scale and inherent sustainability of all the Core Service Centres, Local Service Centres and Rural Service Centres should be reflected in the relative distribution of all forms of development - particularly the strategy for housing distribution. The precise scale of development in each of those villages currently identified as Local Service Centres and Rural Service Centres should be determined on a criteria basis which considers the environmental and infrastructure capacity of those settlements, and the general availability of suitable sites which can accommodate development without adverse impacts on the surrounding landscapes and village character.
Mrs Janet Hodson			Question 5	Worksop is the Sub Regional Centre for the District as identified in Policy 7 of the RSS which requires Worksop to be strengthened by providing new houses in and around the urban area. Policy 19 of the RSS also supports new housing in Worksop.
Mr Tom Garnett	Energy Review		Question 5	The settlement hierarchy is correct.
Ms Vicki Ingleby	Turley Associates		Question 5	We support the proposed settlement hierarchy as set out in Option 1.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 5	<p>The settlement hierarchy indicated on page 23 is generally supported. We have not undertaken a detailed analysis of the lower categories but we support the need for the Key Core Service Centres as being Worksop, Retford and Haworth/Bircotes. Although it is indicated at the bottom of the table that it is not currently identified as such in the RSS, the partial review of the RSS is currently underway and this would be consistent with Option 2 in section 7 of the Regional Plan relating to the Northern HMA. This is on page 51 of the June 2009 East Midlands Regional Plan Partial Review - Options Consultation. This would also be in general support of existing RSS policies and we refer particularly to the northern sub area priorities on page 30 of the RSS. See 2.4.21 which emphasises the need to look at settlements should be become the focus of economic activity otherwise their roles and functions may decline further with resulting social consequences. There is specific reference to the benefit economically from the opening of Robin Hood Airport and the A614 from Blyth, with the recently improved junction, is a very important link through the area to the Airport. Housing and employment development should be supported in this area. This would also be consistent with the priorities identified for the Northern HMA on page 40 of the RSS. This emphasises the need to promote the regeneration of smaller settlements in a way that promotes a more sustainable pattern of development and this would also improve the long term economic prospects of the HMA. Particular regard should be had of Policy 19 on page 50 of the RSS which relates to the regional priorities for regeneration. Development in the Haworth/Bircotes area would support the general principles and the areas of greatest identified need. Haworth/Bircotes is a good strategic location with available Brownfield land content and it should be developed in preference to other Greenfield sites throughout the District. To this there will need to be linked employment development and given its proximity to the A1 there may well be a logistics function including warehousing and distribution. The availability of the rail link to other major towns/cities in the area should be considered. This will help promote other sustainable forms of transportation links.</p>
Mr PG Hills	Clerk to Tuxford Town Council Tuxford Parish Council		Question 5	<p>We agree only in part with the proposed settlement hierarchy. Misterton and tuxford should be elevated in status 'higher' than the other settlements listed because of the reasons set out in response to Question 4, above.</p>
Adams	John Martin & Associates		Question 5	<p>Our client supports the proposed settlement hierarchy as set out at Option 1. The hierarchy has clearly emerged from detailed analysis of the sustainability criteria of each settlement, and an assessment of the level of services and facilities. Having assessed the Bassetlaw District Council Services and Facilities Study - one of the suite of background studies to support the development of the Local Development Framework - it is clear that the settlement of Elkesely is well-served by a village school, employment sites, a village shop and a reasonable Monday - Saturday public transport service to the surrounding settlements, together with Worksop and Retford. Elkesley is therefore a sustainable settlement within the District of Bassetlaw, that has a wide range of services and facilities, and which is well-placed to provide a function as a Second-Tier settlement to deliver development. The option to designate Elkesley as a Local Service Centre is therefore welcomed.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Richard Troop	R Troop & Son	Mr Jon Phipps	Question 5	<p>See attachment It is understood that the Bassetlaw District Council Services and Facilities Study is the evidence base for the settlement hierarchy in addition to population figures. It is felt that the Services and Facilities Study is not fine grain enough to assess the quality of rural services on offer. This can make the findings appear arbitrary with a number of proposed service centres smaller than rural service centres. Everton is subject to extensive use of its facilities by non settlement residents (see pg3 earlier) accessing the village by car. At 5.15 of the Services and Facilities Study, Everton is identified as one of only 3 settlements of size 500-1000 population category that does not have a convenience store yet within the last five years, two separate applications to deliver convenience stores in Everton have been turned down by the Local Planning Authority. Those submitting were prepared to undertake substantial investment to deliver schemes and a large petition of local signatures accompanied both applications, including the Parish Council and the Everton Parish Plan support. The LPA refused the most recent scheme on the basis that the location was not close enough to the centre of the village. However, research by Latham's (Everton Village Character Appraisal) has demonstrated that the centre of Everton moved from the Conservation Area to an 18 century core that developed around the High Street and the Bawtry/Gainsborough Road - with as many listed buildings in this location as the current conservation area (excluding the church). The knowledge that a convenience store is a needed and viable proposition for the village has led my clients to work up a proposal for a third application to the LPA for a convenience store with preliminary drawings now available. It is also relevant to note that Gringley is no longer thought to have a village shop - contrary to the findings of your study. Of further note is the sustainment of approximately 1ha employment land in Everton and the regular prescription delivery service from Gringley Surgery to Tonicraft Gallery. 1. Euroforest Office 2. Jaques Transport Yard 3. Everton Nurseries 4. Hall Farm Care Home 5. Jaguar Repairs 6. Mill Cottage Pottery 7. Tonicraft Gallery 8. Hairdressers 9. Beauticians 10. 2 Pubs with Beer Gardens Changes to Preferred Option 1 Option 1 does not go far enough. Inclusion of Everton and other Bassetlaw villages in the Local Service Centre Category in preference to larger scale extensions to Major Service centres (specified as part of option 1). Justification - provision of aspirational residential offer to assist restructure of Local Economy away from low skill low pay offer (higher performing villages). Justification - rural sustainability (more remote/lower performing villages). Justification - large scale extensions to major service centres unlikely to provide the quality of residential offer achievable in rural villages. Under current assessment - question mark over placement of Gringley in Local Service Centre category. Difficult topography, lack of convenience store, no known offer of new convenience store, no known offer of renewable energy provision,</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Andrew Laing			Question 5	<p>The proposed settlement hierarchy is not supported. East Markham is listed as a Rural Service Centre; it should be listed as a 'Local Service Centre'. In the approved 2001 Bassetlaw Local Plan, East Markham is a settlement considered suitable for residential development and there were two housing allocations. Its suitability to accommodate future growth has not changed. The Services and Facilities Study (September 2009) places East Markham as a Rural Service Centre based on its provision of 3 essential services. Up until very recently East Markham had a shop and this closed due to commercial reasons. The shop could re-open again if supported by additional population. In addition our client is discussing development proposals with the Council on a previously developed site (Former Poultry Factory, Site 196 in the September 2009 SHLAA) in East Markham. Development of the brownfield site will provide additional population that will enhance and underpin essential services i.e. the shop could re-open. No account has been taken of the population size of this area which seems a very crude analysis methodology. It also takes no account of future development potential of East Markham. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK The exclusion of the site from the Local Service Centre based on the remaining 3 services is not supported by the governments Rural White Paper and Natural England's study, Rural Services 2000 , which suggests that settlements of over 1, 000 have, or potentially have, greater capacity to accommodate further growth. East Markham has a population of circa 1,160 (Bassetlaw Services and Facilities Study 2007) , which is larger than many settlements listed as Local Service Centres in Table 5.1 including Elkesley; Gringley-on-the-Hill; Misson; Nether Langwith; North Leverton and North and South Wheatley, whose population varies from 600 to 855. in addition Misson is accepted in the study as being isolated, this cannot be said for East Markham which is well located in relation to other settlements and it adjoins the A1 which facilitates greater access. East Markham has recently lost its Post Office (2007) and shop/convenience store (2009) but does have a primary school, public house (x2) and Village Hall and is served by four bus services. The local shop has only recently closed and it could easily re-open in the future with support from an increased population. Placing East Markham as a Rural Service Centre therefore seems a very short term and crude approach. Should the shop and/or Post Office re-open, there would be sufficient services and facilities to be classed as a 'Local Service Centre'. For this reason, East Markham should move up the hierarchy. As a 'Rural Service Centre', new development opportunities are limited to small scale infill development within identified boundaries. By preventing / limiting future development, there could be a detrimental knock on effect for the existing services, particularly the primary school. There is the possibility that the Policy will leave East Markham as a dormant / declining location. Moving the settlement to a Local Service Centre will improve the potential</p>
Mr A W Littlewood		Mr Ian M Calverley	Question 5	<p>No, In my opinion, this is a poor strategy to adopt as concentration of development into a few villages and towns will deprive the rural community of potential growth and windfall development which helps sustain the rural community and businesses within the rural community such as farms, public houses, restaurants, garages, small production factories and the like as well as sustaining primary and secondary school feeder requirements. If there is no development allowed within the currently non growth villages then the rural community in those locations will ultimately wither.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr John Bailey		Mr Ian M Calverley	Question 5	No, In my opinion, this is a poor strategy to adopt as concentration of development into a few villages and towns will deprive the rural community of potential growth and windfall development which helps sustain the rural community and businesses within the rural community such as farms, public houses, restaurants, garages, small production factories and the like as well as sustaining primary and secondary school feeder requirements. If there is no development allowed within the currently non growth villages then the rural community in those locations will ultimately wither.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 5	It is considered that the groupings of the settlement hierarchy within Option 1 are appropriate in that the main urban areas of Worksop, Retford and Harworth Bircotes are selected as Core Service Centres followed by smaller centres which are defined as Local Service Centres and then Rural Service Centres, other villages and finally Settlements in the Countryside.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 5	The settlement hierarchy as set out in within the Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation is acceptable and it is our view that the categorisation of the various settlements is logical based upon their size and the facilities and services that they offer.
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 5	the proposed settlement hierarchy set out in Option 1 appears to be logical (subject to local knowledge regarding the smaller settlements).
Mrs Jennifer Kirk	Clerk to Headon-cum-Upton, Groveand Stokeham Parish Council		Question 5	The council feel that the hierarchy is generally acceptable. In all three of the spatial strategies put forward in the report, development in 'other villages' would be allowed only under very strict criteria. The Council agrees that development in these villages should be limited but considers that the proposed criteria are too restrictive. The Council would like to see the criteria widened to include some infill development in keeping with the character of the village, to prevent villages from dying. Many villages have a large aging population. To allow the building of single houses, e.g. for family members, would help to reverse this trend, encouraging younger families to stay in the villages.
Mr. David Wright	Clerk to the Council Everton Parish Council		Question 5	Settlement Hierarchy Consider the classification of Settlement Hierarchy groups a little arbitrary, particularly when the difference between Local Service Centres and Rural Service Centres is only the presence of one extra essential service and the number of these services can change over time. Consider that the settlement hierarchy is very well done and sets the scene for the status of Bassetlaw's settlements. Agree with the approach treating Harwell and Drakeholes as separate settlements to Everton and placing them lower in the settlement hierarchy and reducing likely levels of future development in these smaller settlements. However, as Drakeholes has a pub should it be re-classified as an other village? Happy with the Classification of Everton as a Rural Service Centre. The Development implications of the settlement hierarchy should make a reference to supporting affordable housing schemes in Rural Service Centres not just in Other Villages. This was agreed as an oversight in this section and will be reconsidered in the next draft of the plan.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
				<p>It is recognised that the three alternative strategic development options suggested by the authority have the potential to deliver housing growth required of the Strategy. It is less clear to what extent the options may contribute to reducing the need to travel and reliance on the car, or the extent to which they could impact upon the operation of the strategic highway network. With regard to each of the spatial options, the Agency wish to make the following observations: Option 1: Distributing development across Bassetlaw based on a Settlement Hierarchy The Agency recognises the benefits of dispersing development across the district as a means of supporting the vitality of settlement, local service provision and existing public transport services. However, it is unlikely that realistic alternatives to the car would be able to be provided in many of the settlements outside of the main centres of Worksop and Retford to access a range of employment opportunities and that this could lead to additional car commuting with implications for the strategic road network. Option 2: Concentrate development in Worksop and Retford Worksop and Retford represent the two most sustainable locations for growth within the district based upon the range of employment opportunities, retail provision and other services provided in the towns, reducing the need for residents to travel further afield. The towns also benefit from the most comprehensive public transport provision within the district with both bus and rail services providing links to settlements further afield. This option is likely to provide the best opportunity to minimise the potential impact upon the strategic road network and to develop enhanced sustainable transport networks. This option would require significant urban extensions to both towns. These should include commensurate provision of employment opportunities and services to reduce the potential for new housing areas to effectively serve as satellite settlements, particularly for Sheffield. The risk of increased longer distance commuting and potential adverse impact on the local highway network and strategic road network needs to be minimised. Option 3: Focusing development in the settlements in west Bassetlaw The Agency recognises the benefits of a regeneration based approach in both reducing the need to travel and securing economic, social and environmental benefits for settlements in west Bassetlaw. Building on the existing linkages between the west of the district and nearby urban centres could contribute towards securing sustainable transport provision and access to jobs, thus helping deliver economic growth in a sustainable way, whilst contributing towards the goals included within the Government's White Paper on 'Delivering a Sustainable Transport System'. However, this approach may not achieve significant levels of self containment and could encourage residents of these settlements to travel further afield, thereby placing greater stress on the transport network, and additional costs to provide necessary network enhancements to support growth.</p>
Mr Owen Walters	Highways Agency		Question 5	
Mr David Langmead	South Leveaton Parish Council		Question 5	Agree with proposed groupings

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Andy Kitchen	Pegasus Planning Group LLP		Question 5	The Spatial Strategy for the District ought to focus development in major centres, but this should not be at the expense of unduly limiting development in other settlements, in areas in need of regeneration and in areas which present opportunities attractive to the market place. Accordingly, an amended Option 1 ought to be promoted which does not restrict developments in other locations to fulfilling only local need. None of the three options allow for the delivery of employment generating opportunities along the A1 corridor as highlighted in paragraph 5.48 of the Core Strategy Consultation and Question 15. As will be noted in the response to Question 15, the Spatial Strategy must appropriately allow for employment related development along the A1 corridor to capitalise on a specific area of demand (chiefly distribution and warehousing). This approach is strongly recommended in the Bassetlaw ELCS and is therefore underpinned by a credible evidence base. The recent A1 improvements significantly improve this section of the A1 improving M18 and A14 links which lead to the principle UK ports, therefore strengthen its viability as a B8. Many of the more substantial/high tech recycling requirements (as identified in the ECLS) and operations share the same locational criteria as B8 users, as they may have facilities serving the UK and import/export inputs and their outputs. Many of the UKs principle food manufactures are based in the East of England. The ELCS identifies this sector for growth and the A1 corridor is well placed to accommodate this type of demand. Much of the raw materials are locally produced reducing food miles and other elements imported. Bassetlaw is well placed to service the UK market due to its central location and the shelf life constraints of food. It is therefore recommended that the spatial strategy allows for employment development along the A1 corridor.
		Miss Kate Helliwell	Question 5	We agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy.
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 5	See response to Question 4 re-Langold and Carlton-in-Lindrick. Generally Option 1 is supported, but there is a case to give some emphasis to the former mining settlements where there is both the need and opportunity for regeneration. Accordingly it is suggested that this Option is modified to include a specific emphasis on development in Langold and Carlton-in-Lindrick beyond that anticipated in this Option as drawn up at present. (A lesser focus on some of the Rural Service Centres [see comments below - Qs.9 and 14] could balance up this change in emphasis.)
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 5	The settlement hierarchy includes conservation areas at all levels and careful consideration will need to be given to the appropriate management of these according to the different pressures associated with each level.
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 5	We have not chosen option 1, but if this strategy is selected we agree with the proposed settlement hierarchy.
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 6	Yes. but boundary should be slightly extended.
Mr David Brown	Merry Vale Development		Question 6	We believe that there should be greater flexibility in the delivery of housing (and employment) growth in the two 'secondary nodes' at Misterton and Tuxford. This approach could result in more than just small scale allocations in these two settlements.
Richard Walters	Hallam Land Management Ltd		Question 6	Agree

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Simon Miller	Persimmon Homes		Question 6	An alternative option is being promoted and the development implications of this option are set out in our response to question 11.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 6	For option 1, yes, but there are significant caveats relating to transport. It is important to establish how these 3500 houses can be best accommodated in sustainability terms. Appropriate transport deliverability and sustainability investigations should inform such a decision, i.e. preparing a robust transport evidence base to support preferred strategic development allocations. Further comments are expressed in the Local Transport comments in the Appendix. Nottinghamshire County Council Q6
Mr John R Holland			Question 6	Settlements seem to have a natural size. A certain level of population is necessary to maintain services (e.g. shops), but excessive size tends to make the settlement less cohesive. Gateford is classed as part of Worksop, but requires transport (rather than walking) to access the services. That is unsustainable development.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Craig Ball	Development Planner UK Coal Mining Ltd		Question 6	<p>in the Consultation Document, and in considering the approach in Option 1, it is essential that Bassetlaw Council also consider the ability for settlements to accommodate the levels of growth and development identified for them so that they can also secure the resulting regeneration benefits. In this regard it is essential that the development limits of settlements be reconsidered so as not to preclude the ability for settlements to accommodate the level of growth identified and in the most suitable locations. UK COAL also supports the view, that to accommodate the growth identified for Bassetlaw within the settlement hierarchy approach, that Worksop, Retford and Harworth/Bircotes would need urban extensions. Harworth has the ability to accommodate this growth and this is supported by the assessment undertaken by Bassetlaw Council and NLP (Future Development Scoping Study for Harworth Bircotes, September 2009), which concludes that there is significant potential for growth in this area and that there are few fundamental constraints to development. This assessment also acknowledges the important role that the colliery in Harworth can play in respect of accommodating future sustainable development in the settlement. This approach is also support by PPS3 (paragraph 37) which states that ' where need and demand are high, it will be necessary to identify and Page 5 of 14 explore a range of options for distributing housing including consideration of.....major urban extensions and the managed growth of settlements in urban and rural areas...'. The settlement hierarchy approach generally accords with advice and policy set out within National Planning Policy, in particular PPS1, PPS3 and PPG 13 and the RSS for the West Midlands (March 2008). UK COAL consider that a settlement hierarchy, which identifies the correct settlements in the most appropriate hierarchy to be a logical and sustainable approach to the distribution of growth and enables a number of settlements to benefit from the inward investment and regeneration benefits that development can bring rather than a select few. This is essential for the successful growth and prosperity of an area as well as its ability to sustain and benefit from this growth both in the short term and long term. It also ensures that the principle settlements that are located in the most sustainable locations, accommodate the largest populations, services and facilities and have the ability to sustain the greatest levels of growth. Therefore Worksop, Harworth and Retford rightly accommodate the majority of the districts growth. However the smaller settlements, many of which suffer from deprivation still have the ability to accommodate some of the growth and as such will be better placed to support the main settlements and secure some regeneration benefits. In line with guidance within PPS12, Option 1 is considered to be generally consistent with National Policy, justified in that it generally appears to be founded on a robust and credible evidence base and is the most appropriate strategy when considered against the alternative Options 2 and 3. Subject to the suitable final wording of the Core Strategy policies, it also</p>
Mr Nick Basley	Ian Basley Associates		Question 6	<p>Mr Pickering agrees with the Council's development implications as set out in table 5.2 both open markets and local needs housing should be directed towards such settlements in appropriate numbers and the settlement boundary will inevitably need to be reviewed and extended to allow a managed increase in development in appropriate locations.</p>
Mr Chris Telford	Associate Director CGMS		Question 6	<p>The broad development implications of Spatial Strategy: Option 1 are supported, other than the implication that only residential infill developments would be approved in those villages currently defined as Rural Service Centres. The potential for small site allocations in such villages, particularly to meet local housing needs, should also be considered.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Michael Meadows	Drivers Jonas	Michael Meadows	Question 6	The East Midlands Plan sets a clear policy basis for Worksop to be identified as the main focus of development within the district, with additional major development directed to Retford and Harworth Bircotes. This would be in accordance with national planning policy, which states that development plans should focus new housing developments in suitable locations, which offer a good range of community and facilities, with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. Therefore, we propose that Option 1 should identify Worksop as a first tier settlement, over and above Retford and Harworth Bircotes, to reflect the town's status as a Sub-Regional Centre.
Peter Frampton			Question 6	See response to Q4
Edward Fisher			Question 6	Support development implications
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 6	Broadly yes, though the changes I have suggested (see response to Question 5) would shift the emphasis slightly.
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 6	Broadly, though due to the changes I have suggested to the hierarchy, I would shift the implications up a level (i.e. OV to RSC, RSC to LSC, LSC to CSC, CSC to SRC).
William Davis			Question 6	William Davis Ltd do not support any of the proposed options for growth identified in the Issues and Options document. We are of the opinion that an alternative strategy should be considered which is more consistent with policy established in the RSS.
Mr Ian Lord	Building Link Design		Question 6	Support development implications. Development limit for settlement groups to be subject to individual circumstances of particular settlement.
Mr Ian Lord	Building Link Design		Question 6	Support development implications. Development limit for settlement groups to be subject to individual circumstances of particular settlement.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 6	Generally we support the development implications as identified for the Core Service Centres. We would, however, suggest that the Service Centres lower down the hierarchy should be downgraded making sure that there is an emphasis on growth in the more sustainable Core Service Centre Locations. Whilst there will be a need to use all reasonable endeavours to maintain the sustainability of other important service centres, clearly strategic growth should be focused on the areas of greatest need and justification consistent with other Plan policies.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
		Ms Emma Cruickshank	Question 6	<p>Question 6 in the Consultation Document, and in considering the approach in Option 1, it is essential that Bassetlaw Council also consider the ability for settlements to accommodate the levels of growth and development identified for them so that they can also secure the resulting regeneration benefits. In this regard it is essential that the development limits of settlements be reconsidered so as not to preclude the ability for settlements to accommodate the level of growth identified and in the most suitable locations. UK COAL also supports the view, that to accommodate the growth identified for Bassetlaw within the settlement hierarchy approach, that Worksop, Retford and Harworth/Bircotes would need urban extensions. Harworth has the ability to accommodate this growth and this is supported by the assessment undertaken by Bassetlaw Council and NLP (Future Development Scoping Study for Harworth Bircotes, September 2009), which concludes that there is significant potential for growth in this area and that there are few fundamental constraints to development. This assessment also acknowledges the important role that the colliery in Harworth can play in respect of accommodating future sustainable development in the settlement. This approach is also support by PPS3 (paragraph 37) which states that ' where need and demand are high, it will be necessary to identify and Page 5 of 14 explore a range of options for distributing housing including consideration of.....major urban extensions and the managed growth of settlements in urban and rural areas...'. The settlement hierarchy approach generally accords with advice and policy set out within National Planning Policy, in particular PPS1, PPS3 and PPG 13 and the RSS for the West Midlands (March 2008). UK COAL consider that a settlement hierarchy, which identifies the correct settlements in the most appropriate hierarchy to be a logical and sustainable approach to the distribution of growth and enables a number of settlements to benefit from the inward investment and regeneration benefits that development can bring rather than a select few. This is essential for the successful growth and prosperity of an area as well as its ability to sustain and benefit from this growth both in the short term and long term. It also ensures that the principle settlements that are located in the most sustainable locations, accommodate the largest populations, services and facilities and have the ability to sustain the greatest levels of growth. Therefore Worksop, Harworth and Retford rightly accommodate the majority of the districts growth. However the smaller settlements, many of which suffer from deprivation still have the ability to accommodate some of the growth and as such will be better placed to support the main settlements and secure some regeneration benefits. In line with guidance within PPS12, Option 1 is considered to be generally consistent with National Policy, justified in that it generally appears to be founded on a robust and credible evidence base and is the most appropriate strategy when considered against the alternative Options 2 and 3. Subject to the suitable final wording</p>
Mr David Barker			Question 6	The broad development implications of Spatial Strategy: Option 1 are supported.
Magnus Educational Centre			Question 6	The broad development implications of Spatial Strategy: Option 1 are supported, other than the implication that only residential infill developments would be approved in those villages currently defined as Rural Service Centres. The potential for small site allocations in such villages, particularly to meet local housing needs, should also be considered.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Walker Dormer Tools Walker Dormer Tools	Ian Baseley Associates		Question 6	In respect of the development implications identified in Table 5.2, for Core Service Centres (i.e. Worksop, retford and Harworth Bircotes) new housing development should be focused onto previously-developed land, in line with Policy 3 of the EMRP, to contribute to the national and regional target of 60% of additional dwellings on such land. This national target is specific to housing development (i.e. it does not include employment or other land uses) and therefore, the development implications need to include this key objective.
Mr Walker East Markham Walker East Markham	Ian Baseley associates		Question 6	In respect of the development implications identified in Table 5.2, for rural Service Centres such as East Markham where the planning issues are very different to the larger urban areas, the Core Strategy should allocate land for small-scale housing and employment uses to support the existing services and facilities in these settlements and to encourage new services to establish themselves. Both open market and local needs housing should be directed towards such settlements in appropriate numbers and the settlement boundary will need to be reviewed and extended to allow a managed increase in development in appropriate locations.
Mrs Janet Hodson			Question 6	We consider development should be focused on Worksop and little development elsewhere as the most sustainable way of achieving growth and regeneration.
Mr Tom Garnett	Energy Review		Question 6	We agree with the development implications.
Ms Vicki Ingleby	Turley Associates		Question 6	It is not clear whether the development limits referred to in the question comprise the overall quantum of development within each settlement, or the definition of a development limit boundary, similar to the envelopes identified within the Local Plan. We would welcome the definition of settlement boundaries within the Local Development Framework to ensure that the best use is made of land within existing settlements before land outwith settlements is considered for development. The level of housing provision should be determined taking a strategic, evidence-based approach that takes into account regional policies. The level of housing growth proposed in the Core Strategy should take due account of the forthcoming Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). It would be prudent to align the timescales for the preparation of the document with the RSS to ensure conformity and a more robust evidence base. We note that the projections set out in paragraphs 5.22 to 5.25 are based on the current RSS target minus completions and expected completions minus permissions and allocations. This provides a residual figure of 3,506 houses to be delivered by 2026.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 6	Generally we support the development implications as identified for the Core Service Centres. We would, however, suggest that the Service Centres lower down the hierarchy should be downgraded making sure that there is an emphasis on growth in the more sustainable Core Service Centre Locations. Whilst there will be a need to use all reasonable endeavours to maintain the sustainability of other important service centres, clearly strategic growth should be focused on the areas of greatest need and justification consistent with other Plan policies.
Mr PG Hills	Clerk to Tuxford Town Council Tuxford Parish Council		Question 6	We believe that there should be greater flexibility in the delivery of housing (and employment) growth in the two 'secondary nodes' at Misterton and Tuxford. This approach could result in more than just 'small scale' allocations in these two settlements.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Adams	John Martin & Associates		Question 6	<p>In terms of Option 1, my client agrees that Local Service Centres should act as a secondary focus for development to ensure an appropriate spread of development across the district in a balanced and sustainable manner. However, my client would suggest that Local Service Centres should accommodate both medium and small scale allocations for new housing and employment sites. In that way, this would provide for a balanced hierarchy for development within settlements across the Bassetlaw District. In terms of promoting housing development in rural areas, the contrast in the strategic interpretations of Rural Sustainable Development arises with regard to the problem of meeting rural housing needs. On the one hand, there is conclusive evidence of a severe shortage of affordable housing in rural communities which is not only creating hardship and social injustice, but also undermines the Governments' aim of creating mixed communities of income and occupation; and to meet the needs of key workers such as teachers, health workers and others to live close to their work. On the other hand planning policies are generally very restrictive in rural areas in order to protect the countryside, reduced car journeys to urban centres and concentrate new housing near urban services. New housing schemes tend to be limited to small exception sites for "affordable housing" on the edge of villages which usually involve complex and time consuming procedures. Mixed market and affordable housing developments tend to be limited to larger villages and market towns, for the same reason. The result is that many thousands of small villages risk being condemned to virtual stagnation, affluent but aging ghettos, far from the sustainable, mixed communities which the Government seeks to foster. There is no reason why this site at Elkesley shall not come forward as a sustainable extension to the west of the settlement. In our view there is a conflict between the needs to meet the social and economic requirements and sustainability of rural communities through the provision of affordable housing, as expressed by the affordable housing commission and PPS3; and the general planning policy of concentrating development in urban areas in order to minimise travel carbon emissions - typically expressed through Regional Spatial Strategies. Both approaches are claiming justification on sustainability grounds. Our view is that we support urban regeneration and the benefits which well planned towns and cities can provide in terms of employment, entertainment, culture and services etc but that rural communities have much to offer to for example potential for good community life and attractive environment. Moreover, we can test the notion that urban areas are more sustainable than rural. On the contrary, research indicates that many urban locations do not score well on many sustainability counts for example commuting from edge of town estates and that both rural and urban communities need to address the question of how they can become more sustainable rather than writing off many smaller villages. In terms of the proposed development</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Andrew Laing			Question 6	Object: Development Implications Flexibility should be built into the policy to reflect changing fortunes of all centres and villages and to encourage improvements to vitality and viability of the settlements. In relation to the listed development implications of each service centre we comment as follows: Core Service Centre Support as a focus for major development in district. Local Service Centre Should act as a secondary focus for development across district. Development in Local Service Centres is a necessity in its own right and should be developed alongside those in Core Service Centres. Development should not necessarily be 'small scale'. The term 'small scale' should be replaced with 'of a scale appropriate to the development area'. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK Rural Service Centre Disagree with development implications. Instead the development implications should read as follows: Development focused on maintaining and enhancing their current roles in providing and supporting essential services and facilities to rural communities. Opportunities for development of a scale appropriate to the settlement that will maintain its current role and provide additional support to the location and its local facilities.
Mr A W Littlewood		Mr Ian M Calverley	Question 6	No, East Markham is a substantial village with areas of land that would suite development for residential purposes. That village already has considerable infrastructure in place and can be considered to be a sustainable village because of transport links, employment availability, existing leisure and shopping facilities either within the locality or near by and businesses with employment potential either in the immediate locality or nearby.
Mr John Bailey		Mr Ian M Calverley	Question 6	No, East Markham is a substantial village with areas of land that would suite development for residential purposes. That village already has considerable infrastructure in place and can be considered to be a sustainable village because of transport links, employment availability, existing leisure and shopping facilities either within the locality or near by and businesses with employment potential either in the immediate locality or nearby.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 6	The proposed settlement hierarchy and groupings of settlements identified as part of Option 1 are considered suitable as the greatest amount of development will be focussed on Core Service Centres where there is more likely to be capacity within existing services and infrastructure to accommodate further development, followed by Local Service Centres and so on. This approach will ensure that the level of development would be proportionate to the position of the settlement within the hierarchy thus ensuring an appropriate scale of development is achieved.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 6	The development implications have been identified within Option 1 are accepted given that it is considered that Worksop it a suitable location to act as a focus for all major development within the district and will maintain and enhance the settlements key role as defined within the Regional Spatial Strategy.
Mrs A Haddon	Clerk to Mattersey Parish Council Mattersey Parish Council		Question 6	We fundamentally disagree that Mattersey and Mattersey Thorpe should be treated differently. We accept that while many of the services which Mattersey Thorpe residents use are in Mattersey such as the school, post office, shop, church etc , these services are as close to Mattersey Thorpe residents as in many other larger sprawling villages. We see the two areas as being a single entity and should be treated accordingly in planning terms as Rural Service Centre.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 6	AGREE WITH DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS
Mr Andy Kitchen	Pegasus Planning Group LLP		Question 6	<p>The Spatial Strategy for the District ought to focus development in major centres, but this should not be at the expense of unduly limiting development in other settlements, in areas in need of regeneration and in areas which present opportunities attractive to the market place. Accordingly, an amended Option 1 ought to be promoted which does not restrict developments in other locations to fulfilling only local need. None of the three options allow for the delivery of employment generating opportunities along the A1 corridor as highlighted in paragraph 5.48 of the Core Strategy Consultation and Question 15. As will be noted in the response to Question 15, the Spatial Strategy must appropriately allow for employment related development along the A1 corridor to capitalise on a specific area of demand (chiefly distribution and warehousing). This approach is strongly recommended in the Bassetlaw ELCS and is therefore underpinned by a credible evidence base. The recent A1 improvements significantly improve this section of the A1 improving M18 and A14 links which lead to the principle UK ports, therefore strengthen its viability as a B8. Many of the more substantial/high tech recycling requirements (as identified in the ECLS) and operations share the same locational criteria as B8 users, as they may have facilities serving the UK and import/export inputs and their outputs. Many of the UKs principle food manufactures are based in the East of England. The ELCS identifies this sector for growth and the A1 corridor is well placed to accommodate this type of demand. Much of the raw materials are locally produced reducing food miles and other elements imported. Bassetlaw is well placed to service the UK market due to its central location and the shelf life constraints of food. It is therefore recommended that the spatial strategy allows for employment development along the A1 corridor.</p>
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 6	<p>Generally agreed, but overall some concern to ensure that unwarranted development is not directed to the "Rural Service Centres" - in terms of a sustainable pattern of development overall it will be necessary for the main focus of new development to be upon the "Core Service Centres" and then the "Local Service Centres". In respect of "Open Countryside" specific mention is made of landscaped parks and gardens. A number of these, including Clumber Park, are important in providing both accommodation for site workers and more particularly a range of attractions and facilities to meet the needs of visitors. As has been the case in the past, and will be in the future, there will be investment in appropriate facilities to meet these reasonable needs. Especially having regard to the wider benefits for the District in economic and social terms such investment is also important if the vital programme of conservation is to be maintained so that the environmental assets are safeguarded and enhanced.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 6	Local Service Centre level includes several conservation areas where small scale infill development should be carefully controlled to ensure that only development that is appropriate to protection of the historic character and distinctiveness is allowed. Rural service centres also include conservation areas where small infill development could be damaging to the historic character if it is not appropriately controlled. In both case the need for up-to-date conservation area appraisals and accompanying management plans is essential. Bassetlaw has a very low number of Conservation Areas with appraisals and should prioritise this, along with new designations of conservation areas (see Q2), to reflect and protect the local built heritage of the district.
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 6	Option 2 selected. We agree with the development implications
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 7	Don't Know
Mr David Brown	Merry Vale Development		Question 7	The alternative spatial strategy is described in answer to Questions 4,5 and 6, above, i.e that Misterton and Tuxford should be afforded a more elevated status than other settlements, as secondary development nodes.
Mr Simon Miller	Persimmon Homes		Question 7	An alternative option is being promoted and the development implications of this option are set out in our response to question 11.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 7	See answer to Question 4 Nottinghamshire County Council
Peter Frampton			Question 7	See response to Q4. A Spatial Strategy should focus development in Major Centres while recognising the needs of other communities especially where development of a significant scale may procure regeneration of previously mining dependent settlement.
Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways		Question 7	Waterways are non-footloose assets i.e. their location and alignment are fixed. As such any Spatial Option needs to provide flexibility as 'certain types of development and uses are dependent upon the location of waterway infrastructure itself and the movement of boats along the waterway. It is important that planning policies acknowledge that it is not always possible to find suitable sites adjacent to the waterways for some waterway-dependent uses, in or around existing settlements – for example: • provision of facilities to support waterway-related visitor attractions and • essential facilities to support boating-related tourism and leisure activity, such as marinas, boatyards and boat-hire companies, and moorings, which are informed by reasonable cruising distances. A degree of flexibility within locational policies and in the assessment of sites is crucial for the long term sustainability of waterways. This is supported by national planning policy in the form of the Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism (2006).....It is also consistent with PPS7. The Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism raises the issue of the 'spatial characteristics' of tourism and includes waterways within the definition of 'particular tourism resources', in recognition of their unique characteristics'. (TCPA Policy Advice Note: Inland Waterways: Unlocking the potential and securing the future of inland waterways through the planning system (2009)). PPS7, para 35 ii) also provides for "appropriate facilities needed to enhance visitors' enjoyment, and/or improve the financial viability, of a particular countryside feature or attraction, providing they will not detract from the attractiveness or importance of the feature, or the surrounding countryside."
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 7	No.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 7	No.
William Davis			Question 7	<p>As indicated above, William Davis Ltd do not support any of the three Spatial Strategy Options put forward in the Issues and Options consultation. We instead consider that an alternative option should be considered, which draws on different elements of Options 1 and 2. We are of the opinion that the major centres of Worksop and Retford should be the focus of the largest levels of development within the Borough as recommended in Option 2. We recognise that this strategy would be consistent with regional policy established in the adopted Regional Spatial Strategy (March 2009). Policy Northern SRS1 establishes the sub regional development policies for the Northern Sub-Region in which Bassetlaw is located. Within this policy, growth in Bassetlaw is principally directed to the Sub-Regional centre of Worksop with smaller levels of development directed to Retford which is recognised as an Urban Area with identified urban capacity. This regional policy should be reflected in the Spatial Strategy for Bassetlaw supporting our belief that the majority of development should be located within Worksop and Retford. In addition to this we consider it important Worksop's RSS status as the only Sub-Regional centre in Bassetlaw should be recognised in the Spatial Strategy. This should be achieved by directing the highest level of development to Worksop with a reduced overall level of development directed to Retford. The remainder of development within the district should then be directed to the Local Service Centres within the borough, as identified in Option 1 of the Issues and Options report (settlement hierarchy approach). Such an approach has foundation in RSS policy SRS1 which has a regeneration focus for the settlements below Worksop and Retford. The Council's Service and Facility Study (September 2009) has guided Option 1 in identifying Local Service Centres in Bassetlaw and William Davis Ltd support these findings. We therefore consider that the smaller levels of development we propose to be allocated in these service centres will help support the services and facilities available alongside meeting regeneration objectives. Option 1 of the Issues and Options consultation includes Harworth Bircotes as a Core Service Centre at the top of the settlement hierarchy. William Davis oppose this proposal and consider that Harworth Bircotes should only be recognised as a Local Service Centre within Bassetlaw. This proposal is supported by the findings of the Service and Facility Study which found the settlement to have only a Local Service Centre role. Consequently the level of development in Harworth Bircotes should be restricted accordingly to that appropriate to Local Service Centres, a proportion guided by the regeneration focus established in the RSS. Housing Distribution Options</p>
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 7	We, subject to our comments before, support Option 3 and to an extent Option 1 as this delivers the RSS objectives for regeneration in areas such as Haworth/Bircotes.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 7	We, subject to our comments before, support Option 3 and to an extent Option 1 as this delivers the RSS objectives for regeneration in areas such as Haworth/Bircotes.
Mr PG Hills	Clerk to Tuxford Town Council Tuxford Parish Council		Question 7	The alternative Spatial Strategy is described in answer to Questions 4, 5 and 6, above, i.e that Misterton and Tuxford should be afforded a more elevated status than other settlements, as 'secondary development nodes'.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Philip CABLE			Question 7	My proposals for part 4 spatial strategy would be for none development villages and ought to be a totally seperate policy. For rural none serviced communities the input from PP and VDS that have support of fuller local consultation but within the constraints of overall planning policies. Main issue would be about the village envelope and the consultation needed to review in line with community. Option 4 for rural settlements objective to manage/permit natural growth within nature and character of the existing community. 1. a seperate planning policy designed for rural non serviced communities. Input of VDS and PP as published and accredited with local consultation. To be within criteria of traditional constraints of published and audited village envelopes. 2. prioritised growth supported by community and ensure suitable numbers of units for young and seniors in our community. 3. Brownfield sites to be priority for cottage industry developments. Eg 2/3 bedroom with large garage workshop and hard standing. Clauses about range of use and class of businesses to be appropriate. 4. All existing sites in village to be reviewed by the community. Full and wide consultation within our communities. 5. Target density to be In keeping with village and not reflect that of city or towns 6. A quota scheme for each community of young persons units and aged persons dwellings before huge dwellings in community 7. Existing open spaces and countryside access to be an absolute priority for preservation. Not just special sites 8. Services and infrastructure to be developed as 1 to 7 above are clearly met
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 7	No
Mr Andy Kitchen	Pegasus Planning Group LLP		Question 7	The Spatial Strategy for the District ought to focus development in major centres, but this should not be at the expense of unduly limiting development in other settlements, in areas in need of regeneration and in areas which present opportunities attractive to the market place. Accordingly, an amended Option 1 ought to be promoted which does not restrict developments in other locations to fulfilling only local need. None of the three options allow for the delivery of employment generating opportunities along the A1 corridor as highlighted in paragraph 5.48 of the Core Strategy Consultation and Question 15. As will be noted in the response to Question 15, the Spatial Strategy must appropriately allow for employment related development along the A1 corridor to capitalise on a specific area of demand (chiefly distribution and warehousing). This approach is strongly recommended in the Bassetlaw ELCS and is therefore underpinned by a credible evidence base. The recent A1 improvements significantly improve this section of the A1 improving M18 and A14 links which lead to the principle UK ports, therefore strengthen its viability as a B8. Many of the more substantial/high tech recycling requirements (as identified in the ECLS) and operations share the same locational criteria as B8 users, as they may have facilities serving the UK and import/export inputs and their outputs. Many of the UKs principle food manufactures are based in the East of England. The ELCS identifies this sector for growth and the A1 corridor is well placed to accommodate this type of demand. Much of the raw materials are locally produced reducing food miles and other elements imported. Bassetlaw is well placed to service the UK market due to its central location and the shelf life constraints of food. It is therefore recommended that the spatial strategy allows for employment development along the A1 corridor.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 7	See response to Question 4 Generally Option 1 is supported, but there is a case to give some emphasis to the former mining settlements where there is both the need and opportunity for regeneration. Accordingly it is suggested that this Option is modified to include a specific emphasis on development in Langold and Carlton-in-Lindrick beyond that anticipated in this Option as drawn up at present. (A lesser focus on some of the Rural Service Centres [see comments below - Qs.9 and 14] could balance up this change in emphasis.)
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 7	Option 2 favoured.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 8	No
Mr David Brown	Merry Vale Development		Question 8	There can be no fundamental problem in allocating land which if developed could provide dwellings which quantitatively would exceed RSS requirements. This in any event would allow for density fluctuations. For example, a 10% flexibility allowance would facilitate greater choice in the rural areas, as an example.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Simon Miller	Persimmon Homes		Question 8	<p>Answer to question 8 is in the supporting evidence responses section. Paragraph 5.22 of the Issues and options consultation is misleading in that it suggests that the core strategy can not consider any other level of housing than that of the extant RSS. This is factually incorrect and is inconsistent with the advice in PPS12 discussed in detail below. Failure of the Core Strategy to take into account the potential range of dwelling requirements that might result from the partial review of the East Midlands Plan would be a fundamental flaw. For a Core Strategy to be found sound it should be capable of accommodating changes to the overall level of dwelling requirement. In light of our representations regarding the inadequacy of the timescale of the Core Strategy it is suggested that the level of dwelling provision at least be increased to that commensurate with the RSS requirement to 2031. If this is taken to be the same as the EMRA household projection for this period then the total level of requirement 2006 to 2031 would be that required to house 8,400 additional households as demonstrated by the extract of the EMRA projections replicated below. See table 1 in the paper version. The CLG household projection for Bassetlaw (table 406) over the period 2008 to 2031 is actually higher at 13,600 dwellings (allowing for 3% vacancy rate). Therefore evidence from both the Regional Assembly and the Government would suggest that the level of housing being contemplated for in the Core Strategy is too low. The Council's statement in paragraph 5.22 is misleading given the significant changes that are being required in RSS's and the fact that the East Midlands Plan will be completed prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy. Central Government advice on how to produce sound Core Strategies makes it very clear the approach that should be adopted in these circumstances and planning for outdated housing figures is unlikely to result in an inspector finding the strategy sound. PPS12 paragraph 4.14 states that the core strategies represent a considerable body of work and are intended to endure and give a degree of certainty to communities and investors. In particular they give a guide to where long term investment in infrastructure should be made. The advice is that the need for frequent updating may be reduced by taking a long-term view and providing some flexibility and that if a strategy has some room for manoeuvre, it should not need to be updated simply because there has been a change in the housing numbers in the regional spatial strategy. The advice is clear that the need for frequent updating may be reduced by taking a long-term view and providing some flexibility. Paragraph 4.15 suggests that this can be achieved by local authorities considering the implications of different levels of development taking place either within the core strategy period or alternatively beyond it. Such an approach is suggested as a way to ensure that the preparation of core strategies is not delayed by the proposed partial reviews of RSSs which will be required to deliver the Government's proposed level of house building by 2020. The advice is clear</p>
Mr Richard Walters	Senior Land Buyer Hallam Land Management Ltd		Question 8	<p>We would agree that land should be allocated to deliver more houses than that required to meet the 'residual target', as the figures shown in the Adopted East Midlands Regional Plan (EMRP) are minimum, rather than maximum. As to the amount of growth, it is perhaps too early to reach a figure, without a steer coming from the revised EMRP.</p>
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 8	<p>There is some doubt that the RSS Partial Review higher levels of growth (under trend projections) will be delivered, and that review concerns the period 2021 onwards. Therefore there is no strategic reason for further development areas to be identified. However, if an area for development should be enlarged to help assure a long-term viable scale of development, this should not be ignored. This would only be justified in specific circumstances. Nottinghamshire County Council Q8</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Chris Telford	Associate Director CGMS		Question 8	Subject to the availability of suitable sites and market demand, the planning authority should be prepared to exceed the residual housing growth requirement derived from the East Midlands Regional Strategy. The benefits of development to regenerate unused, underused and despoiled sites in sustainable locations, and to meet local needs - particularly in rural settlements, should be carefully considered.
Michael Meadows	Drivers Jonas	Michael Meadows	Question 8	In October 2008, the East Midlands Regional Assembly launched a partial review of the East Midlands Regional Plan. It is intended that the review will test the housing provision targets set by the Government, following advice from the National Housing and Planning Advice Unit (NHPAU) and the latest household projections. The East Midlands Regional Plan (March 2009) sets out a housing provision requirement of 21,500 new dwellings per year for the East Midlands Region. The NHPAU estimates that between 23,400 and 24,600 new dwellings per year will be required, while the figure, based on the latest government household projections is 28,600. These housing provision figures provide the framework within which the RSS partial review will work. On this basis, it is anticipated that the partial review will recommend a further increase in housing provision targets across the region. The Council has identified a residual growth target of 3,506 homes from 2015 to 2026 and acknowledges in Paragraph 5.25 of the Core Strategy Issues and Options that housing targets for Bassetlaw are likely to be increased following the partial review. In this context, LIH supports a flexible approach to the distribution of housing development, in accordance with Spatial Strategy Option 1, which will allow the Council to plan positively for growth and deliver sustainable urban extensions to meet regional housing targets.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 8	The Local Development Framework should identify and allocate sufficient land to achieve the RSS housing targets. Additional land should be identified for potential allocation to facilitate meeting potential higher targets that may arise through the RSS review process. The SHLAA should be regularly reviewed and updated to maintain an accurate, up-to-date evidence base to inform this decision making process with an ongoing 'reserve' supply of potential housing development land.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 8	The Local Development Framework should identify and allocate sufficient land to achieve the RSS housing targets. Additional land should be identified for potential allocation to facilitate meeting potential higher targets that may arise through the RSS review process. The SHLAA should be regularly reviewed and updated to maintain an accurate, up-to-date evidence base to inform this decision making process with an ongoing 'reserve' supply of potential housing development land.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
William Davis			Question 8	<p>William Davis Ltd disagree with the way in which the residual housing growth target of 3,506 dwellings has been calculated. This residual target is for the period 2015 to 2026 with all sites considered deliverable within 5 years by the SHLAA excluded from the requirement. This includes site BAS0217 on Doncaster Road in Carlton-in-Lindrick which does not have planning permission and is not an allocated site. This site should therefore not be considered as a commitment and the 150 dwellings it is calculated to be able to accommodate should not be subtracted from the housing growth target for 2010 to 2026. Consequently the residual housing growth target for 2015 to 2026 considered in the Core Strategy should be at least 3,656 dwellings. PPS12 paragraph 4.14 states that "The need for frequent updating may be reduced by taking a long-term view and providing some flexibility. So for example, if a strategy has some room for manoeuvre, it should not need to be updated simply because there has been a change in the housing numbers in the RSS" . William Davis consider that by allocating land capable of delivering more than the currently required housing growth target of 3,656 the Core Strategy would be consistent with the policy recommended in PPS12. An increased level of housing allocations in the Core Strategy would offer the flexibility required by PPS12 should the housing number requirement for Bassetlaw increase in the Partial Review of the East Midlands RSS, as is anticipated by the District Council. William Davis consider that a 10% increase on the RSS housing target would allow an appropriate level of flexibility. Consequently we consider that 700 additional dwellings should be allocated within the district through the Core Strategy.</p>
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 8	<p>Generally we suggest that more housing growth would be appropriate and the figure set should be minima rather than maxima. We also feel that general consideration of this issue should be delayed until such time as the RSS partial review is concluded or nearing conclusion. Obviously this will set the regional guidance which needs to be followed will dictate, to a large extent, allocations within the District. Provided it is in a sustainable form we would support a higher level of growth but we feel it would be premature to indicate the extent prior to a more defining position being clear under the RSS review.</p>
Mr Chris Telford	Associate Director CGMS		Question 8	<p>Subject to the availability of suitable sites and market demand, the planning authority should be prepared to exceed the residual housing growth requirement derived from the East Midlands Regional Strategy. The benefits of development to regenerate unused, underused and despoiled sites in sustainable locations, and to meet local needs - particularly in rural settlements, should be carefully considered.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Ms Caroline Harrison	Planning and Biodiversity Officer Natural England		Question 8	<p>When deciding upon the most sustainable locations for growth we consider it necessary to assess, in addition to the capacity to provide services and jobs, the environmental capacity of a settlement to accommodate growth and this should be central to decisions on future development. Natural England recognises that expansion is likely to have implications for the natural environment but it can also deliver substantial benefits for the natural environment and people together. However this requires a holistic approach which recognises that the planned growth is more than just the delivery of lots of houses but offers an opportunity to provide new jobs, improved services and facilities, better transport network and enhanced open space. An investment in infrastructure is required to support the growth and mitigate the impacts of development. Natural England believes 'green infrastructure' should be at the heart of any new development, an essential element in order to achieve sustainable development, a key principle of PPS12. Green Infrastructure should be planned strategically and should be delivered in an integrated way. Green Infrastructure (GI) is a network of multi-functional greenspace that contributes to the high quality natural and built environment required for existing and new sustainable communities in the future. It consists of both public and private assets, with and without public access, and in both urban and rural locations. Well-designed and integrated GI can promote a sense of community and place and help to reduce crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour, as well as provide opportunities for community involvement and cultural diversity. It can provide opportunities for exercise, sport, active recreation and improved health as a result of increased physical activity, such as walking and cycling. Promoting the adoption of Accessible Natural Green space Standards (ANGSt) in new and, where possible. Improvements in environmental quality can facilitate better air and water quality and contribute to sustainable drainage and flood mitigation. GI is also essential to help protect, recreate or rehabilitate landscapes, historic sites and habitats damaged or lost by previous development or practices and help maintain and enhance biodiversity. Well planned GI can raise the quality of the natural and built environment which in turn will help to attract business and inward investment. The GI Strategy should seek to protect the existing environmental assets, deliver new greenspace and create links between them to develop networks of multi-functional green infrastructure providing a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits. Policies and decisions on major development proposals should conserve valued environmental assets by seeking first to avoid loss or harm, before considering the need for mitigation or compensatory measures and then seek new benefits.</p>
Mr David Barker			Question 8	<p>Subject to the availability of suitable sites and market demand, the planning authority should be prepared to exceed the residual housing growth requirement derived from the East Midlands Regional Strategy. The benefits of development to regenerate unused, underused and despoiled sites in sustainable locations should be carefully considered.</p>
Magnus Educational Centre			Question 8	<p>Subject to the availability of suitable sites and market demand, the planning authority should be prepared to exceed the residual housing growth requirement derived from the East Midlands Regional Strategy. The benefits of development to regenerate unused, underused and despoiled sites in sustainable locations, and to meet local needs - particularly in rural settlements, should be carefully considered.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Walker Dormer Tools Walker Dormer Tools	Ian Baseley Associates		Question 8	By allocating more land than to meet the residual housing growth target of 3,506, there is a danger that the Core Strategy will be deemed to be contrary to Policy 13a of the EMRP. However, conversely given the likely timescales for the adoption of the Core strategy and then the Site allocations Document that will follow, it is probable that the partial review of the adopted EMRP will be at a more advanced stage and will duly carry greater weight. It would therefore be safer to apply the Office of National Statistics-based projections that the East Midlands will experience a 16% growth in population which will in turn lead to the need for more housing than currently provided for in the adopted EMRP. It would appear logical therefore to allocate more land for housing to provide for this expected increase in population.
Mr Walker East Markham Walker East Markham	Ian Baseley associates		Question 8	By allocating more land than to meet the residual housing growth target of 3,506, there is a danger that the Core Strategy will be deemed to be contrary to Policy 13a of the EMRP. However, conversely given the likely timescales for the adoption of the Core Strategy and then the site allocations policy document that will follow, it is probable that the partial review of the adopted EMRP will be at a more advanced stage and will duly carry greater weight. It would therefore be safer to apply the Office of National Statistics-based projections that the East Midlands will experience a 16% growth in population which in turn will lead to the need for more housing that currently provided for in the adopted EMRP. It would appear logical therefore to allocate more land for housing to provide for this expected increase in population.
Mrs Janet Hodson			Question 8	Yes - There is a need for flexibility in the approach and to anticipate increased targets for the district in a revision to the RSS. A large urban extension to the east of Worksop can deliver the existing requirement and any potential increase. We feel that there should be at least 2000 above the current target to provide this flexibility.
Mr Tom Garnett	Energy Review		Question 8	We believe that more land should be allocated to exceed the RSS target. The process can then be managed at development control level. This will ensure a supply of appropriate land that can deliver sustainable developments and affordable housing - and thereby AVOID excess housing development in back land and infill sites which come under the affordable housing threshold.
Ms Vicki Ingleby	Turley Associates		Question 8	We would advise that, given the current economic climate, the Council should exercise a degree of caution when working on the presumption that all permissions and allocations will be delivered. In reality, only a proportion is likely to be implemented. Some sites will remain undeveloped for a variety of reasons. An appropriate level of discount should be employed to take account of this, which will raise the requirement for additional housing land to be allocated. Failing to take account of the present housing market would in turn result in failure to meet the requirements of paragraph 58 of PPS3 in proving that the sites are developable and can contribute to housing delivery at the point envisaged. A flexible response to land allocation is needed in order to be able to meet short-term requirements and to avoid serious delivery shortfalls in the medium-term. The Council should look therefore to allocated land in excess of the requirement in order to give the market greater choice of delivery and a better chance of delivering community benefits such as affordable housing and associated community infrastructure.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 8	Generally we suggest that more housing growth would be appropriate and the figure set should be minima rather than maxima. We also feel that general consideration of this issue should be delayed until such time as the RSS partial review is concluded or nearing conclusion. Obviously this will set the regional guidance which needs to be followed will dictate, to a large extent, allocations within the District. Provided it is in a sustainable form we would support a higher level of growth but we feel it would be premature to indicate the extent prior to a more defining position being clear under the RSS review.
Mr PG Hills	Clerk to Tuxford Town Council Tuxford Parish Council		Question 8	there can be no fundamental problem in allocating land which if developed could provide dwellings which quantitatively would exceed RSS requirements. This in any event would allow for density fluctuations. For example, a 10% 'flexibility allowance' would facilitate greater choice in the rural areas, as an example.
Adams	John Martin & Associates		Question 8	My client objects to the premise of this question. Policy 13a of the East Midlands Regional Plan March 2009 seeks for the delivery of a minimum of 7,000 dwellings in the Bassetlaw District during the period 2006 - 2026. In addition, Policy 14 of the Regional Plan seeks for the provision of a minimum of 10,000 affordable dwellings in the Northern HMA within the Plan period. It is clear that these housing figures as set out in the RSS are not reflected in the Core Strategy Issues and Options, and in any event, are expressed merely as a minimum forecast. Bassetlaw District Councils' Assessment of Five Year Deliverable Housing Supply 2008 sets out an analysis of housing provision delivery for the next 5-years. Whilst it is clearly not possible to forensically analyse each identified planning application site, housing allocation and strategic site within the District, there are many assumptions and factors that have been taken into account. For example, the District Council is relying on a number of outline planning applications, which to-date have not come forward as detailed planning applications - possibly due to the recession and the fall in value of development land. In addition, a number of sites are merely allocated for planning development, but have not come forward as planning applications. Finally, and notwithstanding the credibility of this evidence base, there is no factoring of a lapse rate within this analysis. It is generally assumed that there will be a lapse rate of around 10 % in planning permissions, given changing factors and site circumstances; this percentage of lapsed sites could indeed rise given the state of land economy. To conclude, my client remains to be convinced that there is sufficient 5-years land supply within Bassetlaw District to meet the RSS targets.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Andrew Laing			Question 8	<p>Yes additional land over the 3,506 residual housing growth target should be Allocated Support is given to the allocation of land over and above the residual growth requirement (3,506). This is also supported by national planning guidance, which states the allocation of land for housing in the LDF should identify housing 'for at least 15 years from the date of adoption' (PPS 3 Housing Para. 53). PPS 3 links housing provision in LDF's to take account of the level of RSS requirements. On this basis there is effectively no defined ceiling limit to the housing target and an authority can exceed current RSS requirements taking account of anticipated future housing growth requirements. Setting a housing target over the RSS requirement will allow the authority to more effectively 'Plan, Monitor, and Manage' housing supply. On this basis the authority should consider allocating land to deliver 20-30% over the RSS requirement. e.g. $7,000+30\%=9,100$. This equates to an additional 105 dwellings per annum over the RSS Plan Period ($9,100/20=455$).</p>
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 8	<p>It is appropriate to allocate land to deliver more houses than is required to meet the residual housing growth target based upon the East Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy targets. It is important to acknowledge the LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK significant housing growth that has been identified in the Partial Review of the East Midlands Regional Plan (Options Consultation) since this is based on sound evidence from the NHPAU and Government 2006 Based Household Projections it is important to recognise more growth. In addition it is important to ensure an adequate supply in the event that certain sites do not come forwards or fail to deliver the envisaged amount of housing. Constraints such as land ownership, technical difficulties, contamination, the requirement to provide public open space etc, all have the ability to impact upon the delivery and quantum of development of allocated sites. Therefore providing a greater number of allocated sites than is required will provide a safety net should it be required and ensure that the local planning authority is capable of meeting their housing target. It is difficult to advise how much additional growth should be planned beyond the current target, but indicatively 25% is likely to provide sufficient comfort to accommodate projection changes and any difficulties arising in delivering sites.</p>
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 8	<p>It is appropriate to allocate land to deliver more houses than is required to meet the residual housing growth target based upon the East Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy targets. It is important to acknowledge the significant housing growth that has been identified in the Partial Review of the East Midlands Regional Plan (Options Consultation) since this is based on sound evidence from the NHPAU and Government 2006 Based Household Projections. In addition it is important to ensure an adequate supply in the event that certain sites do not come forwards or fail to deliver the envisaged amount of housing. Constraints such as land ownership, technical difficulties, contamination, the requirement to provide public open space etc, all have the ability to impact upon the delivery and quantum of development of allocated sites. Therefore providing a greater number of allocated sites than is required will provide a safety net should it be required and ensure that the local planning authority is capable of meeting their housing target. It is difficult to advise how much additional growth should be planned beyond the current target, but indicatively 25% is likely to provide sufficient comfort to accommodate projection changes and any difficulties arising in delivering sites.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 8	No comment.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 8	No, there are already many empty houses in the region and the impact on more houses than the existing target would be of no benefit.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 8	YES-ALLOCATE ABOUT 30% MORE -TO EQUAL CURRENT USAGE
Mr Andy Kitchen	Pegasus Planning Group LLP		Question 8	No comments.
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 8	No - meeting the current housing target will be challenging as it is given the current condition of the housing market and the fact that it will take a while to fully recover.
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 8	Yes, we do. Government ministers have made it clear that the RSS targets should be regarded as minima, not maxima. Moreover, there is a tendency to under-perform in terms of delivering housing targets, so the allocation of land over and above the RSS is likely to improve the likelihood of meeting those targets. The development of housing in the District would also have economic and social benefits, helping to sustain local services and the economy.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 9	Option 3
Mr David Brown	Merry Vale Development		Question 9	Option 1 would provide the most appropriate solution to the identified problems in Bassetlaw in order to meet the requirements set out in the RSS of securing economic, environmental and social improvements throughout the District.
Miss Rachael Bust	Deputy Head of Planning and Local Authority Liaison Coal Authority		Question 9	Spatial and Housing Distribution Option 3 Test of Soundness Justified Effective Consistency With National Policy X Whilst The Coal Authority does not have a particular preference for any of the three Spatial and Housing Distribution Options, Option 3: Focusing development in the former coal mining areas of west Bassetlaw should be recognised as resulting in the greatest likelihood of new development occurring in areas of coal mining legacy. Within the Bassetlaw District area the main coal mining legacy issues which need to be identified are mine entries and fissures. Although an issue that must be fully considered and addressed if Option 3 becomes the Council's favoured strategic option, it is important to stress that land instability and mining legacy is not a complete constraint on development, rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable. Reason - In order to address the requirements of PPG14 regarding land stability.
Richard Walters	Hallam Land Management Ltd		Question 9	Option 1
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 9	This should be in line with the settlement hierarchy. However, with the development of Harworth-Bircotes for regeneration, there may be value in a greater emphasis on housing there. In addition, there may be specific reasons to provide more, or limit housing development according to local circumstances such as village character, or affordable housing. Nottinghamshire County Council Q9

