

**REGULATION 30(D)
CONSULTATION STATEMENT**

**BASSETLAW CORE STRATEGY
& DEVELOPMENT
MANAGEMENT POLICIES DPD**

JANUARY 2011

CONTENTS

- 1. INTRODUCTION**
- 2. ISSUES AND OPTIONS**
- 3. PREFERRED OPTIONS**
- 4. ONGOING CONSULTATION**

APPENDICIES

- A. ISSUES & OPTIONS CONSULTATION SUMMARY REPORT**
- B. PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION SUMMARY REPORT**
- C. LIST OF THOSE BODIES AND PERSONS INVITED TO MAKE REPRESENTATIONS**
- D. LIST OF ADDITIONAL BODIES CONSULTED IN RELATION TO INFRASTRUCTURE PROVISION**

1. INTRODUCTION

This statement has been prepared, in line with regulation 30(d) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008 (hereafter 'the Regulations') to demonstrate how Bassetlaw District Council has complied with regulation 25.

The preparation of the Bassetlaw Core Strategy & Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) began with the publication of the *Issues and Options* paper and *Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report* for a six-week consultation period in September 2009. A second formal six-week consultation period on the *Preferred Options* and *Sustainability Appraisal* commenced in May 2010. Finally, the *Publication Core Strategy & Development Management Policies DPD*, *Publication Proposals Map*, *Sustainability Appraisal* and *Habitats Regulation Assessment* were released for public consideration for six weeks in November 2010.

As well as the formal consultation periods, the District Council has consulted with a range of bodies and individuals during the entire period of the DPD's development, and used a variety of methods in line with the Statement of Community Involvement, to secure feedback from as wide ranging a group as possible.

Following the Issues & Options and Preferred Options consultation stages, reports were produced that set out:

- which bodies were invited to make representations;
- how they were invited to do this;
- a summary of the main issues raised; and
- how they were taken into account.

These reports can be found as Appendix A and Appendix B. Appendix C sets out a comprehensive list of the bodies and individuals invited to make representations. This is supplemented by Appendix D, which sets out the additional bodies consulted outwith these processes in relation to infrastructure provision. Together this information addresses the requirements of 30(d) of the Regulations. An overview of each of the consultation stages is, nonetheless, given in Sections 2 and 3 below.

2. ISSUES AND OPTIONS

Which bodies were invited to make representations?

The Council consulted the Specific and General consultees, as required by the Regulations, along with the public, businesses, agents and other relevant organisations within the District. The full list is set out in Appendix C.

How were they invited to do this?

A paper or electronic copy of the document, together with a response form, was sent to the Statutory Consultees. Any one else with their details registered on the Council's LDF consultation database was alerted to the start of the consultation and directed to where they could find the relevant documents on the Council's website. In addition, the document was made available at the Council's offices and at Libraries throughout the District. Notices inviting representations were placed in the Worksop Guardian and Retford Times.

Posters advertising the events were distributed to all Parish Councils, local libraries, community halls/centres, the Council offices in both Retford and Worksop and to the various Council Contact Centres around the District.

The Council held five large-scale public consultation events on Saturdays across the District in Worksop, Retford, Harworth/Bircotes, East Markham and Sturton le Steeple.

There was direct consultation with the County's Gypsy Liaison Officer; Bassetlaw Community Voluntary Service; the Local Strategic Partnership (at Board, Executive and Sub-Group level); and the District's Rural Officer.

The Council held a number of events with local secondary schools in Worksop, Harworth and Tuxford.

Officers attended a number of Parish Council meetings throughout and beyond the consultation period, which established a rolling programme of Officer attendance at Parish Council meetings during the development of the DPD.

What were the main issues raised?

These are set out in the *Issues & Options Consultation Summary Report* at Appendix A.

How were the main issues taken into account?

All comments submitted to us during the Issues and Options consultation period were read, assessed and used to inform the next stage of Core Strategy development: the *Preferred Options* document. More detail on how

the main issues were accommodated is set out in relation to each policy area in the *Preferred Options* document itself.

3. PREFERRED OPTIONS

Which bodies were invited to make representations?

The Council consulted the Specific and General consultees, as required by the Regulations, along with the public, businesses, agents and other relevant organisations within the District. The full list is set out in Appendix C.

How were they invited to do this?

A paper or electronic copy of the document, together with a response form, was sent to the Statutory Consultees. Any one else with their details registered on the Council's LDF consultation database was alerted to the start of the consultation and directed to where they could find the relevant documents on the Council's website. In addition, the document was made available at the Council's offices and at libraries throughout the District. Notices inviting representations were placed in the Worksop Guardian and Retford Times.

Posters advertising the events were distributed to all Parish Councils, local libraries, community halls/centres, the Council offices in both Retford and Worksop and to the various Council Contact Centres around the District. An article was also sent out to local magazines and parish newsletters and placed in the Council's own newsletter that is posted to every house in the District. The Planning Policy Manager gave an interview on local radio station *Trax FM*, aimed at further advertising the consultation and the upcoming events.

The Council held six public consultation events, on weekday afternoons and evenings, across the District in Worksop, Retford, Harworth/Bircotes, Tuxford, Carlton/Langold and Misterton, as well as an additional event at the District Council's public open day on 14 July.

There was direct consultation with the County's Gypsy Liaison Officer; Bassetlaw Community Voluntary Service; the Local Strategic Partnership (at Board, Executive and Sub-Group level); and the District's Rural Officer. Planning Officers ran an event specifically for developers and agents on 1 June.

Planning Policy Officers attended numerous Parish Council meetings and events from October 2009 and all the way through, and beyond, the Preferred Options consultation in late May 2010. In relation to the latter, the following meetings were held with Parish Council representatives:

- Carlton, Langold and Tuxford Parishes (Carlton Village Hall) 24 May
- Hodsock, Shireoaks, Rhodesia and Harworth (Worksop Town Hall) 25 May

- Cuckney, North Leverton, North and South Wheatley, Sturton-le-Steeple, Dunham, Rampton, Nether Langwith, Gringley on the Hill, Elkesley, East Markham (Worksop Town Hall) 1 June
- Bothamsall, West Stockwith, Gamston, East Drayton, Clayworth, Markham Clinton (Retford Town Hall) 3 June
- Everton, Beckingham and Saundby, Blyth, Mattersey, Ranskill, Walkeringham, Claborough (Beckingham Village Hall) 7 June

These were complemented by visits to specific Parish Council meetings, where requested; village events (in Elkesley and Tuxford); and attendance on several occasions at the North East Bassetlaw Forum.

What were the main issues raised?

These are set out in the *Preferred Options Consultation Summary Report* at Appendix B.

How were the main issues taken into account?

All comments submitted to us during the Preferred Options consultation period were read, assessed and used to inform the next stage of Core Strategy development: the *Publication* document. Where necessary, further discussions were instigated with individual representors and organisations to clarify concerns or to come to an agreement about a suitable way forward.

4. ONGOING CONSULTATION

As has already been noted, discussions with individuals and organisations (chiefly Parish Councils) have taken place within and outside the two formal consultation periods, be they face-to-face, via email or on the telephone. Such consultation has included discussions with Parish Councils, infrastructure providers, statutory bodies (notably Natural England and the Environment Agency), neighbouring planning authorities, the former Regional Assembly, the development industry, the Local Strategic Partnership and local interest groups.

APPENDIX A: CORE STRATEGY ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION SUMMARY DOCUMENT


Bassetlaw District Local Development Framework

CORE STRATEGY
ISSUES AND
OPTIONS

CONSULTATION
SUMMARY
DOCUMENT



CORE STRATEGY ISSUES AND OPTIONS
CONSULTATION SUMMARY DOCUMENT



BASSETLAW
DISTRICT COUNCIL
NORTH NOTTINGHAMSHIRE

January 2010

1	Introduction	2
2	Public Consultation Events	3
3	Interest Group Consultation Events	13
4	Local School Consultation Events	15
5	Responses to the Issues and Options Documents	18
6	Compliance with the Statement of Community Involvement	25
7	Next Steps	28
8	Annex A: Consultation Plan	29
9	Annex B: List of Consultees and Interest Groups	34
10	Annex C: Parish Council Feedback	36

INTRODUCTION

- 1.1** The Issues & Options consultation was the first stage of the Core Strategy development process. It was a 'catch all' consultation to get views on what local people and other stakeholders saw as the key challenges facing the District and how best to tackle them in planning terms.
- 1.2** A formal six-week public consultation on the Core Strategy Issues & Options document finished on 23 October 2009 (although late submissions were accepted and processed), with the consultation document available in hardcopy, to download from the Council's website or via the Council's consultation portal (<http://consult.bassetlaw.gov.uk/portal>). In addition, five public events were held around the District on consecutive Saturdays and members of the Planning Policy team attended several Parish Council meetings and met with pupils from local secondary schools.
- 1.3** While considerable local publicity was undertaken (see Annex A for details), a number of organisations (see Annex B for list) were formally notified of the consultation, in line with the Regulations. They included:
- Specific Consultation Bodies: Statutory bodies involved in service provision, Government Agencies working on particular issues and Parish and Town Councils in or adjoining Bassetlaw District.
 - General Consultation Bodies: A more wide ranging category of local voluntary and community groups.
- 1.4** In addition, all of those individuals and organisations registered on the Council's LDF consultation database were informed of the consultation by email.
- 1.5** This Statement details the consultation mechanisms used for the Issues & Options stage and summarises the responses received. While there is no specific requirement to prepare a Statement at this stage of the Core Strategy development, it has nonetheless been prepared in accordance with Regulation 30(1) (d) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008, which requires the submission of a DPD to be accompanied by a statement setting out:
- those bodies consulted;
 - how they were consulted;
 - a summary of the main issues raised;
 - how representations have been taken into account.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION EVENTS

2.1 The five public consultation events provided an opportunity for members of the local community to highlight specific issues that they felt should be addressed in planning the future of Bassetlaw. They were aimed at all sectors of the local community and comprised detailed display boards that explained the proposed options for growth and the key policy areas that would need to be addressed to deliver such growth. Attendees were able to leave comments and to vote for their preferred growth option. Planning staff were present to answer questions. There were also copies of the Core Strategy Issues & Options document and the draft Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment available for the public to have a look at or to take away with them. Attendees were able to leave their contact information if they wanted to be kept informed about the further stages of the process.

EAST MARKHAM EVENT



Picture 2.1

Views on the Spatial Options

Option 1: This was the favoured option on the day. Many residents agreed that local services were important in considering future growth.

Option 2: This option was considered reasonable, as many believe that it offered a sustainable option by placing all future housing and employment development within the two largest towns.

Option 3: This option was the least favourable as this was seen as the least sustainable by members of the public.

Views on the Themes

Local Services

There was a general concern over the loss of rural businesses and local services e.g. Shops and Post Offices. Many local residents felt that these services should be encouraged and supported by the District Council.

Many residents did not oppose further development within rural areas, but did agree that this should be supported by local services such as schools and shops.

Affordable Housing

The need for affordable housing within rural areas was highlighted. Tuxford was seen as an area where there have been specific issues with housing affordability. It was also suggested that there should not be a fixed percentage of houses required. Currently BDC ask for a 30% affordable housing contribution on developments of 15 dwellings or more. This should be an adjustable tier subject to the amount of houses being developed.

Many residents suggested that there was a need for starter homes for young people and young families within rural communities. It was felt that young people are priced out of the rural housing market and this is contributing to a significant decline in the activity of certain rural villages.

Housing development, Infilling & Backland Development

Parish Council representatives felt that recent infilling and poor design has undermined the character of both East Markham and other rural villages. It was suggested that any new policies regarding infill and design should consider both existing local character and building styles.

It was suggested that orchards should be protected as important village spaces.

Rural Development

Farm diversification should be encouraged along with suitable development within rural villages. Housing development should not be restricted if there is no alternative use for derelict buildings.

A number of people said they would prefer to see some growth within most rural areas. It was also mentioned that there was a need for further employment within rural areas, particularly within some of the larger settlements.

Open Space

There are not enough play areas; the current facilities are in poor condition, particularly in Rampton. There are many villages that do not have any form of play or recreation facilities namely East Markham, Askham, East Drayton and Dunham.

Elkesley needs new football facilities as the current lack of facilities is threatening the village football team's survival.

Drainage

There was major concern among local residents that some current sewerage and drainage is inadequate and any further development would severely strain existing infrastructure.

HARWORTH BIRCOTES EVENT



Picture 2.2

Views on the Spatial Options

- 2.2** Option 1: Most residents supported this option as it shows a considerable amount of growth for Harworth as well as seeing more local services for the area.
- 2.3** Option 2: This was the least favoured option on the day as it only sees development for Worksop and Retford.
- 2.4** Option 3: This was the most favoured option on the day. Although Option 1 and 3 are very similar, this option was seen to be more sustainable and sees slightly more growth for Harworth.

Views on the Themes

Affordable Housing

- 2.5** Most people felt that there is the need for more affordable housing in Harworth, which would encourage young people to stay in the area in the future. A number of residents also put forward the idea that there should not be a fixed percentage of affordable houses that are built. At present, Bassetlaw District Council asks for a 30% affordable housing contribution for any development of more than 15 dwellings. Instead, residents would like to see this percentage adjusted depending on the number of houses being developed per site allocation.
- 2.6** In terms of growth, residents of Harworth would also like to see more housing for the elderly, for example bungalows.

Local Services

- 2.7** It was felt that public transport in the area was poor, as there is no regular service that runs to Worksop and Retford; improvements would be needed before any growth could occur. Facilities at the Leisure Centre and School are also insufficient as there are no 'parent and family' parking spaces or disabled parking spaces in close proximity to the entrance of the facilities.
- 2.8** Other comments from local people suggested that people of Harworth do not want to see any more takeaways. Local services such as banks, a post office and a supermarket would be more beneficial as there has been a recent increase in the loss of local services and businesses in the area. The majority of people wanted to see a better supermarket for the town, as the current Co-operative is regarded as being too expensive for local people.
- 2.9** Some residents believe that there are not enough facilities for young people in the town and there are no facilities for the elderly.

Employment

- 2.10** There is the need for better quality jobs in Harworth. A general concern of residents is that the main purpose of any employment should be to employ local people to reduce the number of people that are unemployed in the area.

Drainage

- 2.11** Poor drainage facilities were a concern amongst various residents, as the current system is not sufficient for the development that is currently in Harworth. During periods of heavy rainfall, areas often flood as a result of the poor infrastructure. The condition of the facilities would need improving if Harworth were to see any growth in the future.

Open Space

- 2.12** There is currently an insufficient amount of open space available for play areas or recreational purposes.

STURTON EVENT

Views on the Spatial Options

Option 1: Most residents supported this option as it shows a considerable amount of growth within the more sustainable settlements within Bassetlaw.

Option 2: This was the least favoured option on the day, as it was felt it placed an undue burden on Worksop.

Option 3: This was the second most popular option, as many residents agreed that the former coalfield settlements do need investment and regeneration.

Views on the Themes

Affordable Housing

2.13 Most people felt that there is the need for more Affordable Housing in rural areas, which would encourage young people to stay in the area in the future. A number of residents also put forward the idea that there should not be a fixed percentage of affordable houses that are built. At present, Bassetlaw District Council asks for a 30% affordable housing contribution for any development of more than 15 dwellings. Residents would like to see this percentage adjusted depending on the number of houses being developed per site allocation.

2.14 In terms of growth, residents of Sturton would also like to see more housing for the elderly, for example bungalows.

Employment

2.15 There was a concern about the lack of local employment opportunities for residents who want to stay in the area in the future.

Local Services

2.16 Another concern was the apparent lack of a regular service that runs to Worksop and Retford; improvements would be needed before any growth could occur.

2.17 Many residents agreed that rural villages should see protection of local services and facilities, such as shops, post offices and village Halls. There was a concern that a number of local services are closing in rural areas across Bassetlaw.

2.18 Local residents felt that the new play facility is a positive contribution to the village; that Sturton does have sufficient services; and that the school is good and well-attended.

2.19 Some residents from South Leverton felt that it should be linked with North Leverton insofar as access to local services was concerned.

Flood Risk

2.20 During 2007 and 2008, there were major flash floods that affected most of Sturton and the surrounding area. It was suggested that any new development should include, where appropriate, flood mitigation measures.

2.21 There were concerns that the drainage infrastructure around Misterton is poor and that major improvements would be needed before any growth could occur.

Renewable Energy

2.22 With reference to a recent windfarm application, many residents were concerned at the scale of the proposed development and the consequences it poses to the village and surrounding areas. A number of residents suggested that the Council should allocate specific sites for renewable energy, such as the High Marnham Power Station site, and not allow windfarms in such close proximity to small villages.

RETFORD EVENT

Views on the Spatial Options

Option 1: Most residents supported this option as it shows a considerable amount of growth for Harworth as well as seeing more local services for the area.

Option 2: This was the least favoured option on the day as it only sees development for Worksop and Retford.

Option 3: This was the most favoured option on the day. Although option 1 and 3 are very similar, this option was seen to be more sustainable and sees slightly more growth for Harworth.

Views on the Themes

Housing

2.23 The majority of residents understood that Retford could see some more housing growth, which would help to attract more people to the area, and mean that villages would not have to accommodate large developments.

2.24 Various comments were raised about the high density of housing developments in areas in Retford. It was felt that greater consideration needed to be given to the character of local communities. Other comments from local people suggested that standards of new homes should reflect Lifetime Homes requirements wherever possible, while others felt this was unnecessary.

2.25 There was a strong feeling from many people that Retford had seen enough housing growth in recent years and was starting to lose its 'market town' character (with a good balance of jobs, retail and services), while others felt that it should be trying to grow into a stronger centre.

Employment

2.26 Other comments from local people suggested that employment growth is necessary to keep housing growth sustainable in Retford.

Flooding

2.27 Poor drainage and sewerage facilities were a concern among various residents from Retford and Misterton. Some believed that poor existing infrastructure could restrict future developments.

2.28 It was also noted that during periods of bad weather, various areas around Retford flood as a result of poor water infrastructure. There was support for the use of sustainable drainage systems and the prevention of development in areas at risk of flooding. Residents also believed that developers in particular should be required to improve local infrastructure before being allowed to build.

Local Services

2.29 There was a strong perception that public transport in the area would need to be significantly improved if Retford was to see any growth, particularly the train service from Lincoln to Sheffield. There was also support for an improved retail offer in the town, which was felt to be insufficient (although there was recognition that many people preferred to travel to Newark and Lincoln).

WORKSOP EVENT



Picture 2.3

Views on the Spatial Options

Option 1: Most residents supported this option as they agreed that growth should be distributed across a number of settlements and that it was the most balanced option.

Option 2: This was the least favoured option on the day. Some attendees thought that as it only sees development for Worksop and Retford, the focus for development is too narrow.

Option 3: Residents also supported this option, but there were comments that more should be done to balance development in the east of Bassetlaw.

Views on the Key Themes

Local Services

2.30 A number of local people suggested that a Bus Station is needed in Worksop, as this facility is not currently present in the town. It was felt that this would improve transport links throughout the town, which is imperative if Worksop is to see more growth.

2.31 Another concern was the lack of leisure facilities in the town. Some attendees felt that a cinema, ice-skating facilities and a motorbike track would be beneficial for young people.

Housing development, Infilling & Backland Development

- 2.32** Some residents of Blyth felt that the village should not see anymore infilling, backland development or construction of town houses. It was felt that the village has seen an increasing number of developments such as this, which has contributed to undermining the character of the village. Some local residents would like to see the conservation area in Blyth extended to ensure that local character and building styles are maintained.

Other issues

- 2.33** There was strong support for 'proper' pedestrianisation of Bridge Street to prevent vehicles using it as an access route.
- 2.34** Many residents had concerns about waste issues, particularly around the River and Canal. Residents would like to see these areas cleaned up and improved.
- 2.35** The comment was made that community facilities need to be centrally located in large scale developments so that they are a focus for the community and that there needs to be appropriate infrastructure in places that will see more growth.

INTEREST GROUP CONSULTATION EVENTS

Engagement with the Gypsy Liaison Officer

- 3.1** The County's Gypsy Liaison Officer acted on the Council's behalf during the Issues & Options consultation period to strengthen relations and communication. Her response to the consultation was as follows:

Gypsy Liaison Officer Comment

'As gypsy and traveller liaison officer, I welcome the inclusion of gypsy and traveller accommodation needs within the Core Strategy (more detailed site allocation work to be done in Site Allocation DPD). It is vitally important that provision is made for gypsy and travellers within Bassetlaw. Key criteria for sites should include that they are close to services and facilities and therefore should be located around the larger settlements within Bassetlaw. Furthermore, it must be recognised that due to the transient nature of some gypsies and travellers, sites may also need to be located close to main thoroughfares within the District'.

Engagement with Bassetlaw Community Voluntary Service (BCVS)

- 3.2** A letter detailing the Issues & Options consultation and explaining the Local Development Framework was sent out to a wide range of organisations affiliated to the BCVS. Meetings with individual groups were also offered. Prior to the consultation, Council Officers from various departments met with BCVS groups to discuss how to better engage with them on a range of issues.

Engagement with the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP)

- 3.3** A considerable amount of work was undertaken with the LSP at Board and Executive level, as well as with individual LSP sub-groups. This included presentations on the LDF generally and on the Issues & Options work specifically. A successful workshop to engage LSP partners with infrastructure planning was also held. The LSP will continue to be a key consultation partner.

Engagement with the District's Rural Officer

- 3.4** As Bassetlaw has a large rural area, it was agreed that the District's Rural Community Officer would become directly involved with a number of consultation events. The representative attended all five of the main public consultation events across the District. This was designed to assist and advise members of the public who had issues with rural development and/or rural issues.

Rural Officer's Comment

It is important to engage with the rural community, particularly within a rural District. I welcome the chance to work alongside the Planning Department with regards to the formulation of the Local Development Framework. I will continue to support and advise on how the Planning Department can engage with rural communities.

Engagement with Parish Councils

3.5 Parish Council input to the Core Strategy is seen as essential if local issues are to be addressed, where possible, in the most effective way. To this end, Planning Aid was engaged, in advance of the Issues & Options consultation, to run an event specifically for Parish Councillors informing them about the LDF system and how the consultation process would work. Planning Officers offered to attend Parish Council meetings to discuss the Issues & Options document. A number of Councils took up this offer and notes of these meetings can be found at Annex C. There were, clearly, differences of opinion between Councils, although the areas of interest tended to be common. Most rural Parishes felt that there should be strong policies protecting local services and that affordable housing for those with a local connection should be encouraged. Most Councils also felt that design quality of new housing was increasingly important and felt that there had been too much in the way of backland and infill development to the detriment of village character. Misterton Parish Council was reluctant to see more housing growth in the village, at least in the next five years or until current sites have been built out (which reflects the findings of a separate consultation on this issue carried out by the Parish Council in the village in 2009) while Harworth Town Council was supportive of new growth and investment in the town, providing the necessary infrastructure is in place.

SCHOOL CONSULTATION EVENTS

The Events

- 4.1** Bassetlaw District Council, with the assistance of the East Midlands Planning Aid Service put together a consultation workshop to help engage young people with the Core Strategy 'Issues and Options' document. The session was also designed to raise the awareness of the planning system and sustainability issues more generally, to enable young people to participate in planning matters in the future.
- 4.2** The event was held on the 24 September 2009 at Worksop Town Hall, for schools in Worksop and Harworth, which included Portland School, Valley School, Serlby Park School and was held from 9am-12pm. The session involved young people aged 12-17 and twenty two pupils attended. The secondary schools in Retford did not wish to take part.
- 4.3** A presentation was prepared for the pupils, to provide information on what could potentially be happening in the District until 2026. Planning Aid provided a detailed presentation on the purpose of the event, which included an introduction to what planning is, what it means to them and why they should care. Following this, Planning Aid discussed what sustainable development is and why this should be considered when looking at the Core Strategy development options. This was followed by a short presentation by Bassetlaw District Council on key issues for future housing and employment in Bassetlaw. It also included a brief introduction to the Core Strategy and how pupils could contribute to the 'Issues and Options' document to help plan for their own future.
- 4.4** The pupils were split up into groups of four and each activity was designed to give participants the opportunity to interact with each other and to build understanding of what the Planners at Bassetlaw District Council are working on and the hard choices that need to take place when planning for future development. The feedback from the session was as follows:

Activity 1: The first activity involved looking at detailed maps of their area. Attendees were asked what they liked and disliked about their area and the top three things that they would improve. Many pupils suggested introducing more shops and facilities to the area, in particular for young people, such as an entertainment centre. On the whole, pupils found the maps to be easily navigable and they could easily identify their house, schools and local shops.

Activity 2: Activity two involved looking at Local Plan maps to see what has been proposed for the District over the last few years. The task also involved using the key to work out what the various colours on the maps represent and why planners have decided to protect some sites and not others. Other questions included working out what a town envelope is, why it is important and also thinking about why Planners have to allocate new housing land. Pupils suggested which areas they thought should be protected and raised specific concerns for the future. For example, some pupils said that there is the need for more shops and local services in Harworth.

Activity 3: The next activity involved looking at large-scale maps of the whole District. Pupils were asked to choose where they thought new housing developments should go. The three different options for housing, set out in the Issues & Options document, were placed in separate envelopes and contained squares of paper, which represented to scale the amount of land that would be required for each of the three housing options.

The pupils were asked to vote on the option they liked best and were encouraged to justify their reasons. The majority of the pupils favoured option one for new housing growth in Bassetlaw, as this is the option that would potentially see growth for most of the villages in the District and not just restricting it to one or two settlements. The majority of attendees decided against option two because this would only see growth for Worksop and Retford. Option three was also favoured slightly as this would see the most growth for Harworth and pupils thought this area needed major investment and regeneration.

Activity 4: This activity involved looking at large-scale maps of the whole District. Pupils were asked to consider what, if any, areas of open space or countryside they would like to see protected. The majority of pupils highlighted various woodlands, parks and fields that they would like to see protected in the future, for example the cricket field at East Drayton, and pupils also gave detailed comments on which areas of the District are more important to them. Some groups stated that there needs to be a balance of local parks and farmers' fields as they are both equally important. Other groups, however, felt that the countryside is more important, as farmers need the land to live and make money.

Activity 5: The pupils were asked to consider where new employment land should go. They felt that it needed to be close to where they had decided to put the new housing development to make both options sustainable. Pupils were also asked to consider where and how they would like to work in the future and were encouraged to give reasons for their choices. The pupils were asked to think about whether existing employment sites should be extended for employment uses only or if it would be better to allocate new employment areas in different places. When the pupils were asked whether employment land should be protected in the future, they thought this was a necessity as it might be under threat from other development, such as housing, which they considered to be unsustainable.

At the end of the sessions, pupils were asked to post their comments and preferred options on the voting wall

The feedback

Harworth

- 4.5** The majority of pupils felt that areas of Bassetlaw needed to see more growth and that Harworth in particular should see the most of this growth. Many pupils from Serlby Park School believed that most of the housing allocation for Harworth should be located on the old Colliery site, although more services would be necessary to accommodate this increase in population. Other concerns were that of the security for pupils walking to school on a daily basis and the route in that they take. More lighting, for example, may be required in areas that are used by pupils to get to school.
- 4.6** Most pupils from Harworth said that there is nothing for them to do in the town, as one side of Harworth in particular offers very little in terms of services and facilities. However, the majority of participants were satisfied with the open space that the area provides such as the BMX track and Bircotes play area.

Worksop

- 4.7** Pupils in Worksop agreed that it is an area that could see more growth. However, to accommodate this growth, more services would need to be introduced. It was felt that bus services in the town are also good and operate on a regular basis, which would help to support any growth that would occur.
- 4.8** Pupils highlighted litter as a problem and felt that more waste bins are needed, as there are high volumes of rubbish, particularly by the Canal. There is anti-social behaviour at the park close to Thievesdale Lane, which is a cause for concern as it makes it unsafe for younger people that want to play there.
- 4.9** The pupils also considered the development options and it was clear they thought option 1 was the best option as this allowed for all areas within Bassetlaw to potentially grow in the future and receive the benefits from future development.