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Craig Ball	Development Planner UK Coal Mining Ltd		Question 9	<p>In respect of Question 9 of the Consultation Document and in line with UK COAL's preferred option for the Spatial Strategy for Bassetlaw, UK COAL support the principles of Option 1, which would distribute housing based on the settlement hierarchy. As stated above for the Spatial Strategy, this is a logical approach to secure sustainable development and a balance of development across the district. UK COAL consider that the level of growth identified for Harworth is appropriate, though the scale of growth for the Local Service Centres is too low. Further consideration should be given to reducing the growth in Worksop from 40% to 30% and increasing that in Local service Centres to 20% to allow for regeneration of settlements such as Carlton in Lindrick and Langold. The percentage split of residual Page 7 of 14 RSS housing target set out within the consultation document should be seen as minimum to be achieved not a maximum that could not be exceeded. Housing needs to be delivered close to employment and services to provide sustainable growth and encourage people to use alternative modes of transport to the private car, such as walking, cycling or public transport as well as to underpin the existing services and facilities. The hierarchy approach follows advice in PPS3, such as that in paragraph 10 which requires 'housing developments in suitable locations, which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure.' PPS3 recognises the need to balance development across areas, whereby in paragraph 38 it states that authorities need to take into account 'the need to provide housing in rural areas, not only in market towns and local service centres but also in villages in order to enhance or maintain their sustainability.'</p> <p>As well as the 'need to develop mixed, sustainable communities across the wider local authority area as well as at neighbourhood level.' As with the spatial strategy options, UK COAL does not support Options 2 or 3 for the reasons set out in the Spatial Strategy section above.</p>
Mr Nick Basley	Ian Basley Associates		Question 9	<p>Mr Pickering considers housing distribution policy based on a settlement hierarchy (option 1) is the most appropriate means of distribution future housing accross the District. Such an approach would more closely accord with the EMRP and would comply with a spatial strategy based on a settlement hierarchy for the Core Strategy. It is extremely important in adopting this distribution strategy that the needs and interests of local service centres are not overlooked at the expense of the District's larger urban areas are often very different to other areas and the strategy needs to reflect this.</p>
Mr Chris Telford	Associate Director CGMS		Question 9	<p>It is considered that in the interests of sustainable development housing distribution should be based on a settlement hierarchy, reflective of the advocated broad Spatial Strategy, i.e. Option 1 for housing distribution. However, as above, the distinction between Local Service Centres and Rural Service Centres should be removed. All such settlements should be considered as being potential locations for housing development, depending on the availability of suitable smaller sites, as discussed above.</p>
Michael Meadows	Drivers Jonas	Michael Meadows	Question 9	<p>The Core Strategy Issues and Options proposes three housing distribution options. LIH supports Option 1: Housing distribution based on a settlement hierarchy, largely in accordance with Spatial Strategy Option 1 above, but taking into account our suggested changes to Worksop's status (see Question 5).</p>
Edward Fisher			Question 9	<p>Support housing distribution option 3</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 9	Option 1. It is unclear why the Core Strategy seeks to differentiate between the 'Spatial Strategy' and a 'Housing Distribution' strategy. The Core Strategy would be inconsistent with itself if any housing distribution option did not follow the Spatial Strategy. If any area is imbalanced in, for example, the existing level of housing compared with the employment provision, then the Spatial Strategy should direct that this imbalance be corrected, subject to compliance with any other relevant objectives that emerge from the Core Strategy. Housing Distribution Option 1 most closely complies with national and regional policy, assists with regeneration, provides for appropriate levels of growth in more rural areas and reduces the need to travel for local services.
William Davis			Question 9	William Davis Ltd do not support any of the Spatial Strategy Options identified in the Issues and Options consultation. Consequently we do not support any of the three housing distribution options suggested in the Core Strategy. Instead we propose a housing distribution that directly collates to our suggested spatial strategy put forward in response to question 7. Consequently we suggest the following distribution: Settlement % Split of RSS Housing Target Housing Growth 2015-2026 Annual Housing Target Worksop 60% 2,194 199 Retford 25% 914 83 Local Service Centres 15% 548 50 Totals 100% 3,656 332 The above development distribution strategy is consistent with our proposed spatial strategy, with the majority of development being directed to Worksop and Retford (85%) due to their status in the RSS. We also consider that the distribution of 15% of the residual housing to the Local Service Centres will support our belief that some development should be directed to these settlements to support the regeneration focus of the RSS and to help maintain their roles as service centres. William Davis recognise that the proposed level of development in Retford is relatively low, but consider this level appropriate due to the high level of commitments (over 1,000) within Retford identified in the SHLAA for the period 2010-2015. A higher percentage of distribution to Retford combined together with the large levels of commitments would result in over development in Retford when considered against our proposed spatial strategy.
Mr Ian Lord	Building Link Design		Question 9	Support Housing Distribution Option 1.
Mr Ian Lord	Building Link Design		Question 9	Support Housing Distribution Option 1.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 9	We support Option 3 which directs the growth to the areas of greatest need and to support regeneration and other employment opportunities. See our comments before about the general requirements for the Haworth/Bircotes area consistent with the proposed Area Action Plan and RSS policies. This would also be achieved to an extent through Option 1 but we would certainly object strongly to Option 2 since this does not in any way deal with the regeneration required and it does not make best use of Brownfield land which is a key driver from national planning guidance. To an extent there may be a place for a combination of Options 1 and 3. The figure for Haworth/Bircotes should be a minima 40% as this is an area that needs regeneration, employment growth and it is a very sustainable location consistent with other national Planning Policy Guidance. This fits with the RSS.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
		Ms Emma Cruickshank	Question 9	<p>Question 9 of the Consultation Document and in line with UK COAL's preferred option for the Spatial Strategy for Bassetlaw, UK COAL support the principles of Option 1, which would distribute housing based on the settlement hierarchy. As stated above for the Spatial Strategy, this is a logical approach to secure sustainable development and a balance of development across the district. UK COAL consider that the level of growth identified for Harworth is appropriate, though the scale of growth for the Local Service Centres is too low. Further consideration should be given to reducing the growth in Worksop from 40% to 30% and increasing that in Local service Centres to 20% to allow for regeneration of settlements such as Carlton in Lindrick and Langold. The percentage split of residual Page 7 of 14 RSS housing target set out within the consultation document should be seen as minimum to be achieved not a maximum that could not be exceeded. Housing needs to be delivered close to employment and services to provide sustainable growth and encourage people to use alternative modes of transport to the private car, such as walking, cycling or public transport as well as to underpin the existing services and facilities. The hierarchy approach follows advice in PPS3, such as that in paragraph 10 which requires 'housing developments in suitable locations, which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure.' PPS3 recognises the need to balance development across areas, whereby in paragraph 38 it states that authorities need to take into account 'the need to provide housing in rural areas, not only in market towns and local service centres but also in villages in order to enhance or maintain their sustainability.' As well as the need to develop mixed, sustainable communities across the wider local authority area as well as at neighbourhood level.' As with the spatial strategy options, UK COAL does not support Options 2 or 3 for the reasons set out in the Spatial Strategy section above.</p>
Mr Chris Telford	Associate Director CGMS		Question 9	<p>It is considered that in the interests of sustainable development, housing distribution should be based on a settlement hierarchy, reflective of the advocated broad Spatial Strategy, i.e. Option 1 for housing distribution. However, as above, the distinction between Local Service Centres and Rural Service Centres should be removed. All such settlements should be considered as being potential locations for housing development, depending on the availability of suitable smaller sites, as discussed above.</p>
Mr David Barker			Question 9	<p>It is considered that in the interests of sustainable development housing distribution should be based on a settlement hierarchy, reflective of the advocated broad Spatial Strategy, i.e. Option 1 for housing distribution.</p>
Magnus Educational Centre			Question 9	<p>It is considered that in the interests of sustainable development housing distribution should be based on a settlement hierarchy, reflective of the advocated broad Spatial Strategy, i.e. Option 1 for housing distribution. However, as above, the distinction between Local Service Centres and Rural Service Centres should be removed. All such settlements should be considered as being potential locations for housing development, depending on the availability of suitable smaller sites, as discussed above.</p>
Mrs Sophie Lucas			Question 9	<p>Similarly, in response to Question 9, SSL are supportive of the planned housing growth for Worksop. However, having regard to the RSS, which seeks to "...significantly strengthen..." the Sub-Regional role of Worksop to provide "... new jobs, houses, services and facilities in and around their urban area..." ,</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Walker Dormer Tools Walker Dormer Tools	Ian Baseley Associates		Question 9	A housing distribution policy based on a settlement hierarchy (Option 1) is supported as the most appropriate means for housing distribution across the District. This approach accords with the EMRP and would comply with a spatial strategy based on a settlement hierarchy for the Core Strategy.
Mr Walker East Markham Walker East Markham	Ian Baseley associates		Question 9	A housing distribution policy based on a settlement hierarchy (Option 1) is supported as the most appropriate means for housing distribution across the District. This approach accords with the EMRP and would comply with a spatial strategy based on a settlement hierarchy for the Core Strategy. It is extremely important in adopting this distribution strategy that the needs and interests of rural service centres are not overlooked at the expense of the District's larger urban settlements. The needs of rural areas are often very different to other areas and the strategy needs to reflect this.
Mrs Janet Hodson			Question 9	We don't support option 1-3 and consider development needs to be focused on Worksop (see above answers). There needs to be another option to represent this e.g. Option 4.that is development concentrated on an eastern urban extension.
Mr Tom Garnett	Energy Review		Question 9	Housing distribution should be based upon settlement hierarchy - this is specifically in line with RSS policy.
Ms Vicki Ingleby	Turley Associates		Question 9	In line with the preferred spatial strategy outlined above, our client supports Option 1 - Housing Distribution based on a Settlement Hierarchy.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 9	We support Option 3 which directs the growth to the areas of greatest need and to support regeneration and other employment opportunities. See our comments before about the general requirements for the Haworth/Bircotes area consistent with the proposed Area Action Plan and RSS policies. This would also be achieved to an extent through Option 1 but we would certainly object strongly to Option 2 since this does not in any way deal with the regeneration required and it does not make best use of Brownfield land which is a key driver from national planning guidance. To an extent there may be a place for a combination of Options 1 and 3. The figure for Haworth/Bircotes should be a minima 40% as this is an area that needs regeneration, employment growth and it is a very sustainable location consistent with other national Planning Policy Guidance. This fits with the RSS.
Mr PG Hills	Clerk to Tuxford Town Council Tuxford Parish Council		Question 9	Option 1 would provide the most appropriate solution to the identified problems in Bassetlaw in order to meet the requirements set out in the RSS of securing economic, environmental and social improvements throughout the district.
Adams	John Martin & Associates		Question 9	Notwithstanding the criticism as set out in my clients' response to Question 8, my client generally supports Housing Distribution Option 1: Housing distribution based on a settlement hierarchy. The approach appears to be consistent with RSS8, which seeks to promote the regeneration of smaller settlements in a way that promotes a more sustainable pattern of development.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Andrew Laing			Question 9	Support: Option 1: Housing Distribution Based On A Settlement Hierarchy Justification: Option 1 is the only alternative that is endorsed by national and regional guidance. Implementation of option 1 would ensure a distribution of growth that would support local social networks, assist people to live near their work, benefit key services, minimise the development of large Greenfield developments and their environmental impact and help to develop mixed, sustainable communities across the wider local authority. Neither options 2 and 3 adhere to the principles set out in PPS 3 Para. 38 regarding the strategy for locating new housing which contributes to sustainable development. Implementation of either of these two options would severely limit housing land supply to specific locations to the detriment of sustainable Brownfield locations elsewhere on the authority. Para. 39 of PPS3 clearly acknowledges the need 'to provide housing in rural areas, not only in market towns and local service centres but also in villages in order to enhance or maintain their sustainability'. Development in Worksop and Retford (Option 2) or the former Coal mining areas of West Bassetlaw (Option 3) cannot be justified and would go against national guidance and regional guidance (Policy 3 of the East Midlands RSS, 2009)
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 9	Housing Distribution Option 1 is favoured. The reasons behind this being similar to the justification provided in response to question number 4.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 9	Housing Distribution Option 1 is favoured. The reasons behind this being similar to the justification provided in response to question number 4.
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 9	On balance, we support the housing distribution based on a settlement hierarchy - see comments above.
Mrs Jennifer Kirk	Clerk to Headon-cum-Upton, Grove and Stokeham Parish Council		Question 9	Housing Distribution Option 1 = Housing distribution based on a settlement hierarchy.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 9	Option 3 plus Retford
Mr Simon Miller	Persimmon Homes		Question 9	None of the options are supported and an alternative Strategy is proposed the full reasoning for this alternative strategy is set out in our response to question 11.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 9	Option 1
Mr Andy Kitchen	Pegasus Planning Group LLP		Question 9	No comments.
Mr Andy Kitchen	Pegasus Planning Group LLP		Question 9	no comments.
		Miss Kate Helliwell	Question 9	We are of the opinion that Option 1 - Housing Distribution based on a Settlement Hierarchy is the most suitable option. This provides a spread across the district and provides for suitable sized development to the existing settlements.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 9	Option 1 - but with a slightly greater emphasis on Langold and Carlton-in-Lindrick - the detail of this requires careful consideration having regard to the SHLAA work, but perhaps of the 10% allocation for Local Service Centres around 3% might be allocated to these two settlements, with the remaining 7% distributed amongst the other 12 Local Service Centres. The emphasis should be pre-dominantly upon the major settlements and the relative distribution between these main centres appears to be about right.
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 9	Option 1 is the most appropriate in respect to the future of small local centres with historic conservation area designations where the preservation of their character is an issue of sustainability.
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 9	Option 2 for the reasons set out in the attached letter.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 10	Yes
Mr David Brown	Merry Vale Development		Question 10	There should be greater emphasis given to housing growth in the service centres, especially Misterton and Tuxford, if the objectives of rural regeneration are to be achieved. In this regard the bias should be shifted marginally towards the service centres, ie Worksop falls by 2% to 38%, but remains the dominant recipient of growth. Harworth also falls by 2% to 28%, still sufficient to support regeneration. Retford falls by 2% to 18% to reflect the inherent infrastructure difficulties. Service centres, particularly Misterton and Tuxford increase their percentage share by 6% to 16% to reflect their ability to satisfy RSS ambitions.
Mr Richard Walters	Senior Land Buyer Hallam Land Management Ltd		Question 10	We would suggest that, because of our view of viability issues at Harworth Bircotes, it's 30% should be reduced by 10%, with both Worksop and Retford each being increased by 5%.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 10	As delivery of housing is unpredictable, the figures should be flexible. No further comment on overall proportions on the basis that the emphasis on Harworth-Bircotes is acceptable from a strategic point of view. Nottinghamshire County Council Q10
Mr Craig Ball	Development Planner UK Coal Mining Ltd		Question 10	In relation to Question 10 of the Consultation Document, the policies supporting the distribution of housing need to be flexible in order that they can accommodate the potential increase in housing numbers that may be allocated to Bassetlaw through the revised East Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy. Again, Option 1 and the settlement hierarchy has the best ability to accommodate this required flexibility compared to the alternative Options 2 and 3. In respect of the housing figures contained within Table 5.6 of the Consultation Document, a total of 319 houses per year are identified for the period 2015 to 2026. Whilst UK COAL acknowledge from the supporting paragraphs (5.22 to 5.25) how this figure has been derived, it is partly based on predicted completions and as such has potential to be inaccurate, particularly given the current economic downturn which has had a resulting effect of slowing down housing completions nationally. The Core Strategy should identify the figures contained within the current RSS (March 2009), which as set out in Policy 13a of the RSS should be 350 dwellings per annum, with the ability for this to be increased should the RSS Review require as is anticipated. Furthermore the period identified in the Consultation Document of 2015 to 2026 covers a 12-year period rather than the 11 years currently calculated and as Page 8 of 14 such Table 5.6 (and other related tables for the other Options) should be recalculated accordingly to provide housing growth figures.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Nick Basley	Ian Basley Associates		Question 10	The proposed percentage split is not supported. Whilst an approach which seeks to direct a significant amount of new housing development towards Worksop and Retford is supported, it is considered that 30% is too high a proportion for Harworth Bircotes which, given its geographical location, is likely to support the housing needs of local authorities outside Bassetlaw and not the needs of the District itself. Such a percentage would also unnecessarily compromise the amount of housing development to be provided in the District's local and rural service centres. It is considered that it would be more appropriate to reduce the level of development in Harworth Bircotes and increase the level of provision in the Local and Rural Service Centres.
Mr Chris Telford	Associate Director CGMS		Question 10	It is considered that the proposed distribution of housing under this option is currently inappropriate. The 10% of housing total which would currently be distributed to Local Service Centres only, should be distributed amongst all villages currently defined as Local Service Centres and Rural Service Centres.
Michael Meadows Edward Fisher	Drivers Jonas	Michael Meadows	Question 10 Question 10	As set out in response to Question 5, LIH firmly believe that the settlement hierarchy in relation to spatial strategy Option 1 should be amended to reflect Worksop's identified Sub-Regional role and function, in terms of providing homes and jobs and essential services and facilities. Accordingly, LIH considers that the split of housing allocations proposed across the three larger settlements and local service centres in Housing Distribution Option 1 should be amended to reflect this proposed settlement hierarchy, in line with regional planning policy. Policy 7 of the East Midlands Plan promotes strengthening the role of the Sub-Regional Centres, including providing new housing development in and around their urban areas. In addition, Policy Northern SRS1 identifies that significant growth will be provided for in and adjoining Sub-Regional Centres, including the provision of urban extensions. The Draft East Midlands Plan Examination Panel Report (2007) notes that, despite the designation of Worksop as a Sub-Regional Centre, the district is largely one of rural areas and small towns, and there is little re-usable land. The Panel Report also identifies a concern that housing provision is not balanced by employment provision in Bassetlaw. The East Midlands Northern Sub-Region Employment Land Review identifies a strong demand for employment around Worksop. A number of the main opportunity sites identified by the study are located to the north of Worksop, towards Robin Hood Airport, and are accessible from Gateford. In this context, it is proposed that at least 50% of future housing growth should be directed at Worksop. Support the proposed percentage split of housing growth

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 10	On the basis of the number of Local Service Centres suggested in the consultation document, Option 1 (Housing distribution based settlement hierarchy) would in effect spread the potentially available housing growth too thinly across too many Local Service Centres. Twenty five dwellings over the LDF period (as suggested by footnote 26), equating to only 2 to 3 dwellings per year, will not provide any significant level of support for existing or new services in those Local Service Centres. The ability to identify and plan more comprehensive development, which may be required to bring forward mixed use schemes with wider community benefits, would be severely curtailed. Such a low level of growth would also be unlikely to generate any substantial requirements for developer contributions (on or off site) to new or enhanced community facilities. Larger scale growth in a more limited number of settlements (i.e. more focused growth) would be more likely to result in a quantum of development through which such wider community benefits could be derived. This supports the arguments presented above for a reduction in the number of Local Service Centres within an amended Settlement Hierarchy.
Mr Ian Lord	Building Link Design		Question 10	I support the proposed percentage split of housing growth.
Mr Ian Lord	Building Link Design		Question 10	Support the proposed percentage split of housing growth. Suggest percentage split to be re-aligned towards option 3 with greater emphasis on former coal mining areas of west Bassetlaw. i.e. Worksop, Carlton in Lindrick, Langold and Harworth.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 10	The figure under Option 3 for Haworth/Bircotes should be a minimum 40% and we feel this should receive a greater allocation in the region of 50%-60% because we consider this is consistent with RSS policies and the need to achieve sustainable economic growth in a much more sustainable location. It lies at the heart of the area with good transportation links in all directions.
		Ms Emma Cruickshank	Question 10	Question 10 of the Consultation Document, the policies supporting the distribution of housing need to be flexible in order that they can accommodate the potential increase in housing numbers that may be allocated to Bassetlaw through the revised East Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy. Again, Option 1 and the settlement hierarchy has the best ability to accommodate this required flexibility compared to the alternative Options 2 and 3. In respect of the housing figures contained within Table 5.6 of the Consultation Document, a total of 319 houses per year are identified for the period 2015 to 2026. Whilst UK COAL acknowledge from the supporting paragraphs (5.22 to 5.25) how this figure has been derived, it is partly based on predicted completions and as such has potential to be inaccurate, particularly given the current economic downturn which has had a resulting effect of slowing down housing completions nationally. The Core Strategy should identify the figures contained within the current RSS (March 2009), which as set out in Policy 13a of the RSS should be 350 dwellings per annum, with the ability for this to be increased should the RSS Review require as is anticipated. Furthermore the period identified in the Consultation Document of 2015 to 2026 covers a 12-year period rather than the 11 years currently calculated and as such Table 5.6 (and other related tables for the other Options) should be recalculated accordingly to provide housing growth figures.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Chris Telford	Associate Director CGMS		Question 10	It is considered that the proposed distribution of housing under this option is currently inappropriate. The 10% of housing total which would currently be distributed to Local Service Centres only, should be distributed amongst all villages currently defined as Local Service Centres and Rural Service Centres.
Mr David Barker			Question 10	It is considered that the proposed distribution of housing under this option is currently inappropriate. A greater proportion of housing should be allocated to Retford, relative to Harworth-Bircotes, reflective of the former's recognised status as a town, and the greater range of services, employment opportunities, and public transport connections from which it benefits. It is therefore suggested that Retford should accept in the order of 30% of the total housing provision, whereas Harworth-Bircotes contribution should not exceed 20%. The latter settlement has a relative lack of employment opportunities, suffers from significantly lower market demand, and has very limited opportunities for further development without closure of the colliery and / or major and prominent urban expansion.
Magnus Educational Centre			Question 10	It is considered that the proposed distribution of housing under this option is currently inappropriate. The 10% of housing total which would currently be distributed to Local Service Centres only, should be distributed amongst all villages currently defined as Local Service Centres and Rural Service Centres.
Mr Walker Dormer Tools Walker Dormer Tools	Ian Baseley Associates		Question 10	We do not agree with the proposed percentage split. Whilst an approach which seeks to direct a significant amount of new housing development toward Worksop is fully supported, 30% is too high a proportion for Harworth Bircotes which given its geographical location is likely to support the housing needs of local authorities outside of Bassetlaw and not the needs of the District itself and this also compromises the amount of housing development in other parts of the District.
Mr Walker East Markham Walker East Markham	Ian Baseley associates		Question 10	We do not agree with the proposed percentage split. Whilst an approach which seeks to direct a significant amount of new housing development toward Worksop is supported, 30% is too high a proportion for Harworth Bircotes which given its geological location is likely to support the housing needs of local authorities outside of Bassetlaw and not the needs of the District itself and this also compromises the amount of housing development in other parts of the District. It would be more appropriate to reduce the level of development in Harworth Bircotes and increase the level of provision in the Local and Rural Service Centres.
Mrs Janet Hodson			Question 10	No because the majority of the new growth should be allocated in Worksop because it is the most sustainable solution, replicating unsustainable patterns of development based on a previous economic structure is not sustainable in the broadest sense for the 21st century. That is why the regional plan identifies Worksop as the sub-regional centre and prioritises it. 90 % in Worksop
Mr Tom Garnett	Energy Review		Question 10	The housing distribution by settlement is correct.
Ms Vicki Ingleby	Turley Associates		Question 10	We believe that the proposed split should be as follows: Worksop - 40% Harworth Bircotes - 25% Retford - 25% Local Service Centres - 10% This distribution better reflects the potential housing land supply as demonstrated by the SHLAA and provides greater choice for the housing market, particularly in Retford which is sustainably located.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 10	The figure under Option 3 for Haworth/Bircotes should be a minimum 40% and we feel this should receive a greater allocation in the region of 50%-60% because we consider this is consistent with RSS policies and the need to achieve sustainable economic growth in a much more sustainable location. It lies at the heart of the area with good transportation links in all directions.
Mr PG Hills	Clerk to Tuxford Town Council Tuxford Parish Council		Question 10	There should be greater emphasis given to housing growth in the service centres, especially Misterton and Tuxford, if the objectives of rural regeneration are to be achieved. In this regard the bias should be shifted marginally towards the service centres, ie Worksop falls by 2% to 38%, but remains the dominant recipient of growth. Harworth also falls by 25 to 28%, still sufficient to support regeneration. Retford falls by 2% to 18% to reflect the inherent infrastructure difficulties. Service Centres, particularly Misterton and Tuxford increase their percentage share by 6% to 16%, to reflect their ability to satisfy RSS ambitions.
Adams	John Martin & Associates		Question 10	Notwithstanding the criticism as set out in my clients' response to Question 8, my client generally supports the proposed percentage split of housing growth between the identified settlements within Housing Distribution Option 1. The approach appears to be consistent with RSS8, which seeks to promote the regeneration of smaller settlements in a way that promotes a more sustainable pattern of development.
Mr Andrew Laing			Question 10	Proposed Percentage Split of Housing Split - Ref: Option 1 - Table 5.6 and alternative housing distribution option Whilst the overall proportionate approach broadly aligns with the approach to locating development in identified settlements (as set out in the East Midlands Regional Guidance 2009) there remains a heavy reliance on sites in Worksop, Harworth Bircotes, Retford Area coming forward for development to meet the RSS requirements. With regard to the potential housing land requirement, there are no targets expressed in the East Midlands RSS as such the percentage figures listed in table 5.6 should not be regarded as a minimum or maximum'. As such, there is the potential to consider increasing the provision of development in Local Service Centres and add a percentage housing target for Rural Service Centres to facilitate and maintain their growth and economic needs and to improvement and enhance these important local and rural service centres. This could be done without detriment to the urban areas of Worksop, Redford, Harworth Bircotes, and/or the other identified settlements. Table 5.9 should be revised to assist, we have prepared a similar table (Table 1) setting out an alternative approach to the proportionate split of new housing (reflecting on the potential to include greater provision for Local Service Centres and inclusion of Rural Service Centres), for consideration by the Council (see below). Table 1 See paper version This approach to dispersion of growth across the Bassetlaw would better accord with Spatial Option 1 and enable the growth of the main Towns and other urban and rural settlements in accordance with East Midlands RSS and National Guidance.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 10	Whilst a proposed percentage split of housing in accordance with the Option 1 Spatial Strategy is supported, it is considered that it would be more appropriate to divert a greater percentage of the proposed housing towards Local Service Centres placing a slightly reduced reliance upon the Core Service Centres of Worksop, Harworth Bircote and Retford. The suggested split of residual RSS housing figures of 10% to Local Service Centres would only provide for an average of 25 new dwellings per settlement over the life of this plan period and in most instances it would be possible for a slightly increased number of houses to be achieved within each of these settlements thereby placing a reduced emphasis upon the Core Service Centres.
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 10	The relative percentage split should be informed by an understanding of the environmental capacity of the settlements to accommodate growth and the decision should not just be made on the basis of the relative levels of service and facility provision (it is not clear if this includes utilities). See comments under Option 1 regarding the distribution of development at the Core Service Centre level. One tool for informing the choice of location would be to undertake a landscape/cultural/natural sensitivity analysis. You may wish to have a look at work commissioned by the North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit, which has recently been completed but does not seem to have been put on their website yet.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 10	#NAME?
Mr Simon Miller	Persimmon Homes		Question 10	It is considered inappropriate to express the distribution as a percentage for while this may give the impression of flexibility in terms of future levels of growth when the percentages have been determined by an assumed level of provision and there are, according to the district at least levels of development that can not be exceed at Retford and levels that are actually required to secure regeneration in locations at Harworth then a change in the total level of housing requirement will adversely impact on these settlements either by requiring an unacceptably high level of development or not enough development to secure regeneration aims. For example an increase in the level of provision to meet the CLG 2008 to 2031 projections of 590 dwellings would require 236 dwellings a year in Retford which would mean that all of the SHLAA available sites would be developed within the first 8 years of the plan. For these reasons it would appear inappropriate to rely on a percentage split of dwellings between areas but a minimum level of development should be proposed for Harworth based upon what is required to secure regeneration and a maximum level of development in Retford if it can be established what the capacity of the town actually is.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 10	NO-DECREASE HARWORTH BIRCOTES AND INCREASE DEVELOPMENT IN "OTHER VILLAGES"
Mr Andy Kitchen	Pegasus Planning Group LLP		Question 10	No comments.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 10	See response to Q.9 re-Langold and Carlton-in-Lindrick. Option 1 - but with a slightly greater emphasis on Langold and Carlton-in-Lindrick - the detail of this requires careful consideration having regard to the SHLAA work, but perhaps of the 10% allocation for Local Service Centres around 3% might be allocated to these two settlements, with the remaining 7% distributed amongst the other 12 Local Service Centres. The emphasis should be pre-dominantly upon the major settlements and the relative distribution between these main centres appears to be about right.
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 10	Any annual target for growth affecting a designated conservation area must take into account the capacity for change that a particular centre has. This should be identified through conservation area appraisals, arbitrary allocations of 2-3 dwellings per annum are not appropriate for CAs.
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 10	Yes.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 11	Don't Know
Mr David Brown	Merry Vale Development		Question 11	Yes, answers to Question 10
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 11	No
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 11	While no other distribution is suggested, the following points should be addressed. Section 4 para 4.3 includes a description of the rural road network which is a gross simplification and does not reflect either the key north -south arteries (including the A1 and A1M , A614 and A60) and the strategic east-west connections afforded by the A57. Section 5 Defining a Spatial Strategy section 5.4 there is no transport evidence cited. Have there been any specific transport studies undertaken to inform the broad spatial strategy? Section 5.24 identifies that the LDF is required to identify broad locations for 3500 dwellings between 2015 and 2026. In transport terms (para. 5.27) it is important to establish howthese 3500 houses can be best accommodated in sustainability terms. Appropriate transport deliverability and sustainability investigations should inform such a decision, i.e. preparing a robust transport evidence base to supportpreferred strategic development allocations. The distribution of residential development for each of the 3 options is given andlarge strategic urban extensions are a likely outcome regardless of the chosen option, for example Worksop is expected to witness growth of between 1400 and 2100 extra dwellings. However, there is no commentary to suggest what supporting transport infrastructure would be required to support such a quantum of development and whether this would act as a constraint to this level of development. The potential transport constraints appear to have been completely overlooked. Nottinghamshire County Council Q11
Peter Frampton			Question 11	Option 2 should be amended to make provision for up to 25% of the housing provision to be identified to previously mining dependent communities where such provision can contribute towards a strategy for regeneration.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 11	See response to Question 10.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Ian Lord	Building Link Design		Question 11	My particular interest is within the village of Misson. I believe an option exists to develop housing within part of the existing employment site E31. The land is a Brownfield site and is located adjacent existing residential properties and would allow the introduction of landscape screening between residential and employment activities together with the option of a new vehicular route into the employment zone from outside the village on Bawtry Road.
Mr Ian Lord	Building Link Design		Question 11	My particular interest is within the village of Langold, which is classified as a local service centre under option 1. However its location is West Bassetlaw linked to both Worksop and Harworth provides opportunity for an increased rate of housing growth as identified in option 3.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 11	The figure for Haworth/Bircotes should be a minima 40% and preferably higher circa 50% to help support the regeneration initiative and the sustainable development proposed at this location.
Mrs Janet Hodson			Question 11	Yes - see above
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 11	The figure for Haworth/Bircotes should be a minima 40% and preferably higher circa 50% to help support the regeneration initiative and the sustainable development proposed at this location.
Mr Andrew Laing			Question 11	Proposed Percentage Split of Housing Split - Ref: Option 1 - Table 5.6 and alternative housing distribution option Whilst the overall proportionate approach broadly aligns with the approach to locating development in identified settlements (as set out in the East Midlands Regional Guidance 2009) there remains a heavy reliance on sites in Worksop, Harworth Bircotes, Retford Area coming forward for development to meet the RSS requirements. With regard to the potential housing land requirement, there are no targets expressed in the East Midlands RSS as such the percentage figures listed in table 5.6 should not be regarded as a minimum or maximum'. As such, there is the potential to consider increasing the provision of development in Local Service Centres and add a percentage housing target for Rural Service Centres to facilitate and maintain their growth and economic needs and to improvement and enhance these important local and rural service centres. This could be done without detriment to the urban areas of Worksop, Redford, Harworth Bircotes, and/or the other identified settlements. Table 5.9 should be revised to assist, we have prepared a similar table (Table 1) setting out an alternative approach to the proportionate split of new housing (reflecting on the potential to include greater provision for Local Service Centres and inclusion of Rural Service Centres), for consideration by the Council (see below). Table 1 See paper version This approach to dispersion of growth across the Bassetlaw would better accord with Spatial Option 1 and enable the growth of the main Towns and other urban and rural settlements in accordance with East Midlands RSS and National Guidance.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
				<p>It is considered that a slightly different approach is taken to the distribution of housing based upon both the drivers of housing growth and the implications of future demographic and economic changes. Consideration of the drivers for growth in Bassetlaw and their implications for the distribution of housing The Temprow based projection that has been utilised for the sub areas analysis below provides a very similar level of housing to that required by the CLG projections so it provides a suitable proxy on which to base an assessment of the implications of the policies in the Options Consultations. For Bassetlaw the implications for future distribution set out below are considered to be robust for the lower level of regional provision suggested by the EMRA projections as well as the higher levels suggested by the CLG projections. Refer to table 5 of the paper version. The CLG projection for Bassetlaw is for some 13,400 dwellings 2008 to 2031 and the Temprow projection is a little lower at 11,600 dwellings this suggest a rate of provision between 500 to 590 dwellings a year. What is significant for the Core Strategy is the high level; of housing requirement compared to that which the Core Strategy is suggesting it provides. A second import element of these projections is the relatively high level of demand that is generated by the rural areas. Accommodating these requirements in sustainable location might require specific choices being made with regard to the type of locations allocated for development. It is likely that in order to be attractive to those who would otherwise wish to live in rural locations then attractive alternatives will need to be allocated. The imbalance of new workers and jobs (with projected new jobs exceeding new workers by a ration of almost 2:1 is due in part to the impact of the ageing population. The impact of the aging population also means that even if a total of 13,600 houses are delivered in the period to 2031 then there is still a potential mismatch of new workers joining the workforce compared to the potential for new job creation as demonstrated by the table below: Refer to table 6 of the paper version. The above table also demonstrates very clearly the projected impact of the aging population at Harworth is likely to be. In the other settlements projected levels of migration will, to some extent, off set the aging of existing residents the low levels of net migration into Harworth if continued will result in a significant aging of the population. Perhaps most importantly in Harworth/Bircotes is the reduction in the number of the population of working age that would result from accommodating the implied number of dwellings from this projection. As a percentage of the total population the number of people over 65 is not high for this settlement (as demonstrated by the table below) but it is the potential reduction in the size of the workforce that may have a significant impact on the local economy. Refer to table 7 of the paper version. The distribution that would result from the projection is not one that would support any of the proposed options as the largest level of housing (over 4,000) would be required to be provided in the rural area</p>
Mr Simon Miller	Persimmon Homes		Question 11	
Mr David Langmead	South Leveaton Parish Council		Question 11	Yes as 10 above
Mr Andy Kitchen	Pegasus Planning Group LLP		Question 11	No comments
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 11	Only as previously expressed in response to Q.9.
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 11	No.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 12	No