Tuxford

- 4.10** The majority of pupils from Tuxford felt that areas of Bassetlaw needed to see more growth and that Tuxford should also see some of this growth. Option 1 is the only option that will see growth for Tuxford so overall this was the favoured option by pupils at Tuxford School. To accommodate growth, Tuxford would need more local services and open spaces, particularly for young people in the area, as these are facilities that have been highlighted as a necessity to the village. Pupils believe that the bus service operates on a regular basis, although there are concerns that the route has not been well planned and would, therefore, require improvements for any future growth.
- 4.11** Overall, the majority of pupils were interested and were keen to participate in the activities and competition. The feedback was very informative and a good indicator as to what the main concerns are for young people in the area. It was clear that pupils thought option 1 was the best option as this allowed for all areas within Bassetlaw to potentially grow in the future, including Tuxford, and receive the benefits from future development.

RESPONSES TO THE ISSUES & OPTIONS DOCUMENT

5.1 Around 1400 comments were submitted in response to the questions set out in the Issues & Options document. All the comments received have been recorded in full in our consultation database and can be viewed in our **Issues & Options Individual Response Record Document, which is available to view on the Council's web pages:**

- **www.bassetlaw.gov.uk**

5.2 A summary, however, is provided below.

VIEWS ON THE OPTIONS

Option 1 - Response Summary

This option proved popular throughout the consultation period. Many people suggested that a hierarchical approach would help to achieve more sustainable development within Bassetlaw and ensure a more even distribution of new development at key centres across the District. **Roughly 58 % of respondents supported this option.**

Option 2 - Response Summary

This was the least favoured option throughout the various consultation events. However, a number of respondents did suggest that it complies with the Regional Spatial Strategy as it focuses development within the two largest settlements in the District. **Roughly 5% of respondents supported this option.**

Option 3 - Response Summary

Option 3 was supported, particularly within more western parts of the District, and feedback suggested support for a greater focus on regenerating former coal mining areas. **Roughly around 37% of all respondents supported this option.**

Summary Of Other Proposals

Many people said that elements of both Option 1 and Option 3 should be brought together to provide the best possible spread of development for the District, and the A1 highlighted for employment development. In addition, many suggested that Worksop, as the principle settlement in Bassetlaw, should be the key focus for new development and elevated above other centres in the settlement hierarchy. Similarly, there was agreement that Retford remains a concern, in terms of the amount of housing and employment growth it could receive, as it was suggested that the town is severely constrained due to issues of landscape sensitivity, flood risk and infrastructure. Nonetheless, others felt that it should have a higher standing than Harworth in the settlement hierarchy, for housing development, in line with the Regional Spatial Strategy.

A number of respondents suggested that Tuxford should have a greater emphasis in Option 1 as it does provide essential services and acts as a major service centre to many surrounding smaller villages. A similar view was expressed about Misterton by some respondents. The reasoning for both was that it was felt that neither settlement was comparable to, say, Hayton or Gringley, with which they were grouped. Some respondents said that both Shireoaks and Rhodesia should be considered separately from Worksop within the proposed hierarchy, even though the Regional Spatial Strategy groups them together.

It was also suggested that the 'other villages' tier was removed from the hierarchy, since in policy terms there will be little difference between how these settlements and open countryside are treated. In addition, some respondents felt that infill development in villages should not just be restricted to Rural Service Centres, as there is the potential for some infilling within smaller villages to meet local housing needs.

Views on the District's Strengths and Weaknesses

It was felt that the Core Strategy's objectives should be centred on the following suggestions about strengths for the District to build on and weaknesses to be addressed:

Strengths

- Good strategic location (in terms of proximity to major urban centres and Robin Hood Airport) and decent accessibility (road and rail)
- Good land availability (brownfield and greenfield)
- Strong network of green infrastructure/attractive countryside
- Good quality local built environment (especially in rural areas)
- Regeneration opportunities in former coalfield areas
- Strong sense of community in local areas

Weaknesses

- Quality of employment and retail offer in main centres (especially Worksop)
- Low skills and education levels in some areas
- Poor quality local estates in parts of Manton and Harworth
- Perception that rural bus services are poor
- failure to exploit potential tourist assets, such as the Chesterfield Canal

Views on possible Objectives for the Core Strategy

- Address coal mining legacy/regeneration opportunities
- Use the RSS Sub-Regional objectives as set out in paragraph 4.3.7 of the Regional Spatial Strategy
- Protection/enhancement of rural services and rural employment opportunities
- Improved design standards
- Regenerate employment base
- Enhanced Green Infrastructure
- Range and quality of housing

- Increase use of renewable energy

VIEWS ON THE THEMES

Affordable Housing

- 5.3** This was one of the main issues raised throughout the consultation process, mainly due to the fact that many feel that rural locations within the District have become unaffordable. There was a general agreement that there should be variable targets for specific areas of the District and not a set target as stated within the current Local Plan, although there was no clear steer about what these should be or what the 'trigger' for on-site affordable housing should be. A number of people also suggested that affordable housing should be located within rural areas as well as the major settlements. This approach could be tackled using local needs assessments. It was also suggested that any split between socially rented and intermediate housing should be addressed on a site-by-site basis.
- 5.4** It was suggested that the split of affordable housing could correlate with the settlement hierarchy, identifying a higher level of provision for the larger settlements and a lower contribution for rural areas.

Older People's Needs - Lifetime Homes

- 5.5** There was little support for requiring Lifetime Homes from developers, although there was greater support for a more flexible approach to retirement 'villages' and sheltered accommodation. Locating older persons homes near to local services such as shops, doctors and public transport connections should be priority.

Accommodation For Gypsies, Travellers And Travelling Showpeople

- 5.6** Beyond encouraging the Council to reference national guidance on criteria for sites, there were few suggestions for new criteria. It was suggested that re-cycling facilities should be made available on new sites. There was little support for locating Gypsy sites within the smaller rural villages and it was felt that they should instead be within or near to the main settlements as issues of local schooling and access to services should be addressed. It was suggested that current sites, such as Daneshill, should be developed further for Gypsy and Travelling communities.

Housing Mix

- 5.7** It was generally agreed that the housing mix of larger development sites should reflect local need and character and this should be a main consideration when evaluating housing applications. It was suggested that larger sites could reflect the population mix set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

Housing Density

- 5.8** There was strong support for a criteria-based policy, rather than a District wide target (notwithstanding the national target of 30 dwellings per hectare), and it was felt that the Council should be prepared to identify areas where a higher, lower or graduated density requirement maybe justified (wherever possible at the site allocations stage). Some respondents suggested that lower densities may be acceptable in locations where the character of the area demands such an approach and also on sites which have physical

constraints which limits where developments can be sited. In addition, targets could be set on a settlement by settlement basis with higher densities being applicable in the settlements towards the top of the proposed settlement hierarchy.

Householder Extensions

- 5.9** It was felt that a criteria-based policy or, at least, treating proposals on case-by-case basis was the most logical approach. There was a strong suggestion towards limiting the amount of backland development within historic areas and conservation areas.

Design

- 5.10** There was strong support for the inclusion of design principles in the Core Strategy, but some respondents felt that these should not be overly prescriptive. There was also support for the use of the Building for Life standard for major developments and some support for the requirement for all new houses to meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3.

Local Services

- 5.11** There was strong support for a policy to protect local services, where a service is a reason for a settlement having a particular role. There was less support for exception sites for local services, other than where clear local support had been achieved.

Climate Change And Energy

- 5.12** There was an agreement that the Council should incorporate methods to combat climate change within the Local Development Framework, as long as they were viable in the context of new development. There was little support for trying to move ahead of the Government's own agenda in relation to zero carbon development. It was suggested that if specific sites were allocated for wind farm developments (there was little support for such a move) they should be away from settlements and sensitive local environments. There was also support for a criteria-based policy for largescale renewable energy developments.

Rural Development

- 5.13** There was support for a criteria-based approach to rural development, so long as any policy was carefully worded, particularly in relation to farm diversification, tourism (namely the Chesterfield Canal) and historic rural buildings. consultation comments did not provide a clear or obvious agreement of how this issue should be tackled. However, a number of issues were raised that included:

Backland And Infill Development

- 5.14** There was strong support for a policy approach that would ensure development is judged on its individual merits in relation to a series of criteria.

Historic Environment

- 5.15** Careful consideration should be taken to preserve the local traditional character of many historic and rural areas. There was support for designating more conservation areas across the District, particularly in areas that are likely to see future housing growth. Many rural communities have stated that recent housing development have not considered local character or design of existing building at the planning stages.

Landscape And Village Character

- 5.16** There was support for policy to address both landscape and village character, possibly as part of a wider suite of policies to manage new development in sensitive areas, although no consensus on the means by which this might be achieved. It was felt that Village Design Statements were useful tools, but needed to go through the proper planning process if they were to carry any weight.

Green Infrastructure

- 5.17** There was strong support for promoting Green Infrastructure, where appropriate and possible, in relation to new developments, provided it was in line with a clear Green Infrastructure Strategy. Similarly, Open Space provision should be addressed in relation to local need, as established through the Council's Open Space and Sports Facilities Studies.

Drainage, Sewerage And Flood Risk

- 5.18** There was support for a flexible approach to new development in flood risk areas, albeit in line with national planning policy, to the extent that if new development incorporates flood mitigation measures then limited development should be allowed within high flood-risk areas. There was also a strong support for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) particularly in large scale developments, and for policies to ensure that new development in areas deemed to suffer from surface water or sewerage problems demonstrates that it will not exacerbate existing problems. There was encouragement for the protection or reinstatement of natural floodplains.

The Re-use Of Previously Developed Land

- 5.19** There was strong support for a criteria-based policy approach. A number of respondents highlighted that a large percentage of previously developed land is located within entirely inappropriate locations across the District. Due to this, previously developed land within or adjoining existing settlements (particularly those in settlements likely to see major growth) should be promoted in advance of other areas. It was also suggested that such a policy should be linked to a policy on backland development and infill development, which should encourage the re-use of redundant buildings.

Protecting Employment Land

- 5.20** Most respondents suggested that a criteria-based policy would be the most appropriate way forward and a number of suggested criteria were proposed.

Worksop And Retford Town Centres

5.21 There was a consensus that there should be changes to the town centre boundaries within both Retford and Worksop, but that there should not be a set figure for the amount of new retail floorspace in these towns. Within Worksop it was suggested that the Chesterfield Canal plays a significant part of the town centre that could be improved to improve the local environment and encourage walking and cycling, and there was support for improvements to the Canch and Priory. Both towns need major improvements to the existing public realm, which would encourage more people into the town centres.

General Retail Issues

5.22 There was a clear agreement that there should be a policy to control shop front design. Restrictions on concentrations of certain types of retail use in certain areas was supported, particularly take-aways in town centres, although there were no suggestions as to how this should be taken forward. There was support for formally designating retail areas in some smaller settlements and developing policy to direct new retail development in these settlements to these areas.

Planning Obligations

5.23 There was an agreement that the list of potential planning obligations was reasonable. Other suggested areas for contributions on were:

- Green Infrastructure
- Waterway enhancement
- Flood Mitigation
- Lifetime Homes
- Public Realm

There was no consensus on whether the Council should pursue the development of a Community Infrastructure Levy, although most respondents felt that a 'wait and see' approach to the Government's proposals in this area was prudent.

COMPLIANCE WITH THE STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT (SCI)

6.1 Legislation is clear that LDF consultation should conform with the proposals sets out in the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). The table below highlights the consultation methods used and how they complied with the SCI.

Engagement Method as stated within the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)	Description	Method of Consultation through Issues & Options Consultation	Conformed with SCI
Public Exhibitions/Community Days	Exhibitions held at Council Offices, town and rural centre locations, public events and supermarkets on policies and planning applications.	A number of consultation events/workshops were set up to run throughout the consultation period.	YES
Distribution of Documents on request	Distribution to consultees that request a document.	A copy of the document was distributed to all statutory consultees and all Parish Councils across the District. Other copies were distributed on request to members of the public and interested organisations.	YES
Use of Media	Press releases (newspapers and radio), parish newsletters, Bassetlaw News.	Press releases were sent to the Worksop Guardian and Retford Times. Bassetlaw News featured an article on the consultation. Also a short interview was conducted with a presenter from Trax FM, the local radio station.	YES
Letters		Letters were sent out to all the Parish Councils, District Councillors, statutory consultees and consultees who have registered with our consultation portal and expressed a preference for communication by letter.	YES
Email		For those who are registered on our consultation portal an automatic email was sent out to inform consultees of the recent	YES

Engagement Method as stated within the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)	Description	Method of Consultation through Issues & Options Consultation	Conformed with SCI
		consultation event and keep them informed of additional information and closing dates.	
Leaflets, Posters and E-Flyers		These were displayed in the Council Offices, Libraries, Village Halls, Community Centres and on town centre notice boards	YES
Newspaper Inserts	Advertisements in the local media	Both the local papers, the Retford Times and Worksop Guardian had a number of articles advertising the events.	YES
Use of the Website	All documents will be available on the Bassetlaw District Council's website.	The Issues & Options document and relevant supporting documents were available from the beginning of the consultation on 14 September 2009.	YES
Use of the online portal		From 14 September 2009, all LDF and supporting documents were made available to view.	YES
Public Meetings/Presentations	Public meetings to be held on request	public consultation events were held across the District.	YES
Planning Aid		Planning Aid supported workshops, including the school consultation events, were held throughout and in advance of the formal consultation process.	YES
Meetings with Individuals/Groups		The Council attended a number of meetings with local Parish Councils.	YES