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr David Brown	Merry Vale Development		Question 12	Misterton has the potential to function as a secondary development node, providing services and facilities for a wide rural hinterland. It is appropriate to allocate a strategic site therefore in Misterton in order to demonstrate an ability to deliver a mixed use scheme to satisfy not only local housing needs but also those components of community life which are presently missing or poorly provided. (Evidence submitted elsewhere identifies an appropriate strategic allocation on land adjacent to the primary school at Grovewood Road).
Mr Richard Walters	Senior Land Buyer Hallam Land Management Ltd		Question 12	Planning guidance allows for strategic sites to be included in Core Strategy documents, and we would encourage BDC to include them in its Core Strategy.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 12	Housing growth on the scale suggested at Worksop and Harworth-Bircotes indicates that strategic site allocations might be necessary, if the options for housing development are limited. In any event suggested alternative directions for growth should be indicated (e.g. West of Worksop) and could be determined. It is important that a full analysis of prospective sites is undertaken for strategic site allocations in the Core Strategy. This would incorporate transport, as indicated above, landscape character and visual impact and other aspects of these strategic sites. The County Council would be willing to assist with this if required, for example, with its Landscape and Reclamation Team. Nottinghamshire County Council Q12
Mr Craig Ball	Development Planner UK Coal Mining Ltd		Question 12	Question 12 in the Consultation Document relates to the potential need for strategic site allocations in the Core Strategy. PPS12 enables strategic sites to be allocated in the Core Strategy where they are considered central to achieving the strategy (paragraph 4.6). It may therefore be necessary to identify strategic sites in the Core Strategy for the larger settlements where a greater level of development is focused such as Worksop, Retford and Harworth/Bircotes and where urban extensions will be necessary as these sites are central to achieving the strategy. If Bassetlaw decide to adopt this approach, UK COAL advise that their site at Harworth Colliery would be appropriate for identification within the Core Strategy as this is a strategic site, key to delivering growth and development in Harworth in line with Option 1. It is also located in a prime location adjacent to the settlement's centre, is previously development and/or former colliery land, available for development and its redevelopment will bring significant regeneration benefits to the settlement. Furthermore, the site's redevelopment with mixed use development accords with the general aims and objectives of the RSS and National Policy and Guidance. However, Bassetlaw Council should note that if this approach is adopted, advice in PPS12 says that 'it may be preferable for the site area to be delineated in outline rather than detailed terms, with site specific criteria set out to allow more precise definition through masterplanning using an area action plan (if required) or through a supplementary planning document (SPD)' (paragraph 4.7). UK COAL has a number of comments
Mr Nick Basley	Ian Basley Associates		Question 12	In the light of the suggested residual housing needs for the District, Mr Pickering considers there is no need for a strategic site allocation in the Core Strategy. Instead, land should be allocated through the site allocations document based on those sites identified through the SHLAA. This will ensure that new housing development is distributed more evenly across the District, to achieve a wide choice of high quality homes and helping to create sustainable, inclusive, mixed communities in all areas (in line with para. 9 of PPS3).

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Michael Meadows	Drivers Jonas	Michael Meadows	Question 12	LIH considers that it will be vital to allocate strategic housing sites, to achieve the levels of growth identified in the plan. Large housing sites, such as urban extensions, are likely to require long-lead in times and will require significant on-site infrastructure provision in advance of any residential development. The allocation of strategic sites in the Core Strategy will provide certainty for landowners and developers to prepare and submit planning applications, working with the Council, to bring forward key housing sites and ensure that housing targets are met.
Peter Frampton			Question 12	The Core Strategy should identify strategic allocations i.e. these that are significant to the delivery of the strategy. Such allocations should include these locations that are significant in achieving the regeneration of previously mining dependent communities. Welbeck Colliery should hence be identified as a strategic allocation in the Core Strategy.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 12	No.
William Davis			Question 12	Whether or not strategic site allocations are needed within the Core Strategy will depend on the definition of strategic sites adopted by the district council. William Davis Ltd suggest that a strategic site should be recognised as being 1,500 dwellings or more in capacity. If this suggestion is accepted than strategic site allocations in the Core Strategy would not be necessary as the pattern of sites identified in Worksop and Retford (where we consider the majority of development should be located) within the SHLAA do not include sites of this size and scale.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 12	Consistent with many other Core Strategy documents which we have seen, there would be a benefit in identifying the strategic site allocations but clearly these need to be general at this stage without being too site specific until further appraisal work has been undertaken.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
		Ms Emma Cruickshank	Question 12	<p>Question 12 in the Consultation Document relates to the potential need for strategic site allocations in the Core Strategy. PPS12 enables strategic sites to be allocated in the Core Strategy where they are considered central to achieving the strategy (paragraph 4.6). It may therefore be necessary to identify strategic sites in the Core Strategy for the larger settlements where a greater level of development is focused such as Worksop, Retford and Harworth/Bircotes and where urban extensions will be necessary as these sites are central to achieving the strategy. If Bassetlaw decide to adopt this approach, UK COAL advise that their site at Harworth Colliery would be appropriate for identification within the Core Strategy as this is a strategic site, key to delivering growth and development in Harworth in line with Option 1. It is also located in a prime location adjacent to the settlement's centre, is previously development and/or former colliery land, available for development and its redevelopment will bring significant regeneration benefits to the settlement. Furthermore, the site's redevelopment with mixed use development accords with the general aims and objectives of the RSS and National Policy and Guidance. However, Bassetlaw Council should note that if this approach is adopted, advice in PPS12 says that 'it may be preferable for the site area to be delineated in outline rather than detailed terms, with site specific criteria set out to allow more precise definition through masterplanning using an area action plan (if required) or through a supplementary planning document (SPD)' (paragraph 4.7). UK COAL has a number of comments</p>
Ms Janet Hodson	JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd		Question 12	Yes Urban extension of Worksop should be a strategic allocation in the Core Strategy.
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 12	Strategic site allocations should be addressed in the Core strategy, especially the potentially large areas of urban extension around Worksop, in order to ensure that their potential impacts are addressed at a strategic spatial level.
Mr Walker Dormer Tools Walker Dormer Tools	Ian Baseley Associates		Question 12	In the light of the suggested residual housing need for the District, we would suggest that there is no need for a strategic site allocation in the Core Strategy. Instead, land should be allocated through the Site Allocations Document based on those sites identified through the SHLAA. This will ensure that new housing development is distributed more evenly across the District, to achieve a wide choice of high quality homes in different parts of the District and helping to create sustainable, inclusive, mixed communities in all areas (in line with Para. 9 of PPS3).
Mr Walker East Markham Walker East Markham	Ian Baseley associates		Question 12	In the light of the suggested residual housing need for the District, we would suggest that there is no need for a strategic site allocation in the Core strategy. Instead, land should be allocated through the Site Allocations Document based on those sites identified through the SHLAA. This will ensure that new housing development is distributed more evenly across the District, to achieve a wide choice of high quality homes and helping to create sustainable, inclusive, mixed communities in all areas (in line with Para. 9 of PPS3).

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Ms Vicki Ingleby	Turley Associates		Question 12	PPS12 (at paragraph 4.6) recognises that core strategies may allocate strategic sites for development. These should be those sites considered central to achievement of the strategy. Progress on the core strategy should not be held up by inclusion of non-strategic sites. Notwithstanding the points set out above about allocating land in excess to allow for flexibility, we would encourage the Council to consider whether the sites under consideration to are critical to the delivery of the strategy. This is particularly the case with prospective urban extensions, as referred to in paragraph 5.6 of the Core Strategy, which require significant investments in infrastructure. These sites should not be promoted at the cost of sustainably located sites within the current development envelope.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 12	Consistent with many other Core Strategy documents which we have seen, there would be a benefit in identifying the strategic site allocations but clearly these need to be general at this stage without being too site specific until further appraisal work has been undertaken.
Mr PG Hills	Clerk to Tuxford Town Council Tuxford Parish Council		Question 12	Misterton has the potential to function as a secondary development node, providing services and facilities for a wide rural hinterland. It is appropriate to allocate a strategic site therefore in Misterton in order to demonstrate an ability to deliver a mixed-use scheme to satisfy not only local housing needs but also those components of community life which are presently missing or poorly provided. (Evidence submitted elsewhere identifies an appropriate strategic allocation on land adjacent to the Primary School at Grovewood Road).
Mr Andrew Laing			Question 12	Before consideration is given to the inclusion of Strategic Housing Allocations to be included within the Core Strategy, the authority should carefully consider sites put forward across the Borough through the SHLAA. This review should include sites, particularly Brownfield opportunities, located the main urban settlements but also sites in Local and Rural Service Centres that can effectively contribute to supply. This would better accord with Spatial Option 1 and the percentage split of housing under Option one and our suggested changes (see response to Q 10 & 11 Table 1).
Mr Simon Miller	Persimmon Homes		Question 12	It is not considered that there is sufficient information available for the core strategy to identify strategic sites at this time. Any identification of such sites will need to be tested against alternative locations for such sites as well as alternative distributions that may not require such allocations. Such sites will require to be the subject of further consultation and at present the evidence (albeit untested) in the SHLAA does not suggest that strategic sites will be required to deliver any of the proposed strategy or the strategy that is the subject of this representation.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 12	No
Mr Andy Kitchen	Pegasus Planning Group LLP		Question 12	No comments.
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 12	No.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 12	Please see attached letter. We consider that Option 2 may require strategic site allocations in Worksop and Retford, but there is a need to avoid directing the majority of houses to a small number of large sites as this may hinder deliverability. Looking at how the housing targets will be met, both options 1 and 2 identify a need for urban extensions to both Worksop and Retford ("significant" urban extensions in the case of Option 2). The issue that will need to be addressed in both the Core Strategy and the Housing Allocations DPD is how this level of housing can be delivered. the Issues and Options report accepts that there is likely to be a need to make some strategic allocations in the Core Strategy rather than leaving this solely to the Housing Allocations DPD. We agree with this.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 13	Option 1
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 13	Option 1
Mr Richard Walters	Senior Land Buyer Hallam Land Management Ltd		Question 13	Option 1
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 13	See Q 16 Nottinghamshire County Council Q13
Peter Frampton			Question 13	For similar reasons to the submissions made in the context of the housing options - a more responsive portfolio approach is required for employment distribution in order to ensure that where urban regeneration is required to maintain sustainable communities, effective strategic spatial policies are incorporated into the Core Strategy.
Edward Fisher			Question 13	Support employment land distribution option 3
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 13	Option 1 because it most closely complies with national and regional policy, assists with regeneration and reduces the need to travel for local services.
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 13	Option 1 because it most closely complies with national and regional policy, assists with regeneration and reduces the need to travel for local services.
Mr Ian Lord	Building Link Design		Question 13	Support Employment land Distribution Option 1.
Mr Ian Lord	Building Link Design		Question 13	Support Employment land distribution option 1.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 13	We support principally Option 3 but to an extent Option 1. Both deliver essential growth in the Haworth/Bircotes area consistent with regeneration policies both existing and emerging through the RSS review. Option 2 is not a sustainable Policy. The studies which have been undertaken, and the existing and emerging RSS, support Option 3.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Craig Ball	Development Planner UK Coal Mining Ltd		Question 13	In respect of Question 13 of the Consultation document and in line with UK COAL's preferred option for the Spatial Strategy and Housing Distribution, UK COAL supports the principles of Option 1, which Page 9 of 14 would distribute employment land based on the settlement hierarchy. As stated above for the Spatial Strategy and Housing Distribution, this is a logical approach to secure sustainable development and a balance of development and employment opportunities across the district. In line with UK COAL's comments for housing distribution, employment needs to be located close to housing and services to provide sustainable growth, encourage inward investment and encourage people to use alternative modes of transport to the private car, such as walking, cycling or public transport as well as to underpin the existing services and facilities. The hierarchy approach would enable this to be secured. As with the spatial strategy options and housing distribution, UK COAL do not support Options 2 or 3 for the reasons set out in the Spatial Strategy section above.
Miss Claire Whittaker	Assistant Planner DPP		Question 13	This document proposes the following three options for the distribution of new employment land growth in Bassetlaw are proposed Planning policy statement 4 'planning for prosperous economies' was released for consultation in May 2009, and is expected to be adopted by the Government in due course . PPS4 adopts a flexible approach to employment land and recognises retail as an employment use stating: policy should undertake a critical approach towards allocating employment land, avoiding designating sites for single or restrictive uses if there is no realistic prospect of it being used as such during the plan period. Employment land distribution option 1 puts forward a potential settlement hierarchy to guide development. To achieve growth this option focuses the distribution of new employment land on the centres of Worksop, Harworth Bircotes and Retford, with secondary focus allocated to Local Service Centres. Given the future direction of PPS4 we recommend option 1.
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 13	There should be a criteria-based assessment of employment land to screen potential sites (as in the SHLAA).
Mr Walker Dormer Tools Walker Dormer Tools	Ian Baseley Associates		Question 13	An employment land distribution policy based on a settlement hierarchy (Option 1) is supported as the most appropriate means for distributing land for employment purposes throughout the District. This would ensure that not all employment land is provided in the same area which in turn would lead to an uneven distribution of such land which would run counter to sustainable development objectives as journeys to work would inevitably increase.
Mrs Janet Hodson			Question 13	We consider that new employment should be concentrated in Worksop to underscore its role as identified in the RSS. A large urban extension to the east of Worksop can include a significant new employment allocation to bring quality employment land forward in a managed and attractive location. Therefore a Fourth Option needs to be identified to provide this choice.
Mr Tom Garnett	Energy Review		Question 13	Employment land distribution should be based upon settlement hierarchy - this is specifically in line with RSS policy.
Ms Vicki Ingleby	Turley Associates		Question 13	We believe that the distribution of employment land should conform with the spatial strategy and housing distribution in order to ensure integrated sustainable development. As such, we favour Option 1.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
		Ms Emma Cruickshank	Question 13	Question 13 of the Consultation document and in line with UK COAL's preferred option for the Spatial Strategy and Housing Distribution, UK COAL supports the principles of Option 1, which would distribute employment land based on the settlement hierarchy. As stated above for the Spatial Strategy and Housing Distribution, this is a logical approach to secure sustainable development and a balance of development and employment opportunities across the district. In line with UK COAL's comments for housing distribution, employment needs to be located close to housing and services to provide sustainable growth, encourage inward investment and encourage people to use alternative modes of transport to the private car, such as walking, cycling or public transport as well as to underpin the existing services and facilities. The hierarchy approach would enable this to be secured. As with the spatial strategy options and housing distribution, UK COAL do not support Options 2 or 3 for the reasons set out in the Spatial Strategy section above.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 13	We support principally Option 3 but to an extent Option 1. Both deliver essential growth in the Haworth/Bircotes area consistent with regeneration policies both existing and emerging through the RSS review. Option 2 is not a sustainable Policy. The studies which have been undertaken, and the existing and emerging RSS, support Option 3.
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 13	The relative percentage split should be informed by an understanding of the environmental capacity of the settlements to accommodate growth and the decision should not just be made on the basis of the relative levels of service and facility provision (it is not clear if this includes utilities). See comments under Option 1 regarding the distribution of development at the Core Service Centre level. One tool for informing the choice of location would be to undertake a landscape/cultural/natural sensitivity analysis. You may wish to have a look at work commissioned by the North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit, which has recently been completed but does not seem to have been put on their website yet.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 13	Option 3 plus Retford
Mr Simon Miller	Persimmon Homes		Question 13	None of the employment options are supported and the same reasoning that has led to the alternative housing distribution explained in our response to question 11 would lead us to support a different distribution of employment. Like our response to question 11 it is considered that the distribution should be a composite of options 1 and 3. Further information is given in our response to question 16.
Mr Jeremy Johnson	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council		Question 13	As with question 4, Doncaster would support options 1 and 3 as these are commensurate with regenerating Harworth/Bircotes. Option 2 does not assist this objective. Doncaster accepts that RHADS will stimulate economic development in the sub-region including Bassetlaw and has calculated that a greater proportion of jobs at RHADS will be taken up by workers outside Doncaster above the normal commuting patterns
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 13	Option 1

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Andy Kitchen	Pegasus Planning Group LLP		Question 13	None of the three options set out in the consultation document appropriately provide for employment development along the A1 corridor. Whilst Option 1 provides the most appropriate employment land distribution based on a settlement hierarchy, the amount of employment growth must include reference to development along the A1 corridor. In all three employment distribution options, 143 hectares of employment growth between 2009 and 2026 is proposed based on an average employment growth rate of 8 hectares per annum. This reflects the employment land capacity study recommendation of 133-142 hectares 2009-2026. However, it is not clear from the consultation document the extent to which remaining allocated employment sites in the Local Plan and those sites with planning permission have been included within the figures; it is thus not possible to ascertain how much additional employment land ought to be allocated through the Core Strategy process. This needs to be identified. Having regard to the findings of the ELCS it is clearly appropriate that land ought to be allocated along the A1 corridor for employment, particularly distribution. The rationale for this approach is set out within the ELCS which seeks to capture investment opportunities particularly in the distribution sector and that this would be likely to be successful if new sites close the A1/A57 were made available (paragraph 5.39). Paragraph 5.40 goes on to note that such sites would not meet the employment space needs of the District's indigenous firms and that there is immediate scope for medium sized units. Concern is expressed over the quantum of land that might appropriately be allocated for employment along the A1 corridor in the ELCS of 5-10 hectares. The total amount of land proposed to be allocated for employment development in the ELCS is, at the lower end limited to 40 hectares, and at the upper end 80 hectares. It is thus considered appropriate to delete reference to the lower threshold and focus on the higher threshold which is recommended as follows in the study: Worksop - 40 hectares Retford - 10 hectares A1 Corridor - 10 hectares Harworth/Bircotes - 20 hectares Total - 80 hectares This apportionment is heavily weighted to Worksop (50%). We consider Worksop is better placed to service more general and smaller scale B1/B2/B8 uses due to the existing industrial activities, and local labour demographics. The high volume of traffic along the A57 slows connectivity to the M1 and A1. We believe the A1 corridor is therefore better placed to accommodate major distribution/warehouse facilities where there is likely to be increased HGV movements, as well as scope to deliver larger, level sites able to support major high bay distribution/warehouse as well as major manufacturing requirements. It is thus recommended that some of the 40 hectares identified for new allocations in Worksop could be appropriately reduced given the high proportion of commitments already in and around Worksop. A further 5 hectares could be taken from that identified for new allocations at Harworth/Bircotes. A transfer of circa 10 hectares of employment land from
		Miss Kate Helliwell	Question 13	We believe Option 1 - Employment land distribution based on the settlement hierarchy is the most suitable option. Combined with option 1 for residential development, the policies will encourage development proposals which mix residential and commercial development which will be sustainable into the future.
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 13	Option 1 with employment land in the Local Service Centres having a slightly increased proportion distributed to Langold and Carlton-in-Lindrick as per the responses above to the distribution of new housing.
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 13	Option 1 has potential to input into the sustainable future and protection of conservations areas.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 14	No - Higher percentage to local service centres

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 14	Land in Local Service Centres should be allocated for the development of small businesses to provide local employment and easy access.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 14	See Q 16 Nottinghamshire County Council Q13
Edward Fisher			Question 14	Do not support proposed percentage split of employment land growth.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 14	The split would appear to be appropriate. Employment opportunities in Local Service Centres may arise in the form of leisure developments, in addition to more traditional employment uses.
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 14	Yes.
Mr Ian Lord	Building Link Design		Question 14	Support percentage split of employment land growth. I believe an option to cut back the employment zone from adjacent within the village whilst extending the employment zone to the west and north to increase the area of land available and from a new vehicular route into the employment zone from Bawtry Road, thus, avoiding much commercial traffic from entering the village.
Mr Ian Lord	Building Link Design		Question 14	Support percentage split of employment land growth. My particular interest is within the village of Langold which is classified as a local service centre under option 1. However its location in West Bassetlaw linked to both Worksop and Harworth provides opportunity for an increased rate of employment land growth.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 14	We would suggest the employment growth target should be minima of 50%. We would question to an extent the need to specifically identify limits to employment growth. This is key to the future viability of the District and achieving sustainable employment and housing growth. By limiting the employment land possibilities this will discourage inward investment and the establishment of sustainable development through the District.
Mr Walker Dormer Tools Walker Dormer Tools	Ian Baseley Associates		Question 14	We do not agree with the proposed percentage split. Worksop already contains within its town envelope boundary a substantial amount of employemnt land, significant portions of which are vacant largely due to the demise in the manufacturing sector. It is unrealistic to expect that 40% of businesses who will establish themselves within the District's boundary up to 2026 will want to locate in Worksop, particularly given the size and diversity of the District. A more appropriate apportionment of land should therefore be allocated across the District, with a higher percentage of land in Local (and Rural) Service Centres to maximise the spread of employment opportunities throughout the District. This will also take account of the fact that employment-generating uses extend far beyond the traditional B1, B2 and B8 Use Classes and therefore a variety of types and sizes of sites in a variety of locations will be more sustainable.
Mr Tom Garnett	Energy Review		Question 14	The level of land distribution by settlement is correct.
Ms Vicki Ingleby	Turley Associates		Question 14	Furthermore, the percentage split should be as follows: Worksop - 40% Haworth Bircotes - 25% Retford - 25% Local Service Centres - 10%.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 14	We would suggest the employment growth target should be minima of 50%. We would question to an extent the need to specifically identify limits to employment growth. This is key to the future viability of the District and achieving sustainable employment and housing growth. By limiting the employment land possibilities this will discourage inward investment and the establishment of sustainable development through the District.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Simon Miller	Persimmon Homes		Question 14	It is not considered that a percentage is a suitable way to deal with the distribution of employment land in this particular instance and that a minimum level of provision might be the more appropriate device so as to provide flexibility and longevity to the Core Strategy.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 14	DECREASE HARWORTH BIRCOTES AND INCREASE EMPLOYMENT GROWTH IN "OTHER VILLAGES"
Mr Andy Kitchen	Pegasus Planning Group LLP		Question 14	None of the three options set out in the consultation document appropriately provide for employment development along the A1 corridor. Whilst Option 1 provides the most appropriate employment land distribution based on a settlement hierarchy, the amount of employment growth must include reference to development along the A1 corridor. In all three employment distribution options, 143 hectares of employment growth between 2009 and 2026 is proposed based on an average employment growth rate of 8 hectares per annum. This reflects the employment land capacity study recommendation of 133-142 hectares 2009-2026. However, it is not clear from the consultation document the extent to which remaining allocated employment sites in the Local Plan and those sites with planning permission have been included within the figures; it is thus not possible to ascertain how much additional employment land ought to be allocated through the Core Strategy process. This needs to be identified. Having regard to the findings of the ELCS it is clearly appropriate that land ought to be allocated along the A1 corridor for employment, particularly distribution. The rationale for this approach is set out within the ELCS which seeks to capture investment opportunities particularly in the distribution sector and that this would be likely to be successful if new sites close the A1/A57 were made available (paragraph 5.39). Paragraph 5.40 goes on to note that such sites would not meet the employment space needs of the District's indigenous firms and that there is immediate scope for medium sized units. Concern is expressed over the quantum of land that might appropriately be allocated for employment along the A1 corridor in the ELCS of 5-10 hectares. The total amount of land proposed to be allocated for employment development in the ELCS is, at the lower end limited to 40 hectares, and at the upper end 80 hectares. It is thus considered appropriate to delete reference to the lower threshold and focus on the higher threshold which is recommended as follows in the study: Worksop - 40 hectares Retford - 10 hectares A1 Corridor - 10 hectares Harworth/Bircotes - 20 hectares Total - 80 hectares This apportionment is heavily weighted to Worksop (50%). We consider Worksop is better placed to service more general and smaller scale B1/B2/B8 uses due to the existing industrial activities, and local labour demographics. The high volume of traffic along the A57 slows connectivity to the M1 and A1. We believe the A1 corridor is therefore better placed to accommodate major distribution/warehouse facilities where there is likely be increased HGV movements, as well as scope to deliver larger, level sites able to support major high bay distribution/warehouse as well as major manufacturing requirements. It is thus recommended that some of the 40 hectares identified for new allocations in Worksop could be appropriately reduced given the high proportion of commitments already in and around Worksop. A further 5 hectares could be taken from that identified for new allocations at Harworth/Bircotes. A transfer of circa 10 hectares of employment land from
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 14	Split should be as per the housing split so should accord with the response to Q.9 - of the 10% allocation for Local Service Centres around 3% might be allocated to Langold and Carlton-in-Lindrick, with the remaining 7% distributed amongst the other 12 Local Service Centres.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 14	As with question 10. Any annual target for growth affecting a designated conservation area must take into account the capacity for change that a particular centre has. This should be identified through conservation area appraisals, arbitrary allocations of 2-3 dwellings per annum are not appropriate for CAs.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 15	Yes
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 15	Yes - site of Bevercotes
Mr Richard Walters	Senior Land Buyer Hallam Land Management Ltd		Question 15	We disagree with this option. Daily commuting distances for workers would un-necessarily be increased. The A57 bypass provides Worksop with good transport links to the A1 for distribution and warehouse traffic. By location such uses at/near Worksop, daily commuting distances would be reduced.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 15	See Q 16 Nottinghamshire County Council Q15
Mr John R Holland			Question 15	Grouping employment land around the A1 corridor seems churlish in the present climate of sustainable development. Grouping near a major road and a railway would make more sense - that would prevent dependence upon road traffic. It is also important that employment land allocation takes topography into account. The warehousing at Red House (A1/A638 junction north of Doncaster) is an illustration of how the landscape can be marred for miles around by unsuitable siting of industrial development in an elevated position. Employment land ought to be protected from housing development.
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 15	No, except at Harworth-Bircotes. The growth potential the A1 corridor represents could be diverted to Worksop, located as it is on an A1-M1 link.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 15	This is essential and this can be delivered at Blyth and to the north linking the major intersection at this point (recently approved) and Haworth/Bircotes, through to the Robin Hood Airport. The area of land to the south of Haworth/Bircotes would be the ideal location for this and it will, consistent with the regeneration and Brownfield land opportunities that arise in the area of Haworth/Bircotes adjoining, produce sustainable development in an important location with a rail and particularly good road links to other area in the District and beyond.
Mr Craig Ball	Development Planner UK Coal Mining Ltd		Question 15	In relation to Question 15 of the Consultation Document, advantage should be taken of locations
Mr Walker Dormer Tools Walker Dormer Tools	Ian Baseley Associates		Question 15	It is entirely logical to allocate employment land along the A1 corridor to allow distribution and warehousing companies to take locational advantage of access to the A1. This would also enable vacant and redundant former employment land within Worksop to be redeveloped for mixed-use purposes, including housing, and would better enable the Council to meet its minimum target of 60% of new housing on previously-developed land in sustainable locations.
Mrs Janet Hodson			Question 15	Yes - land adjacent to the A1 corridor is ideally located to support B8 uses and the spin-off effects of the Yorkshire and the Humber RSS and its warehousing provisions in Doncaster District. Demand in Bassetlaw District can be accommodated on land adjacent to the A1 at appropriate locations and this would enable land within and adjacent to the principal urban areas of Worksop to be dedicated for more intensive employment uses which are better located in an urban location. Locating warehousing uses in and adjacent to the urban area simply draws B8 traffic off the principal distribution network and takes up land that can achieve other uses. Land is available west of the A1 to support the demand identified.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Tom Garnett	Energy Review		Question 15	With the recent upgrading of the A1 in the Bassetlaw area, the route will be highly attractive to major employers in the warehouse and distribution field - it would be a badly missed opportunity to not allocate employment land in this corridor - offering accessible employment opportunities for a large proportion of the Bassetlaw population. Areas such as the Blyth junction, which is very central to the principal conurbations as well as the former mining areas (option 3) should be considered as a strategic opportunity for such allocations.
		Ms Emma Cruickshank	Question 15	Question 15 of the Consultation Document, advantage should be taken of locations close to the strategic highway network for the location of distribution and warehousing. The preferable location in terms of promoting and facilitating sustainable forms of development would be to locate this form of development close to existing settlements and therefore housing (to house the workforce) and existing services and facilities as well as close to existing development of this type so that where possible shared facilities/services can be promoted. Such a location would be Harworth and Bircotes. In parallel with Question 12 for housing distribution, it may also be considered appropriate to identify strategic sites for employment as well as housing, where these are key to achieving the strategy. In which case it may be appropriate to identify suitable sites on the edge of the settlement of Harworth and Bircotes where these forms of employment development could be supported by the opportunity for significant levels of new housing development in the settlement.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 15	This is essential and this can be delivered at Blyth and to the north linking the major intersection at this point (recently approved) and Haworth/Bircotes, through to the Robin Hood Airport. The area of land to the south of Haworth/Bircotes would be the ideal location for this and it will, consistent with the regeneration and Brownfield land opportunities that arise in the area of Haworth/Bircotes adjoining, produce sustainable development in an important location with a rail and particularly good road links to other area in the District and beyond.
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 15	Large-scale distribution and warehousing development usually has significant adverse impacts on the landscape. Given the amount of land already proposed in the region, e.g. Markham Vale and DIRFT and elsewhere, there needs to be clear justification of the need for B8 development in this area. Sensitive locations such as Clumber Park and Blyth should be identified and avoided.
Mrs Jennifer Kirk	Clerk to Headon-cum-Upton, Grove and Stokeham Parish Council		Question 15	The council would agree with this.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 15	The A1 corridor should be supported both for distribution and housing, but impact on the local countryside should be considered in the design and style of buildings.
Mr Philip CABLE			Question 15	The A1 corridor is the most appropriate area for transport associated development. The promotion of the River Trent should be included as a quality of life measure.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Simon Miller	Persimmon Homes		Question 15	There is a good case for the consideration of an additional allocation in the A1 Corridor given the results of the Employment Land Review however it is considered that such allocations should be related as closely as possible to Harworth Bircotes as this is the largest settlement in this corridor and such development may assist the regeneration of this settlement while at the same time a reasonable proximity would assist such an allocation to achieve an improved level of sustainability.
Mr Jeremy Johnson	Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council		Question 15	The A1 provides an opportunity for warehousing and distribution however in order to reduce travel and support regeneration, any development should be located near to or adjacent urban areas where communities can easily access jobs. Much of the A1 through Bassetlaw is rural in location and the provision of sites would not provide ready access to communities. The Core Strategy is also uncertain as to what Strategic Sites are to be provided. Doncaster would wish to be consulted on future proposals for strategic employment allocations.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 15	No

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Andy Kitchen	Pegasus Planning Group LLP		Question 15	<p>None of the three options set out in the consultation document appropriately provide for employment development along the A1 corridor. Whilst Option 1 provides the most appropriate employment land distribution based on a settlement hierarchy, the amount of employment growth must include reference to development along the A1 corridor. In all three employment distribution options, 143 hectares of employment growth between 2009 and 2026 is proposed based on an average employment growth rate of 8 hectares per annum. This reflects the employment land capacity study recommendation of 133-142 hectares 2009-2026. However, it is not clear from the consultation document the extent to which remaining allocated employment sites in the Local Plan and those sites with planning permission have been included within the figures; it is thus not possible to ascertain how much additional employment land ought to be allocated through the Core Strategy process. This needs to be identified. Having regard to the findings of the ELCS it is clearly appropriate that land ought to be allocated along the A1 corridor for employment, particularly distribution. The rationale for this approach is set out within the ELCS which seeks to capture investment opportunities particularly in the distribution sector and that this would be likely to be successful if new sites close the A1/A57 were made available (paragraph 5.39). Paragraph 5.40 goes on to note that such sites would not meet the employment space needs of the District's indigenous firms and that there is immediate scope for medium sized units. Concern is expressed over the quantum of land that might appropriately be allocated for employment along the A1 corridor in the ELCS of 5-10 hectares. The total amount of land proposed to be allocated for employment development in the ELCS is, at the lower end limited to 40 hectares, and at the upper end 80 hectares. It is thus considered appropriate to delete reference to the lower threshold and focus on the higher threshold which is recommended as follows in the study: Worksop - 40 hectares Retford - 10 hectares A1 Corridor - 10 hectares Harworth/Bircotes - 20 hectares Total - 80 hectares This apportionment is heavily weighted to Worksop (50%). We consider Worksop is better placed to service more general and smaller scale B1/B2/B8 uses due to the existing industrial activities, and local labour demographics. The high volume of traffic along the A57 slows connectivity to the M1 and A1. We believe the A1 corridor is therefore better placed to accommodate major distribution/warehouse facilities where there is likely to be increased HGV movements, as well as scope to deliver larger, level sites able to support major high bay distribution/warehouse as well as major manufacturing requirements. It is thus recommended that some of the 40 hectares identified for new allocations in Worksop could be appropriately reduced given the high proportion of commitments already in and around Worksop. A further 5 hectares could be taken from that identified for new allocations at Harworth/Bircotes. A transfer of circa 10 hectares of employment land from</p>
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 15	Detailed consideration would need to be given to the merits or otherwise of specific sites, but in principle it is recommended that such sites are not allocated along the A1 as generally they would be in unsustainable locations and likely to adversely impact upon the countryside and its landscape character, as well as having implications for water and soil resources.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 16	Don't Know
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 16	See Q 16 Nottinghamshire County Council Q16

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 16	While a distribution on the basis of the overall strategy suggested in Q4, i.e. Option 1, would be an appropriate starting point, the allocation of sites should also recognise the availability of suitable land, in both market and sustainability terms, including previously developed land, the accessibility of the sites to labour by cycling, walking and public transport. For this reason it may be necessary to specify how selection of sites would be made. There may be specific locations near the A1 that justify consideration of that corridor, but this should not be solely for market reasons. It is noted that the former Bevercotes Colliery is likely to be redeveloped and provide a substantial contribution to sites in this corridor. In addition, significant transport considerations need to be made. The cumulative impact of this scale of development (combined with residential development) could have wide ranging transport implications for Worksop, similar issues would arise for Retford and Harworth also. A strategic transport impact assessment needs to be conducted to examine any transport constraints and to identify the strengths and weaknesses of each option in transport terms. Further comments are expressed in the Local Transport comments in the Appendix. Nottinghamshire County Council Q16
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 16	Supplementary - Appendix Distribution of Employment (Section 5.44 onwards) identifies that Bassetlaw should plan for between 79.5 and 92.5 hectares of new employment land between 2006 and 2026. Based on the three options outlined for residential development a broad assessment of the settlements required to accommodate employment land growth has been undertaken. In which case Worksop, for example, would witness employment growth of between 57 and 86 hectares. The cumulative impact of this scale of development (combined with residential development) could have wide ranging transport implications for Worksop, similar issues would arise for Retford and Harworth also. Employment Distribution questions seek views on a preferred distribution option and relative proportions of employment development in each settlement. Quite clearly a strategic transport impact assessment needs to be conducted to examine any transport constraints and to identify the option with the most cost effective and sustainable transport solution, or at very least to identify the strengths and weaknesses of each option in transport terms. Nottinghamshire County Council Q16 (Appendix)
Peter Frampton			Question 16	As a more balanced strategy to facilitate the regeneration of previously mining dependent communities, in the order of 25%-35% of the employment land allocation should be set aside for this strategic purpose.
Edward Fisher			Question 16	I believe that Langold has land to the North of the village that could support development of both housing and employment growth comfortably with good existing transport links and infrastructure already in place.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 16	No.
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 16	No.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 16	Generally we are satisfied that certainly Option 3 would give in general terms a reasonable base for employment land distribution in the future.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 16	Generally we are satisfied that certainly Option 3 would give in general terms a reasonable base for employment land distribution in the future.
Mr Philip CABLE			Question 16	The cottage industry and home workshop needs to be included in the future development of our rural community.
Mr Simon Miller	Persimmon Homes		Question 16	<p>The reasoning for the alternative housing distribution explained in our response to question 11 would lead us to suggest a different distribution of employment. Like our response to question 11 it is considered that the distribution of employment should be a composite of options 1 and 3. Section 9.4.2 of the East Midlands Northern Sub-Region Employment Land Review suggests a range of demand projections, from 79.5 to 92.5 hectares (net) and while it recommends that the lower part of the range should be used to inform the District's Local development Framework it does highlight the potential impact of the Robin Hood Growth Zone north of Worksop as a long term economic growth opportunity that will become increasingly important towards the end of the plan period. It therefore suggests that new sites in particular should be weighed towards distribution related uses, or small industrial/office based businesses due to the current (and projected future) level of market demand. The report states that Bassetlaw District currently has only a moderate supply of employment land compared with other Districts in the area, a 114 hectares and that this figure appears insufficient to cater for the full 20 year plan period; given that past take up rates in Bassetlaw are the highest in the Sub-region. This observation that the current allocation of employment land is sufficient for the District is echoed in the Bassetlaw Employment Land Study, which notes that recent take up has predominantly taken place in the west of the District as reflected I the joint Structure Plan's allocations. Bassetlaw's ELS proposes that existing allocations should be increased I West Bassetlaw but decreased in East Bassetlaw. This emphasis on distribution is supported by th east Midlands Northern Sub-Region Employment Land Review which states that when attempting to redress the shortfall in employment land allocations the District should predominantly consider sites located in West Bassetlaw. The disparity between the current level of supply and projected demand is likely to be intensified due to the results of the site appraisal process for the District. This process analysed 57 sites (the highest number analysed in the Sub-Region after Chesterfield) and identified constraints relating to a number of these. This could require a comprehensive restructuring of the District's overall employment land portfolio. The employment Land Review outlined in section 6 recommended that five committed sites should be de-allocated removing 13.75 hectares from the forward supply. The Employment Land Review also identified four committed sites that would benefit from a mixed-use component in order to cross-subsidise and facilitate the developments, which would further reduce the overall amount of employment land by 6.51 hectares. A further eleven sites whilst meriting retention for employment use, have significant constraints that would have to be overcome before development could be attempted. In conclusion, the Employment Land Review recommended that 20.26 hectares of committed sites should be discounted from the overall portfolio of employment land in Bassetlaw</p>
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 16	DECREASE HARWORTH BIRCOTES AND INCREASE EMPLOYMENT GROWTH IN "OTHER VILLAGES"