Table 6.1

CONSULTATION WITH 'HARD TO HEAR' GROUPS

Hard to Hear Group	Engagement Techniques in the SCI	Conformed with SCI
Young People	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worksops held in Colleges and Schools • Attending public meeting and school events • Council's Website • Online Portal • Use of new Technologies 	YES
Elderly Residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings • Attending public meetings • Workshops at community/village halls 	YES
Ethnic Minority Groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing documents in different languages on request • Providing translators at meetings on request • Meeting with representatives 	YES
Travelling Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings • Worksops • Site visits to talk to travelling communities • Liaising with the NAVO Gypsy and Traveller liaison officer 	YES
Small Businesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Meetings • Workshops • Website • Online Portal 	YES
Rural Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public meetings and workshops held in rural areas • Attended Parish Council meetings • Meeting with local interest groups • Liaising with the Council's Rural Officer • Website • Online Portal 	YES
Those with Disabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workshops • Documents produced in Braille, large print and audio on request • Attending public meetings 	YES
People with low Literacy Rates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workshops • Attending public meetings on request • Use of picture boards and plain English 	YES

Table 6.2

NEXT STEPS

- 7.1** All comments submitted to us during the Issues and Options Consultation period have now been uploaded onto our consultation database and summarised in this document. They will be used to inform the next stage of Core Strategy development, which will build on the Issues and Options consultation that took place in September/October 2009. It will summarise the views that were given on a range of issues and set out what we believe to be the best possible planning options available to tackle them. It will set out what we believe to be a reasonable approach to locating development, as well as the policy approaches that will need to be taken if that development is to properly meet the needs of the District. There will be further opportunity for interested parties to comment on this next set of firmed up proposals later in the year.
- 7.2** After this we will pull together, into a single document, all representations submitted and make them available to the public. We will use what you tell us, together with the results of any new research, to produce a final Pre-Publication document. This will be what the Council believes to be a 'sound' final version of the Core Strategy, which we must consult on for six weeks. It will, subsequently, be submitted to the Secretary of State ready for examination in public. The formal timetable for the development of this, and the other planning documents is in our Local Development Scheme, which is on the Planning Policy pages of the Council's website. Clearly, given the uncertainties around numbers of consultation responses and length of public examination, timescales can only be approximate.
- 7.3** For more information on the Local Development Framework, please visit the Council's Planning Policy web pages at:
- www.bassetlaw.gov.uk or telephone 01909 535150.
- 7.4** Alternatively, if you are not registered on our consultation database and would like to be, please register at:
- <http://consult.bassetlaw.gov.uk>

ANNEX A: CONSULTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

Date w/c	Channel	Target audience	Key messages	Deadline	Resp.	Information/ Contact info
W/c 10/08/09	Bassetlaw News	Local residents	Your Council would like you to be involved in shaping your local area.	17/08/09	NP	September edition
W/c 24/08/09	Posters: Council buildings	Local residents	Have your say and get involved in shaping the future of the place where you live.	28/08/09	NC	Bassetlaw District Council
	Libraries	Local residents		28/08/09	NC	Nottinghamshire County Council
	Leisure Centres	Local residents		28/08/09	NC	JT supplied contacts
	Community Centres	Local residents		28/08/09	NC	A1 Housing
	Schools	Local residents		28/08/09	NC	E-shot of flyer to Nottinghamshire County Council
W/c 24/08/09	Parish Council Newsletters	Parish Councils		28/08/09	NC	For specific Parish Council locations for each event: East Markham Harworth / Bircotes Sturton-le-Steeple Worksop Retford

W/c 24/08/09	Top 25 x Local Community and Voluntary Groups	Local community groups			NC	JT supplied contacts to NC
W/c 24/08/09	Members Information Bulletin	Members	Raise awareness of the events that are taking place.	5pm on Friday 28/08/09	JT	The info bulletin will be collated on the 1st September (Monday 31st is Bank Holiday) and will be sent out the same day. A pro-forma needs to be completed.
W/c 24/08/09	BDC Website	Local residents		01/09/09	CR	JT discussed with CR. PDF on homepage linking to the planning page on BDC website.
W/c 31/08/09	Posters: Birdcages	Local residents	Have your say and get involved in shaping the future of the place where you live.	01/09/09	NC	Bassetlaw District Council Denis Scaife 01909 512211 2 – Bridge Street, Worksop There is no deadline. Items can be put in place/removed at will, however you are only expected to remove older/out-of-date adverts.
W/c 31/08/09	Information Boards	Local residents	Have your say and get involved in shaping the future of the place where you live.	01/09/09	NC	Bassetlaw District Council Denis Scaife 01909 512211 Retford: 1 – Kings Park

						<p>1 - Carol Gate/Spar</p> <p>1 - Market Square</p> <p>Worksop:</p> <p>1 -Newgate Street (to right of entrance to car park)</p> <p>1 -Newgate Street East CP - next to P&D machine</p> <p>1 -Town Hal CP - next to the concrete garage structure.</p> <p>1 -Bridge Street - o/s Lion Hotel (double sided)</p> <p>1 - Leadhill CP - next to P&D machine</p> <p>1 -Castle Hill CP</p> <p>1 Bridge Street - next to Trader Clock</p> <p>1 -Bridge Street - o/s M&Co (double sided)</p> <p>1 -Memorial Avenue - at front on the car park (now a 1 - construction site for the CHUB).</p> <p>There is no deadline. However, items can be put in place/removed at will, however you are only expected to remove older/out-of-date posters/signs.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

W/c 31/08/09	Media: Worksop Guardian	Local residents		Press releases: 07/09/09 (for Sat 12 th Sept event + others) 14/09/09 21/09/09 28/09/09 05/10/09	BK	
W/c 31/08/09	Retford Times	Local residents		Press releases: 07/09/09 (for Sat 12 th Sept event + others) 14/09/09 21/09/09 28/09/09 05/10/09	BK	
W/c 31/08/09	BBC Notts Online	Local residents and media		07/09/09	BK	
W/c 31/08/09	Upload news section: Trax FM	Local residents and media		07/09/09	JT/BK	
W/c 31/08/09	'What's on' section: Trax FM	Local residents		07/09/09	JT/BK	
W/c 31/08/09	Community TV Screens	Local residents		07/09/09	JT	Info. Sent to Clare Merrill, Notts CC.

W/c 07/09/09	Internal: X-change Online	Bassetlaw staff	Raising awareness of the events internally.	07/09/09	CR	Communications Team
W/c 07/09/09	Interviews on Trax FM and BBC Nottingham	Local residents		11/09/09	BK	
W/c 07/09/09	Internal: News X-change	Bassetlaw staff	Raising awareness of the events internally.	Mid Sept	JT	Communications Team.

ANNEX B: LIST OF CONSULTEES AND INTEREST GROUPS

Relevant consultation bodies (under part one of the Town and Country Planning Amendments Regulations 2008) and others with whom Bassetlaw District Council will consult during the formulation of Development Plan Documents include:

- Government Office for the East Midlands
- East Midlands Development Agency
- Yorkshire Forward
- Nottinghamshire County Council
- Derbyshire County Council
- Lincolnshire County Council East Midlands Regional Assembly
- Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council
- Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
- Bolsover District Council
- West Lindsey District Council
- Newark and Sherwood District Council
- North Lincolnshire Council
- Mansfield District Council
- All Parish Councils in Bassetlaw
- All Parish Council immediately adjacent to Bassetlaw
- Sheffield City Region
- East Midlands Highways Agency
- Natural England
- Environment Agency
- Nottinghamshire Police
- The Coal Authority
- English Heritage
- The Secretary of State for Transport
- Telecommunications Companies
- Bassetlaw Primary Care Trust
- Electricity Companies
- Gas Companies
- Water and Sewerage Service Providers - Seven Trent Water Company, and Anglian Water

Other Interested Groups

9.1 There are numerous local and national interest groups, which under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 are classified as 'General Consultation Bodies'. These groups will be informed of draft publications and encouraged to meet planning officers to discuss their contents. Their involvement is vital, as they will have an interest in, and useful knowledge of, a variety of local planning related issues. The list below illustrates the types of interest groups with whom the Council will seek to engage.

- Wildlife/Environmental Groups
- Heritage Groups
- Sports Groups
- Development Industry Representatives

- Planning Agents
- Countryside Groups
- MP's and MEP's
- Cycling and Rambling Groups
- Local Area Forums
- Civic Societies
- Local Schools and Colleges
- Local Chambers of Trade
- Archaeology Groups
- Transport Groups
- Historic Groups
- Other Interest Groups
- Groundwork/Regeneration Groups
- Housing Associations
- Local Community Groups

ANNEX C: PARISH COUNCIL FEEDBACK

10.1	Parish Council	Area Covered	Date	Officers Present
	Mattersey	Mattersey & Mattersey Thorpe	7th October 2009	Richard Schofield Joe Davies
	Shireoaks	Shireoaks	13th October 2009	Tom Bannister Tim Dawson
	Gamston	Gamston, West Drayton, Eaton & Rockley	15th October 2009	Richard Schofield Tim Dawson
	Headon cum Upton	Headon cum Upton, Grove & Stokeham	2nd November 2009	Natalie Cockrell Luke Brown
	Harworth Bircotes	Harworth Bircotes	5th November 2009	Richard Schofield Joe Davies
	Everton	Everton & Harwell	5th November 2009	Richard Schofield Tom Bannister
	Blyth	Blyth & Blyth North	9th November 2009	Luke Brown Natalie Cockrell
	East Markham	East Markham	19th November 2009	Joe Davies Luke Brown
	Misterton	Misterton	24th November 2009	Richard Schofield Joe Davies

Table 10.1 Parish Council Meetings

MATTERSEY FEEDBACK

Theme	Issues Raised
Affordable Housing	Mattersey Parish Plan states that there should be no more affordable housing within the parish - there is enough social housing in Mattersey Thorpe.
Settlement Hierarchy	<p>Mattersey and Mattersey Thorpe - linkages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should they be together in the settlement hierarchy? • Communities are very different, but they are under one parish. • Should the two be joined together physically? • Acknowledged that Mattersey Thorpe has no Services and Facilities (S&F) and, therefore, would not be a suitable location for new development • Mattersey and Mattersey Thorpe - development implications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should we allow replacement dwellings in all settlements - adds to the character and the history of the village but can also alter character. • What about previously developed land? • Should Mattersey Thorpe be classed as a settlement in the open countryside - what services and facilities are there? There is a bus service but (some felt) this is very limited and infrequent. (No other S&Fs were identified at the meeting)
Gypsies and Travellers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unauthorised encampments have been a problem in the area in previous years. • Agree that G&T sites should be in sustainable locations, similar to the housing options. • However, if sites are successful in current locations is there then possibility of extending them?
Housing Mix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough executive or large houses in the villages - need them to attract young professionals and families. • Also need smaller houses for starter homes. • Recognise the importance of having a mix of housing.
Housing extensions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have been numerous planning applications on this issue - Parish Council therefore have been involved in looking at the issue in their locality.
Landscape and village character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New development should respect the character of the local area, although this can be problematic as there are diverse house types and styles in the villages. • More detailed information could be contained within a Village Design Statement.
Infill developments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the possible sites in Mattersey have been built on, but this may change if the envelope lines are altered.

Theme	Issues Raised
Previously developed land (PDL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should all PDL be built upon? Dependent upon location. If sites were in employment use they should remain so, where the market supports this, not be lost to housing.
Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Average 30 dwellings per hectare is not really applicable to small schemes in villages. This density if applied to schemes in villages could really destroy the local character.

SHIREOAKS FEEDBACK

Theme	Issues Raised
Housing targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questioned whether we really need so many new homes in Bassetlaw. It was suggested that we should look to fill the empty homes across the District before building new ones. Where do these targets come from? TB explained these are set in the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands. Some concern was expressed over SHLAA sites being based on assumptions of 30 dph and that while this may be appropriate for more urban areas it was not an appropriate assumption for villages.
Density and design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Particular reference was made to the now withdrawn application for Shireoaks Marina, but with emphasis on setting policies that seek to achieve densities appropriate to the setting – not just cramming houses in for the sake of it. Facilities and services need to be incorporated into larger scale housing developments. There is need for better connectivity on foot/non-car transport. Emphasised the need to consider impact of designs in relation to drainage i.e. new development on the flood plain has meant that floodwater now ends up in other parts of the village because of surface runoff.
Open space and recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested that we need policies to specifically design open spaces as integral parts of new developments, not just lump them on the side afterwards. Reference was made to the role they play in giving activities for kids and keeping them off the streets.

Theme	Issues Raised
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was asked if the spoil tip at the colliery/marina site could be protected and how we can make more of the recreational function of the canal - can we have development briefs for sites like that? The spoil tip is now an important recreational facility and important for wildlife – can we get any protection for it?

GAMSTON FEEDBACK

Themes	Issues Raised
Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What provision is being made to alleviate the impact of Bevercotes Colliery redevelopment? Concern about lorries using B-roads around the area and increased traffic due to the workforce moving in and out. RS – much depends on the work to the A1 junction at Elkesley. Is there any scope for extending the Robin Hood Rail Line to Tuxford, to increase connectivity with Mansfield and to link in with potential redevelopment of High Marnham Power Station? The infrastructure is in place it just needs investment. TD – if it was profitable Network rail would probably be doing it already.
Employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some issues raised around development of Markham Moor and the A1 as an employment centre. RS – it will be given some consideration although should not compromise development elsewhere as put forward in the spatial strategy. There has been a lot of housing development around Tuxford, but where are all these people working? Surely the amount of housing creates some kind of threshold to trigger other needs – i.e. employment or rail linkages?
Leisure	If the railway does not re-open can we look at developing a long distance cycle-way or footpath, as in Newark & Sherwood?
SHLAA	Parish Council would like to receive copies of the updated SHLAA annually.

HARWORTH BIRCOTES FEEDBACK

Themes	Issues Raised
Options for growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regeneration is key to Harworth Bircotes' future. Recognise the need to move away from heavy industry (coal mining and manufacturing) towards business, storage and logistics. It is key to have businesses and jobs in and around the town as well as the new housing. Have to have the infrastructure in place to ensure that problems such as sewerage issues are not repeated. Having infrastructure in place is crucial to the town.

Themes	Issues Raised
Older People's Needs - Lifetime Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very important and becoming increasingly so. • Building homes to Lifetime Home standard is a start - need to look at other methods of provision such as retirement villages. This would mean that they could be close to services and facilities within one area.
Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree that sites have to be located in or adjacent to the most sustainable locations such as the towns in the district. • Recognise that there are different types of gypsies and travellers.
Affordable housing and housing mix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognise that the current housing stock in Harworth/Bircotes is heavily weighted to similar types and tenures of houses, and that there is a need to change the profile of the housing stock. • To attract people to the area through new businesses, we need to have good quality and a variety of houses within the settlement. • Agree that there should be a variable affordable housing requirement depending on local need. • Affordable housing should be pepper potted throughout the development - developments that have placed affordable housing in one area have not worked.
Housing density and housing mix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town has seen some three-storey dwellings being completed. • Although there is a recognition of the need for new housing schemes to be built at a minimum density some three-storey houses are not being sold. Are they really needed?
Planning obligations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational and leisure facilities are crucial, especially for young people. Will these be secured through s106 agreements? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Play facilities • Youth area • Droversdale Wood • Community facilities • Existing sites should be protected and if possible improved. • School is essential to the future of the town.

EVERTON FEEDBACK

Themes	Issues Raised
Settlement Hierarchy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

Themes	Issues Raised
	<p>extra essential service and the number of these services can change over time. Even so, happy with the classification of Everton as a Rural Service Centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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? 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.
Local/Community Services and Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Community Services – application for local shop (outside village) 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. Support the idea of allowing exceptions for rural service centres. However, suggest the term 'Community Services' would be a better 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 would not become redundant leading to a subsequent application for conversion to a dwelling.
Rural Employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The number of people working within villages should be considered when planning for the future of the District considering that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Parish Plan shows there are 72 jobs in Everton; In villages like Everton, working patterns may change up to 2026 with significantly more people working from home using high speed broadband to connect to their businesses; 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.

Themes	Issues Raised
The Future of Everton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 ageing 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
Design and impact of new development on character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
Spatial Strategy Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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

Themes	Issues Raised
	<p>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.</p>
Green Issues and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 supporting cycle routes. RS stated this will be considered in the transport issues in the Preferred Options for the Core Strategy.
Lifetime Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 developers to provide these types of homes in larger schemes.
Backland and Infill Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider that backland developments are more intrusive into the character of the village than infill.
Village Character and Village Design Statements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
Retford Town Centre	<p>Weaknesses (page 90) comments on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.

Themes	Issues Raised
Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 developments to deliver a community facility.

HEADON CUM UPTON

Themes	Issues Raised
Settlement Hierarchy	Strong support was for Option 1 - A settlement Hierarchy. It was suggested that a more spatial distribution of housing and employment was preferred.
Affordable Housing	It was agreed that there should be exceptions for affordable housing within rural areas. Many villages have no housing provision for younger families or single persons.
Local Services	There was strong support for the protection of rural services as there has been a large decrease in the provision of rural services within the area. In addition, the parish said it supported the idea of 'exception' sites for community facilities within areas that are not going to see any growth.
Design	Concern over recent infill developments that have not reflected the surrounding character or design of other buildings. Any new development should reflect the design.
Employment	It was agreed that the A1 corridor would be a suitable location to provide some future employment growth. The protection of employment land is important where rural businesses are at risk from housing pressures.
Rural Development	Strong support for exception for tied dwellings related to agricultural businesses.
Renewable Energy	It was suggested that specific sites should be allocated for wind farm developments across the District.

Table 10.7

BLYTH

Themes	Issues Raised
Settlement Hierarchy	Support for Option 3 - Regeneration of the former Coalfield areas of Bassetlaw. The Parish Council did suggest that Blyth and Blyth North should not be considered as separate settlements in the settlement hierarchy.
Affordable housing	There is support for affordable housing within the village, however there was a concern over the design of affordable housing and what impact this could have on the conservation area.
Local Services	There is support for the protection of rural services, particularly public houses and village shops as these help to engage the community. Although the village does have a bus service to and from a number of villages it was not considered a reliable or frequent service.
Design and Historic Environment	It became clear that there is concern over recent housing developments within the village and that these have not reflected the existing design or character of the village. In addition, there is support over the possible extension of the conservation area that covers the central part of the village.
Employment Distribution	It was recognised that both Harworth and the A1 Corridor are good places to locate some future employment growth as regeneration is needed within the former mining areas of the District.
Flood Risk and Drainage	It was noted that during 2007, 6 houses within Blyth did flood and this should be considered when allocating any future growth.
Planning Obligations	The Parish Council suggested that there should be a criteria base for determining the amount of contributions in a Section 106 agreement.

Table 10.8**EAST MARKHAM PARISH/PUBLIC MEETING**

In light of recent concerns with regards to the land identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), the Parish Council held a public meeting (with around 40 members of the public attending).

The SHLAA map identified a number of locations that were made available during the SHLAA 'call for sites' consultation earlier in the year. The local community were under the impression that these were already future housing allocations. During the meeting, a representative from the Planning Policy Team explained the Local Development Framework process and why a SHLAA 'call for sites' consultation was needed. Furthermore, it was stated that this is the first stage in a long process until the Council gets to the site allocations stage—where there will be a formal consultation period.

Themes	Issues Raised
Settlement Hierarchy	Due to the feedback from the recent 'issues and options' consultation, the settlement hierarchy is currently being revised. Many people recommended that the settlement hierarchy should not be solely based on services and facilities alone. Initial feedback suggests that the number of local service centres will be decreased and therefore less settlements will have planned growth (i.e. allocations), including East Markham.
Housing Distribution (and SHLAA)	<p>The Government guidance states that Local Authorities should consult with key stakeholders and due to the known problems other authorities have experienced when taking the document out to public consultation, it was decided that we should only consult the local landowners and interested bodies who submitted sites, for factual errors only. A formal stage of public consultation would come during the site allocations stage later next year, when members of the public would be able to comment on the sites and their relative merits.</p> <p>As SHLAA is a national requirement, the Council has to demonstrate that it has enough land to accommodate the regional housing targets. In order to determine which settlements should see growth, an up-to-date SHLAA is required to demonstrate that there is a deliverable supply of housing land. We are proposing to allocate housing (and other) land, once we have a good indication of how much housing will go across the District, in a Site Allocations DPD.</p>
Village Design Statements	For a village design statement (VDS) to be considered during the planning application process there needs to be an adopted Local Development Plan. Currently, Bassetlaw District Council's Local Plan is only approved and not adopted. However, the Council is keen to work with Parish Councils in developing VDS in accordance with the Local Development Framework.
Brownfield Land	This issue is currently being looked at through the Core Strategy Issues and Options document. However, it is likely that the LPA would prefer to see the previous use of the site re-nstated. For example, it would be preferable to see employment development on the former chicken factory. However, it is recognised that this site is no longer suitable for businesses and industrial use and therefore an alternative use would be sought. [Asked if people were opposed to new housing development on site - answers ranged but general consensus that something needed to be done and provided that the scheme was in keeping with the character of the village and that no further traffic problems were caused, housing would be acceptable].

Table 10.9

**APPENDIX B: CORE STRATEGY PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION
RESPONSE SUMMARY DOCUMENT**

CORE STRATEGY PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION RESPONSE SUMMARY DOCUMENT

INTRODUCTION

This report summarises the responses received, comments made and discussions that were had during the Preferred Options consultation period and gives a brief overview of the range of consultation events that were run. While there is no specific requirement to prepare a statement at this stage of the Core Strategy development, it has nonetheless been prepared in accordance with regulation 30(1) (d) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008, which requires the submission of a DPD to be accompanied by a statement setting out:

- Those bodies consulted;
- How they were consulted;
- A summary of the main issues raised; and
- How representations have been taken into account.

Given the number of written responses received and the breadth of issues covered in the facilitated workshops and public events, this report extracts the key issues, which will guide the drafting of the next version of the Core Strategy prior to its 'Submission' to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

The Preferred Options consultation was the second formal stage of public consultation following on from the 'Issues and Options' consultation in 2009. It was a six-week consultation, which finished on the 2nd July 2010 (although late submissions were accepted and processed), with the consultation document available in hardcopy, to download from the Council's website, or via the Council's consultation portal ([://consult.bassetlaw.gov.uk/portal](http://consult.bassetlaw.gov.uk/portal)). In addition, six public consultation events were held across the District and members of the Planning Policy team attended various Parish Council events and held a number of specific events (e.g. for the development industry) in Worksop Town Hall.

A number of organisations (see Annex B & C for list) were formally notified of the consultation, in line with Regulations. They included:

- Specific Consultation Bodies: Statutory bodies involved in service provision and Government Agencies working on particular issues in or adjoining Bassetlaw District;
- General Consultation Bodies: A wide variety of local, voluntary and community groups.

In addition, all of those individuals and organisations registered on the Council's LDF consultation database were informed of the consultation by email.

The Council advertised the Preferred Options consultation widely. Posters were distributed to all Parish Councils, local libraries, and community halls/centres, the Council offices in both Retford and Worksop and to the various Council Contact Centres around the District. In addition, notices were put in the local papers (the Worksop Guardian and Retford Times). An article was also sent out to local magazines and parish newsletters and placed in the Council's own newsletter that is posted to every house in the District. A radio interview was also undertaken on local radio station Trax FM aimed at further advertising the consultation and the upcoming events. In addition, the Council's web pages were regularly updated with details of the consultation.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION EVENTS

The six public consultation events provided an opportunity for local residents to comment on all aspects of the document, with members of the Planning Policy Team present to answer questions. There were also copies of the Core Strategy Preferred Options Document, Settlement Boundary Maps and the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment available for the public to have a look at or to take away with them. Attendees were able to leave their contact information if they wanted to be kept informed about the further stages of the process (See Annex A for the consultation management plan).

Tuxford

The event was held in the Methodist Church on 12 May and ran from 2-7pm. Key messages were that:

- The majority of people agreed that Tuxford should receive some future growth.
- There was general agreement that Tuxford maintains a 'key' level of services and facilities and provides a role as a service centre to its surrounding communities (although there was some concern over the range of the current services and facilities), but there were some views about limited retail choice and limited parking.
- There was dissatisfaction at the current state of the town centre environment, especially the current state of the Newcastle Arms Hotel. Many people felt that this should be the focus for regeneration for the town in the coming years.
- the proposed housing numbers were about right, although there were issues surrounding mix, type and density. The concern was that a number of large-scale, high-density developments have altered the character of the town and that any future development should conform to the town's existing character.
- There was some concern that Tuxford would not receive allocated employment growth, given that existing sites were fully occupied.
- (Other than the concern raised by individuals that have land outside them) the revised development boundary was generally agreed.

More general concerns about the wider Tuxford area were expressed over:

- the redundant former factory site in East Markham and how this is likely to be developed in the future.
- the loss of public houses in Askham, Darlton and Laneham and the decreasing level of rural services.

Carlton-in-Lindrick/Langold

This event was held in Carlton-in-Lindrick Village Hall on 13 May and ran from 2-7pm. Key messages were that:

- The majority of people agreed that Carlton and Langold should see some future housing growth.

- The former Firbeck Colliery Site should be developed for housing as it has been subject to decay and vandalism for over ten years.
- Any new developments within the villages should provide benefit to local services and Langold Country Park.
- Langold Country Park should be better maintained and its facilities improved.
- There were limited employment opportunities in the immediate area and a perception that public transport served only a limited number of destinations.
- The development boundary revisions to both Carlton-in-Lindrick and Langold, particularly regarding the inclusion of Firbeck Colliery, were right. The development boundary revisions to both Carlton-in-Lindrick and Langold, particularly regarding the inclusion of Firbeck Colliery, were right.
- While the larger Co-op supermarket remained, a few people were concerned about the loss of the smaller Co-op foodstore.

Harworth Bircotes

The event held in the Harworth Methodist Church on 4 June and ran from 2-7pm. Key messages were that:

- The majority of people agreed that Harworth Bircotes should see growth in the future and that the town has the services, facilities and development opportunities available to support the proposed levels of growth.
- The main concern of local residents was the current state of the town centre, in particular Scrooby Road, with a lack of retail choice and parking. The main issue that was raised at this event was the high number of take-aways on Scrooby Road and the general retail offer.
- Housing figures for Harworth were generally supported, although housing tenures, mix and density were reoccurring issues. The main concerns of residents are that there is not enough housing that is affordable for young people and, consequently, people have to move out of the area. One resident expressed a concern over the lack of housing for the elderly.
- It was generally supported that Harworth Bircotes should see more employment growth as the area has seen a decline in employment land due to the closure of the Colliery. There were very mixed views about whether it would be beneficial for the town for the Colliery to re-open.
- There was general agreement that much of the Harworth Colliery site should be redeveloped to increase the quality and types of housing in the town.
- There was general agreement with the revised development boundaries, although some local residents would like to see Droversdale Wood excluded.

Retford

The event was held in Retford Town Hall on 8 June and ran from 2-7pm. Key messages were that:

- That Retford has already seen a large proportion of growth over the past few years, particularly towards the northeast of the town, and that no-more is required. There were suggestions that further employment areas should be

allocated to encourage investment and employment opportunities, although it was recognised that some current allocations have not been taken up.

- There was concern that large housing developments would occur on the former school sites and it was noted that the former King Edward School on London Road was suffering from vandalism and decay.
- There were a number of concerns surrounding the town centre, particularly with a perceived poor retail provision and perceived under usage of the market square's buildings. It was agreed that more should be done to include the Chesterfield Canal and River Idle in any redevelopment plans. There was praise that the Market Square is seeing regeneration, which will encourage investment.
- That there are a number of significant sites that could be redeveloped to enhance the existing town centre. The Chesterfield Canal, Market Square and Wharf Road areas were identified as 'key' sites for regeneration opportunities.