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Andy Kitchen	Pegasus Planning Group LLP		Question 16	None of the three options set out in the consultation document appropriately provide for employment development along the A1 corridor. Whilst Option 1 provides the most appropriate employment land distribution based on a settlement hierarchy, the amount of employment growth must include reference to development along the A1 corridor. In all three employment distribution options, 143 hectares of employment growth between 2009 and 2026 is proposed based on an average employment growth rate of 8 hectares per annum. This reflects the employment land capacity study recommendation of 133-142 hectares 2009-2026. However, it is not clear from the consultation document the extent to which remaining allocated employment sites in the Local Plan and those sites with planning permission have been included within the figures; it is thus not possible to ascertain how much additional employment land ought to be allocated through the Core Strategy process. This needs to be identified. Having regard to the findings of the ELCS it is clearly appropriate that land ought to be allocated along the A1 corridor for employment, particularly distribution. The rationale for this approach is set out within the ELCS which seeks to capture investment opportunities particularly in the distribution sector and that this would be likely to be successful if new sites close the A1/A57 were made available (paragraph 5.39). Paragraph 5.40 goes on to note that such sites would not meet the employment space needs of the District's indigenous firms and that there is immediate scope for medium sized units. Concern is expressed over the quantum of land that might appropriately be allocated for employment along the A1 corridor in the ELCS of 5-10 hectares. The total amount of land proposed to be allocated for employment development in the ELCS is, at the lower end limited to 40 hectares, and at the upper end 80 hectares. It is thus considered appropriate to delete reference to the lower threshold and focus on the higher threshold which is recommended as follows in the study: Worksop - 40 hectares Retford - 10 hectares A1 Corridor - 10 hectares Harworth/Bircotes - 20 hectares Total - 80 hectares This apportionment is heavily weighted to Worksop (50%). We consider Worksop is better placed to service more general and smaller scale B1/B2/B8 uses due to the existing industrial activities, and local labour demographics. The high volume of traffic along the A57 slows connectivity to the M1 and A1. We believe the A1 corridor is therefore better placed to accommodate major distribution/warehouse facilities where there is likely to be increased HGV movements, as well as scope to deliver larger, level sites able to support major high bay distribution/warehouse as well as major manufacturing requirements. It is thus recommended that some of the 40 hectares identified for new allocations in Worksop could be appropriately reduced given the high proportion of commitments already in and around Worksop. A further 5 hectares could be taken from that identified for new allocations at Harworth/Bircotes. A transfer of circa 10 hectares of employment land from
Mr George	Laneham Parish Council		Question 16	We understand that an area of Church Laneham, Manor Farm, has been designated an Industrial Area. the approaches to the site are narrow with narrow bridges on both approaches. Therefore, this site is only suitable for cottage industries.
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 16	No.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 17	Yes
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 17	In Local Service Centres - low cost market housing must be provided for young families to keep viability of local schools and balance in the demographic population.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Richard Walters	Senior Land Buyer Hallam Land Management Ltd		Question 17	There should be a District wide affordable housing target, but within this, there should be flexibility to allow for local circumstances.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 17	The conclusions of the Viability Study should be applied; however, recent appeal decisions indicate that provision of affordable housing should recognise the current and long-term financial situation and not compromise future delivery because of short-term difficulties. Any policy needs to recognise this. Nottinghamshire County Council Q17
Michael Meadows	Drivers Jonas	Michael Meadows	Question 17	LIH would urge the Council to set a single target for affordable housing across the District, in accordance with the guidance set out in PPS 3 Housing. PPS 3 states that local authorities should "set an overall (i.e. plan-wide) target for the amount of affordable housing to be provided." It will be important that any target for affordable housing provision is applied flexibly, taking into account the viability of land for housing and drawing on informed assessments of the likely levels of finance available for affordable housing, including public subsidy and the level of developer contribution that can reasonably be secured. LIH welcome the approach to delivery taken by the Council in considering issues of viability in the Affordable Housing Viability Study. This study concluded that the Strategic Housing Market Assessment targets are undeliverable and suggested a district-wide affordable housing target of 25%. LIH consider this to be an appropriate target, based on the current evidence.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 17	Any target will need to be flexible and have regard to viability.
William Davis			Question 17	William Davis Ltd welcome the council's recognition that an affordable housing viability assessment is required when setting new targets and thresholds, in line with National Planning Policy in the form of PPS3. William Davis consider that the most suitable approach for affordable housing targets is to set a range of targets for different areas of the district. This approach would allow for recognition of the different market area values that exist within the district. Such an approach would also prevent an overly prescriptive district wide policy from constraining affordable housing delivery in the areas of the district with lower market values where a higher district wide target may result in development becoming unviable. A range of affordable housing targets would result in an increasingly flexible policy and would be more likely to deliver affordable housing within the district over the plan period. We would support the refined set of targets put forward in 6.21 of the Three Dragons viability report. This approach sets a 35% target in the more valuable Northern Rural and Tuxford market areas, 25% for the Rural Belt and Retford Areas and a 15% target for the poorest market areas of South West Rural Bassetlaw and Worksop. Such an approach would be most in keeping with the strategy we support above and would offer the flexibility to deliver a constant supply of affordable housing across the plan period. William Davis Ltd have not had chance to review the Three Dragons Viability Assessment in full and may comment on the detail of the assessment at a later date.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 17	<p>It is dangerous to set a target across the different areas within the District as there will undoubtedly be differences between Brownfield and Greenfield development in terms of viability. If too high a figure is set this will constrain development and viability will be a key issue. If sufficient land is allocated, we contend that there will be a greater balance of supply and demand which will have an impact on land values and in turn built property values. One of the problems that has been experienced in recent years is that there has been a shortage of land thus increasing one of the key components in achieving affordability. Perhaps a minima, set at a realistic level in the current climate, would be appropriate with higher levels being achieved where there are no known constraints and contamination/regeneration expectations.</p>
Mr Craig Ball	Development Planner UK Coal Mining Ltd		Question 17	<p>In respect of Question 17 within the Consultation Document, UK COAL recognises the importance of schemes delivering a certain level of affordable housing where viable to do so in order to create truly sustainable and mixed communities. However there are different needs in different areas and as such policy should be flexible enough to recognise this. Paragraph 32 of PPS3 states that levels of provision should be determined by taking a strategic and evidence based approach. The local authority therefore need to provide up to date information that is continually monitored and updated which identifies what the need is in different areas on which development control decisions will be partly made in relation to the level of affordable housing provision on any one site. Page 10 of 14 In line with PPS3, paragraph 29, local policies should set an overall target for affordable housing provision. However it should also be noted that paragraph 29 continues to state that ' It [the target] should also reflect an assessment of the likely economic viability of land for housing within the area, taking account of risks to delivery and drawing on informed assessments of the likely levels of finance available for affordable housing, including public subsidy and the level of developer contribution that can reasonably be secured.' The need to consider the economic viability of schemes is particularly relevant in the current economic climate and as we emerge from the economic downturn since the requirement for significant levels of affordable housing can make schemes unviable and therefore prevent sites being developed altogether. This will have a significantly detrimental impact on the growth of the district, its ability to attract inward investment and its ability to secure regeneration benefits as well as, of course, its ability to provide a level of affordable housing. The companion guide to PPS3 provides a further indication of the approach which Government believes local planning authorities should take in planning for affordable housing. Paragraph 10 of the document states 'Effective use of planning obligations to deliver affordable housing requires good negotiation skills, ambitious but realistic affordable housing targets and thresholds given site viability, funding 'cascade' agreements in case grant is not provided, and use of an agreement that secures standards.' Bassetlaw District Council's Affordable Housing Viability Assessment Final Report, August 2009 produced by the Three Dragons forms part of the evidence base for the LDF. This report acknowledges that for some years ahead, viability is likely to dictate the level of affordable housing provision and not housing need (paragraph 1.7). Therefore neither the 25% affordable housing requirement currently set out within local policy (Policy 5/6) or the 30% social rented properties set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment are going to be realistic. Best practice across the country has been to include within affordable housing policies, a target for affordable housing provision, but allow the actual amount of affordable housing to be provided be a matter of negotiation at the time of</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Walker Dormer Tools Walker Dormer Tools	Ian Baseley Associates		Question 17	Affordable housing should only be required in sufficient numbers to meet identified local needs. In a geographically and demographically diverse District such as Bassetlaw, the level of affordable housing provision should not be based on a single target because this fails to recognise that there will be different needs in different areas. Instead, it would be more logical to identify different targets for different parts of the District to reflect the need for affordable housing in those areas. for example, Worksop is likely to have a greater proportion of housing at relatively affordable prices than smaller, more attractive settlements. The policy should therefore be proportionate to the level and type of need that exists.
Mr Walker East Markham Walker East Markham	Ian Baseley associates		Question 17	Affordable housing should only be required in sufficient numbers to meet identified local needs. In a geographically and demographically diverse District such as Bassetlaw, the level of affordable housing provision should not be based on a single target because this fails to recognise that there will be different needs in different areas. Instead, it would be more logical to identify different targets for different parts of the District to reflect the need for affordable housing in those areas. The policy should therefore be proportionate to the level and type of need.
Mrs Janet Hodson			Question 17	Any difference across the district will have to be supported by evidence of different needs but if areas have no need this should be reflected. No less than 15 dwellings and any target need to be flexible to reflect the viability of the site.
Ms Vicki Ingleby	Turley Associates		Question 17	PPS12 advises that Core Strategies must be justifiable - they must be founded on a robust and credible evidence base. Any targets for affordable housing must, therefore, be based upon evidence and relate to need. This is likely to be different in different areas (as the Council's Viability Study had found) and this would appear to be a more robust approach to secure delivery.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
		Ms Emma Cruickshank	Question 17	<p>Question 17 within the Consultation Document, UK COAL recognises the importance of schemes delivering a certain level of affordable housing where viable to do so in order to create truly sustainable and mixed communities. However there are different needs in different areas and as such policy should be flexible enough to recognise this. Paragraph 32 of PPS3 states that levels of provision should be determined by taking a strategic and evidence based approach. The local authority therefore need to provide up to date information that is continually monitored and updated which identifies what the need is in different areas on which development control decisions will be partly made in relation to the level of affordable housing provision on any one site. In line with PPS3, paragraph 29, local policies should set an overall target for affordable housing provision. However it should also be noted that paragraph 29 continues to state that ' It should also reflect an assessment of the likely economic viability of land for housing within the area, taking account of risks to delivery and drawing on informed assessments of the likely levels of finance available for affordable housing, including public subsidy and the level of developer contribution that can reasonably be secured. The need to consider the economic viability of schemes is particularly relevant in the current economic climate and as we emerge from the economic downturn since the requirement for significant levels of affordable housing can make schemes unviable and therefore prevent sites being developed altogether. This will have a significantly detrimental impact on the growth of the district, its ability to attract inward investment and its ability to secure regeneration benefits as well as, of course, its ability to provide a level of affordable housing. The companion guide to PPS3 provides a further indication of the approach which Government believes local planning authorities should take in planning for affordable housing. Paragraph 10 of the document states 'Effective use of planning obligations to deliver affordable housing requires good negotiation skills, ambitious but realistic affordable housing targets and thresholds given site viability, funding 'cascade' agreements in case grant is not provided, and use of an agreement that secures standards.' Bassetlaw District Council's Affordable Housing Viability Assessment Final Report, August 2009 produced by the Three Dragons forms part of the evidence base for the LDF. This report acknowledges that for some years ahead, viability is likely to dictate the level of affordable housing provision and not housing need (paragraph 1.7). Therefore neither the 25% affordable housing requirement currently set out within local policy (Policy 5/6) or the 30% social rented properties set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment are going to be realistic. Best practice across the country has been to include within affordable housing policies, a target for affordable housing provision, but allow the actual amount of affordable housing to be provided be a matter of negotiation at the time of the planning application. Therefore at the time of the application,</p>
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 17	<p>It is dangerous to set a target across the different areas within the District as there will undoubtedly be differences between Brownfield and Greenfield development in terms of viability. If too high a figure is set this will constrain development and viability will be a key issue. If sufficient land is allocated, we contend that there will be a greater balance of supply and demand which will have an impact on land values and in turn built property values. One of the problems that has been experienced in recent years is that there has been a shortage of land thus increasing one of the key components in achieving affordability. Perhaps a minima, set at a realistic level in the current climate, would be appropriate with higher levels being achieved where there are no known constraints and contamination/regeneration expectations.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Adams	John Martin & Associates		Question 17	Paragraph 29 - Affordable Housing - of Planning Policy Statement 3 "Housing", states that Local Planning Authorities should set an overall target for the amount of affordable housing to be provided, and that this target should reflect the new definition of affordable housing in the PPS. The PPS Statement continues by advising that the local targets should reflect an assessment of the likely economic viability of land for housing within the area, taking account of risks to delivery and drawing on informed assessments of the likely levels of finance available for affordable housing. The Core Strategy should therefore acknowledge the guidance contained within and be consistent with PPS3 in not severely restricting the provision of shared equity, key-worker and other low-cost housing solutions in favour of social rented accommodation, and would therefore significantly impact upon development viability and the delivery of affordable housing. In terms of the current economic climate, where there is a down-turn in activity in the housing market, this tenure split would discourage developers from entering the market, and ultimately this would have a dramatic effect upon the target of delivering a minimum of 10,000 affordable dwellings in the Northern HMA within the RSS Plan period. Our client would propose that each individual site should be assessed on its own merits, and therefore local housing need should be taken into account in determining the split of social rented and intermediate housing. Recent case law has found that affordable housing policies have been challenged through the courts, where Local Planning Authorities have failed to fully consider and set out an assessment of economic viability within the policy. In this respect, Blyth Valley District Council was taken to the High Court by three house builders', who claimed that that a policy of introducing a 30 per cent affordable housing policy prejudiced their housing plans. Senior planning judge Mr Justice Collins ruled that a Planning Inspector on whose recommendation the council adopted the policy, failed to consider its economic viability.
Mr Andrew Laing			Question 17	Single or Range of Targets for Affordable Housing across the District The issues and option paper does not provide sufficient information to judge whether different targets should be set for different areas of the District. A clearer strategy would be the application of a single housing target set for the whole District. This target should be in the region of 20-25%.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 17	Whilst it may be appropriate to provide a single target for affordable housing across the district, there should be recognition that this is only a starting point, and there should be the opportunity to explore the viability of the schemes on a site-by-site basis as a universal requirement would not be appropriate and in the long term this approach is likely to stifle development of key sites. By placing the onus upon the developer to demonstrate viability, this will ensure that an appropriate level of affordable housing is delivered without frustrating the development of sites.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 17	Whilst it may be appropriate to provide a single target for affordable housing across the district, there should be recognition that this is only a starting point, and there should be the opportunity to explore the viability of the schemes on a site-by-site basis as a universal requirement would not be appropriate and in the long term this approach is likely to stifle development of key sites. By placing the onus upon the developer to demonstrate viability, this will ensure that an appropriate level of affordable housing is delivered without frustrating the development of sites.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mrs Jennifer Kirk	Clerk to Headon-cum-Upton, Grove and Stokeham Parish Council		Question 17	The council feel that different targets are needed for different regions in proportion to the existing size of the region.
Mrs A Haddon	Clerk to Mattersey Parish Council Mattersey Parish Council		Question 17	We believe that any future developments should maintain the same proportions of the existing housing stock from affordable to large detached within the Parish. Care must be taken not to demand excessive affordable housing development which will stop all development.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 17	Targets should be based on local circumstances and need.
Mr Simon Miller	Persimmon Homes		Question 17	Given the clear differences in affordability in the district especially between the rural areas and some of the settlements especially Worksop and Harworth as identified in the Bassetlaw District Council Affordable housing Viability Assessment Final Report (2009) then there is a very benefit to be derived from using different levels of affordable housing requirements. In terms of deriving what the level of affordable housing provision should be the most recent work just considers what maybe extracted from a development the 45% derived from the earlier 2006 report is considered to be seriously flawed. This is because despite projected no market demand in the District at 2006 there was nevertheless continued market activity in the district after that date. This would tend to suggest that the attempts to project the future tenure of households is not sound. The second reason for rejecting this finding is the changes that have occurred since 2006 to the housing market. This exercise required to be repeated and the overall level of households formation in the district needs that results form the Housing Market Assessment needs to be rigorously tested against other assessments of housing demand and need such as the CLG projections or the East Midlands Regional Assembly model. It is important that any policy for affordable housing should make clear reference to the advice in PPS3 regarding the need for schemes to remain viable and deliverable. Therefore a viability assessment for individual proposals should be possible under the new policy.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 17	DIFFERENT TARGETS FOR DIFFERENT AREAS
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 17	Targets should be directly related to housing need surveys and these should be undertaken on a settlement by settlement basis - as a result specific targets should be identified for each of the Core, Local and Rural Service Centres.
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 17	Please see attached letter. In response to this we would draw your attention to the relatively recent High Court decision in the Blyth Valley case. This makes it clear that affordable housing targets should not be set at an arbitrary level, but that they must be based on an up-to-date assessment of the housing need in the area. Any other approach is likely to be undeliverable open to challenge. We would certainly dispute a figure as high as 45%, but we are pleased to see that the Council's own housing viability study also rejects this figure. Affordable housing targets should be based on an up to date assessment of housing need in the area, and within different areas of it. It is therefore appropriate that there could be different targets for different areas of the district, based on this assessment. Accordingly, it is not appropriate to suggest figures at this stage.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 18	50/50
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 18	Social rented and intermediate housing is more suited to urban areas.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 18	There should be no specific split between the two, the present financial circumstances could change significantly over time, as could opportunities. Either the situation should be monitored with the resources the Viability Study has provided, or no specific split set. However, any provision should accord with the requirements of affordable housing. Nottinghamshire County Council Q18
Michael Meadows	Drivers Jonas	Michael Meadows	Question 18	LIH considers that the Strategic Housing Market Assessment suggested split of 2:1 of social rented to intermediate housing is appropriate. However, a split of 60:40, providing for more intermediate housing, may help once the housing market recovers and mortgage borrowing eases. This issue should be monitored and subject to further assessment in the future.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 18	The split should be based on evidence of housing need.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 18	This should be determined on a site by site basis assessed according to need and surveys which should be undertaken.
Mrs Janet Hodson			Question 18	Again this depends on the viability of site proposals and should therefore be flexible.
Ms Vicki Ingleby	Turley Associates		Question 18	The split between Social Rented and Intermediate housing should also be based on evidence.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 18	This should be determined on a site by site basis assessed according to need and surveys which should be undertaken.
Adams	John Martin & Associates		Question 18	My client believes that there should be a 50/50 split between Social Rented and Intermediate Housing within the Bassetlaw District. The Core Strategy should therefore acknowledge the guidance contained within and be consistent with PPS3 in not severely restricting the provision of shared equity, key-worker and other low-cost housing solutions in favour of social rented accommodation, and would therefore significantly impact upon development viability and the delivery of affordable housing. In terms of the current economic climate, where there is a down-turn in activity in the housing market, this tenure split would discourage developers from entering the market, and ultimately this would have a dramatic effect upon the target of delivering a minimum of 10,000 affordable dwellings in the Northern HMA within the RSS Plan period.
Mr Andrew Laing			Question 18	Split between Social Rented and Intermediate Within the district there will be various needs for each type of affordable housing. Different targets should be set for different areas of the district based on that areas requirement, or a range of splits provided generally by the District.
Mr Simon Mlller	Persimmon Homes		Question 18	Given the historic nature of the 2006 evidence base on this matter and the present lack of funding available for intermediate housing it would unwise to prescribe a split between these two types of tenure. Especially as this does not take into account new initiatives to assist households into the private market such as home buy direct.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 18	No comment
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 18	Yes, if this can be justified on the basis of detailed housing studies.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 19	Yes
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 19	Yes with reservations depending on the site
Mr Richard Walters	Senior Land Buyer Hallam Land Management Ltd		Question 19	Yes
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 19	Yes, and encourage parish councils to bring forward exception sites Nottinghamshire County Council Q19
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 19	No. This would reinforce less sustainable spatial patterns of development and accessibility to services and employment opportunities.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 19	Only in exceptional circumstances. This, we believe, should be where it can be identified that the need is specifically related to long term sustainable employment in that location.
Mr Walker Dormer Tools Walker Dormer Tools	Ian Baseley Associates		Question 19	The Council should adopt an exceptions policy for affordable housing to meet local needs where they arise. The Council should also consider the issue of "local needs" more generally, because affordable housing is only one type of local need and other types of need exist, for e.g. housing for specific groups in society such as the elderly. This would more accurately follow the approach in the EMRP.
Mr Walker East Markham Walker East Markham	Ian Baseley associates		Question 19	The Council should adopt an exceptions policy for affordable housing to meet local needs where they arise. The Council should also consider the issue of " local needs " more generally, because affordable housing is only one type of local need and other types of need exist, for e.g. housing for specific groups in society such as the elderly. This would more accurately follow the approach in the EMRP. The Council also need to differentiate between local needs that exist in rural villages and those that exist elsewhere to properly provide for the needs of everyone in the community.
Mr Tom Garnett	Energy Review		Question 19	Referring to our answer Qu 8 above, this approach would ensure a sufficient supply of affordable housing on new allocated sites and thus an exception rule would not be required.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 19	Only in exceptional circumstances. This, we believe, should be where it can be identified that the need is specifically related to long term sustainable employment in that location.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Adams	John Martin & Associates		Question 19	My client believes that the Council should adopt an exceptions policy for affordable housing. In terms of promoting housing development in rural areas, the contrast in the strategic interpretations of Rural Sustainable Development arises with regard to the problem of meeting rural housing needs. On the one hand, there is conclusive evidence of a severe shortage of affordable housing in rural communities which is not only creating hardship and social injustice, but also undermines the Governments aim of creating mixed communities of income and occupation; and to meet the needs of key workers such as teachers, health workers and others to live close to their work. On the other hand planning policies are generally very restrictive in rural areas in order to protect the countryside, reduced car journeys to urban centres and concentrate new housing near urban services. New housing schemes tend to be limited to small exception sites for "affordable housing" on the edge of villages which usually involve complex and time consuming procedures. Mixed market and affordable housing developments tend to be limited to larger villages and market towns, for the same reason. The result is that many thousands of small villages risk being condemned to virtual stagnation, affluent but aging ghettos, far from the sustainable, mixed communities which the Government seeks to foster. There is no reason why this site at Elkesley shall not come forward as a sustainable extension to the northwest of the settlement. In our view there is a conflict between the needs to meet the social and economic requirements and sustainability of rural communities through the provision of affordable housing, as expressed by the affordable housing commission and PPS3; and the general planning policy of concentrating development in urban areas in order to minimise travel carbon emissions - typically expressed through Regional Spatial Strategies. Both approaches are claiming justification on sustainability grounds. Our view is that we support urban regeneration and the benefits which well planned to towns and cities can provide in terms of employment, entertainment, culture and services etc but that rural communities have much to offer to for example potential for good community life and attractive environment. Moreover, we can test the notion that urban areas are more sustainable than rural. On the contrary, research indicates that many urban locations do not score well on many sustainability counts for example commuting from edge of town estates and that both rural and urban communities need to address the question of how they can become more sustainable rather than writing off many smaller villages. Paragraph 30 of PPS3 advises that in providing for affordable housing in rural communities, where opportunities for delivering affordable housing tend to be more limited, the aim should be to deliver high quality housing that contributes to the creation and maintenance of sustainable rural communities in market towns and villages. In addition, this paragraph of PPS3 advises Local Planning Authorities should consider allocated and releasing land using a Rural
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 19	The Parish Council feel strongly that there should be no exception policy.
Mr Philip CABLE			Question 19	The concept of a trigger for including affordable housing is totally unsuitable for the needs of the rural communities. In village development of additional small housing for aged residents and small units for starter homes should be part of the policy.
Mr Simon Milller	Persimmon Homes		Question 19	There is no reason for the district to depart from government guidance on this matter which clearly allows for exception sites.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 19	No

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 19	Yes.
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 19	No, the council should not make special exception for allowing social housing development in areas where development would not normally be permitted. This has the potential to damage the sustainable management of special historic character areas.
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 19	Yes, for development in smaller settlements (i.e. not Retford or Worksop).
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 20	Don't Know
Mr Richard Walters	Senior Land Buyer Hallam Land Management Ltd		Question 20	We consider the trigger should be set at a minimum of 15 dwellings, as indicated in PPS3.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 20	The conclusions of the Viability Study should be applied. (Also see Q17) Nottinghamshire County Council Q20
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 20	No comment.
Mr Walker Dormer Tools Walker Dormer Tools	Ian Baseley Associates		Question 20	This figure must relate to an identified need in different parts of the District.
Mr Walker East Markham Walker East Markham	Ian Baseley associates		Question 20	This figure must relate to an identified need in different parts of the District.
Mrs Janet Hodson			Question 20	14+ Units
Ms Vicki Ingleby	Turley Associates		Question 20	PPS3 sets out that the national indicative minimum site size threshold is 15 dwellings. Local Planning Authorities can set lower minimum thresholds, where viable and practicable, but need to undertake an informed assessment of the economic viability of any thresholds and proportions, including their likely impact upon overall levels of housing delivery. As with the above comments, a robust evidence base is required in order to develop this policy further.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 20	No comment.
Adams	John Martin & Associates		Question 20	My client believes that the trigger for affordable housing provision should relate directly to a strategy based upon a settlement hierarchy. For example, my client believes that affordable housing should be provided on proposals of 15 or more homes within Core Service and Local Service Centres, and on proposals for 3 or more homes within rural service centres and other villages. In addition, there should be provision within the Core Strategy for off-site affordable housing or a financial contribution in lieu of on-site provision, where it can be robustly justified.
Mr Andrew Laing			Question 20	Trigger for Affordable Housing Provision In accordance with PPS3 Para. 29 and the national indicative minimum the affordable housing threshold should be 15 dwellings for developments in Core Service Centres, Local Service Centres and Rural Service Centres. A lower threshold might be applied to more rural areas, classed as 'Other Villages' in the Bassetlaw settlement hierarchy this could be in the region of 5 Dwellings.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 20	The trigger point when affordable housing provision should be delivered should be set based upon the scale of development that is appropriate to each level of the settlement hierarchy. For example, in Core Service Centres and defined LSC the threshold should be set higher than in other Villages and Settlements in the Countryside where only local needs housing is to be supported.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 20	The trigger point when affordable housing provision should be delivered should be set based upon the scale of development that is appropriate to each level of the settlement hierarchy. For example, in Core Service Centres and defined Local Service Centres the threshold should be set higher than in other Villages and Settlements in the Countryside where only local needs housing is to be supported.
Mrs Jennifer Kirk	Clerk to Headon-cum-Upton, Grove and Stokeham Parish Council		Question 20	For development in 'other villages' the trigger number would need to be lower than for large developments in large towns.
Mr Philip CABLE			Question 20	The concept of a trigger for including affordable housing is totally unsuitable for the needs of the rural communities. In village development of additional small housing for aged residents and small units for starter homes should be part of the policy.
Mr Simon Miller	Persimmon Homes		Question 20	There is no reason for the district to depart from government guidance on this matter, which clearly suggests that the trigger should be 15 dwellings. The information in the Affordable Housing Viability Assessment Final Report (2009) while suggesting that greater levels of affordable housing could be achieved by lower the level this would be common to any part of the country and therefore does not represent individual circumstances to depart from central government guidance.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 20	No comment.
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 20	The number should have regard to a) the scale of overall new development identified for the individual settlement, and b) the work on housing need for that settlement (as per the response to Q.17) - trigger levels should then be set accordingly to ensure that the necessary level of overall affordable housing provision for that settlement will be met.
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 20	This should be based on national guidance in PPS3. We recommend a figure of 15 units in larger settlements, but there may be a case for lower levels in smaller settlements in the hierarchy.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 21	Yes
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 21	Semi-detached 2-3 bedrooms.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 21	Any policy requirement for provision of specific house types should be based on evidence.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 21	There will undoubtedly be a range of types required and it will again depend on location and what the housing is linked to. This needs to be assessed on a case by case basis and it would be dangerous to set specific guidelines that might mean that unsustainable development is promoted.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 21	There will undoubtedly be a range of types required and it will again depend on location and what the housing is linked to. This needs to be assessed on a case by case basis and it would be dangerous to set specific guidelines that might mean that unsustainable development is promoted.
Adams	John Martin & Associates		Question 21	My client believes that the trigger for affordable housing provision should relate directly to a strategy based upon a settlement hierarchy. For example, my client believes that affordable housing should be provided on proposals of 15 or more homes within Core Service and Local Service Centres, and on proposals for 3 or more homes within rural service centres and other villages. In addition, there should be provision within the Core Strategy for off-site affordable housing or a financial contribution in lieu of on-site provision, where it can be robustly justified.
Mr Andrew Laing			Question 21	Types of Affordable Housing The SHMA states there is a requirement for 1 and 2 bed dwellings within the District. This requirement should be met. Each settlement will have its own particular house type needs and an up to date housing needs survey should be available and provide guidance to developers on what requirement for type of affordable dwellings is needed. The affordable housing strategy should allow for some flexibility and relate to local need.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 21	
Mr Simon Miller	Persimmon Homes		Question 21	Given the historic nature of the 2006 evidence base on this matter and the present lack of funding available for intermediate housing it would unwise to prescribe a split between these two types of tenure. Especially as this does not take into account new initiatives to assist households into the private market such as home buy direct.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 21	Yes
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 21	Sites of appropriate scale should provide a mix of unit types and sizes sufficient to address identified local need and demand. Any policy should avoid being over-prescriptive for individual sites and the mix proposed should be able to reflect commercial realities as well as meeting defined need.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 22	Yes
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 22	Not necessarily
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 22	No. Such standards should not imposed through the planning system but rather through other legislation, such as the Building Regulations.
William Davis			Question 22	William Davis Ltd note that the national guidance on Lifetime Homes, 'Lifetime Homes: Lifetime Neighbourhoods' does not require new homes to be built to Lifetime Homes standards until 2013. Therefore we consider that any policy requirement for Lifetime Homes within the Core Strategy should follow this timetable with no proportion expected in new developments before 2013.
			Question 22	Not all new housing should meet lifetime homes standards, only a small percentage of new houses.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 22	No comment.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mrs A Haddon	Clerk to Mattersey Parish Council Mattersey Parish Council		Question 22	We would argue that there should be no requirement that all new houses should meet Lifetime Standards, this is the lowest common denominator approach to planning.
Mr. David Wright	Clerk to the Council Everton Parish Council		Question 22	Lifetime Homes - Consider the aims of this to be very ambitious and there will be design implications (e.g. the width of corridors) that will result in bigger houses. However, issues like planning for climate change are bigger issues than Lifetime Homes. Also if more people were aware of this they may choose to build lifetime homes for themselves on a piecemeal basis rather than expecting housing developer to provide these types of homes in larger schemes.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 22	Yes
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 22	Sites of appropriate scale should provide a mix of unit types and sizes sufficient to address identified local need and demand.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 23	Yes
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 23	No. Such standards should not imposed through the planning system but rather through other legislation, such as the Building Regulations. If this standard of provision is required by a registered social landlord then the RSL should be required to make additional payments to the developer if compliance with the standard results in higher build costs.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 23	No comment.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 23	Yes
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 23	Sites of appropriate scale should provide a mix of unit types and sizes sufficient to address identified local need and demand, but avoid the need for over-prescription.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 24	Yes
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 24	Yes-bungalows
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 24	No. Whilst any large development should seek to provide an appropriate mix of housing types, this should not be sought through such a policy.
William Davis			Question 24	William Davis Ltd object to any policy which seeks to establish a prescriptive requirement on the range and mix of housing types expected in new housing developments. Paragraph 22 of PPS3 indicates that LPA's should only identify the likely profile of household types requiring market housing and does not support local policy establishing a prescriptive requirement on the range and mix of house types required. Our preferred approach to providing housing for older people would be to create individual sites designed for the specialist needs of older residents. William Davis have had success in producing specialist retirement development schemes designed specifically to cater for the needs of elderly residents. This would be our preferred approach to housing for the elderly, rather than providing specialist house types for the elderly within larger residential schemes.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 24	No comment.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 24	Yes

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 24	Any requirement should be based on a specific assessment of the need in the settlement or sub-area and will also need to reflect commercial realities if it is to be delivered by the private sector.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 25	Don't Know
Mr Richard Walters	Senior Land Buyer Hallam Land Management Ltd		Question 25	The only comment we have on Lifetime Homes standards is the matter of density. Lifetime Homes are generally larger than regular house types; therefore, in order to provide for other private amenity such as off road parking and garden space, it may be necessary to reduce densities on certain sites.
Mr John R Holland			Question 25	Housing should be built to a quality standard for construction and internal space. Far too much housing is built with profit alone in mind, leading to cramped accommodation and poor life expectancy - homes should be built to last a minimum of 100 years, which includes leaving room for adaptation (e.g. services etc.), and building in high levels of insulation. London are currently in production of a space standards guide, which is available in draft form.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 25	The Core Strategy and subsequent LDF documents, should avoid unnecessary duplication of legislative provision and complexity of policy where this can be achieved through other means.
Mr Tom Garnett	Energy Review		Question 25	The LPA should make Code for Sustainable Housing level 3 a planning requirement in line with other authorities around the country. This would help in providing more properties built to the lifetime homes standard.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 25	No comment.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 25	No
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 25	The design of lifetime homes, especially bungalows, can be damaging to the preservation of historic character areas. Requirement for provision of lifetime home designs should only be applied where the local distinctiveness of the built historic environment will not be eroded.
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 25	No, dealt with above or in the attached letter.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 26	Don't Know
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 26	The conclusions of the regional studies into Gypsy and traveller housing need should be taken into account (as should the update to the Nottinghamshire and Bassetlaw Gypsy and traveller Accommodation Assessments). Nottinghamshire County Council Q26
Mr John R Holland			Question 26	The provision of sites for Gypsies seems strange when they provide zero input into the community. Quite why those who seek to avoid playing their part in society should be supported by that society is something that I have difficulty understanding.
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 26	There should be a criteria-based assessment of Gypsy and traveller sites to screen potential sites (as in the SHLAA).

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Steve Stains			Question 26	FFT and TLRP refer the council to Circular 12/006 which lay out guidance on acceptable criteria. We would remind the council that "criteria should be fair, reasonable, realistic and effective, and written in a positive manner that offers some certainty that where the criteria (not necessarily all of them) are met planning permission will be granted." (para 1, p 21). Our experience of looking at lists of criteria which are being developed at the moment suggests that lists of criteria should not be overlong or prescriptive. Clearly sites need to be developed so that the social exclusion experienced by many Gypsies and Travellers is reduced. Access to services is important but above all sites need to be developed which are affordable and achievable. This may mean compromises with strict sustainability criteria. Circular 1/2006 recognises this in relation to rural setting where councils are reminded that they should be realistic about the availability or likely availability of alternatives to the car for accessing local services.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 26	No comment.
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 26	The impact of proposed development on heritage assets or their setting should be a consideration
Mrs A Haddon	Clerk to Mattersey Parish Council Mattersey Parish Council		Question 26	We suggest that development of existing sites e.g Daneshill for Gypsies and Travelling People would meet the Allocations requirement of the RSS.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 26	- The Parish Council feels strongly that Bassetlaw does not need 43 travellers pitches. The sites should not have a detrimental effect on any residents in the area.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 26	ANY ALLOCATION SHOULD BE IN THE WEST AND NORTH OF THE DISTRICT WHERE THERE IS THE MOST NEED AND REQUIREMENT
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 26	Sustainable locations need to be identified as access to schooling and goods/services will be a relevant consideration. Specific issues in terms of potential impacts upon landscape character and environmental assets (including their wider settings) also need to be incorporated into the development of an appropriate policy.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 27	Don't Know
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 27	Don't Know
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 27	The conclusions of the regional studies into Gypsy and traveller housing need should be taken into account (as should the update to the Nottinghamshire and Bassetlaw Gypsy and traveller Accommodation Assessments). Nottinghamshire County Council Q27
Environment Agency	Environment Agency		Question 27	Traveller sites should include facilities to promote the recycling of their waste - seizing the opportunity to provide facilities above and beyond that suggested in the guidance for such sites.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Steve Stains			Question 27	In general transit sites need to be well related to patterns of movement and stopping. Local Gypsies and Travellers are the best guide to where these sites are best located. In our view councils should be acting now to ensure that needs are met within a reasonable time frame. Progress is generally very slow. The HCA Grant Guidance issued recently (Jan 2009) gives weight to our arguments: _ Some local authorities are waiting for the Regional Spatial Strategy pitch allocations before considering making more site provision - in many cases this is several years away. Where there is clear, unmet need demonstrated in the authorities' Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment e.g. population growth, household formation, overcrowding on pitches, or significant waiting lists for pitches, local authorities should identify land for site provision and, where appropriate apply for Gypsy and Traveller Sites Grant, to address those needs as soon as possible. The core strategy should pay due regard to the need for affordable and private pitches and lay out how the differing needs will be met. We would also like to take this opportunity to draw the council's attention to part of the Site Grant Guidance (Homes and Community Agency, Jan 2009) which encourages innovative approaches in section 8:
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 27	No comment.
Mr. David Wright	Clerk to the Council Everton Parish Council		Question 27	Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople - How easy is it to change the classification of sites from transit to permanent? RS commented that this is a matter of site management, which will be either the County Council or private landowners.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 27	POLICY SHOULD INCLUDE A REQUIREMENT TO TAKE STRONG, IMMEDIATE AND DECISIVE ACTION AGAINST UNAUTHORISED AND ILLEGAL PITCHES AND SITES.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 28	Yes
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 28	We require a better mix of new housing in local service centres-less executive dwellings, more low cost properties. This has been the case for some time but no-one takes it on board.
Richard Walters	Hallam Land Management Ltd		Question 28	Disagree
Mr John R Holland			Question 28	A mix of housing class (i.e. affordable and executive) in a development is appropriate to prevent segregation of the community. The Scandinavian countries mix private and rented accommodation and don't have any kind of social issues associated with renting versus ownership.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 28	No. The district already has a good mix of housing types. It is anticipated that a range of housing types will continue to be delivered across the district - developers will not build what they can not sell. Where necessary, such as on larger urban extension, the evidence of Housing Market Assessments could inform site-specific requirements which may be formalised through, for example, development briefs.
William Davis			Question 28	As indicated in our response to question 24, William Davis Ltd oppose any policy that requires a specific mix of housing types in new developments. Such a policy would be inconsistent with paragraph 22 of PPS3 which indicates that LPA's should only identify the likely profile of household types requiring market housing and does not support local policy establishing a prescriptive requirement on the range and mix of house types required. Consequently we do not consider a prescriptive housing mix requirement appropriate as either an overall policy aspiration or on an individual site basis.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 28	Our comments at question 17 and question 18 would also apply here - it must be assessed on a case by case basis to make sure that there is sustainable development providing a range of opportunities and linked to the needs of that area and the type of development that is envisaged. It is important to ensure that there is a range of house types and stereotyped high density housing across the District, would not be appropriate. If higher quality development and schemes are to be undertaken to secure the long term viability of this area, in order to encourage inward investment and, to increase the academic base, there must be a range with some high quality low density housing linked to strategic employment sites.
Mr Walker Dormer Tools Walker Dormer Tools	Ian Baseley Associates		Question 28	We do not consider it appropriate for the Council to require a specific mix of housing for the District. This type of policy approach is too general. The mix of housing in any development should instead reflect the size of the development, its location and its relationship to existing housing areas which already contribute to the mix of housing in a particular area. For example, it would be inappropriate and ineffectual to require a certain mix of housing on a particular site in a particular area if that area already has an over-supply of a particular type of housing. Each planning application should be considered on its own merits and the reasons why a particular housing proposal includes the type of houses it does should be explained in the Design and Access Statement accompanying a planning application.
Mr Walker East Markham Walker East Markham	Ian Baseley associates		Question 28	We do not consider it appropriate for the Council to require a specific mix of housing for the District. This type of policy approach is too general. The mix of housing in any development should instead reflect the size of the development, its location and its relationship to existing housing areas which already contribute to the mix of housing in a particular area. For example, it would be inappropriate and ineffectual to require a certain mix of housing on a particular site in a particular area if that area already has an over-supply of a particular type of housing. Each planning application should be considered on its own merits and the reasons why a particular housing proposal is proposing the type of houses it is should be explained in the design and Access Statement accompanying a planning application.
Mrs Janet Hodson			Question 28	25+ Units
Ms Vicki Ingleby	Turley Associates		Question 28	We do not consider it appropriate to require a specific mix of market housing within the Core Strategy. In reality, developers are likely to bring forward proposals for market housing which reflect demand and the profile of households requiring market housing.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 28	Our comments at question 17 and question 18 would also apply here - it must be assessed on a case by case basis to make sure that there is sustainable development providing a range of opportunities and linked to the needs of that area and the type of development that is envisaged. It is important to ensure that there is a range of house types and stereotyped high density housing across the District, would not be appropriate. If higher quality development and schemes are to be undertaken to secure the long term viability of this area, in order to encourage inward investment and, to increase the academic base, there must be a range with some high quality low density housing linked to strategic employment sites.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Adams	John Martin & Associates		Question 28	My client believes that consideration of the mix of market housing within the District should be formulated by way of the production of Supplementary Planning Document, which should be subject to consultation with land owners, the development industry and the wider community. A strong local evidence base should also be used to inform the SPD, which would include an up-to-date Housing Needs Survey and other evidence-based analysis. Evidence should also be sought from local land and estate agents to gain a picture of the local housing market. It is therefore that the evidence and consultation responses inform the direction of the SPD, and that there is not an imposition of an approach onto the market i.e. a requirement to provide a tariff of smaller units within housing developments. It is also suggested that economic viability of schemes must be factored into the process, particularly when dealing with housing developments of less than say 15 homes. The SPD would then be structured in a manner which provides guidance in terms of small, medium and larger scale housing developments.
Mr Andrew Laing			Question 28	Housing Mix We support the principle of continuing to let the market provide the type and mix of housing based on sound knowledge of the housing market and saleability of developments. Through specifying the mix of development the authority will deter some schemes coming forward. The authority can influence the mix of housing through the pre- application process.'
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 28	Although it is recognised that a mix of housing needs to be achieved in order to meet the needs of the district, any policy relating to this needs to be responsive to changing markets that are likely to occur throughout the plan period. If such a policy is to be produced, this needs to be general in its composition to allow for flexibility based upon changes in circumstances and respond to information from housing monitoring and Annual Monitoring Reports which are likely to be updated on a yearly basis.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 28	Although it is recognised that a mix of housing needs to be achieved in order to meet the needs of the district, any policy relating to this needs to be responsive to changing markets that are likely to occur throughout the plan period. If such a policy is to be produced, this needs to be general in its composition to allow for flexibility based upon changes in circumstances and respond to information from housing monitoring and Annual Monitoring Reports which are likely to be updated on a yearly basis.
Mrs A Haddon	Clerk to Mattersey Parish Council Mattersey Parish Council		Question 28	Housing Mix There is a need to ensure that there is a full range of housing being developed not just low cost. The District should adopt a policy of development being in line with existing proportions of housing and in that way both starter and detached executive houses would be built to meet demand.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 28	There should be a full mix of housing from apartments and bungalows to four bedroomed houses.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 28	Yes
Michael Meadows	Drivers Jonas		Question 28	LIH strongly recommends that housing mix is determined on a site-by-site basis in discussions with planning officers, taking into account issues of viability and market demand, at the time when the proposals come forward, to ensure the most appropriate mix of housing on each development site.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 28	A specific mix of housing types should be applied so that even small infill development is included. In many cases infill development affects the historic cores of local service centres so it could be appropriate to the local historic character to promote smaller attached and semi-detached units of 3 bedrooms and fewer. This could also help achieve the targets for new housing as set out under option 1 for the Distribution of Housing Development.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 29	
Richard Walters	Hallam Land Management Ltd		Question 29	Disagree
Michael Meadows	Drivers Jonas	Michael Meadows	Question 29	LIH strongly recommends that housing mix is determined on a site-by-site basis in discussions with planning officers, taking into account issues of viability and market demand, at the time when the proposals come forward, to ensure the most appropriate mix of housing on each development site.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 29	No. The district already has a good mix of housing types. It is anticipated that a range of housing types will continue to be delivered across the district - developers will not build what they can not sell. Where necessary, such as on larger urban extension, the evidence of Housing Market Assessments could inform site-specific requirements which may be formalised through, for example, development briefs.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 29	This Plan will cover a long period of time and we feel it would be inappropriate to be too specific at this stage and that each case should be considered on its merits at the time linked what the development hopes to achieve.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 29	This Plan will cover a long period of time and we feel it would be inappropriate to be too specific at this stage and that each case should be considered on its merits at the time linked what the development hopes to achieve.
Mr Walker Dormer Tools Walker Dormer Tools	Ian Baseley Associates		Question 29	We do not consider it appropriate for the Council to require a specific mix of housing for the District. This type of policy approach is too general. The mix of housing in any development should instead reflect the size of the development, its location and its relationship to existing housing areas which already contribute to the mix of housing in a particular area. For example, it would be inappropriate and ineffectual to require a certain mix of housing on a particular site in a particular area if that area already has an over-supply of a particular type of housing. Each planning application should be considered on its own merits and the reasons why a particular housing proposal includes the type of houses it does should be explained in the Design and Access Statement accompanying a planning application.
Mr Walker East Markham Walker East Markham	Ian Baseley associates		Question 29	We do not consider it appropriate for the Council to require a specific mix of housing for the District. This type of policy approach is too general. The mix of housing in any development should instead reflect the size of the development, its location and its relationship to existing housing areas which already contribute to the mix of housing in a particular area. For example, it would be inappropriate and ineffectual to require a certain mix of housing on a particular site in a particular area if that area already has an over-supply of a particular type of housing. Each planning application should be considered on its own merits and the reasons why a particular housing proposal is proposing the type of houses it is should be explained in the design and Access Statement accompanying a planning application.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Ms Vicki Ingleby	Turley Associates		Question 29	Please see our comments on question 28. We do not feel that a specific mix should be applied on a site by site basis.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 29	This Plan will cover a long period of time and we feel it would be inappropriate to be too specific at this stage and that each case should be considered on its merits at the time linked what the development hopes to achieve.
Adams	John Martin & Associates		Question 29	My client believes a specific mix of market housing should be determined on the basis of a threshold consistent with the settlement hierarchy strategy i.e. on proposals of 15 or more homes within Core Service and Local Service Centres, and on proposals for 3 or more homes within rural service centres and other villages.
Mr Andrew Laing			Question 29	Housing Mix We support the principle of continuing to let the market provide the type and mix of housing based on sound knowledge of the housing market and saleability of developments. Through specifying the mix of development the authority will deter some schemes coming forward. The authority can influence the mix of housing through the pre- application process.'
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 29	Yes - 20 dwellings
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 29	As above, any such requirement must be based on a full assessment of the need for the specific mix and on an understanding of the viability and deliverability of this. for this reason it is not realistic to apply this requirement to very small developments unless they are on exception sites in small settlements.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 30	No
Mr Richard Walters	Senior Land Buyer Hallam Land Management Ltd		Question 30	Agree. The market can react far quicker to changes in local demand that the planning process can. Delivering houses of the type that people actually want, has to be an important policy consideration.
Mrs Brenda Wilson			Question 30	Yes
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 30	Yes. The district already has a good mix of housing types. It is anticipated that a range of housing types will continue to be delivered across the district - developers will not build what they can not sell. Where necessary, such as on larger urban extension, the evidence of Housing Market Assessments could inform site-specific requirements which may be formalised through, for example, development briefs.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 30	Generally we support this Policy - see our response to question 29 above.
Ms Vicki Ingleby	Turley Associates		Question 30	We agree that the market should provide a mix of housing which reflects current demand.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 30	Generally we support this Policy - see our response to question 29 above.
Mr Andrew Laing			Question 30	Housing Mix We support the principle of continuing to let the market provide the type and mix of housing based on sound knowledge of the housing market and saleability of developments. Through specifying the mix of development the authority will deter some schemes coming forward. The authority can influence the mix of housing through the pre- application process.'
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 30	No