Worksop

The event was held in the BCVS offices on 27 May and ran from 2-7pm. Key messages were that:

- As the largest settlement within the District, Worksop should accommodate the largest percentage of housing growth. A number of participants suggested that future housing growth should be located to the west of the town. It was also suggested that there should be further housing within the town centre to encourage diversity and attract people and investment to the town centre. In addition, it was agreed that Worksop should see further employment designations to encourage further investment and jobs into the town. It was also recommended that the Council do more to encourage small enterprises into live/work units in the town centre.
- There was a concern at the lack of facilities and retail choice within the town centre. It was also recognised that there was a large percentage of vacant retail units, which are discouraging investment into the town. It was suggested that the environment within the town centre is poor and needs investment to reverse the current decline. The markets stalls need to be improved as the majority of these are damaged.
- There was significant scope for regeneration in Worksop. Respondents identified numerous sites that should be taken forward for regeneration purposes. A number of these were within the town centre, along the Chesterfield Canal and Victoria Square/Canal Road areas of the town.

Misterton

The event was held in the Misterton Centre on 2 June and ran from 2-7pm. Key messages were that:

- The majority of people agreed with that Misterton should only see limited housing development in the future. The main concerns of local residents were that any new development that does take place would need to be of a high quality of design. The design of existing housing, particularly the three-storey

development on Fox Covert Lane, was also a main concern for residents. The issue of affordable housing was also raised, as residents would like to see more housing of this type in the area.

- There are concerns regarding the lack of retail offer in Misterton. The main issue that was echoed throughout the event was the concern over the Co-op being the only convenience shop in the area and the fact that it is regarded as being too expensive.
- There was general agreement with the amendments to the development boundaries.
- There was a perception that bus services are poor although they run on an hourly basis.
- The majority of residents also expressed a concern about poor drainage in the village.

OTHER CONSULTATION EVENTS

Community Planning Day: Worksop Town Hall

A community planning event was undertaken in conjunction with the District Council's public open day. The event ran from 11-6pm on 14 July 2010 and was designed to further provide information regarding the Local Development Framework and the recent Preferred Options consultation. Key messages were that:

- Worksop has a large percentage of social housing and that the local housing market has been suffering due to the lack of new market housing within the town. The proposed housing target figure for Worksop was generally supported, but there were concerns over the potential allocation of some sites (most notably Kilton Golf Course).
- The number of empty units the increase in 'low-end' shops were seen as a concern. It was felt that more should be done to protect local businesses and attract more national chain stores (although many recognised that the proximity of Meadowhall made this unlikely).
- A number of people commented favourably on the recent regeneration that is currently underway in the Canch. There was concern over the level of security within the park and some felt that further CCTV is needed.

A further public open day is scheduled for Retford later in the year which Planning Policy will be attending.

Engagement with the Gypsy Liaison Officer

The County's Gypsy Liaison Officer was re-consulted for the Preferred Options Consultation period to allow further input and responded favourably.

Engagement with Bassetlaw Community Voluntary Service (BCVS)

A letter detailing the Preferred Options consultation and explaining the current stages of the Local Development Framework was sent to a wide range of organisations affiliated with the BCVS. Meetings with individual groups were also offered and a consultation event was held in the BCVS offices.

Engagement with the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP)

Planning Policy Officers attended further meetings with the LSP at Board and Executive level, as well as with individual LSP sub-groups and received a favourable response to the Preferred Options. The groups were made aware of the Preferred Options consultation period and urged to comment on the consultation document. The LSP will continue to be a 'key' consultee partner throughout the remaining LDF process.

Engagement with the District's Rural Officer

As Bassetlaw has a large rural community, the Council felt that it was important to continue to liaise with the District's Rural Officer regarding the LDF processes. In addition, the Rural Officer attended a number of our consultation events to assist with any rural development and/or rural issues. These issues included the protection of local services, school provision, community facilities and public transport. Policies seeking to protect and encourage local facilities were strongly supported.

Engagement with the Development Industry/Planning Agents

Planning Officers ran an event specifically for developers and agents on 1 June. Key issues were whether the proposed removal of the RSS would delay progress and where the Council was with its infrastructure work. There was discussion of the site allocation process and a request that, in relation to Harworth specifically, greater flexibility be introduced over when and how greenfield sites might come forward. There was also discussion of rural exception sites and a request that the Energy Opportunities Map be clarified for the Publication Stage.

Engagement with Parish Councils

Planning Policy Officers have attended numerous Parish Council meetings and events from October 2009 and all the way through, and beyond, the Preferred Options consultation in late May 2010. These have been visits to specific Council meetings, village events (in Elkesley and Tuxford), events arranged for groupings of Councils and attendance at the North East Bassetlaw Forum. Brief notes of the formal consultation sessions arranged for Parishes are given below:

Carlton, Langold and Tuxford Parishes (Carlton Village Hall) 24 May

Key areas of discussion included: affordable housing (how it is defined and how it will be addressed in rural areas); infrastructure delivery (are local services full); housing density (too high in some areas); site allocations (how parishes can be involved); and housing numbers (believed to be too high).

Hodsock, Shireoaks, Rhodesia and Harworth (Worksop Town Hall) 25 May

Key areas of discussion included: the methodology for drawing up Development Boundaries; the reason for Shireoaks and Rhodesia being part of Worksop; how the elderly population will be catered for in terms of housing supply; infrastructure delivery (whether local services utilities providers on board; whether local schools are full); whether the Core Strategy will allocate sites for wind farms; whether colliery tips been looked at as possible places for renewable energy production; whether there are likely to be any legislative changes to the planning system that may change the way the LDF is developed; whether the site allocations document will allocate land for Gypsies and Travelling Show people.

Cuckney, North Leverton, North and South Wheatley, Sturton-le-Steeple, Dunham, Rampton, Nether Langwith, Gringley on the Hill, Elkesley, East Markham (Worksop Town Hall) 1 June

Key areas of discussion included: how some Parish Councils can make objective responses when most Councillors have an interest in the outcome of the Core Strategy; affordable housing (how need would be assessed and how it would be delivered in rural areas); whether more can be done to prevent windfarm developments and whether there should be greater clarity over where they can and can't be located; how the new development boundaries have been drawn up; whether the Core Strategy can protect local services (and strong support for it doing so); how derelict and replacement buildings outside development boundaries can be addressed; how new development might impact on flooding and how drainage infrastructure can cope.

Bothamsall, West Stockwith, Gamston, East Drayton, Clayworth, Markham Clinton (Retford Town Hall) 3 June

Key areas of discussion included: whether there was likely to be commercial development at Markham Moor (no support for this); how new development might impact on flooding; how rural affordable housing will be delivered; how rural businesses can expand; whether the Core Strategy will allocate sites for wind farms; whether there are likely to be any legislative changes to the planning system that may change the way the LDF is developed; how Parish Councils can better engaged with the process and make representations on planning applications; how greenfield development in the middle of nowhere would be treated.

Everton, Beckingham and Saundby, Blyth, Mattersey, Ranskill, Walkeringham, Claborough (Beckingham Village Hall) 7 June

Key areas of discussion included: how some Parish Councils can make objective responses when most Councillors have an interest in the outcome of the Core Strategy; whether the Core Strategy can protect local services; affordable housing (how it would be delivered, especially in rural areas, and how it can be prioritised for local people); how the size of new allocations will be determined (housing allocations should only be of a size proportionate to the existing settlement); renewable energy (strong resistance to wind farms); how local services and utilities can cope with new houses (education and drainage were particular issues).

RESPONSES TO THE PREFERRED OPTIONS DOCUMENT

The Preferred Options Consultation document received over 500 comments from 200 respondents. A summary is provided below.

Views on the vision

The majority of people agreed with the vision and we only received a few comments regarding its context. It was suggested, however, that the vision needed to strengthen the service role for Tuxford. In addition, the vision includes climate change and design policy in the same paragraph, which is seen as confusing and suggests they are linked issues.

Views on the Strategic Objectives for Bassetlaw

There was general support for the Strategic Objectives identified within the Consultation Document. It was suggested, however, that a further objective should be included, aimed at safeguarding natural resources from inappropriate development which would reflect the policy in the County's mineral plan. In addition, the restoration of mineral sites should be included in SO8.

A respondent noted that none of the Strategic Objectives references transport and it was suggested that there should be reference to the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment in Objectives 5 and 8.

Views on the Development Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy

There were only a few comments relating to aspects of the development strategy. It was suggested that Dunham was removed from the rural service centre category due to issues of flooding. It was also suggested that Retford and Harworth Bircotes should be combined into a 'town' category within the hierarchy, with Local Service Centres relabelled as Large Villages and the Rural Service Centres as villages and no mention of other villages, resulting in a four-tier hierarchy rather than the six tiers currently proposed.

There were numerous comments regarding the proposed housing numbers in the Core Strategy, although these were concerned with, in many cases very minor, adjustments up or down depending on the settlement(s) in which the respondent had an interest, rather than fundamental concerns about the quantum of housing proposed or the general approach to its distribution.

Views on Core Strategy policies

Views on Policy CS1 Worksop

There was general agreement with this policy, but there were a number of suggested alterations:

- The policy should consider the town centre conservation area and numerous listed buildings when considering future development sites.
- An even greater percentage of new housing development should be directed to Worksop.
- There was concern that the policy fails to provide sufficient clarity over the need (or not) for urban extensions in Worksop.
- It was suggested that the River Ryton should be mentioned within Policy CS1 and the growth of the Priory Centre should be used as a catalyst to spur development along the Canal.
- A few respondents suggested that further clarification is needed on whether the development of a single dwelling would trigger the requirement for a contribution to affordable housing as the phrase 'net addition', may imply application to redevelopment of housing sites only.

Views on Policy CS2 Retford

There was general agreement with this policy, but there were a number of suggested alterations:

- The proposed housing numbers should be more than those for Harworth and redistributed accordingly.
- The proposed percentage of employment land for Retford is too low, particularly given the recent loss of two large employment sites in the town.
- The River Idle and Retford Beck should be included within the policy as they offer positive development opportunities.
- The policy should clarify what the retail centre is for the purposes of national retail policy and the application of the sequential approach to locating retail development.

Views on Policy CS3 Harworth Bircotes

There was general agreement with this policy, notably that the Colliery site was a priority regeneration site and the town a focus for regeneration, but there were a number of suggested alterations:

- There should be greater flexibility about when greenfield housing sites will be released if the Colliery site does not come forward fast enough.
- Some felt the housing percentage was too high based on past completions in the area and should be redistributed across the District.
- Such a large percentage of growth will have an affect on the surrounding landscape of Harworth and care should be taken when allocating development sites.

Views on Policy CS4 Tuxford

There was general agreement with this policy, including support for future growth in Tuxford, but there were a number of issues raised:

- A number of respondents highlighted the need for affordable housing in Tuxford and stated that the current high density housing developments are impacting the existing character of the town.
- It was suggested that Tuxford should see more employment growth, due to its strategic location and the fact that employment sites around the town are full.
- Concern was raised over the quality and choice of retail offer in the town and respondents agree that there are numerous regeneration opportunities.

Views on Policy CS5 Carlton and Langold

There was general agreement with this policy, particularly the explicit support for Firbeck Colliery redevelopment and improvements to Langold Country Park. There was a suggestion that the proposed housing figure for Carlton-in-Lindrick/Langold is too low and that future development should contribute to the improvement of the current poor state of the buildings and public realm in Langold's retail area.

Views on Policy CS6 Misterton

There was strong agreement with this policy from local residents, particularly that Misterton should not see any major growth due to the past rates of development in the village. It was noted, however, that restrictions on release of greenfield sites coming forward should not be tied to delivery in specifically named settlements.

There were a number of comments that raised concern over recent developments in Misterton. It was noted that development has been of poor design and high density that has conflicted with local character. In addition, the substantial new development has been in an area with few employment opportunities. Other issues included the current drainage and flood risk to the settlement and that any further development would need to consider these factors.

Views on Policy CS7 Rural Service Centres

There was general agreement with this policy, including support for some rural development (explicitly from Blyth, East Markham and Everton), notably for affordable housing or to deliver local services and facilities, but there were a number of issues raised:

- It was suggested that Nether Langwith should be elevated to a Local Service Centre due to the settlement's close proximity to Langwith.
- Issues regarding drainage, flood risk and local transport were raised as concerns in relation to a number of potential development villages.

Views on Policy CS8 All Other Settlements

There was general agreement with this policy, including support for the policy's scope to accommodate community facilities, but there were issues raised:

Some respondents felt that there should be scope for some limited growth in other settlements. It was noted that this policy does not provide for any infill development

within the built up areas of these settlements. In addition, local transport issues and the lack of affordable housing have also been highlighted as a concern.

Development Management Policies

While there were different views about the precise content of each policy, no views were expressed to suggest that any of the policies were unnecessary or fundamentally unsound.

Views on Policy DM1 Farm Diversification and Agricultural/Forestry Buildings

There was mixed support for this policy, with one respondent feeling that it should not prevent schemes designed to be larger than the original farming enterprise. industry. The view was also expressed that the, potentially negative, landscape implications of farm diversification should be appreciated.

Views on Policy DM2 Development in the Countryside

It was suggested that this policy should allow for consideration to be given to the wider landscape impacts of development. It was welcomed that this policy emphasises the need to diversify the local economy and there was support for part D of the policy as many rural businesses do require a rural location and this should not be restricted.

Views on Policy DM3 Conversion of Rural Buildings

There were views that a 12-month marketing period for non-domestic rural buildings, before permission for other uses is given, is too long and should be amended.

Views on Policy DM4 Design

There was general agreement that design is an important issue and should be a significant consideration when planning for new developments. Suggested amendments included the need to recognise that a site could be in an area in need of improvement; that Historic Landscape Characterisation should be used within policy in conjunction with the Council's Landscape Character Assessment; that 'major development' needs defining; and that the policy should also set out requirements for major development proposals to be supported by a detailed transport assessment. A number of respondents suggested that a Supplementary Planning Document for design needs to be produced to provide further detail on this issue.

Views on Policy DM5 Housing Mix and Density

The key views on this policy were that the Council needs to be aware that an amendment has been made to paragraph 47 of PPS 3, which has removed the blanket minimum density requirement of 30 dwellings per hectare. There were split views on whether the policy should reference density targets at all, ranging from the recommendation that local character should directly inform the density of any

scheme put forward to ensure it is not out of character with its neighbouring housing areas to the need for a clear statement on expected density levels.

Views on Policy DM6 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People

The only views on this policy were that greater flexibility should be given for traveller sites in Rural Service Centres, in line with the approach taken for housing, and that local landscape and nature conservation designations should not in themselves be used to refuse planning permission for sites. There was also a request for greater flexibility in terms of the wording of where transit sites might be located, with 'ready access' to the strategic road network.

Views on Policy DM7 Protecting Employment Land

This policy was generally supported. The recognition that not all employment sites are likely to be suitable for employment into the future was welcomed. It was suggested that the policy was overly restrictive, however, in relation to PPS4's sequential test and that the policy should be amended to allow the loss of employment land on the basis of absence of need or inappropriateness of allowing a use to continue, or in situations where employment uses are not viable.

Views on Policy DM8 Conservation and Built Heritage

There were no significant issues with this policy. There was a view that heritage issues might be better highlighted in place specific policies and that a more proactive strategy that relates to the wider matters than those addressed in the development management policy would be preferred. In addition, a recommended amendment to this policy is the title, which should be changed, to conform to national policy, to 'conservation and the historic environment'

Views on Policy DM9 Green Infrastructure; Biodiversity; Open Space and Sports Facilities

It was noted that sites such as Clumber Park are important areas in providing green infrastructure and this should be recognised further within the Core Strategy. In addition, the protection of open spaces should be a priority in the Core Strategy, particularly in areas where a large percentage of growth is likely to occur. There was also a recommendation to include biodiversity as a separate issue and not incorporate it into either green infrastructure or open spaces. The Chesterfield Canal should be included as a key link in the regeneration of Worksop and providing new green infrastructure.

Views on Policy DM 10 Renewable Energy

While there was support for the Council's approach in not trying to run in advance of Government policy, this policy received the most negative comments (although most of these were copies of a standard letter). These were more concerned with the specific issue of windfarms than they were with the overall thrust of the policy, with the view that greater specificity about how windfarm applications should be assessed

is required. There were mixed views about whether policy should specifically allocate windfarm sites. In contrast, there was agreement that more should be done to provide renewable energy within the District, particularly from new developments.

Views on Policy DM11 Developer Contributions

There was general agreement with this policy, although it was noted that since the Preferred Options document was released the CIL regulations had come into force and thus the explanatory text was incorrect. It was stated that the Council needed to be cautious in how it seeks such contributions, given the current uncertainty around CIL and that the Council follow this policy up with a Supplementary Planning Document. A further amendment is that public art should be included in the bulleted list of contributions and that transport mitigation measures should be included.

Views on Policy DM12 Flood Risk, Sewerage and Drainage

There was general agreement with this policy, although the view was expressed that development can be successful in flood zones 2, 3a and 3b if designed to overcome a flood threat. There were some views that East Drayton, Eaton, Dunham and Normanton-on-Trent should be included in Part B, as requiring drainage assessments for planning applications.

Views on Policy DM13 Local Parking Standards

It was suggested that this policy should be expanded to address issues of sustainable transport more widely and to provide clear linkages with the Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan.

Further comments

It was requested that the Core Strategy address the ground stability issues that are associated with the District's coal mining legacy and which still affect certain localities.

Settlement Boundary Representations

Submissions made regarding the revised Development Boundaries have not been included within this consultation response document. All respondents have been written to under separate cover explaining the outcome of their submission. If you require any further detail on this matter, please do not hesitate to contact the Planning Policy Team on 01909 535150.

Annex A: Consultation Plan

Date	Event	Time		Parishes invited
12 May	Public	Afternoon	Tuxford Methodist Church	
13 May	Public	Afternoon	Carlton-in-Lindrick Village Hall	
20 May	Members	Evening	Ceres Suite	
24 May	Parish Council	Evening	Carlton-in-Lindrick Village Hall	Carlton-in-Lindrick Langold Misterton and Tuxford
25 May	Parish Council	Evening	Venetian Room	Worksop, Retford, Shireoaks, Rhodesia and Harworth Bircotes
27 May	Public	Afternoon	BCVS Booked	
1 June	Parish Council	Evening	Ceres Suite	Clarborough & Hayton, Cuckney, Dunham, East Markham, Elkesley, Gamston, Nether Langwith, North Leverton, North & South Wheatley, Sturton le Steeple and Rampton
2 June	Public	Afternoon	Misterton Centre	
2 June	Developers	Afternoon	Ceres Suite	
3 June	Parish Council	Evening	Ballroom, Retford Town Hall	All other Settlements
4 June	Public	Afternoon	Harworth Methodist Church	
7 June	Parish Council	Evening	Beckingham Recreation Room	Beckingham, Lound , Blyth, Everton, Gringley on the hill, Mattersey, Misson, Ranskill, Sutton and Walkeringham
8 June	Public	Afternoon	Market Hall, Retford Town Hall	

Annex B: List of Consultees and Interest Groups

Relevant consultation bodies (under part one of the Town and Country Planning Amendments Regulations 2008) and others with whom Bassetlaw District Council will consult during the formulation of Development Plan Documents include:

- Government Office for the East Midlands
- East Midlands Development Agency
- Yorkshire Forward
- Nottinghamshire County Council
- Derbyshire County Council
- Lincolnshire County Council
- East Midlands Regional Assembly
- Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council
- Rotherham Borough Council
- Bolsover District Council
- West Lindsey District Council
- Newark and Sherwood District Council
- North Lincolnshire Council
- Mansfield District Council
- All Parish Councils in Bassetlaw
- Sheffield City Region
- Natural England
- Environment Agency
- Nottinghamshire Police
- English Heritage
- Bassetlaw Primary Care Trust
- Utility Companies

Annex C: Other Interested Groups

There are numerous local and national interest groups, which under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 are classified as 'General Consultation Bodies'. These groups will be informed of draft publications and encouraged to meet planning officers to discuss their contents. Their involvement is vital, as they will have an interest in, and useful knowledge of, a variety of local planning related issues. The list below illustrates the types of interest groups with whom the Council will seek to engage.

- Wildlife/Environmental Groups
- Heritage Groups
- Sports Groups
- Development Industry Representatives
- Planning Agents
- Countryside Groups
- Cycling and Rambling Groups
- Local Area Forums
- Civic Societies
- Local Schools and Colleges
- Local Chambers of Trade
- Archeology Groups
- Transport Groups
- Regeneration Groups
- Housing Associations
- Local Community Groups

APPENDIX C: LIST OF THOSE BODIES AND PERSONS INVITED TO MAKE REPRESENTATIONS

Consultees - Individuals		
Adamson, Mr A	Evans, Mrs June	Ogley, Mr Mike
Allen, Mrs R	Favill, Mr S	Oregan, Mr Steven
Allen, Mr T	Fawcett, Mrs Eve	Palmer, Mr John
Alliyn, Mr D	Fear, Mr Michael	Parker, Mr A
Allwood, Mr Edward	Featherstone, Mr Roy	Parkes, Mrs D
Anderson, Mr John	Febery, Mr	Pasley, Mr A
Anderson, Mr Richard	Ferrar, Mr Lynne	Patchesa, Mr Sam
Anderson, Mrs	Fish, Mrs S E	Payling, Mr Patrica
Anderson, Mrs P	Fisher, Mr A	Peart, Mrs J
Angier, Mr Richard	Fisher, Mr Edward	Peel, Mr Howard
Anthony, Mr J	Fisher, Mr G	Perry, Mr David
Ashton, Mr Stuart	Fishleigh, Mr Mark	Phillips, Mr John
Ashton, Mrs Emma	Flavell, Mr John	Phillipson, Mr A
Aspbury, Mr	Ford, Mr	Pickering, Mr M
Asquith, Mr Peter	Ford, Mr R	Pilkington, Mr T
Atkinson, Mr Tim	Fox, Mr Stuart	Plimmer, Mr Luke
Aukland, Mr W	Fox, Mrs R	Plumb, Mr J
Bacon, Mr Richard	Evans, Mrs June	Pots, Mr Peter
Bailey, Mr John	Frisby, Mr Mark	Pottinger, Mr Martin
Bancroft, Mr J	Fulcher, Mr	Potts, Mr
Bardill, Mr G	Garnett, Mr Tom	Powell, Mrs I
Bardsley, Mr D	Gascoigne, Mr Roger	Presley, Mr
Barker, Mr	George, Mr M	Price, Miss
Barker, Mr D	Gibbs, Mr Mike	Priddle, Mr D
Barker, Mr Martin	Gibson, Mr D	Pots, Mr Peter
Barnacoat, Mr R	Girling, Mr Derek	Pottinger, Mr Martin
Barnett, Mr B	Goacher, Mrs J	Proudley, Mr
Barnett, Mr Roy	Godfrey, Mrs C	Ramsay, Mr P
Barry, Mr Kevin	Goldsmith, Mr	Raven, Mr P
Bartle, Miss C	Goodman, Miss R	Raven, Mrs C
Bartle, Mr D	Goodman, Mr J	Ray, Miss Jenny
Bathgate, Mr	Gould, Mr D	Regan, Mrs P A
Beard, Mr S	Graham, Miss K	Reid, Mr W
Bell, Mr I	Grainger, Mr A	Reilly, Mr James
Bell, Mr Noel	Gray, Mr	Renner, Mrs M
Belshaw, Mrs Wendy	Greaves, Mr R	Richardson, Mr Paul
Bennett, Mr G	Grimes, Mr G	Ridgeway, Mr Linda
Benson, Mr James	Guest, Mr	Ridgway, Mr
Benson, Mrs C	Hall, Mrs Marie	Roberts, Miss C
Bentley, Mrs R	Hamilton, Mr S	Roberts, Mr
Berry, Mr M	Hammond, Mr Douglas	Robinson, Mrs
Bingley, Mrs Pam	Hanbury, Mrs R	Rodgers, Mr Wilfred
Birch, Mr	Hancock, Mr A	Roberts, Mr

Bird, Mrs A	Hardley, Mr J	Roots, Mrs D
Blacknell, Mrs Tracy	Harris, Mr G	Roots, Mrs Emma
Blackwell, Mr J	Harrison, Mr G	Ross-Ellis, Mr David
Blagg, Mr Michael	Hart, Mrs	Rossington, Mr Peter
Blagg, Mr Paul	Hayes, Mr R	Salanyk, Mr M
Blagg, Mr Tim	Haynes, Mrs A	Salmon, Mrs Sue
Bland, Mr G	Hayton, Mr	Sanderson, L W
Bland, Mr Paul	Hearn, Mrs M E	Saunders, Mr D
Blatchford, Mrs R	Hebdon, Mr	Saville, Mr G
Bolton, Mr Ian	Helliwell, Miss Kate	Scarborough, Mr P
Bolton, Mr S	Helliwell, Mr James	Schofield, Mrs
Booth, Mr J	Herbert, Mr Martin	Scholey, Mr S
Booth, Mr Leslie	Hickman, Mr C	Schuller, Mr J
Booth, Mr S	Hill, Mr John	Rossington, Mr Peter
Booth, Mrs C	Hayes, Mr R	Scott, Mr John
Bower, Mrs Joan	Hodson, Mr A	Seaman, Mr John
Bowes, Mr Keith	Hodson, Mrs	Sennett, Mr
Bowls, Mr	Holdstock, Mr D	Sewell, Miss Kate
Bradfield, Mr D	Holland, Mr	Shah, Mr S
Bradshaw, Mr Richard	Holland, Mr John	Sharpe Bevan, Mr P
Bratton, Mrs K	Hollingsworth, Mrs A	Shearing, Mr A
Bray, Mr T	Hopkinson, Mr D	Shed, Mr James
Bray, Mrs	Horton, Mr K	Shepherd, Mr Ryan
Brereton, Mrs Fiona	Houghton, Mr J	Sherwood, Mr L
Brett, Mr E	Howard, Mr	Silkstone, Mr D
Brewer, Mr Roy	Howard, Mr A	Simpson, Mr
Brice-Watts, Mr Paul	Howard, Mr R	Siveter, Mr A
Briggs, Mrs Kate	Howcroft, Mr Graham	Sleigh, Mrs Helen
Brigstocke, Mr	Howitt, Mr	Smith, Mr H R
Brigstocke, Mrs E	Howitt, Mr Paul	Smith, Mr S
Brindle, Mrs Jan	Hudson, Ms Laura	Smith, Mr T D
Broadbent, Mr A	Hurdley, Mr John	Smith, Mr Walter
Brookes, Mr G P	Iggo, Mrs K	Spencer, Mrs
Broome, Mr Stephen	Ingray, Mrs M	Stain, Mr C
Brown, Mr	Inman, Mr	Staines, Mrs J
Brown, Mr James	Isaacs, Mrs Jane	Stanley, DR
Brown, Mr W J	Jack, Mr Paul	Stanley, Mrs E
Brunyee, Mr David	Jackson, Mrs	Steer, Miss A
Bryant Danby, Mr Peter	Jackson, Mrs S	Stevens, Mr C
Bullen, Mr Michael	James, Mr	Stevens, Mrs
Burns, Mr	James, Mr Michael	Stevens, Mrs L
Burton, Mr Phillip	Jedger, Mrs Susan	Stockdale, Mr
Burton, Mr Tom	Jefferies, Mrs E	Summers, Mr I
Burton, Mrs Margret	Johnson, Mrs Jean	Summers, Mrs Sue
Butroid, Mrs Pauline	Jones, Mr Michael	Sutcliffe, Mr R
Buxton, Mr Keith	Jones, Mr Terry	Smith, Mr H R
Cable, Mr Phillip	Jones, Mrs R	Smith, Mr S