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Michael Meadows	Drivers Jonas		Question 30	LIH strongly recommends that housing mix is determined on a site-by-site basis in discussions with planning officers, taking into account issues of viability and market demand, at the time when the proposals come forward, to ensure the most appropriate mix of housing on each development site.
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 30	See question 29.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 31	Don't Know
Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways		Question 31	People living on their boat as their main place of residence are recognised by the Government as a separate household group. 'Strategic Housing Market Assessments - Practice Guidance, by DCLG published in March 2007 to support PPS3, refers to barges used for residential purposes as a different type of accommodation and a minority and hard to reach household group, under chapter 6 on 'Housing Requirements of Specific Household Groups'. BW as the navigation authority is willing to work with the Council's as the local housing authorities to ensure that people living afloat are taken into account as part of any housing needs assessment. Where the supply of moorings for residential use is identified as an issue within a particular housing needs assessment, it is important that the associated land use implications are addressed within the statutory development plan as part of the plan preparation process.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 31	The Core Strategy and subsequent LDF documents should avoid unnecessary complexity.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 31	Not at this stage.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 31	Not at this stage.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 31	No
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 31	No.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 32	No
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 32	No.
Mr Richard Walters	Senior Land Buyer Hallam Land Management Ltd		Question 32	Disagree
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 32	No. PPS3 provides sufficient guidance.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
William Davis			Question 32	William Davis Ltd consider that a flexible approach to housing density should be adopted and that an overly prescriptive and constraining housing density policy should be avoided. A prescriptive blanket density policy set across the district would be too rigid and as a consequence would be likely to force unsuitable densities in particular areas. Identifying different density requirements in different areas of the borough would offer increased flexibility, but is unlikely to recognise the different local character areas that exist throughout the district at a local level. Consequently William Davis support the option of considering housing density on a case by case basis. Such an approach would allow for the flexibility required to ensure that suitable densities are applied to sites depending on the character and function of the local area. Such a policy would allow for higher densities to be applied in suitable urban areas and lower densities in rural and urban fringe locations to ensure the highest quality of design for new residential development. Any policy or decisions on housing density should be based on a credible and robust local evidence base.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 32	The Plan should be consistent with PPS3 but diversity will be required and there will be occasions when there will be greater density and in other areas the need to have lower density housing to accommodate a range of house types and demand.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 32	The Plan should be consistent with PPS3 but diversity will be required and there will be occasions when there will be greater density and in other areas the need to have lower density housing to accommodate a range of house types and demand.
Adams	John Martin & Associates		Question 32	My client believes that Planning Policy Statement Note 3 (Housing) should be considered as the basis for the density requirements for housing development across the District. Paragraphs 45 to 51 of PPS3 provide guidance as the achieving the balance between an efficient use of land and achieving a high quality, well-designed housing area. Whilst paragraph 47 of PPS3 suggests a national indicative minimum of 30 dwellings per hectare, there are instances where this density should be much higher, such as with a urban area which is well-served by services and facilities. Conversely, a case can be made that in rural areas the density should be less than 30 dwellings per hectare, taking into account the prevailing pattern of development and housing needs. It is essential that there is flexibility for a varied approach in the density of housing development. This approach is also considered to be consistent with the guiding policy within PPS3.
Mr Andrew Laing			Question 32	Housing Density As set out, PPS3 promotes the efficient use of land and buildings and suggests a national minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare. We consider that the Council's approach to density of development should accord with national and regional planning guidance; however, there should be some flexibility on a site by site basis to enable consideration of other material factors i.e. develop constraints and landscape impacts etc.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 32	A blanket minimum density requirement across the District of 30 dwellings to the hectare creates the risk that the character of the surrounding area is not fully considered in the formulation of development proposals. For example in locations where the surrounding area has a dispersed pattern of development it may be inappropriate to achieve a minimum of 30 dwellings to the hectare with this perhaps being most relevant in less urban areas.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 32	A blanket minimum density requirement across the District of 30 dwellings to the hectare creates the risk that the character of the surrounding area is not fully considered in the formulation of development proposals.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 32	Every housing development should be tailored to the individual circumstances and be sympathetic to the surrounding area. They should be designed to enhance the area and not just built to satisfy the minimum density requirement.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 32	No
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 32	A blanket approach such as this is inappropriate as it can lead to a "one size fits all approach". The reality is that some sites, usually in central, urban locations, can accommodate higher densities, but edge of settlements and some in-fill sites need to reflect the character of the area and this may result in a lower density. The need to ensure a high quality development which is in keeping with its setting should be paramount.
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 33	Relevant to size of community and design.
Mr Richard Walters	Senior Land Buyer Hallam Land Management Ltd		Question 33	Disagree
Mr Chris Telford	Associate Director CGMS		Question 33	The planning authority should be prepared to identify areas where a higher, lower or graduated density requirement may be justified - wherever possible at the Site Allocations stage. Similarly other key parameters relating to built form and existing features to be protected (where relevant) may be built into site-specific policies in the allocations document, to maximise transparency and ensure that sites in more sensitive locations can be brought forward for suitable forms of development. Notwithstanding the brownfield or greenfield nature of potential sites, it is considered that opportunities to develop villages without prominent extensions into open countryside, should be considered before such extensions.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 33	Site specific development briefs may be appropriate in some locations. These densities do not need to be identified in the Core Strategy.
Mr Chris Telford	Associate Director CGMS		Question 33	The planning authority should be prepared to identify areas where a higher, lower or graduated density requirement may be justified - wherever possible at the Site Allocations stage. Similarly other key parameters relating to built form and existing features to be protected (where relevant) may be built into site-specific policies in the allocations document, to maximise transparency and ensure that sites in more sensitive locations can be brought forward for suitable forms of development. While the subject site is of a previously developed nature, notwithstanding the brownfield or greenfield nature of potential sites, it is considered that opportunities to develop villages without prominent extensions into open countryside, should be considered before such extensions.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr David Barker			Question 33	The planning authority should be prepared to identify areas where a higher, lower or graduated density requirement may be justified - wherever possible at the Site Allocations stage. Similarly other key parameters relating to built form and existing features to be protected (where relevant) may be built into site-specific policies in the allocations document, to maximise transparency and ensure that sites in more sensitive locations can be brought forward for suitable forms of development. It is considered that opportunities to develop towns without major urban extensions into open countryside, should be considered before urban extensions. In this context, it should be noted that the subject site is well contained by strong physically defined boundaries on all sides, and is of a locations and character which relates most strongly to the existing built up area rather than to the surrounding agricultural landscape.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 33	It is difficult to tell at this stage and restrictive policies should be avoided. There must be flexibility so that this can be assessed at the time the development occurs on a needs basis and depending on the type of development which is expected.
Magnus Educational Centre			Question 33	The planning authority should be prepared to identify areas where a higher, lower or graduated density requirement may be justified - wherever possible at the Site Allocations stage. Similarly other key parameters relating to built form and existing features to be protected (where relevant) may be built into site-specific policies in the allocations document, to maximise transparency and ensure that sites in more sensitive locations can be brought forward for suitable forms of development. Notwithstanding the brownfield or greenfield nature of potential sites, it is considered that opportunities to develop villages without prominent extensions into open countryside, should be considered before such extensions.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 33	It is difficult to tell at this stage and restrictive policies should be avoided. There must be flexibility so that this can be assessed at the time the development occurs on a needs basis and depending on the type of development which is expected.
Mr Andrew Laing			Question 33	Housing Density As set out, PPS3 promotes the efficient use of land and buildings and suggests a national minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare. We consider that the Council's approach to density of development should accord with national and regional planning guidance; however, there should be some flexibility on a site by site basis to enable consideration of other material factors i.e. develop constraints and landscape impacts etc.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 33	Lower densities may be acceptable in locations where the character of the area demands such an approach and also on sites which have technical constraints which limits where development can be sited. Higher densities may be appropriate in highly sustainable locations such as local and town centres.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 33	Whilst an efficient and effective use of land should be encouraged, this needs to be assessed on a site by site basis. However, indicative targets could be suggested on a settlement by settlement basis with higher densities being applicable in the settlements towards the top of the proposed settlement hierarchy.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 33	
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 33	URBAN AREAS 30 DWELLINGS PER HECTARE -RURAL AREAS MUCH LOWER

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Michael Meadows	Drivers Jonas		Question 33	As above, LIH strongly recommends that housing density is determined on a site-by-site basis in discussions with planning officers, taking into account local character and local housing needs, including the need for larger, family-sized housing. It will be important to take a flexible approach to housing density, to ensure the most appropriate use of land on each development site.
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 33	It will be appropriate to have a mix of density requirements that reflect the characteristics of individual settlements. Generally it is anticipated that the larger settlements will be able to more readily absorb higher densities and this should also be compatible with related sustainability considerations such as access to and provision of public transport. Particularly in the Rural Service Centres, but also in locations in other centres where there are particular environmental qualities (e.g. within Conservation Areas), density expectations should ensure that distinctive local character (which may include space around buildings) is respected and reinforced.
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 33	Only in general terms, unless covered by a specific development brief.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 34	Yes
Mr Richard Walters	Senior Land Buyer Hallam Land Management Ltd		Question 34	Agree. Planning applications should reflect local characteristics, including density.
Mrs Brenda Wilson			Question 34	Yes-but with some overall ceiling is rural areas to prevent over density.
Michael Meadows	Drivers Jonas	Michael Meadows	Question 34	As above, LIH strongly recommends that housing density is determined on a site-by-site basis in discussions with planning officers, taking into account local character and local housing needs, including the need for larger, family-sized housing. It will be important to take a flexible approach to housing density, to ensure the most appropriate use of land on each development site.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 34	Yes.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 34	We generally support this position in view of our comments before. It will not only be linked to the character of the surrounding area but will also be to the needs in that location relating to the type of development which occurs.
Mr Tom Garnett	Energy Review		Question 34	All sites should be treated on a case by case basis to identify the most appropriate density.
Ms Vicki Ingleby	Turley Associates		Question 34	We consider that the most appropriate mechanism to consider suitable densities for a site is at the development control stage. This should be determined during pre-application discussions with the prospective developer and informed by the Design and Access Statement process. A density of 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) net should be used as a national indicative minimum to guide decision making.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 34	We generally support this position in view of our comments before. It will not only be linked to the character of the surrounding area but will also be to the needs in that location relating to the type of development which occurs.
mr keith buxton			Question 34	Yes -agree

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Andrew Laing			Question 34	Housing Density As set out, PPS3 promotes the efficient use of land and buildings and suggests a national minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare. We consider that the Council's approach to density of development should accord with national and regional planning guidance; however, there should be some flexibility on a site by site basis to enable consideration of other material factors i.e. develop constraints and landscape impacts etc.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 34	In accordance with the response to Questions 32 and 33, the approach being advocated in this question is supported.
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 34	While there is a case for well-designed areas of higher density housing, there should be a degree of flexibility to take account of historic character, especially in or adjacent to conservation areas, e.g. higher density development may be appropriate in the centre of historic settlements, but lower densities in areas of Victorian suburbs. Conservation Area Appraisals should be used to determine appropriate densities. Such flexibility is in line with PPS3, paragraphs 16, 46 and 49.
Mrs Jennifer Kirk	Clerk to Headon-cum-Upton, Groveand Stokeham Parish Council		Question 34	The council agree with this approach.
Mrs A Haddon	Clerk to Mattersey Parish Council Mattersey Parish Council		Question 34	We propose that each application for multiple housing development should be treated on a case by case basis and that there should not be a minimum housing density. Applications should be measured against the existing proportions of housing stock.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 34	The Shireoaks Marina site is a good example of an area where the need to build to a sympathetic and spacious design would enhance the area. Density of approximately 15 dwellings per hectare should be considered.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 34	Agree
Mr Philip CABLE			Question 34	Yes, the case by case solution will specifically cater for requirements in rural communities.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 34	Yes
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 34	This would be acceptable if supported by suitably worded Development Management policies.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 35	No
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 35	All applications would be dealt with on their merits, however, identifying areas where a density outside a range of, say 30-50 dph would give guidance to developers as well as maintaining higher densities overall. Nottinghamshire County Council Q35
Mr John R Holland			Question 35	Questions 33 & 34 seem to be a statement of the same thing. Housing density must be appropriate to the character of the area - in settlement cores this will be higher.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 35	No, see responses to Questions 32, 33 and 34.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 35	We would generally support the need for a case by case analysis rather than any fixed determination at this stage.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Walker Dormer Tools Walker Dormer Tools	Ian Baseley Associates		Question 35	We agree that a combination of the approaches set out in questions 32-34 is most appropriate. PPS3 advocates a minimum density for new residential development of 30 dwellings per hectare but goes on to recognise that local authorities may apply lower density thresholds in certain areas where it would be more in keeping with the character and appearance of the area. 30dph should therefore be applied as a minimum, unless the LDF stipulates otherwise for identified settlements or parts settlements.
Mr Walker East Markham Walker East Markham	Ian Baseley associates		Question 35	We agree that a combination of the approaches=s set out in questions 32-34 is most appropriate. PPS3 advocates a minimum density for new residential development of 30 dwellings per hectare but goes on to recognise that local authorities may apply lower density thresholds in certain areas where it would be more in keeping with the character and appearance of the area. 30dph should therefore be applied as a minimum, unless the LDF stipulates otherwise for identified settlements or areas within settlements.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 35	We would generally support the need for a case by case analysis rather than any fixed determination at this stage.
Mr Andrew Laing			Question 35	Housing Density As set out, PPS3 promotes the efficient use of land and buildings and suggests a national minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare. We consider that the Council's approach to density of development should accord with national and regional planning guidance; however, there should be some flexibility on a site by site basis to enable consideration of other material factors i.e. develop constraints and landscape impacts etc.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 35	Disagree
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 35	Yes
Michael Meadows	Drivers Jonas		Question 35	As above, LIH strongly recommends that housing density is determined on a site-by-site basis in discussions with planning officers, taking into account local character and local housing needs, including the need for larger, family-sized housing. It will be important to take a flexible approach to housing density, to ensure the most appropriate use of land on each development site.
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 35	Yes. A combined approach to setting and dealing with housing density is preferable. Urban historic cores of Retford and Worksop lend themselves to higher density development, as will some, but not all, of the local service centres. Local characteristics and distinctiveness of settlement layout and form should be a key consideration of the urban design of all new development.
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 35	This would be acceptable.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 36	No
Mr Richard Walters	Senior Land Buyer Hallam Land Management Ltd		Question 36	Consider how to deal with changes in local demand change, if densities are set - should it be necessary to change house types because of changing demand, it may be necessary to increase/decrease density.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 36	The Core Strategy and subsequent LDF documents should avoid unnecessary complexity.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Environment Agency	Environment Agency		Question 36	Adverse impacts of high density housing on the districts ability to comply with the waste hierarchy will need to be addressed.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 36	No.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 36	Sites should be developed to a standard which enhances the area and be sympathetic to the surroundings. Less density means more open space for children and developers should be encouraged to consider safe areas for children to play.
Mr Owen Walters	Highways Agency		Question 36	It is important to recognise the key link between housing density and the potential impact on the highway network. High-density developments in appropriate locations provide an opportunity to maximise accessibility by public transport, cycling and walking. They also have the potential to load significant levels of traffic onto the highway network and this would need to be considered through a Transport Assessment and Travel plan.
Mr David Langmead	South Levertton Parish Council		Question 36	No
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 36	No.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 37	No
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 37	No strict limits.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 37	No.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 37	No comment.
mr keith buxton			Question 37	Yes
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 37	Specific limits may not be appropriate in the case of historic buildings. For example, the following criteria would be relevant to listed buildings: - the proposals should maintain the character of the original building and preserve its architectural and historic features (both internal and external); - the extension should be appropriate in design, scale, materials and colour to the rest of the building and its setting.
Mrs Jennifer Kirk	Clerk to Heaton-cum-Upton, Grove and Stokeham Parish Council		Question 37	The council feel that a maximum of around 30% of the original dwelling would be an appropriate limit.
Mr David Langmead	South Levertton Parish Council		Question 37	No
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 38	Yes - appropriate to the neighbourhood
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 38	Yes. Criteria should be set out in subsequent DPDs, not the Core Strategy.
Mrs Janet Hodson			Question 38	No - should be flexible depending on the site and characteristics and objectives.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 38	No comment.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Ms Ursilla Spence	Nottinghamshire County Council		Question 38	A criteria based policy, taking into account aspects of the historic environment, both built (visible) and archaeological (usually invisible) would help protect the quality of the built environment and its archaeological heritage. This is particularly relevant to the historic cores of villages and towns, but may also be relevant to complexes of older industrial buildings.
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 38	Specific limits may not be appropriate in the case of historic buildings. For example, the following criteria would be relevant to listed buildings: - the proposals should maintain the character of the original building and preserve its architectural and historic features (both internal and external); - the extension should be appropriate in design, scale, materials and colour to the rest of the building and its setting.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 38	Yes
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 38	This approach is preferred - criteria should have particular regard to the specific character of the dwelling and its surroundings, as well as the impact upon the amenities of neighbours.
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 38	Yes. A criteria based approach is preferable for domestic extensions. Criteria worth considering include: Affect on the housing mix, in particular limiting the availability of smaller units in an area for future generations. Impact of the proposals on the local distinctiveness of an area, including appearance, settlement plan form, permeability of light and historic character (in the case of designated conservation areas). Sustainable design value of the proposals.
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 39	Each case judged on merit.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 39	No, see response to Question 38.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 39	No comment.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 39	Agree
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 39	No
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 39	Without sufficient explanation from the Local authority, the limited guidance of PPG 1 and the GDPO could provide insufficient safeguard against the long-term negative impacts of erosive changes to local distinctiveness.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 40	The Core Strategy and subsequent LDF documents should avoid unnecessary complexity.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 40	No comment.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Ms Ursilla Spence	Nottinghamshire County Council		Question 40	Within the historic cores of villages, houses that are 100 years or older will often sit in property plots that have their origin in the Medieval period. Despite the relatively small number of conservation areas within the District many historic village cores have clear identities and high quality built heritage features. Outside of conservation areas it can be difficult to protect the overall historic character of the settlement. Badly designed extensions and infill development can have a corrosive impact both on the visual aspects of the historic environment, and on its buried archaeological dimension.
Mrs A Haddon	Clerk to Mattersey Parish Council Mattersey Parish Council		Question 40	Householder extensions should be on a case by case basis and should be further limited by Village Design Statements where applicable.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 40	No
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 41	Yes - appropriate to the area
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 41	Opinion of local people e.g Parish Councils should be obtained.
Miss Rachael Bust	Deputy Head of Planning and Local Authority Liaison Coal Authority		Question 41	Test of Soundness Justified Effective Consistency With National Policy X Regarding the issue of the Council setting out design fundamentals for all new development, The Coal Authority considers that mining legacy and land stability is one such locally distinctive issue in the west of the District that should be included in any design appraisal process to meet the requirements of PPG14 and ensure the stability and safety of development. Reason - In order to address the requirements of PPG14 regarding land stability.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 41	Yes, basic design guidelines could be listed without being too prescriptive. New development should be in scale with the surrounding landscape and should blend in rather than stand out. Appropriate design and planting to integrate development into the surrounding landscape should be promoted. Nottinghamshire County Council Q41
Michael Meadows	Drivers Jonas	Michael Meadows	Question 41	LIH considers that the use of design principles, set out in the Local Development Framework, can be useful to guide discussions between developers and the local planning authority. However, it will be important that any design criteria are not too prescriptive, to ensure that each development site can respond to local circumstances.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways		Question 41	<p>'Inland waterways are successfully being used as tools in place-making and place-shaping; in re-branding; in confidence-building; in attracting and generating investment; and in improving the quality of life in areas undergoing transformational change through regeneration, renewal and growth'. (TCPA Policy Advice Note: Inland Waterways: Unlocking the potential and securing the future of inland waterways through the planning system (2009)). We would therefore recommend that design fundamentals for waterfront development are specified and reflect some of the following principles. 'Individual waterways and water spaces need to be viewed as an integral part of a wider network, and not in isolation. Water should not be treated as just a setting or backdrop for development but as a space and leisure and commercial resource in its own right. The 'added value' of the water space needs to be fully explored. Waterways themselves should be the starting point for consideration of the development and use of the water and waterside land - look from the water outwards, as well as from the land to the water. A waterways towing path and its environs should form an integral part of the public realm in terms of both design and management. It is important that the siting, configuration and orientation of buildings optimise views of the water, generate natural surveillance of water space, and encourage and improve access to, along and from the water. New waterside development needs to be considered holistically with the opportunities for water-based development, use and enhancement. Improve the appearance of the site from the towing path and from the water at boat level, and enhance the environmental quality of the waterway corridor. It should be recognised that appropriate boundary treatment and access issues are often different for the towing path side and the offside'. (TCPA Policy Advice Note: Inland Waterways: Unlocking the potential and securing the future of inland waterways through the planning system (2009)).</p>
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 41	<p>Broad principles could be set out but these would most likely only repeat guidance provided by national documents and so would be unnecessarily repetitious.</p>
William Davis			Question 41	<p>William Davis Ltd welcome the council's commitment to high levels of design in new development. Consequently we would support policy in the Core Strategy that sets out the level of design quality expected throughout the district. We consider the best way of implementing such a policy would be through the use of the Building for Life Criteria supported by CABE. The Building for Life Criteria would offer the Council an effective tool for ensuring a high level of design quality while giving valuable guidance on design levels expected in the district. Any decision on the level of the Building for Life standards expected to be met on new residential development should be based on a credible and robust evidence base to ensure such a requirement is not overly constraining and would not endanger housing delivery in Bassetlaw.</p>
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 41	<p>Building for Life should be used as a minimum for developments. Domestic buildings should be built to the standards set out in the Code for Sustainable Homes and preferably a target should be set for the number of new domestic buildings that achieve Level 3 (the target level set for social housing) (DCLG (2008) Greener Homes for the Future). For non-domestic buildings BRE Environmental Assessment Methods (BREEAM) should be used to ensure that new build is sustainable.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 41	No particular comment except to say that we would generally support the CABE recommendation mentioned in 6.17 and that it would be appropriate to make sure that, without specific details, all developments should be in accordance with Government guidance and sustainable objectives. Clearly the Code for Sustainable Homes will also have an impact and it must be remembered that with the extra demands that this will impose on developers, viability will be a key issue. Being too prescriptive at this stage could be detrimental to the objective to achieve sustainable development in that location.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 41	No particular comment except to say that we would generally support the CABE recommendation mentioned in 6.17 and that it would be appropriate to make sure that, without specific details, all developments should be in accordance with Government guidance and sustainable objectives. Clearly the Code for Sustainable Homes will also have an impact and it must be remembered that with the extra demands that this will impose on developers, viability will be a key issue. Being too prescriptive at this stage could be detrimental to the objective to achieve sustainable development in that location.
Adams	John Martin & Associates		Question 41	My client believes that the Core Strategy and Development Management documents should set out design fundamentals that it expects of all new developments. Paragraph 33 of Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development (PPS1) states that good design is indivisible from good planning. My client would suggest that the Development Management DPD should consider the following factors:- The development should be responsive to its context The development should be well-connected to its surroundings and be legible There should be distinction between the entrances, edges and announcement of developments Cars should not dominate layouts i.e. use of courtyards and on-plot parking Creating variety in development by way of the layout, form and choice and texture of facing materials Minimising the visual impacts of servicing requirements i.e. bin storage
mr keith buxton			Question 41	Yes
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 41	Good design should be sought in all new development, and it needs to be recognised that good design in one location may not be appropriate in others. Any design policies therefore need to be fairly broad in their requirements and individual design statements, development briefs can then be produced on a site or village basis as deemed necessary.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 41	Good design should be sought in all new development, and it needs to be recognised that certain design principles good design in one location may not be appropriate in others. Any design policies therefore need to be fairly broad in their requirements and individual design statements, development briefs can then be produced on a site or settlement basis as deemed necessary.
Ms Ursilla Spence	Nottinghamshire County Council		Question 41	A good design guide would have the advantages of setting out the authority's expectations of new development of all types, which can only raise the overall standard of development. From the archaeological viewpoint, one would wish to see proposals for alterations or amendments to existing structures avoid the loss of historic features significant to the building or its neighbours. Conversions of farm structures are a case in point, as relatively few conversions beyond conservation areas actually retain individual features which contributed to the interest of the original building.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 41	English Heritage supports the inclusion of a design policy that not only addresses 'sustainable design', but also recognises the role of the historic environment in placeshaping and the importance of masterplanning that uses characterisation as a design tool. HCA and English Heritage have just published guidance: Capitalising on the inherited landscape - An introduction to historic characterisation for masterplanning. http://www.homesandcommunities.co.uk/hca-english-heritage-guidance
Mrs Jennifer Kirk	Clerk to Headon-cum-Upton, Grove and Stokeham Parish Council		Question 41	The council believe that the properties should be in keeping with the existing character of the surrounding properties. They should be in keeping with Village design statements within Parish Plans.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 41	There should not be a fixed policy but suggestions could be put forward for consideration. The local residents and Parish Councils views should carry more weight than at present and be able to have more influence on the design of developments in their area.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 41	Yes
Mr Andy Kitchen	Pegasus Planning Group LLP		Question 41	The Core Strategy should only set out design fundamentals it expects from all new developments if this is likely to be different to the plethora of design advice at national (PPS1) and regional (RSS) level.
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 41	Design expectations should be set out, possibly in (or supplemented by) a SPD. Particular consideration needs to be given to sustainable construction so that natural resources are prudently used, energy requirements minimised and met wherever possible from renewable sources, water use minimised and waste minimised. It will also be important to ensure that new development is complementary to its surroundings and in this respect there is a role for detailed design guidance, particularly in sensitive locations.
Environment Agency	Environment Agency		Question 41	The Core Strategy should encourage development which utilises design and layout which supports adaptation to climate change, such as SUDS. rainwater harvesting and storage and grey water recycling. Please see further details below in the response to question 51.
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 41	Design fundamentals should be adopted and applied to all conservation areas and other sensitive places (such as the setting of listed buildings). It is preferable to apply the same or similar standards to design of all new development to ensure that it protects local distinctiveness and creates appropriate development that contributes to sustainable communities. The fundamentals could be provided for in a dedicated guidance note covering the design of all new development.
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 41	Development management policies should provide the basic parameters, covering scale, detailed design, amenity, landscape protection, townscapes, protection of cultural interests (Listed buildings etc). The application of these policies needs to be flexible in order to accept the need for good modern development which respects the character of the area.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 42	Yes
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 42	No. Compliance with such standards should be encouraged but should not be a policy requirement of the Core Strategy.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 42	Building for Life should be used as a minimum for developments. Domestic buildings should be built to the standards set out in the Code for Sustainable Homes and preferably a target should be set for the number of new domestic buildings that achieve Level 3 (the target level set for social housing) (DCLG (2008) Greener Homes for the Future). For non-domestic buildings BRE Environmental Assessment Methods (BREEAM) should be used to ensure that new build is sustainable.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 42	Generally yes.
Mr Tom Garnett	Energy Review		Question 42	The LPA should make Code for Sustainable Housing level 3 a planning requirement in line with other authorities around the country.
Ms Vicki Ingleby	Turley Associates		Question 42	Nottinghamshire County Council supports the promotion of recognised standards such as Building for Life.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 42	Generally yes.
mr keith buxton			Question 42	Yes
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 42	Whilst standards such as Building for Life are admirable in their aims, from experience these assessments can be very subjective in their nature, allowing for one assessor to score development proposals completely differently from another assessor. Notwithstanding this, it is accepted that design is subjective and Building for Life offers a robust assessment as any and ensures that additional consideration is given towards the design of the proposals in their formulation.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 42	Whilst standards such as Building for Life are admirable in their aims, from experience these assessments can be very subjective in their nature, allowing for one assessor to score development proposals completely differently from another assessor this can lead to inconsistencies in approach which could frustrate the development process. Notwithstanding this, it is accepted that design is subjective and Building for Life offers a robust assessment as any and ensures that additional consideration is given towards the design of the proposals in their formulation.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 42	Yes
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 42	Yes.
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 42	No, design for life is not appropriate in all cases of major development. See Q25.
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 42	Yes.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 43	Don't Know
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 43	The Core Strategy and subsequent LDF documents should avoid unnecessary complexity.
Mr Tom Garnett	Energy Review		Question 43	The LPA should consider requiring a minimum 10% of the energy requirement of new homes to be provided by low or zero carbon technologies.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 43	No comment.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 43	No
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 43	Local distinctiveness, conservation area character and the setting of designated cultural assets should all be considered as drivers for good design.
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 43	No.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 44	Yes
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 44	No-not feasible
Mr B Simpson			Question 44	Local Services (6.18). our local facilities fail to meet anymore development but can I suggest, that the waste land South of Top Farm down towards the bottom end of Yew Tree Road (Elkesley), be made into a Play Area and village green, as the children and teenagers have nowhere to play. Since the farmer stopped keeping this land tidy it has overgrown into an eyesore, plus a fire hazard and other health and safety issues.
Mrs Brenda Wilson			Question 44	Yes where this is economically viable.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 44	Policies to protect rural services need to be justified in the same way as the settlement hierarchy, with which they are linked. Therefore, where a service is a reason for a settlement having a particular role then there is reason for that service to be protected. This may involve funding the use of developer contributions if development threatens the presence or viability of the service, e.g. a post office. Nottinghamshire County Council Q44
Mr John R Holland			Question 44	Local shops may need some planning protection if the property price differential is excessive (which it presently is).
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 44	Yes.
Miss Claire Whittaker	Assistant Planner DPP		Question 44	New or improved services and facilities will be required over time to serve communities across Bassetlaw. The strategy emphasises to the need to provide these services in accessible and sustainable locations which will meet local needs. The supporting text also considers the importance of protecting existing facilities especially in rural areas where NEET groups (not in employment education or training) can be severely affected.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 44	Generally yes but further development, particularly with the need to achieve regeneration in other key areas, should take precedence. Only sustainable, viable and proven development should be allowed where this helps to protect services and facilities. In other ways the diversity which this might produce can be put in as a feature of other more sustainable locations.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 44	Generally yes but further development, particularly with the need to achieve regeneration in other key areas, should take precedence. Only sustainable, viable and proven development should be allowed where this helps to protect services and facilities. In other ways the diversity which this might produce can be put in as a feature of other more sustainable locations.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Adams	John Martin & Associates		Question 44	My client believes that there should be policies that seek to retain key local services and facilities, particularly if dealing with the last remaining shop, public house, garage or other key facility within the rural settlements of the District, unless it can be demonstrated that:- There is no reasonable prospect of that service being retained or resurrected (some form of marketing exercise may be appropriate)
mr keith buxton			Question 44	There is little evidence of public support for that service or facility
Mrs A Haddon	Clerk to Mattersey Parish Council Mattersey Parish Council		Question 44	Yes
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 44	We believe that the District Council should not allow change of use for local services to residential where it would mean the permanent loss of that service to the community such as pubs, shops, schools, etc.
Mr. David Wright	Clerk to the Council Everton Parish Council		Question 44	Agree
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 44	Loss of Community Services - application for local shop in the past has been refused with a negative impact on the local community and subsequent loss of the garden centre where the shop was proposed. Everton Parish Council want a planning regime that would support new services in villages i.e. local shops or village halls.
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 44	Yes
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 44	Yes - the erosion of this resource is a concern.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 45	Yes. Protection of rural services is linked to the sustainability of local service centres and the protection of conservation areas.
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 45	No
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 45	Yes - villages must not be allowed to stagnate.
Mr John R Holland			Question 45	In principle exceptions policies should be unnecessary. If there is justification for a rural service then permission could be granted contrary to a policy (depending on the strength of the case). However, exceptions policies for rural housing are well established, and could provide a basis for such a policy. However, there is a danger of allowing speculative development that should not be permitted, so care needs to be taken in the wording of such policies. Nottinghamshire County Council Q45
Mr Nick Basley	Ian Basley Associates		Question 45	Yes. If we don't, we could end up with unsuitable development, or developers playing the game to use exceptions.
				Mr Pickering agrees that the Core Strategy should contain policies which allow exception sites adjoining existing settlements to be used for services and facilities, including new local village public houses and local needs housing. This will be an extremely effective way of attracting more services and facilities to those settlements considered to be less sustainable because their existing limited services and facilities because developers will not be required to compete for land which is appropriate for open market uses and therefore of greater value.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 45	Only if a strong exceptions test would need to be passed and the proposal is consistent with the settlement hierarchy.
Miss Claire Whittaker	Assistant Planner DPP		Question 45	In response to question 45, we would promote policies that encourage and/ or allow for exception sites on which development would not normally be permitted for rural services and facilities. We consider that within these localities there are opportunities to develop small convenience stores and local services to meet local demand and provide more sustainable communities, therefore policies that encourage development should be supported.
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 45	If there is to be a policy that encourages and/or allows exception sites for rural services and facilities then there needs to be a screening process to ensure that there are no negative impacts on wildlife sites or protected species.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 45	See response to question 17.
Mr Walker East Markham Walker East Markham	Ian Baseley associates		Question 45	We agree that the Core strategy should contain policies which allow exception sites to be used for services and facilities, including local needs housing. This will be an extremely effective way of attracting more services and facilities to those settlements that are considered to be less sustainable because of their existing limited services and facilities because developers will not be required to compete for land which is appropriate for open market uses and therefore of greater value.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 45	It is dangerous to set a target across the different areas within the District as there will undoubtedly be differences between Brownfield and Greenfield development in terms of viability. If too high a figure is set this will constrain development and viability will be a key issue. If sufficient land is allocated, we contend that there will be a greater balance of supply and demand which will have an impact on land values and in turn built property values. One of the problems that has been experienced in recent years is that there has been a shortage of land thus increasing one of the key components in achieving affordability. Perhaps a minima, set at a realistic level in the current climate, would be appropriate with higher levels being achieved where there are no known constraints and contamination/regeneration expectations.
mr keith buxton			Question 45	Yes
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 45	No
Mr. David Wright	Clerk to the Council Everton Parish Council		Question 45	Yes support the idea of allowing exceptions for rural service centres. However, suggest the term 'Community Services' would be a better catch all term for the types of developments that should be allowed in rural communities. RS and TB commented that planning would want some assurances that the rural service would be viable before granting permission, to ensure that the building wouldn't become redundant leading to a subsequent application for conversion to a dwelling.
Mr Philip CABLE			Question 45	Yes, but clear guidelines well published.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 45	Yes
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 45	No. Not if this affects a conservation area or setting of any other designated cultural asset. See Q6.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 46	Public Transport, shops and small work/units

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 46	See Q 44
Mr Nick Basley	Ian Basley Associates		Question 46	The policy should apply to any service or facility upon which local communities rely and which deter longer journeys to utilise such services elsewhere. The policy should not be restrictive because this would deter rather than attract applications for such uses which in turn would defeat the purpose of the policy.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 46	If such a policy is adopted, it should form of a development policies DPD, not the Core Strategy.
Mr Walker East Markham Walker East Markham	Ian Baseley associates		Question 46	The policy should apply to any service or facility upon which local communities rely and which would deter longer journeys to utilise such services elsewhere. The policy should not be restrictive because this would deter rather than attract applications for such uses which in turn would defeat the purpose of the policy.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 46	No comment.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 46	SMALL LOCAL INDUSTRY AND AGRICULTURE
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 46	Public transport, local shops including provision of post office services, and primary schools in the larger rural settlements.
Mr David Brown	Merry Vale Development		Question 47	The community interface, as expressed in the sustainable community strategy and encouraged in PPS 7, requires LPA's to adopt a positive approach to planning proposals, specifically to improve the viability and accessibility of community services and facilities. Misterton is a particularly relevant settlement in this regard.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 47	Maintaining local services depends on many factors outside the control of the LDF; however, a co-ordinated approach should be taken to ensure the service providers priorities align with sustainable development and the policies of the LDF. In other circumstances commercial viability is a factor that development and growth of settlements can influence. Nottinghamshire County Council Q47
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 47	The Core Strategy and subsequent LDF documents should avoid unnecessary complexity.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mrs Emma Mazzega			Question 47	Tuxford is an ideal village for families especially due to the fantastic secondary school, which has a good OFSTED report. I believe that the village would benefit from new family homes so families can not only benefit from the excellent education facilities but all the local services the village offers. Tuxford has great rail, road and air links. A major plus is the train links to London, we have friends based in London who are looking to escape the 'rat race' as they have families and would like to move out of London to live a rural village life and I believe that Tuxford can benefit from such families due to the schools. Having attended Tuxford School myself, I have been promoting the village to people looking to move to a country village, but I feel there is a lack of larger family housing with gardens to enjoy the countryside the village has to offer, therefore I believe Tuxford would benefit greatly from new family housing. In summary, I believe that Tuxford is suitable and able to cope with future growth without any detrimental effect to the character of the village. New families would breath new life into the village and the village would evolve organically.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 47	No comment.
Mr PG Hills	Clerk to Tuxford Town Council Tuxford Parish Council		Question 47	The Community Interface, as expressed in the Sustainable Community Strategy and encouraged in PPS 7, requires LPAs to adopt a positive approach to planning proposals, specifically to improve the viability and accessibility of community services and facilities. Misterton is a particularly relevant settlement in this regard.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 47	No
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 47	The evidence and best practice also show us that a) we can greatly reduce our demand for energy through energy conservation and especially building design that reduces the need for energy (e.g. orientated to take advantage of solar gain, use of very high standards of insulation) - an example in point is the National Trust's work with two volume house builders on a major residential development in Greater Manchester that has demonstrated that even for mass housing schemes energy standards well in excess of current Building Regulations requirements are achievable; and b) there is scope for a range of micro-renewables to be considered, e.g. solar, ground and air source heat pumps.
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 48	Not qualified to answer.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 48	Maintaining local services depends on many factors outside the control of the LDF; however, a co-ordinated approach should be taken to ensure the service providers priorities align with sustainable development and the policies of the LDF. In other circumstances commercial viability is a factor that development and growth of settlements can influence. Nottinghamshire County Council Q48
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 48	It is advised that any targets are based on figures and recommendations in the draft Nottinghamshire Sustainable Energy Policy Framework since it provides a sound evidence base and the rationale for a county wide approach. The Framework is shortly to be finalised and Bassetlaw District Council has participated in the partnership (NSEPP) that has steered the work to date. Nottinghamshire County Council Q48

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Michael Meadows	Drivers Jonas	Michael Meadows	Question 48	LIH is satisfied that targets for decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy generation should be in accordance with the relevant national and regional targets. However, it will be important that any targets are applied flexibly, taken into account issues of viability and the feasibility of delivery on individual development sites.
William Davis			Question 48	William Davis Ltd recognise the increasing importance of combating climate change through planning policy. However we urge caution from the council when setting targets for decentralised or renewable energy, particularly when considering new residential development. Should the council seek targets on new residential schemes they will need to follow the national guidelines established in the 'Planning and Climate Change' Supplement to PPS1. Paragraph 33 of the supplement identifies that when considering local requirements for decentralised energy supply Local Planning Authorities should "ensure what is proposed is evidence-based and viable, having regard to the overall costs of bringing sites to the market (including the costs of necessary supporting infrastructure) and the need to avoid any adverse impact on the development needs of communities" . Any policy that does not follow these guidelines is likely to be highly constraining on residential development in the district and as a consequence would endanger future housing delivery and the council's ability to meet regional housing targets.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 48	Generally this would be supported but again viability issues need to be addressed, particularly when this is an area where the viability of schemes will need to be carefully managed. Imposing rigorous constraints may prejudice sustainable growth.
Mr Tom Garnett	Energy Review		Question 48	Yes, the LPA should consider requiring a minimum 10% of the energy requirement of new homes to be provided by low or zero carbon technologies.
Ms Vicki Ingleby	Turley Associates		Question 48	We support the incorporation of renewable energy generation into major proposals. The targets should reflect those set in RSS and within national planning policy. A key facet will be to ensure flexibility on delivery and the contribution that off-site measures can bring need to be given due recognition within the policy.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 48	Generally this would be supported but again viability issues need to be addressed, particularly when this is an area where the viability of schemes will need to be carefully managed. Imposing rigorous constraints may prejudice sustainable growth.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 48	Bassetlaw should lead the way in environmental policy and expect all new builds to have alternative power sources e.g. solar hot water, a system of recycled water and collection of rain water. This would help with employment in the need to manufacture these commodities and the demand would ultimately speed up the price reduction in the products thus making it more affordable for existing houses to be converted.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 48	No

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Andy Kitchen	Pegasus Planning Group LLP		Question 48	No. A specific target for decentralised and renewable or low-carbon energy generation is inflexible and does not allow development proposals to deliver a more holistic and, potentially, more appropriate approach to energy reduction as opposed to energy generation. It is far more cost effective to deliver savings in energy consumption through development proposals compared to requiring a proportion of energy generation to be achieved. The overall target is to reduce carbon emissions and it is thus far more appropriate for the Core Strategy to have carbon reduction/minimalisation targets as opposed to energy generation targets. Low carbon and renewable requirements may deter footloose occupiers from nearby competing districts due to the impact on build costs etc.
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 48	Yes. The target probably will need to vary over the period of the plan as experience and expectation confirm that more can be achieved. However, it is important that the target does not become the only mechanism - in accordance with the Energy Hierarchy the first step should not be the use of renewable energy but a reduction in the need for energy overall - accordingly schemes that include very high standards of energy efficiency and conservation might justify having a lower target in respect of the proportion of energy to be generated from renewable resources.
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 48	This may be acceptable, but it needs to be used with caution on a site by site basis to take into account specific site constraints.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 49	Identify specific areas
Miss Amy Steer	Planner North Kesteven D C		Question 49	Bassetlaw should consider a wind power based policy due to the scale and contentious nature of these developments.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 49	Specific areas are difficult to substantiate for the regional level footloose technologies, especially biomass and onshore wind schemes that are prevalent in North Nottinghamshire and are likely to provide most capacity in future. It will be important to incorporate the requirement for a high level of energy efficiency and planning-led low carbon energy generation in development briefs & masterplans for major development sites. PPS22 indicates in sections 1, 6 15, and 17 that policies in local development documents are expected to set criteria for assessing the relative merits of planning applications for renewable energy projects. The District Council is advised to refer to chapter 4 of the PPS22 Companion Guide (esp pages 43-45) and to expand upon the policy approach in the approved Regional Plan. It is recommended that criteria should include cumulative landscape impact, taking into account any associated transmission lines, buildings and access roads, installation of a decentralised grid and reinstatement of land to original use when operations cease. Where locations/areas for renewable energy sources/schemes are contemplated in accordance with PPS1 Supplement (see para 20), the District Council should consider preparing a supplementary planning document. Nottinghamshire County Council Q49
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 49	A criteria based policy should be developed. The potential types and locations for renewable energy schemes are likely to be very diverse and not easily 'captured' by a location-based policy in the LDF.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 49	A criteria-based policy should be adopted for the determination of renewable energy schemes to assess the potential impact of schemes on wildlife sites and protected species, and is usually conducted at present by seeking scoping opinions, a scoping report and an Environmental Impact Analysis, if required. As part of a Green Infrastructure Study specific areas could be identified for appropriate types of renewable energy schemes. This would have the advantage of giving greater clarity on where such schemes could be located in the future and give a strategic approach that can examine the possibility of combined impacts at an early stage and avoid opportunistic applications in suitable sites.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 49	Generally the need to achieve renewable energy schemes consistent with Government guidance is welcomed and it would probably be inappropriate at this stage to identify particular locations particularly since it is quite conceivable that some of these will be linked to areas of major growth. Many developers, to achieve compliance with the code for sustainable homes, etc., are looking at renewable schemes linked to residential and other forms of development. This should be encouraged to create sustainable communities and to make best use of resources. It will be inappropriate, for example, to specifically legislate for bio digester plants/biomass where there could be benefits by the use of CHP or similar plants to make use of the heat that is generated. This could service employment and to an extent housing schemes linked to these projects.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 49	Generally the need to achieve renewable energy schemes consistent with Government guidance is welcomed and it would probably be inappropriate at this stage to identify particular locations particularly since it is quite conceivable that some of these will be linked to areas of major growth. Many developers, to achieve compliance with the code for sustainable homes, etc., are looking at renewable schemes linked to residential and other forms of development. This should be encouraged to create sustainable communities and to make best use of resources. It will be inappropriate, for example, to specifically legislate for bio digester plants/biomass where there could be benefits by the use of CHP or similar plants to make use of the heat that is generated. This could service employment and to an extent housing schemes linked to these projects.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 49	English Heritage has produced a range of documents relating to climate change matters, including wind farms, micro-generation and energy efficiency. They can be found online at www.helm.org.uk/climatechange . They underline the impacts climate change can have on the historic environment, and how the historic environment can help combat climate change issues. English Heritage recognises the need to take action to mitigate and respond to the impacts of climate change; however, poorly considered policies for adaptation and mitigation can have potentially a damaging effect on historic buildings, sites and landscapes. In addition, English Heritage has developed a technical website for use by householders on climate change and energy conservation and is commissioning research on the energy efficiency of traditional buildings; the website includes the finding of research with reference to windows: http://www.climatechangeandyourhome.org.uk . We understand that the Government will shortly carry out a consultation on climate change and it is our intention to review our policy statement on wind energy following this. We would support a criteria-based policy. The protection of heritage assets and their setting (including matters such as protecting key views from designed landscapes) should be one of the criteria. The assessment of proposals should take into account the significance of the assets and the magnitude of the impact, in line with the draft PPS 15.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 49	RENEWABLE ENERGY SCHEMES SHOULD BE IN THE WEST AND NORTH OF THE DISTRICT, WHICH IS WINDIER AND HAS NO GENERATION CAPACITY AT PRESENT. NO RENEWABLE ENERGY SCHEMES IN THE RURAL TRENT VALLEY WHICH HAS AN ABUNDANCE OF ENERGY PRODUCERS
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 49	A two handed approach is preferable - i.e. some guidance on suitable locations for different forms of renewable, e.g. for wind so that obvious inappropriate locations (too close to houses, inadequate wind speed) are sieved out; together with an appropriate criteria approach that is consistent with PPS22 and RSS, in particular so that designated sites and their wider settings are appropriately safeguarded.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 50	Don't Know
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 50	There is a big role for all these players in delivering renewable energy, as well as those providing infrastructure. Importantly, the emergence of Energy Service Companies (ESCos) should be recognised and endorsed for more complex development schemes. Nottinghamshire County Council Q50
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 50	All can play a role in facilitating such developments. It would not appear that a specific policy referring to their role is however required within the Core Strategy.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
William Davis			Question 50	We consider that all the relevant groups mentioned in question 50 should play an active role in delivering renewable and low carbon energy. The key element to this will be a thorough consultation process throughout the formulation of the LDF to ensure that all interested stakeholders can have their say on proposed climate change and renewable energy policies. It is the role of the council to produce a robust and credible evidence base supporting any policy requirement they seek to establish and through the consultation process this policy requirement will be thoroughly tested and commented upon by the stakeholders and interested parties likely to deliver such a policy. This approach would be consistent with the guidelines established in the supplement to PPS1 noted in our response to question 48.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 50	It will be important and there will inevitably need to be encouragement for joint ventures/partnerships to ensure that stakeholders have a role to play in delivering renewable and low carbon energy. This would be of particular interest to the economic department of the Council and it is something they should be encouraging.
Mr Tom Garnett	Energy Review		Question 50	LPA can play a significant role as outlined in Qu 48 above, as well as introducing minimum BREEAM "Very Good" requirements for new build commercial uses.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 50	It will be important and there will inevitably need to be encouragement for joint ventures/partnerships to ensure that stakeholders have a role to play in delivering renewable and low carbon energy. This would be of particular interest to the economic department of the Council and it is something they should be encouraging.
Paul Tame	National Farmers Union		Question 50	Farms can be self-sufficient in renewable energy and contribute some back to the grid. Farm building rooves can house solar panels, there is plenty of scope for wind turbines of a size the planning authority will allow, and biomass and biofuels, together with anaerobic digesters using farm livestock and/or crop waste as a feedstock. The local authority can encourage this by not ruling farm renewables out with a restrictive planning policy.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 50	No comment
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 50	Everyone has a role to play as this issue relates to all new building work, conversions and retro-fitting. The local authority needs to ensure that appropriate policies are in place and advice is available.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 51	Don't Know

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Stephen Gaines	Peel Airports Limited		Question 51	Proposals for renewable energy include wind turbine developments that may effect the safe operation of an airport. Green infrastructure may also increase the risk to aircraft of bird strike hazard by encouraging roosting by large flock forming birds. These issues should be addressed in the Core Strategy and other Development Plan Documents and are discussed further below. RHADS is a 'safeguarded' airport, which means; e.g. that it must be consulted by the local planning authority on proposals for the erection of tall structures that could affect aircraft movements. The Joint ODPM/DfT Circular 1/2003 (Safeguarding Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosive Storage Areas, Annex 2) identifies the arrangements for safeguarding aerodromes: "Certain civil airports selected on the basis of their importance to the national air transport system, are...officially safeguarded, in order to ensure that their operation and development are not inhibited by buildings, structures, erections or works which infringe protected surfaces, obscure runway approach lights or have the potential to impair the performance of aerodrome navigation aids, radio aids or telecommunications systems; by lighting which has the potential to distract pilots, or by developments which have the potential to increase the number of birds or bird hazard risk." The Airport works with adjacent local planning authorities to ensure that RHADS is properly safeguarded. Safeguarded areas for bird hazard extend for a 13 km radius of an airport and 30 km for wind turbine development. RHADS safeguarding maps include parts of the local authority area of Bassetlaw. The Circular identifies the requirement for local planning authorities to consult an airport operator in respect of development that may affect aerodrome safeguarding. The Circular states that Development Plans should: "include a policy stating that officially safeguarded areas have been established for a particular airport, that certain planning applications will be the subject of consultation with the operator of that aerodrome and that there may be restrictions on the height or detailed design of buildings or on development which might create bird hazard." The Circular further advises local planning authorities that the outer boundaries of the safeguarded areas should also be shown on their proposals maps. The Airport considers wind farm development in its vicinity in line with 'CAP 764: CAA Policy and Guidelines on Wind Turbines', and will respond to consultations on such schemes according to the likely effect on operations, including effects on radar performance. Also considered are all proposed developments within the 13 km bird hazard safeguarding zone that have the potential to attract large flock forming birds, in accordance with 'CAP 738 Safeguarding of Aerodromes' and CAP 772 Bird Strike Management for Aerodromes'. Such developments may include landfill operations and areas of open water. Copies of the safeguarding map for RHADS, showing its consultation zones, are available on request.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 51	A policy approach to climate change adaptation should be progressed, especially in order to identify vulnerable areas. Nottinghamshire County Council Q51
Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways		Question 51	'Inland waterways are supporting climate change, carbon reduction and environmental sustainability initiatives by: Assisting in the mitigation of flood risk Playing a role in urban cooling Providing sustainable transport Providing biodiversity and forming ecological corridors; and Contributing to regional and local renewable energy targets through onshore hydro electric power, and the use of canal water for heating and cooling buildings'(TCPA Policy Advice Note: Inland Waterways: Unlocking the potential and securing the future of inland waterways through the planning system (2009)). . The role that waterways can play should be recognised and supported, as appropriate, through the policy framework.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 51	The Core Strategy and subsequent LDF documents should avoid unnecessary complexity.
Ms Caroline Harrison	Planning and Biodiversity Officer Natural England		Question 51	The Council can prepare for the consequences of climate change by protecting the integrity of natural systems and processes including river systems and allowing for habitat and landscape change. By identifying a long term vision for GI across the District and delivering a network of greenspace on the ground fragmented habitats will begin to be rehabilitated and restored creating green corridors that will allow wildlife to flourish and adapt to climate change. The aim should be to maintain a healthy natural environment and create new landscapes that are resilient in the face of climate change, providing homes for people and for nature. There is a need to support renewable and clean energy developments in appropriate locations in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. In some locations, micro and community scale energy generation schemes will be highly effective with minimal impacts on the environment and we consider the guidance should offer support and encouragement for such schemes to be progressed.
Miss Claire Whittaker	Assistant Planner DPP		Question 51	In response to climate change, a strategic objective of Bassetlaw District Council is to help reduce the District's eco and carbon footprint. The Council seeks to establish a set target for the level of decentralised and renewable or low carbon generation to be achieved in the District by 2020. This response to reduce resource efficiency has led to the Council seeking further comments on what the targets for carbon reduction should be. Given the national and regional policy for renewable energy generation, we recommend against a proposal that would see the increase of thresholds beyond that of the East Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) which is set at 20%. We would also recommend against the need for additional targets within the Core Strategy, as this is sufficiently covered by national and regional policy such as PPS1 'Planning and Climate Change Supplement', PPS22 'Renewable Energy' and the RSS.
Environment Agency	Environment Agency		Question 51	Reducing, re-using and recycling waste and minimising disposal to landfill (and treating waste as a resource) are important climate change mitigation measures. Please refer to our General Comments and response to questions 1-3.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Environment Agency	Environment Agency		Question 51	The issues in this section focus on encouraging renewable energy and reducing CO2 emissions. From a water resources point of view I would like the Core Strategy to also focus on water conservation climate change adaptation features. The Environment Agency recently commissioned work to demonstrate the potential impact of climate change on river flows across England and Wales by the 2050s, using the medium-high UKCIP02 scenario. The results suggest that river flow will halve in the summer months with some areas (including the East Midlands) seeing a possible decrease of up to 80%. Flows in the winter months could rise by up to 15%. The study suggests that although we will have wetter winters, they could be shorter and that our drier summers could be longer. When combined with increased temperatures- and hence increased evaporation, this could reduce total annual river flow by up to 15%. We have also considered how climate change may affect groundwater. By 2025, it is likely that overall recharge to aquifers will decrease, river flows fed by groundwater will decrease and that there will be a general lowering of groundwater levels, with a more marked reduction further away from rivers. Further information on this work can be found on the Environment Agency Water Resource Strategy for England and Wales (March 2009). In light of the above and the UKCP09 research one of the Environment Agency's highest priorities in adapting to climate change is to reduce demand for water in order to manage our reliance on this vulnerable and uncertain natural resource. This is also of particular importance in Bassetlaw District which is mainly situated within the Idle and Torne Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy (CAMS) area. The resource status within this CAMS area has been assessed as either no water available or overabstracted and the abstraction licensing policy is that there is a presumption against the issuing of any new abstraction licence unless it is of net environmental gain. The Core Strategy should encourage development which utilises design and layout which supports adaptation to climate change, such as SuDS, rainwater harvesting and storage and grey water recycling. The Code for Sustainable Homes has water consumption targets as well as energy targets and the Environment Agency would request that any new homes built before 2016 must achieve the 'water efficiency component' of level 3/4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes (as a minimum). For those built after 2016 the EA would expect code level 5/6 as a minimum (for the water efficiency components). For non-residential buildings the developers should also demonstrate that they have considered water efficiency and conservation in the design and maintenance of the buildings. Where standards currently exist for a particular building type, the developers should aim for BREAM Very Good or Excellent standards and we would request that maximum points are scored on water. It is also important that more is done to make sure that existing buildings use water efficiently, as two thirds of the dwellings that will be in use in the UK in 2050 already exist. There the principle of
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 51	Not at this stage.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 51	Not at this stage.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Ms Ursilla Spence	Nottinghamshire County Council		Question 51	Sites proposed for development for renewable energy schemes can often have an impact upon the historic environment; either upon the setting of listed buildings, conservation areas, parks and gardens or significant archaeological remains, or, more directly, upon buried archaeological remains. While the contents of the supplement to PPS 1 are appreciated, the sustainability of renewable energy projects are questionable if they patently will damage or destroy significant parts of the historic environment. Issues around the historic environment therefore require careful consideration when proposals for renewable energy schemes, such as windfarms, are being developed. Applicants should be encouraged to take these issues fully into account at the design stage.
Mrs Jennifer Kirk	Clerk to Headon-cum-Upton, Grove and Stokeham Parish Council		Question 51	The Council believe that there should be a policy whereby planning permission for new homes would only be given if they include some energy efficiency measures, which are much cheaper as part of a new build than for existing properties eg solar panels, ground source heating.
Mrs A Haddon	Clerk to Mattersey Parish Council Mattersey Parish Council		Question 51	Climate Change - We believe that the Council should set out additional standards for design especially on issues such as insulation. This should require any alteration to a building under a planning application meet a minimum standard for the whole property not just the extension. The District Council has the ability to minimize the use of energy through Development Control and application of Building Standards which would have a far greater effect on Climate Change than allowing the development of renewable energy schemes.
Mr. David Wright	Clerk to the Council Everton Parish Council		Question 51	Renewable energy - Are the high levels of CO2 in the district due to the A1 corridor and the power stations rather than from domestic power consumption or emissions?
Mr Owen Walters	Highways Agency		Question 51	Transport is a significant contributor to climate change and this has been recognised and reflected in the Department for Transport's White Paper on Delivering a Sustainable Transport System produced in November 2008. The Agency would encourage the authority to take this into account within the Core Strategy and include policies to promote more sustainable forms of travel such as public transport, walking and cycling, and reducing the need to travel. Whilst it is encouraging that these concerns are reflected in terms of protecting the environment and energy, the Strategy may align more closely with national policy with further reference to the contribution of transport to climate change.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 51	No
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 51	The application of Part L to existing housing stock has the potential to damage the historic character of the district's designated and undesignated built heritage. The authority should consider issuing guidance for home owners and developers to assist with choices regarding appropriate improvements to existing historic building stock. Such guidance could include advice regarding the use of wooden window frames and secondary glazing in place of PVC-U and other less 'green' solutions.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Leslie Morris	Land & Development Team National Grid		Question 51	The Energy White Paper makes clear that UK energy systems will undergo a significant change over the next 20 years. To meet the goals of the white paper it will be necessary to revise and update much of the UK's energy infrastructure during this period. There will be a requirement for: An expansion of national infrastructure (e.g. overhead power lines, underground cables, extending substations, new gas pipelines and associated installations). New forms of infrastructure (e.g. smaller scale distributed generation, gas storage sites). Our gas and electricity infrastructure is sited across the country and many stakeholders and communities have an interest in our activities. We believe our long-term success is based on having a constructive and sustainable relationship with our stakeholders. Our transmission pipelines and overhead lines were originally routed in consultation with local planning authorities and designed to avoid major development areas but since installation much development may have taken place near our routes. We therefore wish to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of Development Plan Documents (DPDs) which may affect our assets including policies and plans relating to the following issues: Any policies relating to overhead transmission lines, underground cables or gas pipeline installations Site specific allocations/land use policies affecting sites crossed by overhead lines, underground cables or gas transmission pipelines Land use policies/development proposed adjacent to existing high voltage electricity substation sites and gas above ground installations. Any policies relating to the diverting or undergrounding of overhead transmission lines Other policies relating to infrastructure or utility provision Policies relating to development in the countryside Landscape policies Waste and mineral plans In addition, we also want to be consulted by developers and local authorities on planning applications, which may affect our assets and are happy to provide pre-application advice. Our aim in this is to ensure that the safe and secure transportation of electricity and gas is not compromised.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 52	Yes
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 52	All aspects as stated here should be treated sympathetically.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 52	Yes, the Issues and Options paper sets out the issues clearly. However, criteria need careful wording. In particular, farm diversification describes only the former use (i.e. farming) and does not, in itself, justify any proposal. What uses the farm diversifies into must be carefully controlled, as it is the impact of the end use that is more important than the diversification in itself. Similarly, recreation and tourism development can cover a very wide variety of developments and is not justification in itself to override the presumption against development. Specific locational reasons should be present to justify development in the countryside. For recreation the link and association with Green Infrastructure gaps or opportunities may be critical. The County Council would be willing to assist the District in developing criteria, but would not offer any in this response. Nottinghamshire County Council Q52

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways		Question 52	In response to question 7 we identified the inherent constraint of the waterways - they are non-footloose assets i.e. their location and alignment are fixed. Any criteria based policy needs to reflect PPS7, para 35 ii) which provides for "appropriate facilities needed to enhance visitors' enjoyment, and/or improve the financial viability, of a particular countryside feature or attraction, providing they will not detract from the attractiveness or importance of the feature, or the surrounding countryside" and the guidance in the Good Practice Guide on Tourism.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 52	If the criteria provided greater clarity and certainty to landowners and developers, and are not inconsistent with higher level policy and guidance, yes.
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 52	Yes, there should be a criteria-based policy that sets out the issues that should be taken into consideration when assessing applications for the types of rural development listed. The criteria should ensure that the development brings a benefit and does not have a negative impact on wildlife sites or protected species (as stated in PPS7); causes fragmentation or isolation of natural green spaces; does not detract from landscape character (as stated in PPS7); and does not reduce natural floodplain capacity. These issues could be addressed through a SPD.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 52	No comment.
Paul Tame	National Farmers Union		Question 52	By all means have a criteria based policy for all four bullet points but do not make it restrictive. The activities mentioned in these bullet points need to be encouraged. The policy(ies) does not want to be worded in such a way that leads to most projects being ruled out by the planners.
mr keith buxton			Question 52	Yes - protection of rural environment must be given priority.
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 52	Again, we would support a criteria-based approach including reference to the protection of heritage assets. We have produced a number of guidance documents about the reuse of traditional rural/farm buildings that can be found on www.helm.org.uk .
Mrs Jennifer Kirk	Clerk to Headon-cum-Upton, Grove and Stokeham Parish Council		Question 52	The criteria for development of such buildings should be where the use of such buildings replaces previously derelict and unused properties and which would enhance and improve the appearance of the property within the surrounding village.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 52	#NAME?
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 52	Yes
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 52	Yes. Generally the criteria should ensure that there is an essential need - e.g. to support an existing valued enterprise - not solely agriculture or forestry but also other uses appropriate to and located in the rural areas, including tourism. The key test should be that the landscape character of the rural areas is maintained and preferably enhanced. The scale of development needs to be appropriate not only to the need identified but also to the character (built and landscape) of the property/site.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 52	Criteria based policies should include the impact of the proposed rural development on the character and integrity of the local built historic environment. Opportunities to reuse redundant and dilapidated historic rural buildings with appropriate non-domestic uses will protect the local distinctiveness of the area and help promote rural tourism. Holiday let developments have the potential to protect heritage (both buildings and landscape) through the promotion of tourism and farm viability. Highway development associated with intensification and change of use should not be allowed to damage the rural character of farms and the surrounding countryside.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 53	Yes
Mrs Brenda Wilson			Question 53	Yes-sustainability in agriculture with strong emphasis on local sourcing and minimal travel e.g. food cooperatives supplying schools and households rather than imports.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 53	Proposals linked to renewable energy production and affordable housing, agri-businesses linked to farming, but not needing a farm location. Nottinghamshire County Council Q53
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 53	No comment.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 53	In accordance with Planning Policy Statement 7, recognition towards the ability for the rural locations to provide facilities for outdoor sport and recreation and this should be given greater emphasis in the policies within the Core Strategy. In many instances, urban locations are not suitable for outdoor sports, and therefore the ability for supporting development within rural locations needs to be accommodated in order to maximise the sporting opportunities available within the district.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 53	No
Mr George	Laneham Parish Council		Question 53	We understand that an area of Church Laneham, Manor Farm, has been designated an Industrial Area. the approaches to the site are narrow with narrow bridges on both approaches. Therefore, this site is only suitable for cottage industries.
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 53	A number of rural activities have an educational element to them and appropriate development to meet educational needs on individual sites should be favourably considered subject to complying with other relevant criteria such as those set out in response to Q.52 above.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 54	No comment.
Mrs A Haddon	Clerk to Mattersey Parish Council Mattersey Parish Council		Question 54	Rural Development - Appropriate development in rural communities which are sensitive to the existing environment in terms of noise, vehicle movements, etc could be suitable but only after real consultation with local people whose opinions should override local or national planning policies, i.e. almost a local referendum.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 54	No comment
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 54	Yes. Generally the criteria should ensure that there is an essential need - e.g. to support an existing valued enterprise - not solely agriculture or forestry but also other uses appropriate to and located in the rural areas, including tourism. The key test should be that the landscape character of the rural areas is maintained and preferably enhanced. The scale of development needs to be appropriate not only to the need identified but also to the character (built and landscape) of the property/site.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 55	The Core Strategy and subsequent LDF documents should avoid unnecessary complexity.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 55	No comment.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 55	No
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 55	Bassetlaw has a high number of listed and unprotected historic farm buildings. Of these, a high number are in a state of dereliction. Appropriate non-domestic reuse of these buildings will protect the important heritage of the district.
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 56	No-not feasible.
Mrs Brenda Wilson			Question 56	Yes-definitely. Previous approvals have seen gross developments in some areas.
Mr John R Holland			Question 56	Yes. A Victorian garden is still viable, even though it may not be to the current owner. Clumber House was demolished in the 1930s because the Duke couldn't see that anybody could still live like that - now we are having multi million pound mansions built. A large house usually requires a large garden - building on the garden tends to make the house unsuitable for continued use as a house.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 56	No. Each proposal should be considered on its merits.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 56	No comment.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 56	It is not considered that a policy which prevents backland development or infill development per se would be appropriate and certainly would not be reflective upon National Guidance. Whilst in certain instances backland and infill development may not be appropriate, this should be judged on a site-by-site basis. Precluding all backland and infill development is likely to result in the local planning authority sterilising development opportunities for appropriate sites which have the ability to deliver development in a sustainable and appropriate manner.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 56	No
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 56	No to both Qs. 56 and 57 - the appropriateness of such development needs testing in terms of the individual circumstances of each case, including the size of the backland area available, its relationship to surrounding properties, the use of surrounding properties and the character of the surrounding area. A criteria based approach that picks up these matters is the most appropriate.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 57	No
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 57	No. Each proposal should be considered on its merits.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 57	No comment.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 57	It is not appropriate that all applications for backland and infill development are automatically approved and as outlined in response to question 56 above, it is necessary to assess all applications on a case-by-case, site-by-site basis having regard to normal development control criteria. A policy which seeks to preclude or permit backland and infill development is not considered suitable and in accordance with PPS1 and PPS3 local planning authorities should instead be seeking to promote good quality design and making efficient and effective use of land.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 57	No
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 57	No to both Qs. 56 and 57 - the appropriateness of such development needs testing in terms of the individual circumstances of each case, including the size of the backland area available, its relationship to surrounding properties, the use of surrounding properties and the character of the surrounding area. A criteria based approach that picks up these matters is the most appropriate.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 58	Yes
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 58	Judge each case by its merits and feasibility.
Mr David Brown	Merry Vale Development		Question 58	Each proposal should be assessed on its merit taking into account local character; traffic and visual impact; need and demand; scale and density.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 58	Yes, applications should be assessed against a set of criteria which may include, for example:- Does the scale, design and proposed materials blend in with the local vernacular style? Also see response below to question 66. Nottinghamshire County Council Q58
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 58	Yes. Each proposal should be considered on its merits.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 58	No comment.
Mr PG Hills	Clerk to Tuxford Town Council Tuxford Parish Council		Question 58	Each proposal should be assessed on its merits taking into account local character; traffic and visual impact; need and demand; scale and density.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 58	A policy that assesses backland and infill development applications against a set of criteria may be a more appropriate way forward than that outlined within questions 56 and 57. Criteria that such a policy may include should be in accordance with issues identified in paragraph 6.25 of the Core Strategies Issues and Options Consultation including factors such as whether a loss of amenity occurs, noise impact, loss of green space, loss of parking etc.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 58	As highlighted in paragraph 6.26, backland and infill development, including gardens, can have an adverse impact on an area's character, especially where it results in the loss of existing large properties. There may be a strong case for resisting this type of development, particularly backland development, where it results in the loss of gardens and demolition. Conservation Area Appraisals provide a tool for identifying sensitive areas and can inform where infill development might be appropriate. Village Design Statements may also be useful. Clearly, it is areas outside conservation areas that are most vulnerable, such as areas of Victorian and Edwardian suburbs. English Heritage published advice on planning and managing change in suburbs in 2007: Suburbs and the Historic Environment can be downloaded from www.helm.org.uk . It may be, therefore, that a criteria-based approach could achieve the desired effect of resisting unacceptable development. It would need to include criteria relating to the retention of larger properties and gardens and for decisions on the appropriateness of infill development to be based upon an understanding of how the site contributes to the character of the area and whether development would harm this character.
Mrs Jennifer Kirk	Clerk to Headon-cum-Upton, Grove and Stokeham Parish Council		Question 58	The council agree with such a policy. Criteria should be where the development would improve the look of the property. Density of building in keeping with the area. Development in keeping with local Parish plan. Design in keeping with Village Design statement. Restrictions on the size of the infill site to be considered.
Mr Philip CABLE			Question 58	Yes, within the traditional scope of village envelopes and in line with character and appearance criteria.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 58	Yes
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 58	Yes. Assessment criteria should focus heavily on the impact of the proposals on local distinctiveness and historic character of the district's villages and towns.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 59	No
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 59	Allow minor development on edge of villages rather than so much infill-not such a tight village envelope.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 59	The Core Strategy and subsequent LDF documents should avoid unnecessary complexity.
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 59	Access to local green space needs to be considered when managing the impact of infill development (see Natural England's guidelines given in the answer to Question 70).
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 59	No comment.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Ms Ursilla Spence	Nottinghamshire County Council		Question 59	As noted above, many property plots within the cores of historic towns or villages in the District are Medieval in origin, and as such can contain archaeological deposits which provide valuable information about the life of the settlement over the centuries. In many cases, the way in which the property plots were originally laid out provides a patterning of spaces and structures that is appreciable to the present, and is often fundamental to the settlement's sense of place. One may think of the number of villages where the historic core comprises houses with a narrow frontage to the main road, and long thin back plots at right angles to the main road (eg Clarborough, Hayton). Such plots follow the layout of the Medieval open fields. They provide a rhythm to settlements which can easily be disturbed by the layout and access arrangements of unsympathetic infill development. The villages of Bassetlaw have a range of plan forms, and sensitive infill development would probably be much assisted by the incorporation of historic characterisation into village design statements.
Mrs A Haddon	Clerk to Mattersey Parish Council Mattersey Parish Council		Question 59	Excessive backland and infill development has occurred reducing the quality and amenity of property in our community. It also has the effect of reducing the number of larger houses with amenities available in the market forcing more affluent families out of the area with the loss of their spending power within our community. This type of development should only occur where the local community are in support. We support the idea of Village Design Statements which would support development but in a suitably controlled way. Development should only be allowed where there is already adequate drainage, sewerage and no reasonable flood risk. If there is insufficient drainage or sewerage then the developer should be required to contribute to such facilities directly and not to a general fund.
Mr. David Wright	Clerk to the Council Everton Parish Council		Question 59	Backland and Infill Development - Consider that backland developments are more intrusive into the character of the village than infill.
Mr Philip CABLE			Question 59	Open countryside around rural villages is a rural asset that requires protection even if privately owned. Blanket adoption of 'for agricultural use' requires policies to clarify.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 59	No
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 59	Note that Bassetlaw has a low level of designated conservation areas compared to extant historic cores (i.e. settlements with Medieval origins containing several historic buildings), more conservation area designations should be made to address this as a matter of priority (see Q2).
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 60	Development should be sympathetic to existing buildings
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 60	Defer to more knowledgeable organisations.
Mr John R Holland			Question 60	Historic assets must be protected as well as possible - we are only trustees for the generations who follow us. That does not mean preserving in aspic, so there will be change, but this must be sympathetic and reversible.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways		Question 60	'The built environment of the waterways represents a unique working heritage of industrial architecture, archaeology and engineering structures, and is a valuable part of the national heritage, as well as an integral part of regional and sub-regional cultural heritage and local distinctiveness. Inland waterways possess all the 'heritage values' as defined by English Heritage'. From BW's perspective 'the key issues relate to appraising and sustaining waterway character and distinctiveness, and the potential impact of major infrastructure projects upon the structural integrity, environment and character of inland waterways'. (TCPA Policy Advice Note: Inland Waterways: Unlocking the potential and securing the future of inland waterways through the planning system (2009)).
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 60	The existence of an archaeological resource, for example, should not be an automatic barrier to development of a site (and potential consequential loss of the archaeological resource), as long as that resource is first investigated and recorded.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 60	No comment.
Ms Ursilla Spence	Nottinghamshire County Council		Question 60	The coverage of archaeological issues in this section is limited to mention of PPG 16 and scheduled monuments. The vast majority of known archaeological remains in the District are buried, invisible and unscheduled. How many archaeological sites are as yet unknown is unknowable but we may well yet have only 50% of the total (some 3776 entries are currently recorded from the district on the Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Record). There are other less obvious parts of the historic landscape worthy of policy consideration, these include historic parks and gardens which are not registered, and remaining blocks of ridge and furrow (the remnants of medieval ploughing, now in Bassetlaw often only surviving close to village cores and therefore often at risk from development). Consideration therefore needs to be given to policy protection of both known and unknown archaeological assets. The draft PPS puts emphasis on the use of the HER to advise on known assets both archaeological and built heritage, before advising developers to take appropriate expert advice on potential issues, which might include as yet unappreciated heritage assets or features. Such advice would be gained from the District's own conservation officers, and for archaeological issues, the County archaeology service. Finally it would be helpful if the management and mitigation of heritage assets affected by proposed development could be addressed. What information might an applicant be expected to provide, and how might mitigation be achieved where damage or loss of a heritage asset will arise as a result of development? It would be helpful if the stages of addressing heritage issues were outlined in policies and their supporting statements.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 60	<p>The English Heritage Regional Planners have had discussions with the Planning Inspectorate, Government Offices and the CLG about how the historic environment should be addressed in core strategies. These discussions are informing the development of English Heritage guidance on core strategies and the historic environment, which, together with guidance on SEA/SA and characterisation, should be available on the Historic Environment - Local Management website (www.helm.org.uk) by next year. A policy covering the historic environment should address not only those areas, sites and buildings with statutory protection, but also those which are locally valued and important, as well as the landscape and townscape components of the historic environment. This would include undesignated archaeology and the area's industrial/mining heritage. We recognise the need not to repeat national policy, but consider that the core strategy should set out a vision and strategy for the management of the area's historic environment. Thus, the importance of the historic environment should be reflected in the spatial portrait, the vision and spatial objectives. A core policy should be derived from a strategy for the historic environment and address its delivery, as well as providing a hook for associated DPDs/ SPDs, including the development management policies. The policy should address the historic environment from a local perspective, for example: - by highlighting those aspects of the historic environment which are considered to contribute to the distinct identity of the area and indicating how they will be safeguarded or enhanced; - indicating how threats to historic assets in the area will be managed, e.g. major development or renewable energy installations (including any associated infrastructure), - considering how 'at risk' assets might be addressed, and - identifying opportunities for enhancement and local benefits associated with the historic environment, by indicating how it will be used to assist in the delivery of other spatial objectives, e.g. green infrastructure, regeneration schemes and tourism.</p>
Mr. David Wright	Clerk to the Council Everton Parish Council		Question 60	<p>Want to protect the historic elements of the village Allowing large extensions of small properties is changing the built character of the village and resulting in fewer small houses available for people to buy in Everton. Three-storey houses should not be built in rural communities, unless appropriate to the surrounding character; villages need smaller houses to get a better mix of house types in the village.</p>
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 60	No comment
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 60	<p>Need to ensure that the character of individual buildings and wider historically important areas is safeguarded and enhanced - particular consideration needs to be given to impacts upon the wider settings of designated assets (as per PPG15/16 - PPS15 shortly, and the requirements of RSS). All relevant building elements such as form, mass, details, materials etc need to be considered, but related features such as boundary treatments, landscaping/trees, open spaces and the overall pattern of development are also important. For major historic assets designed landscapes - including wider vistas, for example into 'borrowed' landscapes - need especially careful attention.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 60	Factors to consider: Climate change related damage to heritage assets and potential impact of adaptations on local distinctiveness and character - PPS15 and Part L will increase pressure for change that may provide short-term benefits but at a cost to long-term sustainable management of these assets. This should be addressed through guidance. The wider social, cultural, economic and environmental value of the heritage of the district and the potential for this to be greatly enhanced. The high levels of Buildings At Risk in the district reflecting the threats to the area's heritage but also potential for heritage focused regeneration to significantly impact on economic growth, tourism, rural diversification and sustainability. The existing health benefits (physical, intellectual and mental health) of access to the heritage of the area. The potential future health benefits for communities of the district derived from greater appreciation, celebration, protection and enhancement of the district's heritage.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 61	Yes
Mr John R Holland			Question 61	Yes. This is a valuable tool to prevent demolition of locally significant buildings. The maltings on Eldon Street in Tuxford would fit into this category, as would some of the schools demolished in Retford. English Heritage lists protect things of national importance - not everything of significance has national importance.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 61	No comment.
Ms Ursilla Spence	Nottinghamshire County Council		Question 61	Yes. PPS 15 encourages adoption of local interest lists, not least as a way of engaging community support for the protection of heritage assets. Supported by appropriate policies they have the potential to provide added protection for locally significant structures outside conservation areas. The criteria used to adopt local interest buildings would be worthy of consideration, as would the weight to be given to them in the planning process.
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 61	The identification of 'local interest' buildings and features would be in line with the draft PPS 15, so we would support a policy that addresses their conservation.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 61	Yes
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 61	Yes - if initial views are that there is a significant resource of such buildings in the District.
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 61	A local interest list for Bassetlaw already exists as part of the County Council held Historic Environment Record. A policy reflecting this is appropriate. Also in accordance with the proposals in the draft PPS15 development of local interest designations should be undertaken in conjunction with the county council HER to ensure that lists are complimentary and held mutually.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 62	Yes if of historical interest
Mrs Brenda Wilson			Question 62	Yes. Needs a seperate survey with agreed criteria to follow.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 62	No comment.
Ms Ursilla Spence	Nottinghamshire County Council		Question 62	Again yes. Bassetlaw has a high number of village cores which retain a distinctive heritage based character, but there are only about 20 conservation areas in total. A significant tool in the protection of the historic environment is being under-used.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 62	If additional conservation areas were to be designated, it is important that appropriate policies and sufficient resources are in place to protect and enhance their character and that of the existing conservation areas. The priority should be to ensure that all of the existing conservation areas have up-to-date (less than 5 years old) Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans, as these are important planning tools.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 62	No comment
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 62	Whilst it is important to ensure that Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans are prepared and reviewed for existing Conservation Areas, it is the case that consideration does need to be given to the merits of historically important but currently undesignated areas. In this regard the Trust is especially concerned about the lack of Conservation Area status for the Edwardian housing area in Worksop that contains and surrounds Mr. Straws House - a key tourist attraction within Bassetlaw's principal settlement. In particular the potential for new development that was inadequately controlled to adversely impact upon the wider setting, including the visitor approach, to the property is a source of concern, including in the light of developments that have been proposed or implemented in recent times. In this instance following up designation with an Article 4 Direction is considered to be warranted. The Trust would be pleased to discuss with the Council how this matter might be progressed and what assistance it could provide.
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 62	Yes. More conservation area designations are vital to the protection of the district's heritage, and Bassetlaw has a very low rate of designated conservation areas compared to its neighbours in Nottinghamshire (see table below). The list below indicates the village settlements that were in existence before the Victorian period and where there is potential for designation. In all cases post WWII development has eroded the local character, however, there remains sufficient value in designating conservation areas to prevent further erosion and potentially reverse the present condition to greatly benefit the district's local heritage and character. Refer to table showing the number of designated conservation areas and number of historic cores (pre-C19th) A list of the 91 settlements identified on the county council HER for Bassetlaw can be provided on request.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 63	
Mr John R Holland			Question 63	Article 4 directions should be used in conservation areas. That's the only way to stop things like plastic windows in Georgian and Victorian buildings. It should be district wide. The Thoroton Society wrote to the council in support of these earlier this year in connection with the English Heritage list of Conservation Areas at Risk [I have a copy of the letter and can forward it if you desire].
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 63	Any removal should relate to specific Conservation Areas only, based on up-to-date appraisal of the Conservation Area.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 63	No comment.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Ms Ursilla Spence	Nottinghamshire County Council		Question 63	Please note that the removal of some permitted development rights can be an extremely effective tool to protect sensitive buried archaeological remains, following development for instance of adjacent historic properties. It would be helpful if the possibility of article 4 directions being used to protect the historic environment in special circumstances could be covered in policy or supporting statements.
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 63	The 2009 Heritage at Risk register identifies two conservation areas in the District 'at risk' (in addition to the 15 asset entries), which is often because of the cumulative impact of small-scale changes; these are Tuxford and Worksop. We support the use of Article 4 Directions (especially if the Government's proposals are adopted and there is a relaxation of the current permitted development rights). However, you need to be aware of the resource implications.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 63	No
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 63	In the absence of up-to-date Conservation Area Appraisals for most conservation areas, it is advisable to take a precautionary approach to the preservation of existing and future designated conservation areas. In particular the erosive impacts of the following might be worthy of controlling through district wide Article 4 directions: Insertion of PVC-U windows and doors Installation of satellite dishes Changes to roof coverings and chimneys
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 64	Don't Know
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 64	No comments have been submitted on these questions (Historic Environment). However, it is recommended that contact be made with the Heritage team at County Council. Heather Stokes , Conservation Service Manager, based at Trent Bridge House - heather.stokes@nottscc.gov.uk Nottinghamshire County Council
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 64	The Core Strategy and subsequent LDF documents should avoid unnecessary complexity.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 64	No comment.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Ms Ursilla Spence	Nottinghamshire County Council		Question 64	There appears to be limited reference to the reuse and refurbishment of buildings as a potential means of protecting heritage assets. It is suggested that this needs addressing, with clear policy direction to support schemes for reuse and refurbishment of traditionally built buildings, particularly where proposals will meet other plan priorities, and also where such schemes might involve development which would not otherwise be permissible. Section 6.28 This reads oddly, with the first sentence apparently truncated by the first bullet point. PPGs 15 and 16 are currently the relevant documents covering the historic environment, but should some mention be made of the draft PPS15 which will subsume both? Or would it be worth redrafting the section to try and cover all eventualities? The potential for tourism was noted briefly, but nowhere considered in any detail. The historic environment of the District is one of its major potential tourism draws, and the development process needs to take this into account. It is felt this is a serious omission in the Core Strategy document. Any proposals to work on and increase the tourist potential of the District will be working in isolation, without strategic direction. Just one example is the HLF funded Trent Vale landscape project which will be working on heritage led tourism in the Trent floodplain over the next three years. Three years is little in the life of the planning process currently underway, nevertheless, it is likely to lead to expectations for such a strategy to be in place.
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 64	The authority should consider setting up a grant scheme for home owners of listed buildings, focusing on those that are 'at risk', offering funding, where appropriate, to off-set additional costs associated with conservation led repairs.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 65	Yes
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 65	Yes
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 65	Yes-developments should blend with local character of area. Village design statements by local people have recently been ignored to detriment of local communities.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 65	Yes, there should be a policy which addresses landscape character when considering development proposal, for the following reasons:- It would be in line with Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 1: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas; PPS 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas; and the East Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy, Policy 31 To protect the character of rural areas and ensure that appropriate development takes place in the right location To protect the most sensitive areas from inappropriate development To ensure that development is in keeping with the local environment in terms of design, scale, materials etc To ensure that any mitigation is in keeping with the local landscape character To guide new woodland and hedgerow planting and ensure that species are native and in keeping with the local character The recently completed "Bassetlaw Draft Landscape Character Assessment" should be used to guide development. The Landscape and Reclamation Team would be able to advise on criteria at the time of writing the policy. Nottinghamshire County Council Q65
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 65	Landscape character could be one criteria of many that may need to be considered.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 65	Landscape character could be one criteria of many that may need to be considered.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 65	Landscape character could be one criteria of many that may need to be considered.
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 65	PPS7 and Policy 31 of The East Midlands Regional Plan (2009) recommend that Local Authorities complete a Landscape character Assessment.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 65	Undoubtedly there will be the need to identify policies which protect where reasonably possible areas of higher landscape value and good quality landscape design must feature in all sustainable development.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 65	Undoubtedly there will be the need to identify policies which protect where reasonably possible areas of higher landscape value and good quality landscape design must feature in all sustainable development.
Paul Tame	National Farmers Union		Question 65	Do not use landscape character as an excuse to rule out development altogether in particular locations. Use it as a mechanism to allow development provided it complies with the guidelines that arise from the landscape character assessment.
Ms Ursilla Spence	Nottinghamshire County Council		Question 65	Yes. Characterisation of the landscape which includes time depth allows settlements, fields and farms to be put into a context that can form the basis of informed planning decisions, ensuring development respects landscape rather than being imposed upon it. Development which respects the plan form elements of settlements will inevitably be more in keeping than a standard site layout which could be representative of modern development from Berkshire to Berwick.
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 65	Historic Landscape Characterisation provides the understanding of the time depth of the landscape including the survival of historic landscapes and the development of the landscape over time. Taken together with the LCA, it provides a more complete understanding of the character of the area. We would support a policy that addresses landscape character.
Mr Philip CABLE			Question 65	Yes The balance of no supported infrastructure improvements is required to allow the continuing enjoyment of open spaces and rural countryside/fields
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 65	Yes
Mr Andy Kitchen	Pegasus Planning Group LLP		Question 65	Landscape character is an important consideration when assessing development proposals and indeed RSS policy 31 states that there should be criteria based policies in LDF's to ensure that development respects intrinsic character in rural and urban fringe areas. However, these need to take account of development proposals identified in the Core Strategy.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 65	<p>Yes, as set out in the introduction to this part of the consultation document (and indeed as expressed elsewhere in this response) Bassetlaw does have a very valuable landscape resource. As suggested in response to other questions it is considered that this is a key element in respect of the preparation, assessment and determination of development proposals in the District. It is therefore important that there is up to date information on landscape character and that it is used to inform planning proposals.</p> <p>Natural England's work on Tracking Landscape change has identified much of the District's landscape character as either 'neglected' or 'diverging' with only a comparatively modest part 'maintained'. This indicates a) that its landscapes generally do not accord with the aspirations for how they should be, and b) that the character of several areas is being transformed such that their distinctive qualities are being lost or significant new patterns are emerging. Clearly the Core Strategy needs to address these matters and ensure that valued characteristics are respected and reinforced.</p>
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 65	Landscape Character should be protected. It is important to note that the district contains several designated historic Parks and Gardens that are protected (reference to guidance in PPG15 should have been made around paragraph 6.30). Historic Landscape Characterisation project should also be referred to. The Historic dimension is a key element of all landscape character and is vitally important to large parts of the district. The setting of historic settlements (whether or not designated as conservation areas) should be protected.
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 65	Yes, as landscape character is clearly an important consideration, but this should not be used as a tool to prevent essential strategic development.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 66	Yes
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 66	Yes
Mrs Brenda Wilson			Question 66	Yes, but only if it is going to have credance with planners. Needs to be viable and realistic, but would definately curtain development of gardens.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 66	Yes, there should be a policy that addresses village character - to ensure that development within villages respects the local character in terms of design, scale and materials. The historic core of villages have a strong local character but where expansion has taken place a range of styles is often found - some of which appear out of place and with a suburban character out of keeping with a rural environment. New developments should seek to complement and harmonise with the local vernacular style. The County Council Historic Buildings section should be consulted regarding criteria. Nottinghamshire County Council Q66
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 66	Village Design Statements can be useful tools but must be subject to due statutory process if they are to be given weight in the decision making process.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 66	Generally this question seems to address just village character which generally we feel is inappropriate as it is not in many ways sustainable. If village development does take place then design statements would be appropriate although we would question the need for individual villages to be addressed at this stage. A general overriding policy would be appropriate.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Walker East Markham Walker East Markham	Ian Baseley associates		Question 66	We are of the view that it would be appropriate to develop a policy that addresses village character but that any such policy should accord with the allocation of land for new housing in villages, both affordable and market housing. National policy has resulted in a "town cramming" approach to housing development which has seen the gradual but notable erosion of the character and quality of villages, both in Bassetlaw and other districts. It would therefore be most effective to allocate sites in (Local and Rural Service Centre) villages that would not erode their existing character and appearance, for example by identifying sites that are close to but sufficiently removed from village centres to protect their character and appearance.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 66	Generally this question seems to address just village character which generally we feel is inappropriate as it is not in many ways sustainable. If village development does take place then design statements would be appropriate although we would question the need for individual villages to be addressed at this stage. A general overriding policy would be appropriate.
Ms Ursilla Spence	Nottinghamshire County Council		Question 66	Yes. The concept of village design statements is fully supported particularly if this empowers individual communities to become involved with their preparation. Communities may need professional support to undertake such work, but the results have a real value that can assist planning authorities to make good planning decisions that have community support. From the archaeological viewpoint, plan form analysis of settlements is a good starting point, along with the recognition of important buildings, structures, open areas, known archaeological features, and the sites (if they no longer exist) of standard village structures such as wells, mills, pinfolds, smithies, to name but a few.
Mrs Jennifer Kirk	Clerk to Headon-cum-Upton, Grove and Stokeham Parish Council		Question 66	The council strongly agree with this. The properties should reflect the local Village design statement/ Parish plan, following traditional styles of architecture and orientation where possible. To ensure development does not permit building of properties that would spoil the existing character of the villages. To restrict the density of buildings.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 66	The Parish Council believe that Village Design Statements should be encouraged and given weight to decisions regarding planning design.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 66	Yes
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 66	Again, we would support the inclusion of a policy that addresses village character, but also suggest that it should also address urban character. This would reflect the European Landscape Convention that relates to urban as well as rural landscape. In both cases, Conservation Area Appraisals as well as other types of characterization would be relevant tools to assist in the implementation of this policy.
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 66	Village character policies and guidance should focus on local distinctiveness and heritage of the districts settlements where this is appropriate. Conservation area appraisals and designations should be used as the key evidence in developing any policies for new development. A district wide urban design guide would be a useful tool to layout appropriate considerations for villages and their settings.
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 66	Yes, as above in no 65.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 67	No
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 67	No