Campbell, Mr A	Jedger, Mrs Susan	Smith, Mr T D
Campbell, Mr E	Jubb, Miss Susan	Sutton, Mr John
Campbell, Mr J	Kent, Mr	Taylor, Mr
Carnall, Mr Michael	Kent, Mr Richard	Teasdale, Mr D
Carrington-Wilde, Mr Robin	Kent, Mrs	Telford, Mr C
Carter, B F	Kent, Ms C	Testo, Mr Paul
Cartwright, Mrs Dawn	Kernow, Mrs Kimberley	Thomas, Mr
Cassidy, Mrs	Kershaw, Mrs	Thompson, Mr
Casson, Mr David	Keyworth, Mr C	Thompson, Mr R
Choppin, Mr Harvey	Kilner, Mr D	Thorley, Mr D
Clark, Mr	Kingdom, Mr S	Tinsley, Mr
Clark, Mr M	Kisby, Mr Stephen	Tomlinson, Mrs
Clark, Mrs M E	Krystna, Mrs Martin	Tomlinson, Mrs C
Clarke, Mr Steven	Lacey, Mr John	Tonge, Miss Helen
Clarke, Mrs C	Lacy-Jones, Mr Susan	Tonge, Mr Jason
Clarkstone, Mr	Laing, Mr A	Trafford, Mrs
Clay, Mr	Lamb, Mr Peter	Travis, Mr Edward
Clegg, Mr Roy	Lane, Mr	Troop, Mrs Danielle
Clelland, Mrs Muriel	Lee, Mr M	Tully, Mr Keith
Cobb, Mr	Leronimo, Mrs	Turner, Mrs kate
Cody, Mr Paul	Lewis, Mr Justin	Tye, Mr D
Coe, Mr Geoff	Lindsey, Mr	Valentine, Mr
Colver, Miss D	Littlewood, Mr A W	Valentine, Mr Ken
Colver, Mr Jim	Lord, Mr Ian	Wagstaff, Mrs S
Commons, Mr Jack	Lovatt, Mr A	Waite, Mr G
Conroy, Mr Mark	Lucas, Mr Sophie	Walker, Mr
Cook, Mrs Pamela	Lyus, Mr	Walker, Mr Lewis
Cookson, Mrs J	Lyus, Mrs A	Walker, Mr Richard
Cooper, Mr Jason	Lord, Mr Ian	Wallace, Mr
Cooper, Mr Linda	Lovatt, Mr A	Wallace, Mr A
Copcutt, Mr M	Machin, Mr George	Walter, Mr
Cowan, Mr David	Mackeown, Miss S	Ward, Mrs
Cowan, Mrs Zoe	Mackeown, Mr H	Warren, Mrs A
Cox, Mr Richard	Maclagan, Mr George	Waterhouse, Mr Ros
Crank, Mr T	Mallaburn, Mr A	Watkins, Mr
Croft, Mr Trevor	Martin, Mr Patrica	Watson, Mr David
Crookes, Mr John	Mason, Mr	Webster, Mr Stephen
CS Wright	Mason, Mrs	Wheatcroft, Mr A
Cubbin, Mr John	Matthews, Mr G	Wheeler, Mr
Cullen, Mr	Mazzega, Mrs Emma	White, Mr John
Dallman, Mrs Tracy	McDonald, Mr K	White, Mr Stan
Davey, Mr Terry	Mcgarry, Mrs Jackie	Whitehead, Mr Max
Davies, Mr Stephen	McLeod, Mr S	Whitfield, Mrs
Davies, Mr E	Mellors, Mr Peter	Wilkinson, Mr
De Bel, Mrs B	Miles, Mr G A	Wilkinson, Mrs J
Deaker, Mr D	Miles, Mr Jack	Willcox, Mr
Denny, Mr	Milner, Mr John	Wallace, Mr

Dockerty, Miss	Moiz, Mr Khanbhai	Williams, Mr Michael
Dockerty, Mr	Moody, Mr WH	Willows, Mr Ian
Donald, Mrs E	Moore, Mr	Wilson, Mr Terrance
Douglas, Mr G	Moore, Mr David	Wilson, Mrs B
Douglas, Mr John	Moore, Mr J	Wilson, Mrs J
Drever, L W	Moore, Mrs Linda	Wiltshire, Mrs
Drudy, Mr John	Moore, Mr William	Winslow, Mr James
Duddles, Mrs	Moralee, Mr S	Wood, Mr Mark
Dunmore, Mr Terrance	Morgan-Smith, Mr Jonathon	Wood, Mrs
Dunn, Mr John	Murray, Mr Ross	Woodcock, Mr Stephen
Dunphy, Mr	Myers, Mrs	Woodhead, Mr
Edmunds, Mr D	Naish, Mr James	Woods, Mr Patrick
Edwards, Mr A	Naish, Mr R	Wormald, Mr A
Edwards, Mr Richard	Naylor, Mr G	Wright, Mr Peter
Edwards, Mr William	Nettleton, Mr Peter	Wright, Mrs C
Elliott, Mr D	Newby, Mr Paul	Young, Mr
Elliott, Mrs S	Newby, Mrs J	Young, Mr Geoff
Elsy, Mrs A	Noble, Mr	Zaccaria, Mr D
Evans, Mr E	Oates, Mr Howard	Zejma, Mr H

Consultees - Organisations
20 Society
AB UK
Acis group
ADS (Scunthorpe) Ltd
Aldergate Property Group
Allan Joy Architects
Alliance Environment & Planning Ltd
Ancient Monuments Society
Andrew Martin Associates (on behalf of Dooba Developments)
Andrew Martin Associates (on behalf of Andrew Grainger)
Andrew Martin Associates (on behalf of H E Brinkley)
Anglian Water
Anston Parish Council
Antony Aspbury Associates (on behalf of the Hospital of the Holy Trinity)
Antony Aspbury Associates (on behalf of Strawsons Property)
Appletree Homes Ltd
Austerfield Parish Council
B & L M Kent & Sons
Babworth Parish Council
Barnby Moor Parish Council
Barratt Homes, Sheffield
Barton Wilmore Ltd (on behalf of Howard and Sons)
Barton Wilmore Ltd (on behalf of Barratt and David Wilson Homes)
Basilton Properties Ltd
Bassetlaw Community and Voluntary Service
Bassetlaw District Council

Bassetlaw Play Forum
Bassetlaw Primary Care Trust
Bassetlaw Local Strategic Partnership
Bawtry Town Council
Beckingham-cum-Saundby Parish Council
Bedford Stainless Engineering
Ben Bailey Homes
Blaxton Parish Council
Blyth Parish Council
Bolsover District Council
Bothamsall Parish Council
Bramall Construction
Brampton Parish Meeting
Brimble, Lea and Partners
British Waterways
Broadleigh Associates Limited
BSP Consulting
Campaign for Real Ale Ltd
Campaign to Protect Rural England
Carlton In Lindrick Parish Council
Carr Family Properties
CGMS Consulting (on behalf of Hall Farm Yard, Everton)
CGMS Consulting (on behalf of Croft Way, Everton)
CGMS Consulting (on behalf of Fairy Grove Nursery)
Charm Windows
Chesterfield Canal Partnership
Civic Trust
CJ Hemsall & Sons Limited
Clarborough and Welham Parish Council
Clayworth Parish Council
JH Walter Chartered Surveyors
Clinton and Cuckney Parish Council
Coal Authority
Consort Homes
CPS Leisure Limited
David Smith Planning
David Wilson Homes
Derbyshire County Council
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group
Derbyshire Police Authority
Derek Kitson Architectural Technologist Ltd
Dinnington St Johns Town Council
DLP Planning (on behalf of Richard Walker)
DLP Planning (on behalf of Keith Tully)
Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council
DPDS Consulting Group
DPP Planning

Drivers Jonas
Dunham-on-Trent with Ragnall, Fledborough and Darlton Parish Council
E Blagg (and sons)
E.ON Central Networks
East Drayton Parish Council
East Markham Parish Council
East Midlands Airport
East Midlands Councils
East Midlands Development Agency
East Midlands Electricity
East Stockwith Parish Council
Egmanton Parish Council
Elite Homes
Elkesley Parish Council
Elmton with Creswell Parish Council
English Heritage
English Nature
Environment Agency
Everton Parish Council
Fenton Parish Council
Finningley Parish Council
Firbeck Parish Council
First City
Firstplan
Fisher German
Focus on Young People in Bassetlaw
Forestry Commission East Midlands
Framework Housing Association
Framptons (on behalf of Welbeck Estates)
Fusion Online Ltd
F Walter & Sons Ltd
Gainsborough Town Council
G Howcroft and Sons
Gamston, Rampton, West Drayton and Eaton Parish Council
Garden History Society
Gateford Residents Association
Georgian Group
Girton and Meering Parish Council
Gladman Developments Ltd
Government Office East Midlands
Gran-Ville Homes Ltd
Gringley-on-the Hill Parish Council,
GVA Grimley
H. J. Helliwell & Sons
Hallam Land Management Ltd
Hammans Associates Limited
Harris Lamb Property Consultancy (on behalf of Bridge Properties)

Harworth/Bircotes Parish Council
Haxey Parish Council
Hayton Parish Council
Headon-cum-Upton, Grove and Stokeham Parish Council
Heaton Planning (on behalf of Lafarge Aggregates)
Highways Agency
Health and Safety Executive
Hodsock Parish Council
Holbeck and Welbeck Parish Council
Home Builders Federation
Hospital Of The Holy And Undivided Trinity
Humberside Police Authority
Ian Baseley Associates (on behalf of Mr J and M Pepper)
Ian Baseley Associates (on behalf of Mr M Pickering)
Indigo Planning (on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarkets)
Indigo Planning (on behalf of Amber Real Estate)
iPlan Solutions (on behalf of Messers Machin)
Jackson Design Associates Ltd
JJ & AK Jackson (Builders) Ltd
John Martin & Associates
J. Norman & Son
JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd (on behalf of Foljambe Trustees and Osberton Estates)
Kettlethorpe and Laugherton Parish Council
Kier Homes
Kilton Golf Club
King Edward VI School
Kirton Parish Council
King Sturge
Knaith Parish Council
Knight Frank
Lambert Smith Hampton
Lands Improvement
Laneham Parish Council
Langtree Group Plc
Lawn Tennis Association
Lea Parish Council
Letwell Parish Council
Lincolnshire County Council
Lincolnshire Police Authority
Lound Parish Council
Loveden Estates Ltd
Magnus Educational Foundation
Maltby Town Council
Mansfield District Council
Manton Community Alliance
Martin Hubbard Associates

Marton and Gate Burton Parish Council
Mattersey Parish Council
McInerney Homes Yorkshire
Merry Vale Developments
Miller Homes Ltd
Miller Strategic Land
Ministry of Justice
Misson Parish Council Misson Parish Council
Misterton Parish Council
Mobilshop.com Limited
Morton Parish Council
National Farmers Union
National Grid
National Trust
Natural England
Nether Langwith Parish Council
Network Rail
Newark and Sherwood District Council
Newbould & Thorp Ltd
Newton on Trent Parish Council
Normanton-on-Trent with Marnham Parish Council
North Clifton Parish Council
North & South Wheatley Parish Council
North Leverton Parish Council
North Lincolnshire Council
Nottinghamshire County Council
Nottinghamshire Local History Association
Nottinghamshire Police Authority
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust
Oakbourne Investments Ltd
Ollerton and Boughton Town Council
Omnivale Limited
Owston Ferry Parish Council
Peacock and Smith
Peel Airports Limited
Pegasus Planning Group (on behalf of Adrian Goose)
Pentland Planning (on behalf of Stamford Homes)
Peppers Warehousing
Perlethorpe-cum-Budby Parish Council
Persimmon Homes
Peveril Homes Ltd
Play England
Play Nottinghamshire
Portland High School
Quantum Constructions Services Limited
R Troop & Son
Ranskill Parish Council

Regency Building & Tiling Services
Retford Civic Society
Retford Golf Club
Retford Oaks Comprehensive School
Rhodesia Parish Council
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Rotherham Sand and Gravel Co. Ltd
Savills (on behalf of Fenton and Bromley Developments)
Savills (on behalf of John Turner)
Savills (on behalf of Mrs E Neave)
Savills (on behalf of Messers Machin)
Scrooby Parish Council
Scarcliffe Parish Council
Sennett Brown Limited
Severn Trent Water
Sheffield City Region
Shireoaks Parish Council
Showmen's Guild of Great Britain
Shuldhams Calverley
Signet Planning Ltd
South Clifton Parish Council
South Leverton Parish Council
South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive
South Yorkshire Police Authority
SPAB Ltd
Spawforths (on behalf of Harworth Estates)
Spawforths (on behalf of Langtree Group)
Sport England
SSR Planning (on behalf of Land Improvement Holdings)
Stamford Homes
Sturton le Steeple Parish Council
Styrrup-with-Oldcotes Parish Council
Supporting People
Sure Start Childrens Centres
Sutton Parish Council
T Waterhouse and Sons
Tarmac Ltd
Taylor Trustees
Thorpe Salvin Parish Council
Tickhill Parish Council
Torksey Parish Council
Torworth Parish Council
Transco Utility
Treswell with Cottam Parish Council
Trustee Water Lane Allotments
Trustees of Foljambe Estates
Trustees of Judy Walker

Turley Associates
Tuxford Comprehensive School
Tuxford Town Council
UK Coal Mining Ltd
Valley Comprehensive School
Victorian Society
Walkeringham Parish Council
Walesby Parish Council
Walter and Sons Ltd
Warsop Parish Council
Welbeck Estates Company Ltd
Weston Parish Council
West Lindsey District Council
West Stockwith Parish Council
Westdale Services Limited
WH Bett & Sons
Wheatley Energy Forum
Whitwell Parish Council
William Davis Limited
Wm Morrison Supermarkets plc
Woodsetts Parish Council
Worksop Golf Club
Wroot Parish Council
Wynbrook Homes Limited
Yorkshire Forward
Yorkshire Water

APPENDIX D: LIST OF ADDITIONAL BODIES CONSULTED IN RELATION TO INFRASTRUCTURE PROVISION

A1 Housing
Barnsley Premier Leisure
British Telecom
Doncaster and Bassetlaw Hospital NHS FT
East Midlands Ambulance Service
EDF Energy
North Notts College
Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue
Notts Association of Local Councils
Retford Action Centre
River Idle Internal Drainage Board
Stagecoach