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 67	The Core Strategy and subsequent LDF documents should avoid unnecessary complexity.
Ms Caroline Harrison	Planning and Biodiversity Officer Natural England		Question 67	The Core Strategy should provide a context for the protection and enhancement of designated natural environment sites and areas reflecting the policies of PPS7 and PPS9, and giving greatest weight to the international and national legally protected sites in the district . This should be informed by a Nature Conservation Strategy. The distinctive landscape character areas of the District should be recognised and protected. Landscape Character Assessment provides a sound basis for guiding, informing and understanding the ability of any location to accommodate change, and to make positive proposals for conserving character, enhancing it or regenerating it. Natural England's Countryside Character Area descriptions provide a national framework of landscape character and can be viewed at either www.naturalengland.org.uk or www.magic.gov.uk for an interactive map and hotlinks to these descriptions. This useful baseline evidence which should be supplemented by the local district level assessment undertaken Nottinghamshire County Council. Policies should set out to achieve enhancement for the restoration or enhancement of landscape character, biodiversity, geological sites and features and access to the countryside. Natural England want all new development to create high quality, locally distinctive, resource efficient places where people want to live and work.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 67	No comment.
Mr. David Wright	Clerk to the Council Everton Parish Council		Question 67	Village Character and Village Design Statements - Everton Parish Council have considered developing a Village Design Statement (VDS), but would want it to be adopted by the Council. Could the Core Strategy make a clear reference as to where VDSs will sit within the overall LDF and explain the weight they will be given in determining planning applications? If Everton undertook to develop a VDS, the Parish Council would want close consultation with the planning department. RS will send information to the Parish Council about areas where VDSs have been developed effectively.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 67	No
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 67	The extent of historic village cores and the protection of their immediate rural setting and character should be considered. ----- ----- Green Infrastructure This section should make reference to the role of the cultural heritage in the green infrastructure of the district. It is often the case that existing key open green spaces are associated with historic building and sites and (whether publicly accessible or not) are part of the setting of the cultural heritage assets containing considerable biodiversity value and potential. The open countryside around urban cores and village settlements is a key aspect of the green infrastructure of the district. Here the cultural heritage and natural biodiversity heritage of the landscape is interrelated and indistinguishable. Promoting access to the countryside and appreciation of the biodiversity and cultural heritage of the area can be developed in policies that recognise this value and promote it in new development or rural regeneration initiatives.
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 67	No.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 68	Yes
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 68	More scattered development in rural areas to allow retention of white land and integral green areas-see answer to question 59.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 68	Yes
Mr Richard Walters	Senior Land Buyer Hallam Land Management Ltd		Question 68	Disagree. New developments should only be required to contribute to shortfalls in amenity resulting from the development itself.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 68	Not all new development will have clear or direct association with Green Infrastructure (GI). Unless there is strong justification to obtain contributions for GI across the whole borough, the contribution development makes should be in line with a GI strategy, either through on or off-site enhancements or consideration in design and planning. The County Council is currently developing a strategic approach to GI in the sub-region. Nottinghamshire County Council Q68
Michael Meadows	Drivers Jonas	Michael Meadows	Question 68	It will important to ensure that new development contributes to maintaining and enhancing the district's network of green spaces. Large development sites, such as the LIH site at Gateford have the potential to accessible green spaces, which will be secured through the masterplanning process.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 68	Yes. By spatial analysis of multi-modal accessibility to green space, using agreed standards (e.g. the English Nature ANGSt standards) and by preventing development on accessible urban greenspace.
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 68	Yes. By spatial analysis of multi-modal accessibility to green space, using agreed standards (e.g. the English Nature ANGSt standards) and by preventing development on accessible urban greenspace.
William Davis			Question 68	William Davis Ltd consider it important that a flexible approach is taken by the council when considering the provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Space in new developments. Suitable Green Infrastructure links may not be available on all new developments and as a consequence we are of the opinion that Green Infrastructure contributions from new developments should be considered on a site by site basis to ensure that such contributions are suitable and achievable. Any standards for GI or Open Space provision in new developments should be based on a credible and robust local evidence base to ensure what is required can be delivered without endangering housing delivery in the district.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 68	All new developments should contribute to the development of a network of green spaces across the District because that is a theme of PPS9 and the East Midlands Regional Plan (2009). Policy background and mechanisms for achieving that include: Policy 28 of the East Midlands Regional Plan (2009) clearly sets out that a green Infrastructure Plan should be used to inform decisions on the location of new developments and to identify the need for new green spaces. Therefore, the Green Infrastructure study identifies wildlife areas and where linkages can be achieved. The east Midlands Regional Plan (2009) has further identified Biodiversity Conservation Areas (BCAs) (Policy 29) and within Bassetlaw these include Humberhead levels, Sherwood Forest and River Trent. These areas should be targeted for networks of green spaces. Avoid developing extant wildlife sites (to prevent loss of sites and biodiversity) and areas of suitable for new habitat creation to increase size of extant sites and link sites together, both measures that improve resilience to climate change. Policy 28 of The East Midlands Regional Plan (2009) states that Local Authorities should identify mechanisms for the creation and future management of Green Infrastructure, including the planning system. Specific mechanisms include designing in measures that enhance biodiversity into new developments (see PPS9) and seeking a contribution to the management of new or adjacent extant sites as part of a Community Infrastructure Levy. If a development is considered to have a recreational impact on the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC then a mitigation approach is to provide Suitable Alternative natural Green Space (SANGS).
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 68	This as a standalone Policy may not be achievable and greater focus needs to be placed on the need to ensure adequate recreational and other facilities are made available linked to key strategic development. This would be deliverable. It would otherwise be difficult to deliver a network of green spaces if it is not linked to major development proposals.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 68	This as a standalone Policy may not be achievable and greater focus needs to be placed on the need to ensure adequate recreational and other facilities are made available linked to key strategic development. This would be deliverable. It would otherwise be difficult to deliver a network of green spaces if it is not linked to major development proposals.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 68	An approach where all new development contributes to development of a network of green spaces should not be adopted and instead should be applied on a site-by-site basis. In certain instances it may not be viable or feasible to provide green space either on or off site and in certain cases it may not be necessary if there is sufficient existing provision of green space within the locality. It is likely that larger scale development proposals should attract the requirement to contribute towards a network of green space, however, it is unlikely that smaller scale development proposals could sustain this requirement.
Ms Ursilla Spence	Nottinghamshire County Council		Question 68	Significant new development should add to or help achieve GI aims for the district. It is probable that any area of established GI potential also has a heritage value. This may be a river edge with water management features such as mill races or water meadows (Carburton), areas of surviving ridge and furrow close to the village core (South Leverton), or remains of medieval houses surviving as earthworks (Gringley on the Hill). GI provision should therefore include identifying heritage assets, and where possible incorporating these into proposals.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 68	Yes

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 68	We would support the development of a green infrastructure strategy for the Borough, which should incorporate historic assets (see regional guidance on GI at www.emgin.co.uk). Green infrastructure can provide a number of different functions and the development of GI networks, which link individual green space sites, is an important aspect of the concept. The identification of these networks would then feed into the masterplanning of development sites. Thus, masterplanning and developer contributions are important to its delivery, as well as other mechanisms.
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 68	This would be unduly onerous in terms of every single house extension or minor change of use. However, it is the case that a step change is needed in respect of bio-diversity in particular in the Region (RSS), and it is reasonable to expect most new developments - especially where they are likely to place additional demands upon green infrastructure - to contribute to its provision and management (either through direct provision of new resources and securing their long term upkeep, or by financial contribution).
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 69	Yes
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 69	Yes, the contribution to amenity, biodiversity, linkages between other green spaces are all factors that a GI strategy would identify as being provided by such spaces. Nottinghamshire County Council Q69
Michael Meadows	Drivers Jonas	Michael Meadows	Question 69	In order to meet the Council's housing provision targets it will be necessary to develop housing on greenfield sites, in sustainable locations, on the edge of existing settlements. This need to provide land for housing must be balanced with the need to protect existing green space and contribute to the district's network of public open spaces. Where development is proposed on greenfield land, publicly accessible green space may be secured through the masterplanning process. For example, the site at Gateford has potential to offer a large area of public open space on the western part of the site, within the Old Gateford Conservation Area.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 69	It depends upon its function. Whilst important, accessibility is not the sole determinant of the value of open spaces. Some functions do not require access at all. If the site has nature conservation value, the loss of which could be mitigated, is not easily visible or attractive from the public realm, then no it should not be protected.
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 69	It depends upon its function. Whilst important, accessibility is not the sole determinant of the value of open spaces. Some functions do not require access at all. If a site has nature conservation value, the loss of which cannot be mitigated, or value in terms of the visual amenity of the public realm, then yes it should be protected. If the site has nature conservation value, the loss of which could be mitigated, is not easily visible or attractive from the public realm, then no it should not be protected.
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 69	Yes, all existing open green spaces should be protected from development, even if publicly accessible, if they contribute to local amenity or to the development a network of green spaces.
Mr Walker Dormer Tools Walker Dormer Tools	Ian Baseley Associates		Question 69	A policy which protects all existing open green space and environmental sites from development is too restrictive, particularly given the amount of development (of all kinds) that will need to be provided for in the District over the plan period. Instead, each site and each application should be considered on its own merits, with supporting justification as to why it is appropriate to develop a site if environmental issues are relevant.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Walker East Markham Walker East Markham	Ian Baseley associates		Question 69	A policy which protects all existing open green space and environmental sites from development is too restrictive, particularly given the amount of development of all kinds that will need to be provided for in the District over the plan period. Instead, each site and each application should be considered on its own merits, with supporting justification as to why it is appropriate to develop a site if environmental issues are relevant.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 69	No comment.
Paul Tame	National Farmers Union		Question 69	No, we should not protect all existing green space from development. This would prevent all development in rural areas and all farm diversification. The Council has to be very clear about what greenspace will be protected and what types of development will not be allowed in that space, and not restrictive on building for agricultural or diversification purposes.
Ms Ursilla Spence	Nottinghamshire County Council		Question 69	Ideally, one would wish to see a presumption in favour of the preservation of any green space which has any one of amenity, biodiversity, and or heritage value - particularly where the site has the potential to feed into a network of similar sites.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 69	Yes
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 69	We would support the development of a green infrastructure strategy for the Borough, which should incorporate historic assets (see regional guidance on GI at www.emgin.co.uk). Green infrastructure can provide a number of different functions and the development of GI networks, which link individual green space sites, is an important aspect of the concept. The identification of these networks would then feed into the masterplanning of development sites. Thus, masterplanning and developer contributions are important to its delivery, as well as other mechanisms.
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 69	Yes - such sites can also provide a range of benefits for which public accessibility is not needed, e.g. flood storage, wildlife resources (nesting, foraging, migrating to adapt to climate change impacts), securing good water quality, storing carbon, providing natural cooling during hot summers.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 70	Yes
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 70	Yes, although these may be varied depending on circumstances. Nottinghamshire County Council Q70
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 70	Yes, subject to the standards taking account of the function, capacity, quality and accessibility of existing provision, rather than making fixed requirements.
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 70	Yes, subject to the standards taking account of the function, capacity, quality and accessibility of existing provision, rather than making fixed requirements.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 70	Yes, clear standards should be set for the levels of open space provision that will be expected from new development. As part of the spatial plan process and the Green Infrastructure study types of open space should be identified for specific areas of the District. In terms of open space for biodiversity the following criteria should be used: Local Nature reserve criteria set by natural England should be met, as a minimum, across the District. Natural England also recommends that local communities should have access to an appropriate mix of green spaces with at least 2ha of accessible natural green space per 1000 population with the following accessibility criteria: No person should live more than 300 metres from their nearest area of natural green space; At least one hectare of Local Nature reserve should be provided per 1000 population; There should be at least one accessible 20 ha site with 2km; There should be one accessible 500 ha site within 10 km. If it is considered that Suitable alternative natural Green Space (SANGS) needs to be provided to mitigate against impacts on the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC then there are clear guidelines from natural England about the attributes of a SANG. New wildlife sites should seek to create the most appropriate UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitat for the location, in order to help achieve the targets set out in The East Midlands regional Plan (2009) (Appendix 3, policy 29). Increasing the number of green Flag sites in the District is another way of ensuring that high quality sites are provided.
Mr Walker Dormer Tools Walker Dormer Tools	Ian Baseley Associates		Question 70	Akin to the need for affordable housing, the level of open space required for a development should be proportionate to the type and size of development proposed and its location. It may be, for example, that certain parts of Bassetlaw have an over-provision of open space in terms of general standards and therefore new developments in those areas would require less or no open space provision. Any policy needs to be flexible enough to take into consideration the type of development proposed, the size of the site, the likely requirements of its end-users and its location.
Mr Walker East Markham Walker East Markham	Ian Baseley associates		Question 70	Akin to the need for affordable housing, the level of open space required for a development should be proportionate to the type and size of development proposed and its location. It may be for example that certain parts of Bassetlaw have an over-provision of open space in terms of general standards and therefore new developments in those areas would require less or no open space provision. Any policy needs to be flexible enough to take into consideration the type of development proposed, the size of the site, the likely requirements of its end-users and its location.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 70	No comment.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 70	Standards which set out the level of open space provision which is required by new development should be established as this will prevent an ad hoc approach being adopted and will ensure a greater continuity in decisions.
Ms Ursilla Spence	Nottinghamshire County Council		Question 70	One could argue that it might be better to have in place a developed GI strategy covering expectations for biodiversity, heritage and amenity, and linkages between such sites, and express the requirement for developers to show how their proposals will fit into such a strategy, judging proposals on their merits. This is likely to produce more imaginative results than a standard requirement for, for instance, 10% open space.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 70	Yes
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 70	Whilst this is probably necessary in order to ensure a rational and defensible way to secure new provision the Trust notes that at least as important as the quantity of provision is its quality. A hectare of open space in the right location, well managed and providing a wide range of benefits, is arguably much more valuable than two hectares of grass routinely cut to the lowest setting on the mower and surrounded by steel railings. Creating standards that incorporated multi-functionality and measures of quality would be beneficial.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 71	No
Miss Rachael Bust	Deputy Head of Planning and Local Authority Liaison Coal Authority		Question 71	Test of Soundness Justified Effective Consistency With National Policy X Green infrastructure and public open space can attract large numbers of users, which means that in areas of past mining activity where surface hazards exist risks to public safety increase. Within the west of Bassetlaw District there are fissures and mine entries which need to be considered as part of any open space proposals. Mine entries within areas of public open space can present a safety risk. It is important that the Local Planning Authority and developers are aware of the potential risks and location of mine shafts in areas that attract large numbers of people. The presence of mine entries is not a constraint on development, and addressing them in a positive way as part of any improvements to greenspace areas can remove future public safety hazards arising from past mining activity. The Coal Authority also operates a year-round 24-hour emergency call-out facility (01623 646333) for surface hazards for any changes detected in the ground appearance. Reason - In order to address the requirements of PPG14 regarding land stability. CONCLUSION The Coal Authority welcomes the opportunity to make these early comments, we are of course willing to discuss the comments made above in further detail if desired and would be happy to negotiate alternative suitable wording to address any of its concerns. The Coal Authority also wishes to continue to be consulted both informally if required and formally on future stages.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Stephen Gaines	Peel Airports Limited		Question 71	<p>Proposals for renewable energy include wind turbine developments that may effect the safe operation of an airport. Green infrastructure may also increase the risk to aircraft of bird strike hazard by encouraging roosting by large flock forming birds. These issues should be addressed in the Core Strategy and other Development Plan Documents and are discussed further below. RHADS is a 'safeguarded' airport, which means; e.g. that it must be consulted by the local planning authority on proposals for the erection of tall structures that could affect aircraft movements. The Joint ODPM/DfT Circular 1/2003 (Safeguarding Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosive Storage Areas, Annex 2) identifies the arrangements for safeguarding aerodromes: "Certain civil airports selected on the basis of their importance to the national air transport system, are...officially safeguarded, in order to ensure that their operation and development are not inhibited by buildings, structures, erections or works which infringe protected surfaces, obscure runway approach lights or have the potential to impair the performance of aerodrome navigation aids, radio aids or telecommunications systems; by lighting which has the potential to distract pilots, or by developments which have the potential to increase the number of birds or bird hazard risk." The Airport works with adjacent local planning authorities to ensure that RHADS is properly safeguarded. Safeguarded areas for bird hazard extend for a 13 km radius of an airport and 30 km for wind turbine development. RHADS safeguarding maps include parts of the local authority area of Bassetlaw. The Circular identifies the requirement for local planning authorities to consult an airport operator in respect of development that may affect aerodrome safeguarding. The Circular states that Development Plans should: "include a policy stating that officially safeguarded areas have been established for a particular airport, that certain planning applications will be the subject of consultation with the operator of that aerodrome and that there may be restrictions on the height or detailed design of buildings or on development which might create bird hazard." The Circular further advises local planning authorities that the outer boundaries of the safeguarded areas should also be shown on their proposals maps. The Airport considers wind farm development in its vicinity in line with 'CAP 764: CAA Policy and Guidelines on Wind Turbines', and will respond to consultations on such schemes according to the likely effect on operations, including effects on radar performance. Also considered are all proposed developments within the 13 km bird hazard safeguarding zone that have the potential to attract large flock forming birds, in accordance with 'CAP 738 Safeguarding of Aerodromes' and CAP 772 Bird Strike Management for Aerodromes'. Such developments may include landfill operations and areas of open water. Copies of the safeguarding map for RHADS, showing its consultation zones, are available on request.</p>
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 71	<p>The principles of GI should be clearly set out and applied in a GI strategy for the borough, relating also to the sub-regional context. Nottinghamshire County Council Q71</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways		Question 71	'Green Infrastructure is the network of multi-functional open spaces and natural assets. The definition of green infrastructure encompasses 'blue infrastructure and blue spaces' such as waterways, towing paths and their environs. Inland waterways form part of strategic and local green infrastructure networks'. 'The benefits of green infrastructure such as waterways...should not be viewed purely in environmental terms. There is a real risk that this could lead to the development of restrictive planning policies which would affect the sustainability of the waterway network and the waterways' ability to deliver economic and social benefits, as well as environmental benefits'. (TCPA Policy Advice Note: Inland Waterways: Unlocking the potential and securing the future of inland waterways through the planning system (2009)).
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 71	The Core Strategy and subsequent LDF documents should avoid unnecessary complexity.
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 71	No.
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 71	Specific consideration should be given to woodlands as set out in policy 30 of The East Midlands Regional Plan (2009). A supplementary Planning Document should cover the creation/enhancement of wildlife sites to ensure that: The most appropriate UK BAP Priority Habitats is created for the location. Guidance is given on plant species used and their provenance. Funded establishment and aftercare management plans are provided and reported upon.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 71	No comment.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 71	The ratio of open spaces within developments should be increased from the current one and there should be more provision of play equipment.
Mr. David Wright	Clerk to the Council Everton Parish Council		Question 71	Concerned that the Core Strategy does not specifically address green issues in any section, particularly in reducing the levels of travel in the district. RS outlined that the concept of sustainability and promoting sustainable patterns of development that will reduce the need for people to travel is an underpinning factor considered in the development of the Spatial Strategy Options. Should look at developing cycle routes. RS stated this will be considered in the transport issues in the Preferred Options for the Core Strategy.
Ms Ursilla Spence	Nottinghamshire County Council		Question 71	Non-designated heritage assets should have been considered within studies such as the Environmental Sites Assessment and the Landscape Character Assessment, also in the forthcoming Green Infrastructure Study. It may be worth considering an overarching Heritage Asset study for the District, which can feed into the many aspects of the LDF that have the potential to impact upon all aspects of the historic environment.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 71	No

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 71	It is surprising that the section on Green Infrastructure does not deal with wider, strategic, green infrastructure initiatives - particularly that relating to Sherwood Forest <(including the Sherwood Forest Regional Park initiative) which is a regionally important resource that also benefits residents, employees and visitors of/to Bassetlaw. Parts of Bassetlaw are closely related to the Forest and there are key linkages to the range of open spaces and related facilities at Clumber Park and nearby. It is therefore requested that specific mention is made of Sherwood Forest, its key regional role and support given for promoting and improving this, specifically including those elements within Bassetlaw.
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 72	Pressure should be put on water treatment companies to update their facilities and infrastructure to cope with new developments and each development area should be judged on the life of the land.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 72	Yes
Mr David Brown	Merry Vale Development		Question 72	Yes. there is sufficiently extensive array of 'legitimate' development sites.
Mr Richard Walters	Senior Land Buyer Hallam Land Management Ltd		Question 72	Disagree. There may be sustainable locations within settlements that do flood, but are outside the flood risk zone. There are sustainable locations within settlements (e.g. Retford), which are within a flood risk zone, but by re-contouring land whereby there is an exchange of land between that which is in Flood Zone 2 and that that is in Flood Zone 3a, the opportunity to develop the Zone 2 land is enhanced.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 72	No, but this should be a significant material consideration and PPS25 sets clear guidance. Note that the Regional Assembly monitors developments approved against Environment Agency advice. Nottinghamshire County Council Q72
Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways		Question 72	BW's interest is in relation to waterside development and unlocking the social, economic and environmental potential of waterside areas. PPS 25 (Table D3) already considers some forms of development as being appropriate in Flood Zones 2 and 3. For example development which is water compatible, such as marinas, is acceptable in all flood zones, less vulnerable uses are appropriate in flood zone 3a and where the exception test is met more vulnerable uses are also appropriate in zone 3a. This needs to be considered in relation to any policy.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 72	No. The approach in PPS25 embodies this and should be followed.
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 72	No, because this will prevent development that would itself reduce the risk or mitigate the hazard of flooding. The approach in PPS25 embodies this and should be followed.
William Davis			Question 72	Development should be prevented on individual sites that are regarded as being at risk from flooding, rather than complete settlements as suggested in question 72. Sites at risk from flooding are identified on the Environment Agency Flood Maps and within the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Such an approach would result in only individual sites that are at risk from or likely to create problems with flooding being excluded from development, while other sites in settlements considered as at risk but not individually at risk themselves could still be developed.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Environment Agency	Environment Agency		Question 72	Development should be in accordance with PPS25. For those developments located in flood risk areas, we would expect the application of the sequential test to identify if there are suitable sites at a lower level of flood risk. If there are no alternative sites then development in a flood risk area should be appropriate to the flood zone as detailed in table D3 of PPS25. A suitable Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) should be included to ensure that the development is safe and sustainable.
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 72	Yes, new development should be prevented in settlements that are regarded as being at risk of flooding.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 72	Generally this would be consistent with PPS25.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 72	Generally this would be consistent with PPS25.
Mr PG Hills	Clerk to Tuxford Town Council Tuxford Parish Council		Question 72	Yes. There is a sufficiently extensive array of 'legitimate' development sites.
Paul Tame	National Farmers Union		Question 72	New development should only be prevented if it would put the new occupants at risk from flooding.
mr keith buxton			Question 72	Yes
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 72	Rather surprised that you need to ask this question - of course there should not be any development where there is any chance of flood risk either to the developed area or where there would be a consequential risk to other areas.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 72	Yes
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 72	In most circumstances, yes. However, there may be exceptional cases that warrant a different approach, particularly instances such as the conversion of buildings of historic importance and where specific measures are taken a) to reduce flood risks and/or the consequences of flood events, and b) appropriate alarm systems are installed.
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 72	No. New design is capable of taking into account issues of flooding.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 73	Yes
Mr David Brown	Merry Vale Development		Question 73	Yes, for sound and well-documented environmental reasons
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 73	The provision of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SDSs) should be proportionate to the scale of development, and there should be no lower level, as a large number of small proposals, especially in urban areas, can have a significant effect in total. This is one reason that front garden paving is now controlled development. The provision of a SDS may not be onerous, for example using soakaways. Nottinghamshire County Council Q73
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 73	Yes, this is a requirement of PPS25, which indicates that the sequential test should be applied, incorporating flood risk assessment. Nottinghamshire County Council Q73

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways		Question 73	Sustainable drainage systems should be encouraged, where feasible, to manage surface water discharges. Subject to assessment and agreement the canal may be able to accept discharges of surface water. Note however should be made of para 3.3.43 of the East Midlands Regional Plan which advises that 'in advocating the use of SuDS, Local Planning Authorities should ensure that uncertainties over adoption and future maintenance are resolved early in the development process'.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 73	All developments should seek to integrate 'best practice' and where necessary and appropriate this could include Sustainable Drainage Systems. Regard must be given however to the cost and benefits of such systems, and the availability of organisations to manage such systems - to create systems without effective long term management mechanisms would be wasteful and possibly increase flood risk.
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 73	Yes, though where this is difficult or expensive to achieve, I would balance this against the need for regeneration and include in the assessment of feasibility the availability of organisations to manage such systems, because to create systems that are not maintained would be wasteful and possibly increase flood risk where capacity is constrained.
William Davis			Question 73	William Davis Ltd would support any requirement for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) on new development. However in our experience SuDS are not possible on all development sites due to ground or soil type and it is extremely important to include that SuDS will only be required 'where feasible', as the text of question 73 suggests.
Environment Agency	Environment Agency		Question 73	We would like to see a requirement for all new developments to include a Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs), where feasible. A carefully designed SuDS scheme can deliver multi-functional usage similar to those detailed in the second paragraph of this response. These benefits are explained in more detail in the PPS25, Practice Guide Companion page 88. SuDS aim to mimic natural drainage processes and remove pollutants from urban run-off at source. They also comprise a wide range of techniques, including green roofs, swales, detention basins, ponds and wetlands. To realize the greatest improvement in water quality and flood risk management these components should be used in combination, often referred to as the SuDS Management Train. In order to be fully effective SuDS sites need to be managed properly. Section 106 agreements and the Community Infrastructure Levy (once established) provide suitable mechanisms by which properly designed SuDS can be transferred into the management and maintenance of the local authority. A long term maintenance strategy needs to be incorporated into the document not only for SuDS but for all green infrastructure components. Detailed guidance on SuDS can be found in the: 'Interim Code of Practice for Sustainable Drainage Systems' a copy of which is included with this letter. The CIRIA website contains other relevant information on SuDs http://www.ciria.org.uk/suds/ . Waste
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 73	Yes, all new developments should be required to have Sustainable drainage Systems where feasible.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 73	If economically feasible and to ensure compliance with Government directives.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 73	If economically feasible and to ensure compliance with Government directives.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr PG Hills	Clerk to Tuxford Town Council Tuxford Parish Council		Question 73	Yes, for sound and well-documented environmental reasons.
Paul Tame	National Farmers Union		Question 73	Yes and those systems need to be maintained properly and this maintenance checked by the Environment Agency or another reputable agency.
mr keith buxton			Question 73	Yes
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 73	Yes
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 73	Yes. The Trust's work with SUDs in its development with volume housebuilders (see comment above relating to para 6.2) in Greater Manchester has demonstrated how a comprehensive and sustainable approach to water issues can successfully be implemented and there is no reason why such an approach should not become the norm rather than an exception.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 74	Yes
Mr David Brown	Merry Vale Development		Question 74	Yes. All new developments should identify their potential impacts.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 74	Yes.
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 74	Yes
William Davis			Question 74	William Davis Ltd consider that it would be prudent for development proposals in areas with land or sewer drainage problems to demonstrate that the development will not increase the potential for flood risk or pollution.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Environment Agency	Environment Agency		Question 74	We would like to see development proposals in areas with sewer drainage problems demonstrate that they will not increase the potential for both flood risk and pollution. This approach would be in conformity with the recommendations of the 'Future Water: The Governments Water Strategy for England'. Page 57 of the document details the Vision for 2030 in terms of surface water drainage, where it is stated that there should be 'More adaptable drainage systems delivering reduced flood risk, improved water quality and decreasing burdens on the sewer system.' The Pitt review also highlighted the strain that public sewerage systems were placed under during the summer 2007 floods. Pitt goes on to state that: 'The capacity of public sewerage systems to deal with additional surface water flows is limited , unless expensive and disruptive works are carried out; it therefore, makes sense to place some checks on the system that allows surface water connections.' The outlined policy would be in conformity with policy recommendation 10 in the Pitt review which states: the automatic right to connect to surface water drainage of new developments to the sewerage system should be removed. The Water Framework Directive targets will be coming into effect early next year. These will set stringent water quality standards based upon both chemical and ecological measurements. This policy will help towards meeting those targets in the receiving watercourse. You may also wish to make use of our strategic surface water flooding maps as part of the plan making process. Information on how to access these maps is included with this response. These maps were primarily designed to provide Local Resilience Forums (LRF) with an indication of areas that are susceptible to flooding. However, these are also seen as a tool to help local planning authorities make land use choices. We are currently considering how this will work in practice.
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 74	Yes, all new developments in areas with land or sewer drainage problems should be required to demonstrate that they will not increase the potential for both flood risk and pollution.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 74	This would be expected.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 74	This would be expected.
Mr PG Hills	Clerk to Tuxford Town Council Tuxford Parish Council		Question 74	Yes. All new developments should identify their potential impacts.
mr keith buxton			Question 74	Yes
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 74	It would not be unreasonable for the local planning authority to seek confirmation that new development proposals in areas with land or sewer drainage problems will not increase the potential for both flood risk and pollution as a result of the proposals.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 74	It would not be unreasonable for the local planning authority to seek confirmation that new development proposals in areas with land or sewer drainage problems will not increase the potential for both flood risk and pollution as a result of the proposals.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 74	Yes
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 74	All new developments should ensure that they comply with the requirements of PPS25 and the related Best Practice advice.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 75	No

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
		Mr Les Moris	Question 75	We would like to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of development plan documents (dpds) which may affect our assets including policies and plans relating to the following issues. Any policies relating to overhead transmission lines, underground cables or gas pipeline installations. Site Specific allocations/land use policies affecting sites crossed by overhead lines, underground cables or gas transmission pipelines. Land use policies/development proposed adjacent to existing high voltage electricity substation sites and gas above ground installations. Any policies relating to the diverting or undergrounding of overhead transmission lines Other policies relating to infrastructure or utility provision Policies relating to development in the countryside Landscape policies Waste and Minerals Plans
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 75	The Core Strategy and subsequent LDF documents should avoid unnecessary complexity.
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 75	No.
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 75	The protection and (re-) creation of natural floodplains needs to be considered and how the Trent Vale Landscape Project and Isle of Axholme Study can integrate with the Core Strategy.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 75	No comment.
Ms Ursilla Spence	Nottinghamshire County Council		Question 75	It is unfortunate that the policy documents quoted are completely deficient in their coverage of the potential impact of this issue on the historic environment. Significant new development may require the provision of flood alleviation or compensation areas, which can add significantly to the area of land affected by that development, with additional threats to buried archaeology. SUDs may require greater depths of ground disturbance, impacting on archaeological levels that might otherwise have remained in situ. Riverside developments may require the use of construction techniques such as piling, which can have severely detrimental effects on waterlogged archaeological remains. It would be extremely useful to ensure that developers have regard to the potential for unintentional consequences arising from dealing with flood risk issues.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 75	No

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Environment Agency	Environment Agency		Question 75	<p>We would recommend that the Core Strategy takes account of the River Trent CFMP. the River Trent CFMP is a high-level strategic planning tool which sets out the long term investment on sustainable flood risk management for the next 50 to 100 years. The River Trent CFMP has six different policy options to inform investment decisions. Bassetlaw falls within Policy unit 2 and 4, as illustrated on page xvii of the executive summary. A copy of which is included with this document. We would also like to see a policy on culverting included within the Core Strategy. Any proposed new developments should be seen as an opportunity to open up culverted rivers. The Agency considers it beneficial for watercourses to remain open wherever possible for both flood defence and environmental purposes. Culverting can exacerbate the risk of flooding and increase the maintenance requirements for a watercourse. It also destroys wildlife habitats, damages natural amenity and interrupts the continuity of the linear habitat of a watercourse. Wherever possible the Agency will seek to have culverted watercourses restored to open channels. The inclusion of this as a policy within the Core strategy should be considered. Page 55 discusses providing accommodation for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople. In terms of Flood Risk, we would wish to advise that Gypsy sites are considered a 'highly vulnerable' land use in table D2 of PPS25. we would expect the application of the sequential test to direct any proposed sites in Flood Zone 2 and 3 towards areas of lowest flood risk (Flood Zone 1). If no suitable sites are available in Flood Zone 1 then, as this is a highly vulnerable land use, development would only be permitted in Flood Zone 2. Such development could only proceed once the exceptions test has been passed to ensure that flood risk is adequately mitigated against. Groundwater We would like to see due consideration given to of PPS 23: Planning and Pollution Control within the document. We would also like to bring to your attention the document groundwater Protection: Policy and Practice (GP3), as this contains information about how the Environment Agency approach the management and protection of groundwater. Water Quality Issues All developments should be on separate drainage systems (surface water and foul Water) SUD systems should be used to control surface water run-off and drainage. Extra foul flow entering the sewerage system should not exceed capacity of the system and should not cause foul flooding of properties in the new development, there should also be no throttling back in the sewerage network causing overloading of the network upstream. Any flow being received at a Severn Trent water sewage treatment works should not cause the final effluent to have a detrimental effect on the receiving watercourse and cause any deterioration in river water quality. Full sewerage hydraulic modelling should be undertaken along with river water quality modelling to fully assess the impact of the foul drainage. The Water Framework Directive policies for the Idle and Torne catchments should be taken into account in the Core Strategy. These</p>
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 76	Have a criteria based policy.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 76	Have a criteria based policy
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 76	There should be a criteria-based policy as uses proposed on previously developed land may be entirely inappropriate in the location. The status of the land should not be an over-riding factor. The County Council would be willing to assist the District in developing criteria, but would not offer any in this response. Nottinghamshire County Council Q76
Mr John R Holland			Question 76	Steer development

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 76	No, but previously-developed land should be preferred in the allocation and development of land within and adjoining settlements, in accordance with the spatial strategy. In the more rural parts of the district, there is likely to be a requirement to allocate previously undeveloped land to meet growth requirements. Some developments will have specific locational requirements which could mean that only previously undeveloped land is suitable. It would be simpler to have a policy preventing development of previously-undeveloped land, where it cannot be demonstrated that suitable previously-developed sites are not available for redevelopment for the same purpose with public and/or private funding. This would comply with the spatial strategy and ensure efficient land re-use within it.
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 76	No, but previously-developed land should be preferred in the allocation and development of land within and adjoining settlements, in accordance with the spatial strategy. It would be simpler to have a policy preventing development of previously-undeveloped land, where it cannot be demonstrated that suitable previously-developed sites are not available for redevelopment for the same purpose with public and/or private funding. This would comply with the spatial strategy and ensure efficient land re-use within it.
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 76	There needs to be criteria based policy to assess the suitability of previously developed land as appropriate and sustainable. Assess the biodiversity of the site through a desktop study of wildlife sites (SINCs) and protected species, followed by a site survey. Open mosaic habitats on previously developed land (formally called post-industrial sites) is a UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Priority Habitat. Policy 29 of the East Midlands Regional Plan (2009) considers 'Priorities for Enhancing the Region's Biodiversity' and states the Local Authorities should ensure no net loss of BAP habitats and help achieve UK BAP targets (Appendix 3). The present target for the management and restoration of urban and post-industrial sites is 3000 ha by 2015. Therefore, there is a conflict with this policy if all applications for previously developed land are considered favourably. Consideration needs to be given to the proximity of a previously developed site to the Birklands and Bilhaugh Special area of Conservation (SAC) and whether a proposed development needs to undertake a project level assessment. Assess whether the proposed development would lead to the fragmentation and isolation of extant wildlife sites, as part of a Green Infrastructure Study.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 76	Consistent with general planning guidance, the reuse of previously developed land is appropriate but we would not favour all applications for the redevelopment being approved. Locational positions need to be carefully considered and development managed to achieve other key policies within the Core Strategy and to be consistent with targets set through the RSS. We would support generally the desire to steer development to the most appropriate and sustainable locations.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Walker Dormer Tools Walker Dormer Tools	Ian Baseley Associates		Question 76	National planning policy favours the redevelopment of previously-developed land over greenfield land but recognises that sustainability should play an important part in the decision making exercise. It would therefore be inappropriate to allow all or any form of development on land simply because it is previously-developed. However, the nature of the use or former use of the land should be taken into account when assessing the merits of an application for its re-use. It will be the case that regardless of a site's location, a proposed use may be more sustainable than an existing or former use. Sustainable development extends beyond the sole consideration of location and therefore a range of factors need to be capable of being taken into account in a policy.
Mrs Janet Hodson			Question 76	A large urban extension on a large Greenfield site is more sustainable in the round than the use of PDL site in unsustainable locations.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 76	Consistent with general planning guidance, the reuse of previously developed land is appropriate but we would not favour all applications for the redevelopment being approved. Locational positions need to be carefully considered and development managed to achieve other key policies within the Core Strategy and to be consistent with targets set through the RSS. We would support generally the desire to steer development to the most appropriate and sustainable locations.
mr keith buxton			Question 76	para 1 No / para 2 - Yes
Mr Andrew Laing			Question 76	The Re-use of Previously Developed Land Question 76, bullet point one, is poorly worded in regard to the Council allowing development on all sites regardless of where it is located and this will affect the type of responses received. Each site should be viewed on its own merits. Development of previously developed sites makes best use of land. Priority should be given previously developed sites that are located in a Core Service Centre, Local Service Centre or Rural Service Centre where development of the site will contribute to the sustainability and assist in maintaining the viability of existing and future facilities in the service centre.
Ms Vicki Ingleby	Turley Associates		Question 76	PPS3 provides a clear presumption in favour of the redevelopment of previously developed land. However, favouring all previously developed land, as suggested in the question, would not take due account of the sustainability of the site nor the infrastructure in place to support its development. Option B is therefore favoured.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 76	Whilst previously developed land should be developed in advance of greenfield sites, location must also play a primary consideration. It would therefore not be appropriate to allow for development of previously developed land in rural areas with significant new development if the alternative is the development of a green field site in a defined settlement.
Mr James Hobson	Signet Planning LTD		Question 76	Whilst previously developed land should be developed in advance of green field sites, location must also play a primary consideration. It would therefore not be appropriate to allow for development of previously developed land in rural areas with significant new development if the alternative is the development of a green field site in a defined settlement. We trust that the response above will be taken into consideration in the preparation for the next round of consultations for the Core Strategy. Should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Ms Ursilla Spence	Nottinghamshire County Council		Question 76	Surely applications should be judged on their merits? The loss of garden spaces to inappropriate infill can erode an area's sense of place and diminish its value to inhabitants, as well as impacting on buried archaeological remains. Allotment land within village cores may often contain buried archaeological remains. Bassetlaw in particular has a strong tradition of non-conformist Christianity, with examples of burial grounds being established away from Chapels and churches, in orchards and gardens and small closes. Some industrial sites may have a significant buried archaeological potential even after the latest phase of structures has been demolished. A criteria based policy which has regard to historic environment issues (including the potential for buried archaeology) would assist with providing a balanced, sustainable and reasonable approach to development proposals.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 76	1st part - no 2nd part - yes
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 76	We support a criteria-based approach. This policy would also link to a policy on backland and infill development. It should also encourage the reuse of redundant buildings, which can include former industrial and agricultural buildings and empty homes.
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 76	The overall approach should follow the pattern and distribution of development as finally agreed in respect of the spatial strategy element of this DPD. However, within that constraint it is appropriate to have a phasing policy that is based upon a 'brownfield first' approach - usually development of such land will bring direct environmental and image improvements to the District and often it will be better located in terms of access to existing goods, services and public transport.
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 76	There must be criteria based policy to ensure that brown field development is steered to appropriate locations and away from sites that would damage the historic core (including archaeological remains), setting or character of the district's heritage.
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 76	A policy which favours PDL above all other sites, regardless of location should not be adopted as this could result in an unsuitable and unsustainable pattern of development which does not meet the current needs of bassetlaw (see attached letter).
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 77	The Core Strategy and subsequent LDF documents should avoid unnecessary complexity.
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 77	No.
Mr Walker Dormer Tools Walker Dormer Tools	Ian Baseley Associates		Question 77	Whilst I have already made the point above, it is important to reiterate here that the target of achieving 60% of new housing development on previously-developed land only relates to housing, it does not relate to other forms of development such as employment uses. accordingly, in order to contribute to the national and regional target, the Council should prioritise previously-developed land in the main urban areas for housing development over and above other uses. A review of protected employment land in and around Worksop will play a critical role in providing the level of housing on previously-developed land that national and regional policy requires.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 77	No comment.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 77	No

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 77	Archaeological potential of brown field sites should be reflected in any criteria based policies.
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 77	No.
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 78	Point 2.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 78	Protect those sites deemed most suitable for future employment use
Mr David Brown	Merry Vale Development		Question 78	Easy access to employment opportunities is a key element of sustainable development. New employment sites must be identified and a presumption made against the loss of existing ones unless special circumstances can be demonstrated.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 78	There should be a criteria-based policy as uses proposed on previously developed land may be entirely inappropriate in the location. The status of the land should not be an over-riding factor. The County Council would be willing to assist the District in developing criteria, but would not offer any in this response. Nottinghamshire County Council Q78
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 78	Protect all existing employment sites from non-employment creating development (e.g. housing or retail uses)? No. This would ensure the dereliction of many existing and former employment sites, the redevelopment of which for business or industrial uses is simply not viable. Protect only those employment sites that are deemed to be most suitable for future employment uses Yes, subject to the assessment of suitability including amenity, viability and accessibility; and, provided that an identified local requirement has been established. Have no policies protecting employment land from other uses? No. This would lead to the loss of potential economic development, where sites are not available due to their having been developed for higher value uses. Have a criteria based policy that sets the basis by which protected employment sites might be re-developed for non-employment creating uses? Yes. This would ensure existing and former employment sites do not remain derelict where redevelopment for business or industrial uses is not viable. If so, what might these criteria be? The criteria should require that marketing of premises for business or industrial re-uses or a viability assessment of redevelopment for land for such uses has been carried out and that the possibility of cross-subsidisation through mixed uses has been considered.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Craig Ball	Development Planner UK Coal Mining Ltd		Question 78	<p>In answer to Question 78 , UK COAL consider that local policy should not protect all existing employment sites from non-employment uses as this is not flexible, does not offer the ability for response to changing needs and demands, does not recognise that a site may be better suited to an alternative use and can also be counterproductive to the growth and development of an area and its Page 12 of 14 ability to attract inward investment and regeneration opportunities. UK COAL consider the most appropriate approach would be to have a criteria based policy which enables employment sites to be redeveloped for other uses where it can be justified by the applicant that this is appropriate. Care needs to be taken however to ensure that the criteria set out in the policy is not overly restrictive to a sites development with an alternative use. Retail The section of the Consultation Document refers to retail in Worksop and Retford. UK COAL consider that as Harworth is also being prioritised as a settlement for development and growth in Options 1 and 3 at a similar scale to Worksop and Reford, that a policy should similarly be included to deal with retail in Harworth. DTZ has produced a report based on a study they have undertaken of retail in Harworth. This report has also been submitted in support of the outline planning application for Harworth Colliery. This report shows through analysis undertaken by DTZ that the existing centre in Harworth is not functioning successfully, in that it does not adequately serve the residents of Harworth and Bircotes or those in the area. In line with emerging policy (Options 1 or 3 of the Core Strategy), Harworth and Bircotes role as a centre is being promoted as a Core Service Centre and as such it will perform a significant role within the district and as such the centre needs to function more effectively. There is currently significant leakage of retail spend out of the settlement, that could be re-directed and thereby retained within the settlement. Bassetlaw's own borough wide retail study undertaken to inform the emerging LDF, dated May 2009, also confirms this and that this is an increased leakage compared to the earlier retail study, dated 2004. DTZ identify that in order to retain the retail spend, enable Harworth's centre to perform its appropriate role but not have a detrimental effect on other larger retail centres, there is a need for not just the choice of convenience shopping which should be provided by a sufficient size store, but also an adequate range of comparison goods and other retail services. DTZ's report notes that there is very little comparison provision within the settlement. Planning policy at the local level is therefore important to help direct and shape the suitable growth of this centre in order it can fulfil its role and support the level of development that is being directed to the settlement and thereby supporting the creation of a sustainable community. In turn this will encourage inward investment and job creation. As such the same questions asked in the Consultation Document in relation to Worksop and Retford should also be applicable to Harworth and Bircotes. Page 13 of 14 PPS6 supports the role of smaller centres and</p>
Ms Janet Hodson	JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd		Question 78	<p>The strategy should look forward to the identified needs of the next 20years and provide land for the district that will maximize its advantages such as its relationship to the A1 and the regeneration and growth of Worksop.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Miss Claire Whittaker	Assistant Planner DPP		Question 78	It has been identified in PPS4 that retail should be recognised as an employment use. This has not been recognised by Bassetlaw District Council. We therefore recommend that Bassetlaw District Council reflect this within the Core Strategy. We feel that the forth option, a criteria based policy, should be progressed. In terms of the criteria that should be included within the policy we would recommend the following criteria: An oversupply of employment land in the surrounding area can be demonstrated; or It can be demonstrated that the demand for employment land in the area is low The developer is able to demonstrate that an alternative use, or mix of uses, offers greater potential benefit to the community.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 78	Generally yes but there must be flexibility. Inevitably some redevelopment of employment sites will take place in locations that are in the longer term not sustainable and there must be flexibility in the policies within the Core Strategy.
Mr Walker Dormer Tools Walker Dormer Tools	Ian Baseley Associates		Question 78	Firstly, the reference to PPG4 is not entirely accurate as among the "alternative uses" for vacant industrial land suggested by PPG4 is housing. PPG4 does not recommend an appropriate alternative use of industrial land as industrial land because clearly this is the same (and not an alternative) use. The Local Development Framework will need to be flexible enough to satisfy the changing development requirements in the District up to 2026 if it is to be in line with the adopted EMRP. The EMRP is already the subject of a partial review, despite it only having been adopted for seven months, which (we are informed) is likely to result in a greater need for housing land. Flexibility in such policies is therefore fundamental to the longevity and materiality of the LDF once adopted. The most flexible approach therefore is to have a criteria-based policy by which identified employment sites might be redeveloped for alternative uses where justification exists. This effectively complies with the approach of the existing Local Plan.
		Ms Emma Cruickshank	Question 78	Question 78 , UK COAL consider that local policy should not protect all existing employment sites from non-employment uses as this is not flexible, does not offer the ability for response to changing needs and demands, does not recognise that a site may be better suited to an alternative use and can also be counterproductive to the growth and development of an area and its ability to attract inward investment and regeneration opportunities. UK COAL consider the most appropriate approach would be to have a criteria based policy which enables employment sites to be redeveloped for other uses where it can be justified by the applicant that this is appropriate. Care needs to be taken however to ensure that the criteria set out in the policy is not overly restrictive to a sites development with an alternative use.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 78	Generally yes but there must be flexibility. Inevitably some redevelopment of employment sites will take place in locations that are in the longer term not sustainable and there must be flexibility in the policies within the Core Strategy.
Mr PG Hills	Clerk to Tuxford Town Council Tuxford Parish Council		Question 78	Easy access to employment opportunities is a key element of sustainable development. New employment sites must be identified and a presumption made against the loss of existing ones unless special circumstances can be demonstrated.
Mr Owen Walters	Highways Agency		Question 78	the Agency would support an approach to the allocation of employment land which enables goods to be transferred by sustainable modes and which allow employees a choice of means of travel, particularly by public transport, walking and cycling.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 78	1st part - no 2nd part - yes 3rd part - no 4th part - yes
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 79	The Core Strategy and subsequent LDF documents should avoid unnecessary complexity.
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 79	The potential for mixed uses to facilitate the regeneration of existing or former employment sites must be harnessed in a way that maximises economic development.
Mr Walker Dormer Tools Walker Dormer Tools	Ian Baseley Associates		Question 79	The Northern Sub-region Employment Land Review referred to by the Council in its evidence base explicitly states that it was not prepared as a land allocation tool for policy formulation: that is the purpose of a Core Strategy and Site Allocations Document. It is not therefore appropriate for the Council to rely on the recommendations of the Review in terms of which sites are suitable for employment use and which are not, without undertaking a more detailed review itself, including consultation with stakeholders, through the due legal process. It is certainly the case with the former Dormer Tools site that at the time the Review was undertaken, the site was still occupied by Dormer Tools. It is not suprising therefore that the Review did not recommend that this site should be redeveloped for alternative uses. However, the site is eminently suitable for residential development and its use as such would make a significant contribution to the 60% previously-developed land target. The Council must therefore undertake its own up-to-date and more detailed review of employment sites (vacant or otherwise) within the District to determine, in the light of the demands on land for alternative uses, whether existing protected employment land can more appropriately be developed for alternative uses, including the need to provide 60% of new residential development on previously-developed land. This needs to be undertaken with stakeholders, including owners of land, to determine the likely availability of such sites for future employment purposes and their deliverability.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 79	No comment.
Ms Ursilla Spence	Nottinghamshire County Council		Question 79	As has been noted, some existing employment sites include buildings which are capable of re-use and refurbishment. Existing employment sites may have the advantage of a resident workforce close by. Commercial expediency can demand the provision of cheaply constructed employment units, which are then often sited on the edges of settlements. Often poorly designed, and of short life span their sustainability is frequently questionable, and they do not improve quality of life for neighbouring residential areas. While such units may be essential, there ought to be a place for refurbishment of existing employment buildings, as part of an explicit strategy to seek opportunities for heritage led regeneration.
Mrs A Haddon	Clerk to Mattersey Parish Council Mattersey Parish Council		Question 79	All suitable employment land should be protected from non-employment development There should be a policy for shop front development, strictly enforced which creates an attractive shopping environment especially in smaller towns or villages. Efforts should be made to support and encourage the development of retail in the Local Service Centres as defined in Sect 5.7 of the Core Strategy document.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr. David Wright	Clerk to the Council Everton Parish Council		Question 79	The number of people working within villages should be considered when planning for the future of the district considering that: The Parish Plan shows there are 72 jobs in Everton; In villages like Everton, working patterns will change up to 2026 with significantly more people working from home using high speed broadband to connect to their businesses; However, Home working is less likely to be as common in the former coal mining villages where people will continue to travel to more physical and less technical/computer based jobs.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 79	No
Mr George	Laneham Parish Council		Question 79	We understand that an area of Church Laneham, Manor Farm, has been designated an Industrial Area. the approaches to the site are narrow with narrow bridges on both approaches. Therefore, this site is only suitable for cottage industries.
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 80	No more supermarkets-provision for smaller shops in Town Centres only.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 80	Yes
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 80	The figure of 7,400 sq m relating to Worksop (Convenience Goods 2011-2016) does not appear in the text of the Consultation document; the table appears to have added a figure for a supermarket to a 5,700 sq m total described in the text (para. 6.41). A similar discrepancy occurs for 2016-2021 (convenience goods). The text (para. 6.42) refers the capacity in Retford 'growing' to 2,200 sq m by 2021, however reading of the table indicates this is additional from 2016. In overall terms the recommendations of the retail study should be adopted, in particular to support the roles of Worksop and Retford. It is important that proposals elsewhere do not compromise the role of those two town centres. However, if growth is proposed at Harworth-Bircotes careful consideration should be given to future capacity there together with Worksop. Nottinghamshire County Council Q80

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 80	<p>Within the consultation document, respondents are invited to comment upon the proposed policy regarding floorspace provision for convenience and comparison goods within Worksop and Retford over the LDF period. The proposed Policy suggests floorspace provision limits, by goods category, at varying time periods for Worksop and Retford. These figures are taken directly from the Bassetlaw Retail Study of 2009. In accordance with Paragraph 4.52 of Planning Policy Statement 12 -Local Spatial Planning - it is confirmed that for a Core Strategy to be "sound" the document should be justified, effective and consistent with National Policy. With relevance to these considerations, we assess the proposed planning policy, as outlined at Question 80 of the consultation document, as follows: Justified Within the supporting table, which accompanies Paragraph 4.52 of PPS12, it is confirmed that "justified" means that the document must be: Founded on a robust and credible evidence base, and The most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives. With regards to the evidence base, through our ongoing discussions with the Council, and its appointed Retail Consultant, in relation to the current planning application at the Vesuvius Works site, Sandy Lane, Worksop we have undertaken various analysis and sensitivity testing of the findings of the Bassetlaw Retail Study. Amongst other key considerations, it is accepted by the Council's Retail Consultant that the information relevant to expenditure growth and floorspace efficiency within the study period requires updating, and in this context the findings of the Study should already be considered to be somewhat out-of-date. In addition to the above, we have expressed a number of concerns relevant to the approach followed within the assessment by the Council's retail consultant and these matters are the subject of ongoing discussion as to how current and future development proposals should be assessed in the context of the findings of the Bassetlaw Retail Study. With reference to the second bullet point above, it is noted that neither the proposed planning policy within the consultation document, nor the Bassetlaw Retail Study proposes any alternative strategy for the provision of retail floorspace within Worksop and Retford. Instead, the policy is highly specific in terms of the scale and nature of retail floorspace that can be developed within the LDF period. This is wholly inappropriate at the Issues and Options consultation stage, whereby it is for the Local Authority to invite comments on a range of policy options. Accordingly, no party to date has proposed an alternative strategy relevant to the findings of the Bassetlaw Retail Study which, in our view follows an overly cautious and pessimistic approach to the delivery of new retail floorspace, particularly in regard to Worksop which is defined as a Sub-Regional Centre. Effectiveness PPS12 states that "effective" means that the document must be: Deliverable; Flexible, and Able to be monitored. Taking each of these bullet points in turn, with reference to Question 80 of the consultation exercise, with regards to</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mrs Sophie Lucas			Question 80	SSL do not support the policy approach set out in Question 80, which identifies precise retail floorspace capacity figures across the District, throughout the plan period (i.e. up until 2021). These figures do not provide scope for flexibility, which may be required in the event that future retail capacity studies identify an increased need for additional retail floorspace. This is considered even more likely, when having regard to current revisions proposed to the East Midlands Plan (June 2009), the findings of which are based upon more up to date household projections, and are likely to identify a significantly increased housing requirement across the region, and resultant need for further retailing. It is therefore recommended that the retail policy omits a specific level of retail floorspace, given that this would result in a policy which is unduly prescriptive and inflexible. It is also worthy of note at this stage, that a recent Inspector's Report for the Redcar and Cleveland Core Strategy recognised at paragraph 5.11 that "... there does not appear to be any great benefit in setting a strict
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 80	No comment.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 80	Yes
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 81	Yes.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 81	Yes
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 81	Yes, in particular an ad-hoc approach to town centre boundaries in response to proposals should be discouraged. Nottinghamshire County Council Q81
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 81	Yes
Mrs Jennifer Kirk	Clerk to Headon-cum-Upton, Grove and Stokeham Parish Council		Question 81	Council agree with all these.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 81	No comment
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 82	Evening economy to prolong the time people are in town

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways		Question 82	A key strength of Worksop town centre is the canal which passes from east to west through the centre of Worksop, linking outlying residential areas with the commercial area. 'The towpath network provides a motor-vehicle-free environment in which to travel to work, school or home, and 100 tonnes of carbon dioxide (CO2) are saved per 1 kilometre of towing path upgraded'. (TCPA Policy Advice Note: Inland Waterways: Unlocking the potential and securing the future of inland waterways through the planning system (2009)). BW supports the use of the towing path as sustainable transport routes for both walking and cycling. "Planning a Future for the Inland Waterways" (IWAAC, December 2001) states that "waterways corridors have a useful role to play in widening travel choices, providing opportunities for cycling, walking, alternative public transport and green routes. To ensure long term use of towpaths as sustainable route, investment and maintenance are needed ". It should be recognised that whilst waterside developments and regeneration schemes benefit from their waterside location, they can place extra liabilities and burdens on the waterway infrastructure, such as towpaths. As such it is important that policies are framed to support the imposition of conditions or the requirements for planning obligations to mitigate the impact on the waterway infrastructure.
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 82	The lack of large development sites for a more superstores. The lack of a third store reduces competition and so limits choice and value for residents. Within the Strengths and Weaknesses analysis regarding Worksop, it is noted that the 'Limited diversity and limited range and choice of shops with no anchor department store or superstore' represents a key weakness of Worksop Town Centre. Alongside this, 'Development Opportunities' is confirmed as a strength of the Town Centre. Based on our assessment of the Bassetlaw Retail Study and associated information, we would support the assertion that the qualitative retail offer of Worksop, in the context of it's designation as a Sub-Regional Centre within the Regional Spatial Strategy, represents a major weakness of Worksop. That said, we do not support the view that 'development opportunities' are identified within any document - Council produced or otherwise, which identify appropriate sites to enable development to be promoted to address the acknowledged retail quality/provision deficiencies of Worksop. In this context, and in accordance with our comments relevant to Consultation Question 80, we consider that the Core Strategy should be promoting policies which seek to enhance the qualitative retail offer of Worksop, at appropriate sites within or surrounding the Town Centre, in accordance with national and regional planning policy objectives.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 82	No comment.
mr keith buxton			Question 82	Regeneration of Worksop Town Centre should be included in Option 3.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 82	No comment
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 82	The centre of Worksop contains a large number of listed buildings, as well as the Castle site, a scheduled monument. This any development in the town center should seek to enhance its historic character.
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 82	Improvements to the public realm - especially based upon distinctive feature(s) of Worksop - would be beneficial.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 82	A weakness of Worksop, in comparison to Retford, is the appearance of the historic town centre and the ability to appreciate and gain access to its heritage. Retford's strengths include its historic qualities as well as the tourism and local interest value of the museum and centrally located parish church. Worksop has very major heritage lead regeneration potential especially with regards to green infrastructure and tourism associated with the Canch corridor and Worksop Priory sites.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 83	Diversity to encourage a wider spectrum of people to come to the town
Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways		Question 83	A key strength of Retford town centre is the canal which passes from east to west through the centre of Retford, linking outlying residential areas with the commercial area. 'The towpath network provides a motor-vehicle-free environment in which to travel to work, school or home, and 100 tonnes of carbon dioxide (CO2) are saved per 1 kilometre of towing path upgraded'. (TCPA Policy Advice Note: Inland Waterways: Unlocking the potential and securing the future of inland waterways through the planning system (2009)). BW supports the use of the towing path as sustainable transport routes for both walking and cycling. "Planning a Future for the Inland Waterways" (IWAAC, December 2001) states that "waterways corridors have a useful role to play in widening travel choices, providing opportunities for cycling, walking, alternative public transport and green routes. To ensure long term use of towpaths as sustainable route, investment and maintenance are needed ". It should be recognised that whilst waterside developments and regeneration schemes benefit from their waterside location, they can place extra liabilities and burdens on the waterway infrastructure, such as towpaths. As such it is important that policies are framed to support the imposition of conditions or the requirements for planning obligations to mitigate the impact on the waterway infrastructure.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 83	No comment.
Mr. David Wright	Clerk to the Council Everton Parish Council		Question 83	Retford Town Centre - Weaknesses (page 90) comments on: The lack of car parking is a problem for the public as well as the business community. There are two small theatres in Retford not one. Retford having a train station is a strength not a weakness. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) - This could be helpful in villages, considering the piecemeal basis of small developments that currently take place. Many do not have any Section 106 agreements on them due to their small size. CIL could be used to get money from all these small development to deliver a community facility.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 83	No comment
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 83	Any development in the town centre should build on its strengths as a market town, with a strong independent sector. This will also be more sympathetic to its historic character.
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 83	The historic qualities of Retford are recognised by shoppers to be a strength and policies should be made to ensure that this is placed high on the agenda when dealing with management of the development pressure related to commercial activity.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 84	No -diversity is good
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 84	The improvement of Worksop bus station would be a significant factor in improving the attractiveness and accessibility of the centre and around the town as a whole. Consideration could be given to the use of S106 agreements which could assist in delivering improvements. Nottinghamshire County Council Q84

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Miss Claire Whittaker	Assistant Planner DPP		Question 84	Worksop has been identified in the issues and options consultation paper as a key centre for retail, entertainment and leisure in the District. Question 80 considers the need to establish a policy for securing convenience and comparison goods floorspace in Worksop over the LDF period. Figures are proposed in table format for convenience and comparison goods are proposed from 2011-2016. We recommend that an allowance should be made for greater flexibility, enabling a response to a changing economic climate. Therefore no figures should be proposed within the Core Strategy as this could restrict development within Bassetlaw District. In addition, the Council also seek to reduce Worksop's Town Centre and retail boundary, in line with the recommendation of the Bassetlaw Retail Study published by the Council May 2009, that Worksop's town centre boundary is too extensive and needs to be drawn in. This approach is at odds with the Core Strategy which identifies the need to support additional growth within Worksop. Reducing the Town Centre boundary will surely preclude this. We therefore recommend that the Council extends its town centre boundary to include the new Tesco site and Railway Station, as this would allow the town centre to accommodate more growth and investment making it a more viable place.
			Question 84	No comment.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 84	No
Mr John Hurdley			Question 84	I first lived in this area in 1961 also in Ranskill but spent much time in the Retford area from 1955 and I very much welcome your point on page 91 that both Worksop and Retford should be protected from out of centre development. I work mostly either at home or in Derbyshire and I very much enjoy living here with my family and friends, and indeed we're lucky to have such excellent access to both the main Road and Rail Networks. Both my wife and I are now in our 60's with both children predominantly away from home, My wife's mother aged 81 years lives only 8 houses away, and we very much wish to downsize now to make our lives a little easier in the years ahead. We love living in our immediate area and for some while now have wanted to build our own "Eco-House" - a two bedroomed small dwelling with very low running costs and small carbon footprint. My friend who accompanied me has indeed built one such dwelling in Newark and has reduced his running costs very substantially. We would ask you to give consideration to "Squaring off" the envelope at the rear of our property in line with the recent barn development. Plainly, there is much yet to consider on the detailed design of such a dwelling and we shall be working closely with Richard to present plans early in the New Year.
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 85	Yes-design of frontages should be in keeping with age of the buildings.
Mrs Brenda Wilson			Question 85	Yes please. Shop fronts should be sympathetic to the overall building of retail growth, but protect any original old buildings from being hidden. Retford is a case in point!

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Miss Claire Whittaker	Assistant Planner DPP		Question 85	It is noticed within the Core Strategy that there are also a number of other smaller centres in the District, as well as rural retail outlets that may benefit from specific policy approaches. The Council therefore considers that the following centres should be designated as Local Centres with specific policies to protect and strengthen them: Harworth Bircotes Langold Carlton Tuxford Markham Misterton Ordsall The Worksope Centres of: Manton Raymoth Lane Prospect Hill Gateford Road
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 85	No comment.
mr keith buxton			Question 85	Yes - maintain suitability for area with a mix of appropriate retail outlets.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 85	Yes
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 85	Given the historic importance of Worksope and Retford, policies that control shopfront design are desirable, including the preservation of traditional shop fronts. In other centres, good design should also be encouraged.
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 85	Restrictions on the type and size of shop front fascias and the restriction in the use of shutters is supported by existing guidance in PPG 15 and would be an important part of protecting the historic character of all local centres, but particularly Worksope and Retford.
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 86	Not feasible.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 86	Yes - the area becomes too limited and uninteresting
Mr John R Holland			Question 86	Yes
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 86	No comment.
Mrs Jennifer Kirk	Clerk to Headon-cum-Upton, Grove and Stokeham Parish Council		Question 86	The council would favour option 2. Criteria would be where it is in keeping with parish plans/ design statements. Density would be in keeping with surrounding developments. Design would be in keeping.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 86	Yes
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 86	Restricting the number and location of fast food outlets is a positive proposal that could help limit the potential damage caused by concentrations of fast food outlets on the viability, liveability and historic character of the local centres.
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 87	Retail areas in rural areas should be encouraged.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 87	No - villages need retail outlets, but not too many or too big or the area ceases to be a village
Mr John R Holland			Question 87	Yes
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 87	Yes, as long as such policies take a positive approach in accordance with national guidance.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 87	No comment.
Paul Tame	National Farmers Union		Question 87	The Council needs to bear in mind farm shops as a valuable form of rural diversification and not put in place policies which are restrictive to this form of development.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
mr keith buxton			Question 87	Yes
Mr Philip CABLE			Question 87	Yes. Despite economies of scale for growth, all the rural communities contribute to the community costs. A proportionate amount of support and funding should be available for 'other villages' specifically for 2 bedroom starter homes and for Aged Persons purpose designed accommodation.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 87	yes
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 87	There should be an approach based on ensuring that retail development in villages/rural areas is in scale with the likely demand from the relevant settlement - it will also be important to a) encourage the re-use of existing buildings, and b) ensure that new development is of an appropriate quality that respects the character of both the wider area and its more immediate surroundings.
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 87	Restricting out of town retail is vital to protecting and sustaining the viability of local centres. Maintaining a commercial element of local centres is an important contributor to protecting the mixed use character of historic villages. Local commercial outlets are an important factor in facilitating community cohesion.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 88	Yes
Michael Meadows	Drivers Jonas	Michael Meadows	Question 88	LIH supports the proposed designation at Gateford Road as a Local Centre. It is considered that small-scale convenience retail provision may be suitable within urban extensions, to serve the needs of the new community, subject to demonstrating minimal impact on the proposed Local Centre(s).
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 88	Designation as Local Centres may be a useful policy tool but defining the boundaries may be difficult. In some local centres, services are not all located together in one distinct location but are rather dispersed through the settlement, for example in Misterton where there are smaller clusters of shops/other services along (or adjacent to) the main thoroughfare, separated by other uses (primarily housing). Seeking to define a single 'local centre' within such settlements may result in a false definition of the 'settlement centre', which may (or may not) actually be the most accessible location or reflect the historical pattern of development of that settlement.. In such circumstances, it may be more appropriate to define the 'local centre' more loosely or have criteria-based policies which apply within the entire settlement envelope.
Mrs Janet Hodson			Question 88	A major urban extension to the east of Worksop will provide a new local centre to service that area but will also support the centre reached by foot and cycle in the Kilton area.
			Question 88	No comment.
mr keith buxton			Question 88	Yes - no overspill into residential areas. Clarification needed to answer question properly re expansion of local centre boundaries into other areas.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 88	Why isn't Shireoaks within this category. There are suburbs of Worksop mentioned yet other village communities have been omitted. Designating certain areas in this way should not be encouraged as it stifles flexibility of approach and possible change of circumstances.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 88	Yes

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 88	Yes - the list of potential local centres is sensible. Local centre designation and protective policies would contribute to preserving and enhancing the historic character of Carlton, Misterton, Markham, Tuxford and Ordsall. Some of these have designated conservation areas, within which development can be controlled to preserve their character, others should be considered for designations. Where conservation area boundaries exist these should be reflected in designation of local centre boundaries, where CAs are not in place it may be worth considering designating new ones for these centres.
MR DAVID PECK	PRINCIPAL PLANNER ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES	MR DAVID PECK	Question 89	The Core Strategy and subsequent LDF documents should avoid unnecessary complexity.
William Davis			Question 89	William Davis Ltd accept that planning obligations may be expected on all of the areas identified in question 90. However we are keen to point out that developer contribution towards alternative employment land, natural heritage and cultural heritage should only be expected on sites where mitigation for the loss of such areas is required. Requiring developer contributions towards such areas from sites which do not influence employment sites or natural and cultural heritage areas would not directly relate to the proposed development and as a consequence would be inconsistent with circular 05/2005. It is very important that any policy proposed on planning obligations follows the national guidance contained in Circular 05/2005.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 89	No comment.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 89	No
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 90	Council needs to make plans to ensure all needs may be met.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 90	Affordable Housing Healthcare Education Open Space & Transport
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 90	Of the areas listed the only one which would seem unnecessary to seek contributions towards would be alternative employment land. The example given for requesting such contributions, which suggests that alternative sites could be requested to mitigate the loss of protected employment land, is somewhat spurious in that it is unlikely that the council would grant permission for a use other than employment on a protected site in the first place. Protected employment sites are protected for very good reasons and the recent appeal decision in the district involving the Dormer Tools site would serve to enforce this point. Therefore, it is highly unlikely to be necessary to ask for such a contribution. Nottinghamshire County Council Q90
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 90	Supplementary - In particular, Transport Contributions will also be required to provide the necessary transport infrastructure/improvements in order to accommodate the proposed development. This is an extremely important issue for the Local Planning Authority which needs to be addressed in detail. Nottinghamshire County Council Q90 (supplementary)
Michael Meadows	Drivers Jonas	Michael Meadows	Question 90	LIH considers that planning obligations should be sought on a site-by-site basis, in accordance with the tests set out in Circular 05/05. It will be important that proposed planning obligations are set at an appropriate level, taking into account issues of viability. It is important to note that if a Community Infrastructure Levy is introduced, this should be in place of, not in addition to, equivalent planning obligations.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways		Question 90	<p>Areas of interest to British Waterways are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Open Space: Waterways are a form of open space, performing a variety of functions. As part of the open space network (as recognised in PPG 17), inland waterways and towing paths perform multiple functions, such as: Strategic links between areas Important wildlife corridors A recreation and sport resource Accessible amenity in urban areas Access to the countryside Visual amenity; and A community resource (TCPA Policy Advice Note: Inland Waterways: Unlocking the potential and securing the future of inland waterways through the planning system (2009)). 2. Natural Heritage: The waterways support biodiversity and form ecological corridors 3. Transport: 'Waterways and towing paths play an important role in widening travel choices for cycling, walking, freight and public transport. The towing path network provides a motor-vehicle-free environment in which to travel to work, school or home, and 100 tonnes of carbon dioxide (CO2) are saved per 1 kilometre of towing path upgraded' (TCPA Policy Advice Note: Inland Waterways: Unlocking the potential and securing the future of inland waterways through the planning system (2009)). It is important that the extra liabilities and burdens placed upon the network are addressed in relation to new development. and 4. Cultural Heritage: 'The built environment of the waterways represents a unique working heritage of industrial architecture, archaeology and engineering structures, and is a valuable part of the national heritage, as well as an integral part of regional and sub-regional cultural heritage and local distinctiveness. Inland waterways possess all the 'heritage values' as defined by English Heritage' (TCPA Policy Advice Note: Inland Waterways: Unlocking the potential and securing the future of inland waterways through the planning system (2009)).
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 90	<p>Yes to all except alternative employment land mitigation, since release should only occur where the site is not viable for entirely employment re-uses anyway, or where a sufficiency of employment land has been identified..</p>
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 90	<p>We consider that the council should be seeking to secure planning contributions for habitat protection, restoration and creation, establishment and aftercare management costs (funded management plans) and site accessibility, where appropriate, and site interpretation. Hopefully the need for mitigation can be reduced with a strategic spatial approach to development, but if necessary developers should finance off site mitigation to ensure no net loss of biodiversity and give biodiversity gain.</p>
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 90	<p>There needs to be clarity in terms of how these issues will be addressed through both Section 106 contributions and the emerging Community Infrastructure Levy. It would be dangerous to suggest it should be planning contributions. There should be obligations to provide some both in a physically built form and others by way of contributions if the sites are not adequate to support some of the facilities envisaged, for example, schooling. It might be, as is generally consistent with Section 106 agreements that capital contributions will be given to the County Council or others for the provision of services off site. There should be direction that all of these issues need to be addressed depending on the scale of the development and that there would be an appropriate level of either contributions or provision within the development scheme. The list is fairly comprehensive and it would be expected by developers that all these issues would need to be addressed as part of the engagement process and the negotiations leading up to the conclusion of the Section 106 Agreement.</p>

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr Walker Dormer Tools Walker Dormer Tools	Ian Baseley Associates		Question 90	The Council should be seeking planning obligations only if necessary in respect of any development proposal. Obligations are not a means by which the Council should secure revenue where that revenue is not required as a direct result of the development approved. The requirement to provide alternative employment land where such land is developed for other uses is entirely unreasonable as a standard requirement and is only likely to hinder land coming forward.
Mrs Janet Hodson			Question 90	This depends on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the final outcomes. The main issue is that contribution be commensurate with the scale of development and maintain viability. A large urban extension will have the ability to improve all transport linkages, deliver sustainable and affordable new homes and other substantial community benefits.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 90	There needs to be clarity in terms of how these issues will be addressed through both Section 106 contributions and the emerging Community Infrastructure Levy. It would be dangerous to suggest it should be planning contributions. There should be obligations to provide some both in a physically built form and others by way of contributions if the sites are not adequate to support some of the facilities envisaged, for example, schooling. It might be, as is generally consistent with Section 106 agreements that capital contributions will be given to the County Council or others for the provision of services off site. There should be direction that all of these issues need to be addressed depending on the scale of the development and that there would be an appropriate level of either contributions or provision within the development scheme. The list is fairly comprehensive and it would be expected by developers that all these issues would need to be addressed as part of the engagement process and the negotiations leading up to the conclusion of the Section 106 Agreement.
Ms Ursilla Spence	Nottinghamshire County Council		Question 90	The use of planning obligations to ensure mitigation measures for the historic environment is supported, not least because (when dealing with buried archaeological issues) it can reduce the level of risk for developers.
mrs a haddon	clerk shireoaks parish council		Question 90	It is assumed that this policy would replace the section 106 agreements, this levy should be targeted more within the local areas involved in the development. A certain percentage should be retained in this area and used in accordance with local residents wishes. The developments have an impact on the areas in which they are built and as such alter the needs of the whole community. The levy would help alleviate the impact.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 90	Should seek all listed items
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 90	We welcome the inclusion of cultural heritage. The reference to open space should also include wider multi-functional GI networks.
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 90	It will be especially important to pursue the provision of multi-functional open spaces/new habitats/improved linkages (including to the wider countryside) - i.e. a combination of open space and natural heritage considerations, but also including landscape character and preventative health care dimensions. Clearly where development would impact upon the historic environment (including wider settings) mitigation measures will be necessary if development is deemed to be satisfactory. Public transport and provision/improvements along with new improved facilities for non-car users - pedestrians and cyclists in particular - is also a priority.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 90	All of the above are capable of being covered by planning contributions (whether by S.106 or) but in each case the contribution must be clearly justified and related to the development. The impact of the contributions on the viability and deliverability of the development must be a key consideration.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 91	Affordable Housing
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 91	Of the areas listed in question 90, the most important areas for the Council to be collecting contributions towards are education and transport. Nottinghamshire County Council Q91
Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways		Question 91	'As a priority, local authorities should consider investing planning obligations secured from the development or regeneration of sites on the waterside, or otherwise benefiting from it, to enhance the waterways infrastructure or to mitigate against matters such as increased risk of flooding' (TCPA Policy Advice Note: Inland Waterways: Unlocking the potential and securing the future of inland waterways through the planning system (2009)).
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 91	All except alternative employment land mitigation.
Mr Craig Ball	Development Planner UK Coal Mining Ltd		Question 91	In respect of Questions 91 and 92 UK COAL generally recognise that the elements set out in the consultation document for which the Council can seek planning contributions are appropriate. However the policy needs to be worded to enable flexibility in the prioritisation of the areas for contributions depending on site specific, locational requirements and/or Council strategies or priorities which change and evolve over time as well as the changing priorities and demands in that area. As with the affordable housing policy, UK COAL suggest that the actual amounts of contribution to be provided for each element be a matter of negotiation at the time of the planning application and be considered as a whole package rather than completely separate provisions. Therefore at the time of the application, the local authority would have to have regard to such things as any abnormal costs associated with the development of the site, the economic viability of the scheme and other requirements associated with the development, such as the other S106 requirements that may be a greater priority in that particular area. Therefore the policy should be flexible enough to deal with changing circumstances, particularly those associated with the economy and/or site specific constraints and not prevent sites coming forward altogether but rather have the ability to accept lower contributions to enable development to come forward.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 91	They all have a place depending on the scale of development and it is, therefore, difficult to say that they are in any degree of importance as a lot will depend on the site and the demands that would be generated by that development.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
		Ms Emma Cruickshank	Question 91	UK COAL generally recognise that the elements set out in the consultation document for which the Council can seek planning contributions are appropriate. However the policy needs to be worded to enable flexibility in the prioritisation of the areas for contributions depending on site specific, locational requirements and/or Council strategies or priorities which change and evolve over time as well as the changing priorities and demands in that area. As with the affordable housing policy, UK COAL suggest that the actual amounts of contribution to be provided for each element be a matter of negotiation at the time of the planning application and be considered as a whole package rather than completely separate provisions. Therefore at the time of the application, the local authority would have to have regard to such things as any abnormal costs associated with the development of the site, the economic viability of the scheme and other requirements associated with the development, such as the other S106 requirements that may be a greater priority in that particular area. Therefore the policy should be flexible enough to deal with changing circumstances, particularly those associated with the economy and/or site specific constraints and not prevent sites coming forward altogether but rather have the ability to accept lower contributions to enable development to come forward.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 91	They all have a place depending on the scale of development and it is, therefore, difficult to say that they are in any degree of importance as a lot will depend on the site and the demands that would be generated by that development.
			Question 91	We consider the following areas to be of greatest priority when securing developer contributions: Affordable housing; Healthcare; Education; Open space; Transport.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 91	No comment
Miss Ann Plackett	Regional Planner English Heritage		Question 91	Priorities should be determined on a site by site basis; cultural and natural heritage and GI should not be considered to be a low priority.
Mr Alan Hubbard	Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust		Question 91	It will be especially important to pursue the provision of multi-functional open spaces/new habitats/improved linkages (including to the wider countryside) - i.e. a combination of open space and natural heritage considerations, but also including landscape character and preventative health care dimensions. Clearly where development would impact upon the historic environment (including wider settings) mitigation measures will be necessary if development is deemed to be satisfactory. Public transport and provision/improvements along with new improved facilities for non-car users - pedestrians and cyclists in particular - is also a priority.
Mr Jason Mordan			Question 91	Cultural Heritage mitigation - the heritage of the district is a non-renewable resource mitigation offers an appropriate opportunity to reinforce this fact. Preservation of heritage assets must always be at the forefront of any planning decisions with regard to the management of the local and designated heritage, but preservation by record will be appropriate in some circumstances. Enhancement of the heritage of the area through improvements to its setting and intellectual access, as well as physical access, are also to be encouraged. The affect of highway works on the character and setting of conservation areas, scheduled monuments, historic parks and gardens and listed buildings should be considered as part of the planning process and appropriate mitigation required to conserve these assets.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 92	Bassetlaw District Council could be seeking contributions towards other areas such as Libraries and Adult Social Care. Taking into account projected population predictions of the prevalence of a larger element of elderly people within society, the latter issue will become increasingly important in future years. Green Infrastructure is also considered to be an increasingly important area which should be taken into consideration within new developments. In this regard it is considered appropriate to request contributions towards the delivery or management of such infrastructure. Nottinghamshire County Council Q92
Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways		Question 92	Site specific waterway infrastructure, environment and access should be considered to be the top priority for all waterside sites within any planning obligation strategy. The following opportunities relating to wider public benefits and contributing to the delivery of sustainable waterside development and regeneration could be secured through planning obligations: improvements to the towing path itself (including signage and interpretation) and towing path access in the vicinity of a new development or creation of new access to the towing path as types of on-site transport measures and facilities in order to encourage use of towing path for walking and cycling; the provision of a new bridge over a waterway where there is a clear need for improved access from a new development site; the provision of new wharves, slipways, boathouses and landing stations (used in connection with water-based recreation, leisure and sport) to meet identified shortfall and need for such facilities in the area; the creation or extension of mooring basins lay-bys, on-line linear moorings, associated services and built facilities, to meet identified shortfall and need for such facilities in the area; the provision of commuted sums to assist waterway enhancement in the vicinity of an application site including habitat enhancement and creation and management schemes; maintenance agreements/commuted sums for ongoing maintenance of towing path as a sustainable route; reinstatement of waterway walls affected by development; the provision of replacement or improvement of existing surface water discharge channels into feeders, culverts, sluices, weirs or reservoirs; the construction of new soakaways, culverts or other works (or improvements to existing ones) required to alleviate flooding risk arising from nearby or remote development; works to realign water courses which feed into any of the feeders, culverts, sluices, weirs or reservoirs, the construction of new soakaways or works required to alleviate flooding; transportation in the construction cycle, for delivery of supplies as well as removal of extracted minerals and waste by water; works to ensure that off-site landscaping occurs, and agreement given for the use of British Waterways land (for example where development has a visual impact on the waterway which cannot be addressed on the development site); provision of navigable crossings as part of future road schemes, where proposed road or rail schemes cross over a disused or derelict waterways earmarked for restoration.
	CEG c/o	Mr Bob Woollard	Question 92	No.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 92	No comment.
Ms Vicki Ingleby	Turley Associates		Question 92	The Council should also consider seeking contributions towards flood risk mitigation where appropriate.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 92	No

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Ms Judith M Goacher			Question 93	No.
Mrs Auriol Bird			Question 93	No
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 93	Measures to improve the delivery of infrastructure and services within the county would be welcome. However, as currently proposed, the County Council has grave concerns about the ability of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to achieve this. It would be sensible, however, for the District Council to undertake the infrastructure planning and viability assessments necessary to develop a CIL so that one could be implemented if that was appropriate. This would seem especially prudent as the proposed restrictions to the current planning obligation system may force local authorities to impose a CIL in order to be able to continue to collect contributions towards the delivery of required services and infrastructure at the necessary levels. It is suggested that the County and District Councils establish a working group to jointly agree the required levels of infrastructure to be included within any possible CIL charging schedule in order to be able to establish at as early a stage as possible what these joint requirements will be. Nottinghamshire County Council Q93
Mr Martyn Coy	Planner British Waterways		Question 93	British Waterways has no comment to make on whether the Council should develop a Community Infrastructure Levy. Should the Council pursue this 'waterways should be considered under the following forms of infrastructure as currently defined in the provisions for CIL: green infrastructure and open space sustainable transport infrastructure; and part of the infrastructure supporting flood alleviation, drainage and water supply (TCPA Policy Advice Note: Inland Waterways: Unlocking the potential and securing the future of inland waterways through the planning system (2009)).
William Davis			Question 93	The government are currently consulting on the detailed proposals and draft regulations of the CIL. Any policy on CIL in the Core Strategy should be consistent with finally adopted national guidance.
Mr Craig Ball	Development Planner UK Coal Mining Ltd		Question 93	In terms of Question 93 and the Community Infrastructure Levy, the Council will need to be guided by Government's progression with this, for which a decision has been delayed until the next budget in April 2010 and more than likely any decision on this will be taken after the General Election in Spring 2010.
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 93	We believe that the Council should develop a Community Infrastructure Levy alongside specific Planning Obligation requirements to help fund biodiversity gain in the District and to help achieve the targets set in The East Midlands Regional Plan (2009). When the Council is considering any potential impact on the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC and the need to mitigate (through the provision of SANGS) a model is provided by the Dorset Heathland Joint DPD, whereby developers contribute towards a fund for the heathlands.
Mr Marin Herbert			Question 93	This would help as it would produce clarity for developers who are concerned about the interaction between Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy contributions. Each scheme must, however, be assessed on its viability and the ability to contribute to other schemes. Also it would be appropriate to not be too prescriptive in terms of what other regional projects will take place and which should be funded by the Community Infrastructure Levy. We feel there should be an emphasis on development focused in areas where there is no significant need to upgrade the infrastructure.

Issues and Options Consultation Responses

Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
Mrs Janet Hodson			Question 93	This is an option that is available under forthcoming legislation. Any outcomes should not duplicate requirements and make the position of the authority absolutely clear. In the interim period the authority could provide an SPG on obligations to set out their position.
		Ms Emma Cruickshank	Question 93	Question 93 and the Community Infrastructure Levy, the Council will need to be guided by Government's progression with this, for which a decision has been delayed until the next budget in April 2010 and more than likely any decision on this will be taken after the General Election in Spring 2010.
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 93	This would help as it would produce clarity for developers who are concerned about the interaction between Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy contributions. Each scheme must, however, be assessed on its viability and the ability to contribute to other schemes. Also it would be appropriate to not be too prescriptive in terms of what other regional projects will take place and which should be funded by the Community Infrastructure Levy. We feel there should be an emphasis on development focused in areas where there is no significant need to upgrade the infrastructure.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 93	Yes
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 93	We would recommend that the Council sees how other LPAs progress with this first as are likely to be issues of deliverability of major infrastructure through CIL. If the Council adopts this approach it needs to be dealt with rigorously, with a full justification for each contribution.
Mrs Sally Gill			Question 94	The policies contained in the County's Planning Contribution Strategy document, or any subsequent document produced by the County Council, should be adopted, along with the thresholds for consultation on new development planning applications contained therein. In line with the areas requiring contributions mentioned in Question 90 in the Issue and Options document and above in Question 92, the County Council would wish to be consulted on all new development applications which trigger a contribution request and therefore would wish to see a protocol introduced which would enable this. Nottinghamshire County Council Q94
Mr Carl Cornish	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust		Question 94	There is the opportunity in the Core Strategy (and related Green Infrastructure Study and a Landscape Character assessment) to have a policy that identifies areas within the District which are priorities for enhancement and expansion of natural green spaces. The East Midlands regional Plan (2009) has identified Biodiversity Conservation Areas (see answer to Question 68) - humberhead Levels, Sherwood Forest and River trent. PPS9 supports planning permission for schemes that deliver biodiversity gain (e.g. creation of new nature reserves) and that could be highlighted in such a policy as suggested. An issue that needs to be considered is that an area of Nottinghamshire meets the criteria to be designated as a Special Protection Area for nightjar and wood lark. At the moment this area has not reached the stage of being a proposed SPA (pSPA) but it has recently been taken into consideration at the Public Inquiry for the proposed Rufford ERF; the PI has been adjourned until april 2010 to clarify the ecological issues. The potential impacts of developments within and adjacent to a pSPA/SPA will have to be taken into account and an Appropriate Assessment undertaken. A plan of the potential pSPA is attached and if you would like further clarification on this matter then please contact Mrs Janice Bradley, Head of Conservation Policy and Planning, Nottinghamshire Wildlife trust (telephone 0115 9588242; e-mail jbradley@nottswt.co.uk_

Issues and Options Consultation Responses				
Full Name	Organisation Details	Agent Full Name	Number	Consultee Responses
		Mr Martin Herbert	Question 94	No comment.
Mrs A Haddon	Clerk to Mattersey Parish Council Mattersey Parish Council		Question 94	Planning Obligations should be sufficient to ensure adequate infrastructure is provided directly for the development within the specific planning application and not to create a general fund for use (mis-use) by local authorities.
Mr David Langmead	South Leverton Parish Council		Question 94	No
Mr John Scott	Head of Town Planning		Question 94	No.